



Parliamentary Debates

(HANSARD)

FORTIETH PARLIAMENT
FIRST SESSION
2019

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 27 August 2019

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, 27 August 2019

THE SPEAKER (Mr P.B. Watson) took the chair at 2.00 pm, acknowledged country and read prayers.

VISITORS — BRUNSWICK JUNCTION PRIMARY SCHOOL

Statement by Speaker

THE SPEAKER (Mr P.B. Watson) [2.01 pm]: I acknowledge Brunswick Junction Primary School in the Speaker's gallery today, on behalf of the member for Murray–Wellington.

PRISON SERVICES PROJECT

Statement by Minister for Corrective Services

MR F.M. LOGAN (Cockburn — Minister for Corrective Services) [2.02 pm]: I rise to inform the house of the unprecedented reform of Western Australia's corrective services. The prison services project is based on three pillars of reform that aim to not only transform our existing custodial estate, but also maximise rehabilitative outcomes for offenders. This reform complements this government's Our Priorities targets, particularly to reduce Aboriginal overrepresentation in the prison system as well as the Department of Justice's priorities on rehabilitation, security and safety.

The first pillar of reform is to examine the role and function of each prison and how they interrelate across the prison network, including the delivery of services. This will ensure that the estate caters to the needs of specific prisoner cohorts more efficiently without the duplication of services, and provides a stable environment for prisoner rehabilitation, education and employment. Secondly, the review will examine how each prison functions within the prison network and the assessment of resourcing requirements of each prison, with a primary focus on the individual operational requirements, location and size. The third area of reform is within prison operational settings. The department is currently reviewing the custodial operational policies and procedures that will establish clear, simplified, consistent and operational instruments ensuring correctional officers know what is required of them. Once this is complete, the department will identify, consider and recommend options for operational change to complement both the network of the estate and the service delivery of each prison. This reform will ensure that the Department of Justice will be in a better position to deliver long-term sustainability to the estate, ensuring that our prisons remain stable, secure and prepared to manage a vast range of complex offenders within the WA prison system.

LEGAL AID WA — VIRTUAL OFFICES

Statement by Attorney General

MR J.R. QUIGLEY (Butler — Attorney General) [2.04 pm]: In a Western Australian first, Legal Aid WA has taken the law to hard-to-reach people by using new technology. In June 2019, Legal Aid WA set up a network of virtual offices around the state. On 3 July 2019, I had the pleasure of launching this initiative. This new network is in addition to the existing services being delivered by community legal centres across the state. These centres often interact with people at their most vulnerable and continue to meet and overcome barriers for those in need through multidisciplinary advice and advocacy. Working with partner organisations, Legal Aid WA has opened virtual offices in Armadale, Joondalup, Mandurah, Midland, Esperance, Fitzroy Crossing, Karratha, and Leonora. Two other virtual offices at Halls Creek and Meekatharra are in the process of being established.

The virtual offices involve the installation of a large screen and camera unit in community centres around Western Australia operating in partnership with the centres and allowing people to make appointments. The offices connect a Legal Aid lawyer to clients who require advice, providing valuable face-to-face contact for those who face barriers of remoteness, mobility, disability or safety concerns. These virtual offices are all in locations where Legal Aid WA does not have a physical office and are in addition to existing community legal centres. Regionally, the offices are targeting some of the most remote locations in the state and allow people in those locations to meet face-to-face with a Legal Aid lawyer. These offices have been set up in partnership with local community agencies and allow people to make an appointment alongside existing services such as information, advocacy, counselling, support and referral.

Legal Aid WA recognises how important it is to gain trust and build rapport with a vulnerable client base. The large screens provide as close to an in-person experience as technology can offer and provides a much more connected experience than a telephone conversation. At the launch event, I heard feedback directly from the virtual legal offices at Mandurah and Esperance. Both host agencies at those locations reported on the positive difference that this new service is providing to their communities. I commend Legal Aid WA, led by Dr Graham Hill, for this initiative that has brought its services closer to these communities, and the work being done by community legal centres to provide advice and assistance across Western Australia.

FUTURE BATTERY INDUSTRY STRATEGY

Statement by Minister for Energy

MR W.J. JOHNSTON (Cannington — Minister for Energy) [2.07 pm]: It is with great pleasure that I stand today to deliver an update on the progress of the state's future battery industry strategy. Since the launch of the strategy on 31 January, the government has been focused on achieving economic growth, diversification and job creation in the state's burgeoning future battery industry. The government has been liaising closely with industry and research organisations to deliver tangible outcomes across the strategy's action themes of investment attraction, project facilitation, research and technology sector development, and adoption of battery technologies. Highlighting the state's comparative advantages is paramount to the strategy's success. To this end, the government has been facilitating in-bound and out-bound delegations to actively promote investment in the state's future battery industry; producing market-specific investment attraction strategies for priority markets including Europe, the United States, East Asia, China and India; and engaging with industry representatives in mining, downstream processing, chemical manufacturing, construction, energy and the unions to ensure the strategy responds to industry needs both locally and overseas.

The government has also been actively supporting local industry by funding 13 battery minerals explorers through round 19 of the state's exploration incentive scheme; releasing a future battery industry round of the local capability fund to provide small to medium-sized businesses with the opportunity to participate as suppliers of products and services related to downstream activities in the lithium-ion battery industry; developing a funding assistance register to make it easier for battery industry proponents to access state and commonwealth funding assistance; and, facilitating new entrants establishing diverse downstream processing projects involving graphite and high purity alumina within the state's strategic industrial areas.

The state government, through the Minerals Research Institute of Western Australia, is also channelling its strong commitment to research and technology sector development by contributing \$6 million to the Future Battery Industries Cooperative Research Centre and through membership on the International Energy Agency's Critical Raw Materials for Electric Vehicles program. The state government is also leading by example on the uptake of battery technologies through the installation of energy storage systems, including standalone power systems and micro-grids, particularly in the regions. Major achievements through the implementation of the future battery industry strategy are paving the way for more investment and greater participation in downstream, value-add activities such as manufacturing of cathode active materials or battery components.

MAY HOLMAN BUILDING

Statement by Minister for Women's Interests

MS S.F. MCGURK (Fremantle — Minister for Women's Interests) [2.09 pm]: I rise to inform the house that the McGowan government will rename 189 Royal Street, East Perth, the May Holman Building. This fulfils our election commitment that a WA Labor government would name a significant Western Australian building after its first woman Labor member of Parliament, May Holman. Elected in 1925, she became the first woman in Australia to represent the Labor Party in a Parliament. She was also the first woman in Australia to serve 10 years in Parliament. May was a woman of many talents. She was a professional singer, pianist and performer who seriously considered a career on the stage before she decided to enter politics. She was a trailblazing politician, who is widely credited with introducing some of the first pieces of worker health and safety legislation anywhere in the world.

During her time in Parliament, she was a strong advocate for her electorate of Forrest in the state's south west, and for the protection of women and children. Tragically, she was killed in a car accident the day after she won her fifth term as the member for Forrest. She stayed alive until the following Monday, when she was told that she had been re-elected—two hours before she passed away. Among Ms Holman's many admirers was former Prime Minister John Curtin, who was a pallbearer at her funeral and who once said of his WA party colleague, "I can only say her life was magnificent." One can only imagine what further legacies May would have gone on to leave our state.

The building previously named the May Holman Centre at 32 St Georges Terrace, Perth was renamed Golden Square in 2015. The co-location of the Department of Communities and the Department of Health at 189 Royal Street, East Perth, presented an opportunity to ensure the public recognition of May Holman's contribution to Western Australian society is preserved. Elected at just 31 years of age—a significant achievement even now, almost a century later—I am proud that Ms Holman's significant contributions to WA will not be forgotten.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

WESTPORT TASKFORCE — ROE 8 AND 9

655. Mrs L.M. HARVEY to the Premier:

Before I ask my question, I acknowledge on behalf of the member for Cottesloe, the students and teachers from John XXIII College in the public gallery. Also, as an old girl of Mercedes, I acknowledge the politics and —

Mr M.P. Murray: You got the "old girl" right!

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Steady on!

Several members interjected.

Withdrawal of Remark

The SPEAKER: Member, you have more respect, and I ask you to withdraw that, please.

Mr M.P. MURRAY: Touché. I withdraw. Remember the one before?

The SPEAKER: When you withdraw, you do it properly. I call you to order for the first time.

Questions without Notice Resumed

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I acknowledge, as a former student of Mercedes College, the politics and law students and their teachers in the public gallery, who might be interested to know that the Minister for Police, the member for Midland, is also a graduate of Mercedes College —

The SPEAKER: And the member for Maylands.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: And the member for Maylands.

I refer to the internal chaos and division within WA Labor. Will the Premier now direct the Westport Taskforce to give proper consideration to the Roe 8 and 9 option as a simple commonsense contingency in the best interests of Western Australia?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

Prior to answering the question, I also acknowledge the students in the gallery today, in particular the students from Kingsway Christian College in the member for Girrawheen's electorate. I saw some boys and girls from Brunswick Junction Primary School down the back; I would like to acknowledge them. It is a privilege to be in the Speaker's gallery. To the students from John XXIII College and Mercedes College, on behalf of the government, I welcome you all to Parliament and I hope you enjoy your visit here.

The Westport Taskforce is undertaking its role very seriously. The government has delivered on what it said it would do prior to the election—that is, to come up with a long-term plan for freight and trade for Western Australia. The task force has come up with five final options, which are under consideration. It will bring down its final report later this year and, obviously, the government will consider those matters at that point. Part of the task force publication that was handed down the other week analysed the issues surrounding the Roe 8 and 9 corridor. I want to quote a report in the *Westport Beacon* —

In Westport's view, due to the cumulative impact of major social and economic impediments, Fremantle would have rated poorly in the multi-criteria analysis on the long-list of options, even if Roe 8/9 were included in the supply chain designs.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members on my left!

Mr M. McGOWAN: It continues —

As such, **Fremantle ... would not have made the shortlist of options, even with Roe 8/9 considered.**

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members. You asked a question; listen to the answer.

Mr M. McGOWAN: It continues —

Through the MCA process, the Fremantle options were compared against Kwinana options that offered far superior outcomes in relation to the key assessment criteria:

- Kwinana offers better road and rail corridors for freight;
- Kwinana is a safer option for road users, as it will provide better separation between heavy freight vehicles and passenger vehicles;
- Kwinana will improve social outcomes for the community by moving freight out of urban areas;
- Kwinana offers better options for scalability and future-proofing; and
- Kwinana has more scope for industrial and economic development.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members, you asked a question. You might not like the answer but you are getting it. Member for Carine, I call you to order for the first time.

Mr M. McGOWAN: It continues —

Further to this, Roe 8/9 is a more expensive and environmentally-impactful road corridor than the Leach Highway upgrade option that was used in the multi-criteria analysis. Additionally, the \$2.3 billion of uncommitted, unfunded road projects listed on page 4 would still need to be built in addition to Roe 8/9. To that end, including Roe 8/9 in the technical studies may have potentially caused the Fremantle options to score even lower in the MCA.

If members read the analysis done by the Westport Taskforce, they will find the answer that they are looking for.

WESTPORT TASKFORCE — ROE 8 AND 9

656. Mrs L.M. HARVEY to the Premier:

I have a supplementary question. Will the Premier now confirm that building the automated outer harbour is more about undermining Progressive Labor's port workers and factional base than it is about the best interests of Western Australia?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

That is a bizarre question. Clearly, the government wants to promote freight and trade, and jobs in Western Australia. If the Liberal Party wants to run the Maritime Union of Australia's arguments, go for it.

METRONET — RAILCARS

657. Mr T.J. HEALY to the Premier:

I refer to the McGowan Labor government's commitment to creating more local manufacturing jobs through its commitment to building the railcars needed for Metronet here in Western Australia. Can the Premier update the house on what the announcement of the preferred proponent for the new C-series railcars will mean for this government's commitment to bring local railcar manufacturing back to WA?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

I thank the member for Southern River for the question.

It is true that this government supports local manufacturing. Prior to the state election, we said that we would bring railcar manufacturing back to Western Australia and that is exactly what we are doing. We believe that Western Australians have the skills and expertise to build railcars. Obviously, our expression of confidence in local manufacturing is shown by the Matagarup Bridge being built in Western Australia, as opposed to sitting in some obscure fabrication yard on some island in Malaysia. That shows that for manufacturing, we put our money where our mouth is.

Mrs A.K. Hayden interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Darling Range, I call you to order for the first time.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Our railcar manufacturing strategy is another example of that and will be huge step forward to deliver local jobs. As part of this contract, 246 new C series railcars will be delivered. This will be the biggest order of railcars in the state's history and at least 50 per cent of this work will be done locally, as we committed to at the election. So members understand what the situation was before this decision under the last government —

The SPEAKER: Member for Churchlands, I call you to order. You have said it three times and no-one has laughed.

Mr M. McGOWAN: — I indicate that two per cent of the manufacturing was done in Western Australia. It is a 25 times, or 2 500 per cent, increase in the local manufacturing of railcars under this government. Of course, we will replace the A series as part of this—the old red and white railcars—and also provide the railcars for the new Metronet lines. A plant will be built at Bellevue near Midland for the project. Construction of the plant is expected to get underway next year and will be finished in 2021. This will create new construction jobs, and work on a new railcar depot and diesel facility will continue until 2023.

This shows that this government has confidence in the Western Australian workforce, Western Australian skills and Western Australian industry to build the railcars here. It follows on from the Liberal Party closing the Midland workshops 25 or 30 years ago.

Mrs A.K. Hayden interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Darling Range, I call you to order for the second time.

Mr M. McGOWAN: The reinstatement of manufacturing here is cost effective, will provide a high-quality product, employ Western Australians and make sure there is a rebirth of Western Australian manufacturing, which was killed by the Liberal Party when in office.

AMBULANCE RAMPING

658. Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP to the Premier:

Does the Premier acknowledge that while his government was consumed with bitter infighting at his party's state conference over the weekend, Western Australians were stuck in ambulances ramped outside hospitals in record numbers?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

As members know, over the course of this year there have been issues, particularly with the flu season, that caused huge disruption to the health system, but that was obviously outside the control of the government. I acknowledge the excellent work of our health system and the people who work in it in managing that. There is continuing pressure on our emergency departments as the number of people seeking assistance continues to climb year on

year. The Minister for Health and I launched the government's urgent care clinic program a couple of weeks ago. An urgent care clinic will be established at Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital to take the pressure off the busy emergency department there and allow for people who are affected by alcohol and drugs, in particular, to be treated in a different manner from the way they have been treated until now. This follows on from the same style of unit being established at Royal Perth Hospital, which the Minister for Health and I opened last year. This will allow patients who are potentially intoxicated or suffering from drug-induced psychosis or overdoses or the like to have that form of treatment. The urgent care clinic network more broadly, which is now going to enter its trial phase, with around 130 urgent care clinics across Western Australia, will allow for pressure to be taken off emergency departments. We do not hide from the fact that there has been a huge spike in attendances at emergency departments, but we are coming up with positive solutions to deal with the issue.

AMBULANCE RAMPING

659. Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP to the Premier:

I have a supplementary question. Given that the flu season is now under the seasonal threshold and has been for some weeks, and can no longer be blamed for record ambulance ramping, can the Premier confirm that the real reason for this crisis is that he and his health minister are too busy trying to manage the internal fractures within WA Labor?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

That is an immature and juvenile question.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr D.T. Redman interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Warren–Blackwood, I was on my feet. I call you to order for the first time.

Mr M. McGOWAN: It is from someone more suited to guild politics at UWA than the serious business of the Parliament of Western Australia.

We keep our eye on the ball, creating jobs, managing the finances and ensuring that we pass important laws to reform the legal system and other aspects of this state. We are building Metronet—the biggest road build in the history of Western Australia and Australia. We are undertaking railcar manufacturing here in our state.

Point of Order

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: The question was in relation to the health crisis, not in relation to manufacturing railcars. I ask the Premier to get back to the answer.

The SPEAKER: Member for Dawesville, your question had something to do with the factions within the Labor Party, did it not, so it is not a point of order.

Questions without Notice Resumed

Mr M. McGOWAN: The government remains focused on the important issues confronting Western Australia. As I said, those issues are jobs, Metronet, law reform, proper funding and proper management of the state's finances. The government announced on the weekend the introduction of new WorkSafe inspectors. It is planning for and building a new women's and babies' hospital in Western Australia. They are all things that the Liberals and Nationals could not manage in office. They are all the things that this government is focused on. We are not interested in juvenile and petty attacks by the Liberal Party.

RAILCAR MANUFACTURING STRATEGY— AUSTRALIND TRAIN SETS

660. Mr D.T. PUNCH to the Minister for Transport:

My sensible question is to the Minister for Transport.

- (1) Can the minister outline to the house how this government's job-creating railcar manufacturing strategy will deliver two new and locally built *Australind* train sets for my community in Bunbury?
- (2) Can the minister outline to the house how the McGowan Labor government's commitment to that type of local manufacturing compares with that of the previous Liberal–National government?

Point of Order

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Mr Speaker —

The SPEAKER: You cannot answer the question!

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: No, I cannot. On a point of order, I am curious whether this will be considered a repetitive question, given that the Premier has already spoken about railcars —

Several members interjected.

*Questions without Notice Resumed***Ms R. SAFFIOTI replied:**

(1)–(2) I thank the member for Bunbury for that very sensible question. I acknowledge the member for Bunbury, the member for Murray–Wellington and the member for Collie–Preston for their work advancing the cause of the south west and, in particular, new *Australind* train sets. I note the point of order from the opposition. It appears that the only people in Western Australia who do not support railcar manufacturing coming back to WA are those in the Liberal Party. The project has been supported across the community, but the opposition does not support it. It supports Queensland jobs. Every time we mention it, the member for Bateman says, “Queensland, Queensland”, because he wanted them all built in Queensland.

Mr D.C. Nalder interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Bateman.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The reality is that the other side did not have the vision. They did not have the nous to get this policy done. What did they say when we announced it? The member for Nedlands said that our plan was too ambitious. Why does that not surprise me? The man of high ambition said that our project was too ambitious!

Mr D.A. Templeman: He’s looking up the word “ambitious” on his phone.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: “Ambitious—not me!” That is what he is saying.

The Leader of the Opposition said that this was a fantasy railcar project. The member for Bateman dismissed the calls for him to guarantee some local content for railcar manufacturing in WA. The Premier has outlined the delivery of 246 C-series railcars. Of course, we know that the *Australind* needs to be replaced.

Ms L. Mettam interjected.

Mr M.P. Murray: What was that, member for Vasse? I didn’t hear it. Do you support it?

The SPEAKER: I heard you, Minister for Sport and Recreation, and call you to order for the second time.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Does the member for Vasse support the new *Australind* train sets?

Ms L. Mettam: I would support it working.

Several members interjected.

Mr M.P. Murray interjected.

The SPEAKER: I do not know what you had at the weekend, Minister for Sport and Recreation, but do not have it again.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It is great that the member for Vasse supports it, but let us face it —

Ms L. Mettam interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Vasse.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: One of the issues with the *Australind* is that there has been a level of corrosion in the railcars. The reality is that that did not happen when we won government. Members opposite neglected it for eight and a half years. The date for expiry was 2017. What was the Liberal–National government doing about it? The government has a plan to upgrade stations at Yarloop, Cookernup and, of course, North Dandalup. We were there the other day, member for Murray–Wellington. We will introduce new *Australind* train sets because the previous government ignored it for eight and a half years. There was over \$8 billion of spending for royalties for regions, and the government could not get a new train set for the south west. That is our plan: delivering on our commitments and, of course, bringing railcar manufacturing back to WA.

VOLUNTARY ASSISTED DYING

661. Ms M.J. DAVIES to the Premier:

I refer to reports of doctors who deal with patients under the recently enacted Victorian voluntary assisted dying legislation being instructed to limit discussions about voluntary assisted dying to face-to-face conversations or risk being prosecuted under commonwealth laws.

- (1) What action has the McGowan government taken to ensure that medical professionals will be able to engage with patients on voluntary assisted dying via telephone or telehealth should the legislation be enacted in WA?
- (2) If no action has been taken, will the Premier confirm that this issue will be resolved before the bill is considered in detail in the Legislative Assembly and Legislative Council?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

(1)–(2) The legislation is before the house. I heard about this issue on the radio the other day; I think Hon Martin Aldridge raised the matter. Obviously, I will need to seek some specific advice, and the Minister for Health is not here today. However, clearly, we want to work cooperatively on the legislation and we will examine each of the issues. Members will know that Malcolm McCusker, state solicitors and the like will provide some advice, so we will get some advice on that. I would like to work cooperatively with the Leader of the Nationals WA to examine those reports and see if there is any substance to them.

VOLUNTARY ASSISTED DYING

662. Ms M.J. DAVIES to the Premier:

I have a supplementary question. Thank you, Premier. I appreciate that. I am asking as a result of not having that clarification, whether the Premier concedes that without resolution of the matter, he is asking the Parliament to pass legislation that would potentially discriminate against regional and remote constituents being able to access that legislation. That is the reason this question is so important to us.

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

Leader of the Nationals WA, we want to work cooperatively, so if there is an issue, obviously we will get the best advice. I want to make sure that regional people will receive the opportunities that will be provided by this legislation in the same way that city people will. It is an extreme situation, obviously, when someone is terminally ill and in pain and I want to make sure that it is fair for everyone across the state. If there are issues, we want to work to ensure that those issues are resolved. But I am afraid I do not have a specific answer to the question before me today.

OCEAN REEF MARINA

663. Ms E. HAMILTON to the Minister for Lands:

I refer to the McGowan Labor government's commitment to the job-creating Ocean Reef Marina that has long been promised to my people of Joondalup but never delivered. Can the minister outline to the house what the granting of environmental approval means for finally getting this economic-boosting project underway?

Mr B.S. WYATT replied:

I thank the member for Joondalup for her question. Since the 1970s, a marina at Ocean Reef has been talked about for many, many years, across many governments. Under the leadership of the Premier, we took to the election our commitment to get the Ocean Reef Marina underway, and it was endorsed fulsomely, dare I say, by people across the northern suburbs of Perth. We have not waited; we have moved on this very, very quickly. I am pleased to say that just last week I was delighted to go on site with the member for Joondalup to announce the Environmental Protection Authority approval of the marine portion of the project, subject to some very strict environmental conditions, which, of course, will be implemented when we commence construction next year. For the benefit of members, those two environmental conditions are: the development of monitoring and management plans to minimise any impacts on marine water quality and habitats outside the marina as well as adjacent beaches, and measures to improve the management and protection of similar marine nearshore habitats in the Marmion Marine Park. Obviously, member for Joondalup, those issues were raised by the community reference group and some key stakeholders, including the Ocean Reef Sea Sports Club, the Joondalup City RSL and the Whitfords Volunteer Sea Rescue Group. Those three organisations are fundamental to the success of the development of the marina and we will continue to work with them.

I think Western Australia and the northern suburbs have been keen to see the marina be developed because it will offer not only many, many hundreds of ongoing job opportunities, but also, of course, a very exciting and dynamic retail space. We are expecting that when it is complete there will be about 12 000 square metres of retail and commercial space, nearly three hectares of high-quality public open space and, of course, significant boat storage facilities, both boat pens and boat stackers. As with other marinas around Australia and Western Australia, they become places for Western Australians to visit and recreate. This is a very important milestone in the approvals process to get the marina underway. I know that the member for Joondalup has been very much on my case on this. I am committed, as is the government, to ensure that construction gets going next year.

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup: And the mayor—what a great job he's been doing!

The SPEAKER: Yes, and it is a great job you are doing. I call you to order for the first time.

Mr B.S. WYATT: Interestingly, by way of response to that interjection, he has also been critical of the former Barnett–Liberal government and how slow it was to get anything underway. I accept that Mayor Albert Jacobs has been critical of the former Barnett–Liberal government, because I would be too. It is amazing that a government could spend \$40 billion and not build the thing! But, anyway, so be it. We, however, are determined to get this underway. We will do so because I know it is something that the member for Joondalup is committed to and her constituents keenly support.

PUBLIC VIOLENCE

664. Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS to the Premier:

I refer to the two deeply disturbing glassing incidents in Northbridge over the weekend, including one involving actor Hugh Sheridan. When is the Premier going to stop focusing on his own internal political conflicts and start to deal with out-of-control violence on our streets?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

I saw the media reports about what occurred to two gentlemen, I think it was, who were involved in some theatrical performances in Western Australia, and, obviously, it was a terrible thing to see. I understand that a couple of individuals have been charged for those events so I will not comment on that particular case. We have provided enormous support to the WA Police Force since we came to office, which includes a significant increase in its budget; additional officers focused particularly on meth; \$34 million for personal handheld mobile tablets; ballistic body armour, which is being rolled out; body-worn cameras; a new police helicopter; and the introduction of a range of laws, including the capacity to use lethal force when responding to a terrorism incident. One issue that has been around for a while is medically retired police officers. We have come up with a redress scheme for those officers, which they are very happy with. This is something that no government before now has ever managed to do, in particular the Leader of the Opposition. I note that the Liberal Party is trying to run some sort of argument about chaotic conduct. The only chaotic conduct, or the worst chaotic conduct that I have seen in recent weeks has been inside the Liberal Party. I have a copy of the “70th Annual State Conference” booklet.

Ms L. Mettam: Is that the best you’ve got?

Mr M. McGOWAN: But I did get it. The member for Vasse would be interested to know where I got it from. I can tell her one person who did not give it to me, and that is the member for Geraldton. The reason I can tell members that is his face is blanked out in this booklet. He was right there, but now he is no longer there. Remember those photographs from Soviet Russia?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mr M. McGOWAN: The photographs —

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members! I know this is an exciting time, but just listen. You may learn.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Remember the photographs from Soviet Russia: one day they were there and the next day they were not. He has been rubbed out. That is the Liberal Party. People are resigning in disgust. The member for Churchlands has been banished to outer Siberia. For some reason, he appears to have offended the leadership. That is the Liberal Party of Western Australia today. I will not to be lectured by that chaotic disastrous party, which is the Liberal Party, about any conduct, because of the way it has behaved in recent months.

PUBLIC VIOLENCE

665. Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS to the Premier:

I have a supplementary question. What damage are out-of-control violence, meth zombies and homelessness in our city having on our national and international reputation?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

Another thing I have noticed about the Liberal Party is that it loves running down Western Australia. There is nothing it enjoys more than running down the people, the city and the state. It seems to revel in it. That question just then—it is disgraceful to describe this state in that manner. What a disgraceful question!

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mr M. McGOWAN: The rate of recorded meth usage has gone down under this government since Mr Speaker was in office.

Mrs L.M. Harvey interjected.

The SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition!

Mr M. McGOWAN: The rate of recorded crime has gone down since Mr Speaker was in office. Members on the other side put in place that frontline Perth model, which resulted in massive increases in recorded crime in Western Australia. We got rid of it, and what has happened? Crime rates have gone down. I have absolute faith in Commissioner Dawson and the fact that he is dealing with these issues in the right manner, has reinstated traditional policing, and has put in place good models to deal with these matters, unlike the Leader of the Opposition when she was Minister for Police.

WATER CORPORATION — METROPOLITAN WATER AND DRAINAGE OPERATIONS

666. Ms J.M. FREEMAN to the Minister for Water:

I refer to and congratulate the McGowan Labor government's decision to overturn the Liberal Party's privatisation of Water Corporation's metropolitan water and drainage operations.

Can the minister outline to the house how bringing this work and these jobs back into public hands will save taxpayers money and benefit Western Australians?

Mr D.J. KELLY replied:

I thank the member for the question. I thank her for her commitment to quality services here in Western Australia.

On Friday, we announced that the operations and maintenance work at the Water Corporation in the metropolitan area is being brought back in-house. To give people a little bit of context, it was 1995 when the Liberal Party's then Minister for Water, Peter Foss, made an announcement that this work was going to be privatised and put out to the private sector. Since then, the staff have gone through numerous tender processes. The work went out for the first time in 1995; they were put through a contracting process in 2002, and again in 2011; and here we are in 2019. After reviewing the operating structures at the Water Corporation, its board has come to the conclusion that, amongst a number of the changes they want to make, this work is core business for the Water Corporation.

Dr D.J. Honey interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Cottesloe!

Mr D.J. KELLY: Just so that members understand, when the proverbial hits the fan, these are the people in the metropolitan area who go in and clean it up. These people do incredibly important work at the Water Corporation.

Mr P.A. Katsambanis interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Cottesloe, I call you to order for the first time.

Dr D.J. Honey: I didn't say anything!

The SPEAKER: Yes, you did. For the time before, then. Minister for Water.

Mr D.J. KELLY: That work is core business for the Water Corporation. The board also looked at that decision and came to the same view. On Friday, we went out there, met with the staff and told them that over the next nine months, the Water Corporation was transitioning that work back and making those staff directly employed by the Water Corporation. About 250 staff will be affected. I have to say, they were pretty happy about the decision. It is not only about the better pay and conditions that they will receive as direct employees of the Water Corporation, but also about what that decision by the board of the Water Corporation says to them about the value they place on their work. I just give one example: one member of the staff there said to me that he had been employed doing that work for 30 years.

Mr V.A. Catania interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for North West Central!

Mr D.J. KELLY: He was going to retire in a couple of years. He could now retire with dignity as an employee of the Water Corporation. He always felt, as a private contractor, it meant that the Water Corporation never really valued the role that he played. Therefore, it is not just about pay and conditions or job security; it is about the dignity of the work that was done. Those staff are very happy. But I can also say to members of the public that the Water Corporation believes it will deliver a better service. It will allow it to have a direct line of sight between the Water Corporation and its customers —

Mr V.A. Catania interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for North West Central!

Mr D.J. KELLY: — and it will allow it to better maintain its assets. Rather than having capital expenditure in one bucket and maintenance expenditure in a separate bucket, it will be able to bring the two together so that it can maximise the end-to-end life of its assets. Finally, the Water Corporation believes that it will lead to cost savings.

Several members interjected.

Mr D.J. KELLY: I can see members on the other side are not interested.

Several members interjected.

Mr D.J. KELLY: If members could listen—it was privatised by the then Liberal government in 1995, the same government that closed the Midland Workshops, if members remember. We dealt with that a bit earlier.

Mr V.A. Catania: What about Fisheries up north?

The SPEAKER: Member for North West Central, you have mentioned that three times, and it did not work. I call you to order for the first time.

Mr D.J. KELLY: We want to deliver better services for the people of Western Australia at a lower cost while delivering a better working environment for those people who do the really hard work here in Western Australia.

ANIMAL ACTIVISM

667. Ms M.J. DAVIES to the Premier:

I refer to the tough laws that the Premier's Attorney General has promised to introduce to deal with the illegal and threatening behaviour of animal activists. Why has the government not given this proposed legislation priority for drafting, securing cabinet approval and introduction into Parliament?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

This is an important issue, and I know that a lot of regional communities and farming families would like to see some action taken here. Obviously, the government has made it a priority, and we are working on it. Obviously, when we draft legislation, we have to take account of every potential nuance and what could potentially happen, to make sure that we deal with those things. There are some complexities around this. We are working hard, and the Attorney General, as members know, is working hard on the issue.

The issue itself has come into greater prominence because there has been more activity by people invading properties and the like in recent months. Obviously, we are working hard on it. I would just make the point that activists in this field have been around for a long time. In eight and a half years in office, the National Party did nothing about it.

ANIMAL ACTIVISM

668. Ms M.J. DAVIES to the Premier:

I have a supplementary question. Why is the government dragging its heels on this important issue? When will legislation be introduced so that the people who are impacted will know?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

The legislation will be introduced when it is drafted. We cannot introduce legislation if it has not been drafted. It has a priority.

Ms M.J. Davies interjected.

The SPEAKER: Leader of the National Party!

Mr M. McGOWAN: We are working to ensure that it happens as soon as we can. As the member knows, the government has a very large legislative agenda, but it is a priority for the government to deal with this important issue. I ask the member again: if it was so important to the National Party, why did it not draft the legislation in the eight and a half years it was in office?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Leader of the National Party and member for Moore, I call you to order for the first time.

Mr M. McGOWAN: I ask the question again: why did the National Party not make it a priority in eight and a half years?

Ms M.J. Davies: This is a statement by the Premier's own minister, who said it was a priority. The Premier just said he has not even drafted it!

Mr M. McGOWAN: The question is answered, because the National Party did nothing about this issue in eight and a half years.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Leader of the National Party, I call you to order for the second time. Member for Moore, I call you to order for the second time. This is not a shouting match.

CREATIVE ARTS — GOVERNMENT INVESTMENT

669. Mr S.A. MILLMAN to the Minister for Culture and the Arts:

I refer to the McGowan Labor government's massive investment in the creative industry, which has resulted in a surge in local productions such as the ABC television series *The Heights*. Can the minister outline to the house how this government's investment is creating jobs for Western Australians and supporting those workers in the creative industries?

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN replied:

I can, and I thank the member for Mount Lawley for the question. I was very pleased to be in Mt Lawley with the members of cabinet only last week and experiencing the wonderful community that the member represents. I had a meeting there with a number of people involved in the creative industries who live and work in Mt Lawley, which is tremendous. As members would be aware, the McGowan government is absolutely committed to making sure that as part of a diversified economy, creative industries will continue to grow and play a key part in creating jobs and supporting job development, innovation and technology. As we know, the creative arts is very much a part of creative industries that are spread across a range of areas and is growing in its influence and importance.

As the member noted, we have seen a surge in the screen industry in Western Australia through documentaries and feature, animation and virtual reality films. They are all very important components of the creative industries that are now attracting back many workers in the creative industries who had gone across to the eastern seaboard. One such drama series is *The Heights*. I was very pleased to visit the ABC studios yesterday to see the filming of the second series, which will involve and include a cast and crew made up of over 85 per cent Western Australians. It includes outstanding Western Australian talent across performance, technical and training staff. *The Heights* is a series that will continue to promote Perth and Western Australia and is filmed in and around the —

Mr R.R. Whitby: Minister, was there a cameo for you?

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I did ask but I was rejected—a little bit like the member for Carine who was rejected as shadow Minister for Culture and the Arts and dispatched to somewhere else, but we will not go into that.

We are investing heavily in the creative industries. We are building a world-class \$400 million new museum for Western Australia. We are reactivating the rooftop of the Art Gallery of Western Australia, which was an election commitment. The visual arts is receiving an \$8 million regional exhibitions boost, which will see more of the state collection shared in regional Western Australia. The McGowan Labor government has committed over the next four years to a \$20 million creative regions program across a range of areas, including assistance in the activation of Indigenous artists in rural and remote regions in Western Australia. Our first virtual reality festival, which is known as XR:WA, premiered in July as part of the Revelation Perth International Film Festival. That is another example of investing in emerging, groundbreaking technology with a large number of emerging practitioners in the VR and immersive industries. Of course, we are providing ongoing support to Screenwest and the film industry across Western Australia through Lotterywest and government investment. Later this week the CinefestOZ film Festival starts in Busselton in the south west where members can see *H is for Happiness*, which was filmed in Albany. It is a magnificent film and features young talent from Western Australia. I urge members and people to see those films and experience that because —

Mr P.A. Katsambanis interjected.

The SPEAKER: Are you exhausted yet, minister, because the rest of us are!

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I am very concerned about the constipated member for Hillarys over there. He seems to want to interrupt me. We are investing heavily in the creative industries. We believe in it as a viable industry for the future. It employs a lot of people, many of whom are young people. It is an exciting area to be in and Western Australia is putting itself forward to share its creative talent with the rest of the world. I am very proud of that and we are committing to it as an industry going forward.

POLICE — WAGES AND CONDITIONS

670. Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS to the Premier:

I refer to a recent media release from the WA Police Union claiming that it would be forced into arbitration by the McGowan government over a paltry 32-hour rest period for police officers. Can the Premier please advise the house why he refuses to acknowledge that police officers need a rest from the front line by denying their calls for additional annual leave and effectively cutting annual police wages by \$25 million a year?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

The former Leader of the Opposition, the member for Riverton, is on record as supporting the government's wages policy.

Dr M.D. Nahan interjected.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Does the Liberal Party —

Mr B.S. Wyatt interjected.

The SPEAKER: Treasurer, did you see me on my feet? I call you to order.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Our wages policy is fair and equitable.

Dr M.D. Nahan interjected.

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

Mr M. McGOWAN: The only thing I would say is that we froze the pay of politicians, judges and CEOs to set an appropriate example.

Mr B.S. Wyatt interjected.

The SPEAKER: Treasurer, I call you to order for the second time.

Mr M. McGOWAN: It is a four-year freeze for people in those positions to set an example for the rest of the public sector workforce. The government's wages policy is in place to deal with the forty thousand million dollars of Liberal-National debt—that is why it is there. When members opposite ask these questions, they should be reflecting—I can see that the member is not listening. He is looking at his supplementary question—I can see that.

Mr D.C. Nalder interjected.

Withdrawal of Remark

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: The member for Bateman just used an unparliamentary term and I ask you to get him to withdraw.

The SPEAKER: Did you, member for Bateman?

Mr D.C. Nalder: I withdraw.

Questions without Notice Resumed

Mr M. McGOWAN: When members opposite ask these questions, they should reflect on the fact that they left \$40 billion of public sector debt for this government to deal with. Obviously, we cannot do everything we would like to do, and so when members opposite have their meetings with the police union, or the MUA as it may be, perhaps they should say to them that they are sorry for the debt they left to this state.

POLICE — WAGES AND CONDITIONS**671. Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS to the Premier:**

I have a supplementary question. Does the Premier think that it is appropriate for the government to claim the successes of frontline police officers as its own and then turn around and cut annual police wages by \$25 million?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

I have a couple of things to say. Firstly, it was this government that reinstated the traditional policing model and abolished the policing model that members opposite brought in. Members opposite brought in a policing model that resulted in crime skyrocketing, so we got rid of it, and now they seem to be complaining about it. Secondly, I do not know why they cannot understand that a \$1 000 pay increase is an increase. Unfortunately, because of the Liberal–National disastrous debt record, we cannot offer more than that. We have been open, honest and accountable with the workforce in explaining that time and again. It would do the Liberal Party a little bit of good to take responsibility for the condition in which it left this state. It would do them a little bit of good to apologise for what they did. In the lead up to the next election, I will remind the people every single day that the previous government left this state with a \$40 billion debt and that it cannot be trusted to once again go onto the treasury bench. Every step its members take in opposition shows that they have learnt nothing.

The SPEAKER: That is the end of question time.

PUBLIC VIOLENCE, METHAMPHETAMINE AND HOMELESSNESS*Standing Orders Suspension — Motion*

MR P.A. KATSAMBANIS (Hillarys) [2.57 pm] — without notice: I move —

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

That this house condemns the divided McGowan Labor government for its failure to address out-of-control violence, meth zombies and the homeless in Western Australia and the damage it is having on our national and international reputation.

Standing Orders Suspension — Amendment to Motion

MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah — Leader of the House) [2.58 pm]: We will move an amendment to the motion that allows for debate to be limited to 15 minutes for each government and non-government member. However, I want to note that a month or so ago a motion with similar wording was moved on a matter of public importance. This again highlights how the opposition is simply coming into question time preparing to suspend standing orders. I move —

To insert after “forthwith” —

, subject to the debate being 15 minutes for government members and 15 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 P.A. KATSAMBANIS (Hillarys) [2.59 pm]: I move the motion.

Once again, this is a motion that I do not want to move. It is a motion that an opposition would not have to move if the government was looking after the interests of Western Australians and if it was genuinely concerned about safety in our streets and communities and the reputation of Perth and Western Australia, both nationally and

internationally. Unfortunately, we do not have that sort of government. Unfortunately, I am forced to stand here today to move this motion to condemn this government, which is mired in its own infighting and backstabbing. It is far more interested in its own factional warfare than it is in protecting the public of Western Australia. What better example do we have than the events on the streets of Northbridge over the past weekend in which we saw absolute horror and carnage?

Mr D.J. Kelly interjected.

The SPEAKER: Minister for Water!

Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS: Law-abiding Western Australians and visitors to Western Australia were attacked for no other reason than simply being there.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members! Minister!

Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS: Meanwhile, this government was attacking itself.

Ms L.L. Baker interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Maylands!

Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS: It was attacking itself in such a manner that a senior federal Labor luminary —

Ms L.L. Baker interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Maylands!

Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS: Stephen Conroy described the Western Australian Labor Party and its conference as barking mad.

Ms L.L. Baker interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Maylands, are you deaf?

Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS: That is what this government was doing on the weekend—it was fighting with itself and tearing itself apart.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Minister! I call you both to order! I called out to you three times.

Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS: Half of the conference attendees walked out on the welcome to country. Half of the conference attendees walked out on a tribute to Labor luminary Bob Hawke. None of you are Bob Hawke; I can tell you that much. None of you are worthy of even tying up Bob Hawke's shoelaces! Half the conference attendees walked out.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members! This is a matter of public interest. Members on my right side will have an opportunity to talk. Let the member on the other side have his say.

Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Half the conference attendees walked out on the welcome to country, half of the conference attendees walked out on a tribute to Bob Hawke and half of the conference attendees stayed out when the Premier delivered his keynote speech, including members of Parliament! This Premier's own members of Parliament were not prepared to listen to him. This government is divided between its left and its right. Some of the people who used to be in the left are now in the right and some of the people who used to be in the right are now in the left and, unfortunately, on Saturday, a whole heap of them were left right out! One of those left right out was the Minister for Police. We know that this police minister is a lame duck. We know that she has such a toxic and dysfunctional relationship with the Premier, that the Commissioner of Police simply bypasses the minister —

Mr D.A. Templeman interjected.

The SPEAKER: Leader of the House, I call you to order for the first time.

Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS: We know that the relationship between the minister and the Premier is so toxic that the police commissioner simply bypasses the minister and goes directly to the Premier, not that that has much effect, unfortunately.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Everyone who interjects from the right side—whoops, I had better be careful what I say! I will call to order anyone on the government side of the house who interjects. This is an MPI and you will have a chance to get up and speak. The member for Hillarys has the courage to stand up—let him speak.

Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS: We are seeing morale in our police force smashed. Our police officers are trying to do the best they possibly can, but their numbers have been cut by this government and it has not replaced them. Police officers have been taken off the front line and asked to man 24-hour police stations. It is just not good enough. On the weekend we saw what happens when a government loses sight of safety on our streets and in our suburbs and towns. We saw a high-profile incident in the entertainment precinct of Northbridge. A person who was part of a group led by the well-known Australian actor Hugh Sheridan was glassed in the streets on Friday night. On Saturday night, there was another high-profile glassing incident on the streets of Northbridge. Unfortunately, there is vision of that attack and we can see how horrific and random it was.

This government has no recipe to address this issue. This has not been happening in Northbridge just this past weekend. We have seen the crime statistics. We know that crime in Northbridge and the Perth CBD is out of control and the police simply do not have the resources to put an end to it. Over the past 12 months, crime in Northbridge is up by 10.5 per cent right across the board. Unfortunately, horrific offences, such as sex offences, are up by over 50 per cent.

Mrs M.H. Roberts interjected.

The SPEAKER: Minister for Police!

Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS: That should never be allowed to happen. Assaults are up by 39.1 per cent in a year and stealing is up by 15 per cent. We saw evidence of that over the weekend. The situation in the Perth CBD is even worse. Crime is up 7.3 per cent in a year; sex offences, including rape, are up by 33 per cent, which is horrific; and stealing is up 9.4 per cent. We know what impact theft has on retail businesses, especially when retailers in this state are doing it so tough. It is little wonder that crime has gone up. This government simply is not prioritising policing, police resources, the welfare of police officers and the pay of police officers. We are having grave difficulty filling the vacancies that exist in the Western Australia Police Force, let alone adding any strength so that police can combat crime, which is what they want to do.

Unfortunately, the impact over the weekend has not been just local; it has not been just those few people who were attacked or local people who found out about it. The attack was on a person associated with a very well known actor and news of it has gone national and international. We want to attract people to Perth. We want students to live here, particularly in the CBD, so that they can go out at night and give it vibrancy. We want both national and international tourists to come here and have a great time. We want to support the retailers and hospitality venue providers in Perth and Northbridge and right across Western Australia, who put their money, capital and family's future on the line to keep their businesses open and create employment opportunities. We do not want to send the message internationally that Perth is no longer open for business and that it is a dangerous place to be—"If you go to Perth, stay indoors at night." We do not want to say that. We do not say that. It is the media that says that because of high-profile incidents that are caused by the police force's lack of resources to combat crime. If this government were serious about Western Australia, it would give up on its internal bickering. It would get together, sort it out and get on with the job of governing this state, and it can start by providing safe streets and communities, which would send a strong message nationally and internationally that we welcome tourists, we want them to come here, and they will be safe when they get here, not the message that has been sent over the last few days with the sort of stuff that we see on our streets because our police, as hard as they are trying to look after our streets and community, are simply run off their feet. They have simply been disregarded and unloved by a government that should know better. The Premier and his government should stop fighting amongst themselves. This is not about them; rather, it is about Western Australians and the reputation of Perth and Western Australia. If they do not fix this, the public will remember. It is less than 18 months to the next election and they will pay the price.

Mr D.R. Michael interjected.

The SPEAKER: What was that comment?

Mr D.R. Michael: Keep them off the radio.

The SPEAKER: I will keep you on the book here. I call you to order for the first time.

MR A. KRSTICEVIC (Carine) [3.08 pm]: I rise to support the motion moved by the member for Hillarys. It is pretty obvious that the weekend's events have transpired here in Parliament. If we look around the chamber, there are only 18 Labor Party members out of 40. They have progressively walked out of the chamber, including the member for Midland. They know that shortly the Premier will get to his feet to address this motion. They do not want to be here to listen to him; they want to boycott it! What happened on the weekend was an absolute disgrace. On the one hand is the progressive right, and on the other hand is the lazy left. Unfortunately, the lazy left is controlling this state.

The SPEAKER: Are you talking to the motion?

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: Yes, I am, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: In what way?

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: The lazy left is controlling this state and controlling this government. That is why there is so much homelessness and why the cost of living and crime are out of control. But there is one member of the lazy

left who is not lazy. We all know who that is—Hon Pierre Yang. He is out there recruiting for the lazy left to increase their numbers to try to make sure they have control of the Labor Party. Do not forget—the lazy left is the Premier’s faction. That is the faction he supported with his voting card on the day, trying to keep a right delegate out of there just in case they had the numbers to win a vote. What happened was an absolute disgrace.

The SPEAKER: Member! I will get back to the point: you have to speak to the motion. I have been looking at the motion. You have not said one word about the motion. I will sit you down.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: No problem, Mr Speaker.

The motion talks about homelessness and out-of-control crime. Homeless people are the biggest victims of crime. They are vulnerable. A lot of that crime goes unreported. That is an important point to note: they are the victims of crime. We need to do more to protect them. The opposition is very keen for the government to step up in this space. Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members on my right!

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: We know that meth is a big problem out there. The Premier discounts it and says, “Oh, but it’s less than when you were in government.” But do members know what? Crime and violence is on the rise. Only today a report came out that said that WA is now the overdose capital of Australia. Meth is not a problem, drugs are not a problem, crime is not a problem and homelessness is not a problem because we have meth under control!

Ms M.M. Quirk interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Girrawheen!

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: Of course, the government is trying to shift all this to the City of Perth and other councils to get them to deal with the problem. The government says, “It’s not our problem; we don’t want to deal with it.” Of course, we know exactly what the Premier thinks about homelessness. Earlier this year, we raised the issue of the camp in Rockingham and whether the Premier had been to visit homeless people there. At that stage, he indicated that he had not been. Obviously, we know from continued questioning in Parliament that the Premier was embarrassed enough that he finally decided to go and visit the homeless camp in Rockingham on 26 July 2019, as stated by the Deputy Premier—the Premier could not even inform the Parliament himself. The Premier went there on 26 July 2019 and met with Alan and Lyn. Does the Premier remember Alan and Lyn and their son Dale?

Mr M. McGowan: Yes.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: He met with them. Alan is a 67-year-old man and Lyn is a 61-year-old woman. Their son lives there with them. They are not drug addicts. They do not have mental health issues. They are looking for some help. They are stuck living in a caravan in this homeless village. I spoke to them on the weekend. I spoke to Alan again today. I said, “What did the Premier say to you when he came down there?” His response was, “He said he would send some help.” That was on 26 July 2019. I asked him what had happened so far, one month later, and he said: nothing. Nobody has done a thing, Premier. That is true. The Premier can ring Alan. Alan has my mobile number and I have his mobile number. I have made that available to the Premier’s office. I said to Alan, “The Premier will ring you today. I will raise it in Parliament and I will ask the Premier to ring you today.”

The SPEAKER: Do you want me to table that, member? You said you would give it to the Premier.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: The number has already been given to the Premier’s office by email. The Premier has the number. He can ring Alan. The Premier promised Alan that he would help him. He is struggling. He and his wife have operations that they have to go to. He went to the doctor today. They are postponing serious operations. They have nowhere to live. They do not know where their next meal is coming from. They are struggling. The Premier promised them that he would help them. He went down there, in his own electorate, to help these people.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: What chance does anybody else in Western Australia have if the Premier cannot help the people in his own electorate? He drives past them every single day. They are struggling out there. They are asking him for help. I asked them whether I could raise this issue in Parliament and they said yes. They wanted me to raise this.

Ms S.F. McGurk: Shame!

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: Do not say “shame”, minister; you walk over those homeless in Fremantle every single day! Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: The minister walks over those homeless people every single day. She does not care.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Minister!

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: She pretends that she does. Does she want to give her mobile number to homeless people? I am happy to give them mine. They can ring me directly if they like. They will ring me and I will know what is happening in that camp in Rockingham.

Several members interjected.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: I will raise it in Parliament to the Premier.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members, please!

Ms S.F. McGurk interjected.

The SPEAKER: Minister for Child Protection, I call you to order for the first time.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: I want Alan and his wife, Lyn, to be helped. I want someone to ring them today. I want someone to offer a solution. It has been one month since the Premier of Western Australia went down there. With all the resources of the government, nobody has been down there to see them. It is an absolute disgrace.

Several members interjected.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: Government members should be ashamed of themselves. I have told Alan, “You ring me every single day and you tell me if the Premier’s rung you. You tell me if you’ve got some support services, some help, or if you have had the operations that you need for your wife and your son.” He is 67 years old and his wife is 61. They are living like that in the Premier of Western Australia’s electorate and nobody wants to help them. What chance have the rest of us got? I want the Premier to promise to me today that he will ring Alan.

Ms S.F. McGurk interjected.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: I know the minister does not care.

The SPEAKER: Minister for Child Protection!

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: Looking at the 2019–20 budget, funding has been cut.

Ms S.F. McGurk interjected.

The SPEAKER: Minister for Child Protection!

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: Funding for homelessness services, domestic violence and family support services have all been cut in the forward estimates.

Several members interjected.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: There are massive reductions. Government members should look in the 2019–20 budget; the figures are right there.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Minister for Child Protection, I call you to order for the third time.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: Perth homeless services are sounding alarm bells. They are at breaking point. Foodbank WA is doing great business—it has double-digit growth every year. It is ashamed at the fact that it has double-digit growth. People are lining up for food vouchers. They cannot afford to eat. They cannot afford to pay the bills. The Leader of the Opposition and I went down to Foodbank. We are catching up with the sector. We care. We are visiting all these people. The Premier is nowhere.

Several members interjected.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: We asked them whether they have seen him there and he is nowhere. He does not care about the most vulnerable. We want the Premier to step up and show some leadership. Forget about these internal fights. Forget about the left and the right.

The SPEAKER: Sit down! Members, the question is that the motion be agreed to.

MR M. MCGOWAN (Rockingham — Premier) [3.15 pm]: Obviously, the government will not be supporting the motion. I urge the Liberal Party to better use its matter of public interest motions in future, rather than coming in with these stunts. It is surprising to me, and I would not have thought it was possible, but the opposition has reached a new low today with this sort of carry-on. It is shocking behaviour by the Liberal members in here. Sensible members amongst them must be embarrassed by it.

I want to address the motion itself. The term “meth zombies” has been put in the motion. The opposition claims to have some concern about people who might be homeless or destitute and then it describes those same people as meth zombies. It is crass, it is appalling, it is patronising, it is headline seeking and it is shocking that they use that sort of language. The Liberal Party portrays itself as the alternative government of Western Australia and then puts in writing the sort of language that one would expect to be used in only the most shocking of British tabloids. That is the sort of language opposition members have used to describe fellow Western Australians.

The second point I would make about this motion and about the opposition and its language is that the opposition revels in running down this state. I refer to some of this language about our own state, our own people and our own suburbs. Opposition members seem to enjoy running down their fellow citizens, their suburbs and, in effect, our police who deal with these issues. They have engaged in appalling conduct. The motion talks about our national and international reputation. We will shortly have planeloads of Japanese tourists arriving in Western Australia because of the direct flights to Western Australia, yet the opposition goes out and uses this sort of language.

As I read out in question time, the fact remains that since this government has been in office, crime has been trending down. That is because we reinstated the traditional policing model. We have had a comprehensive approach to dealing with methamphetamine across Western Australia, including, I might add, the one I am most proud of, the meth rehabilitation prison, which gives women and, shortly, men the opportunity for proper rehabilitation so that they can come out of prison and get on with productive lives. The opposition describes these people as meth zombies. When the Liberal Party was in power for those eight and a half years, there were headlines such as “Meth City” in *The West Australian*. Opposition members acted like it was a revelation that this situation was confronting the state. When we came to office, we put in place measure after measure to deal with both demand and supply and rehabilitation. Liberal Party members did virtually nothing when they were in office. They now come in here and rant on this poorly drafted and, frankly, demeaning motion and claim that they somehow care about these issues.

Then there was the performance from the member for Carine, which was one of the most embarrassing performances I have ever seen in this chamber.

Mr A. Krsticevic interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Carine, I call you to order for the second time.

Mr M. McGOWAN: It was factually inaccurate in every respect. It is no wonder the member for Carine was demoted in the reshuffle when the member for Geraldton abandoned the Liberal Party. The member for Geraldton was so disappointed in the Liberal Party that he joined the Nationals WA—I mean that says something. He was so outraged by the conduct of the Liberal Party that he joined the National Party. We have division in the Liberal Party ranks, with members being demoted, who frankly should not have been, and members who are actually decent human beings abandoning the Liberal Party because they cannot stand it anymore.

Mr A. Krsticevic interjected.

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

Mr M. McGOWAN: That is the reality of what is happening inside the Liberal Party. The government is getting on with fixing problems, creating jobs and getting the finances back under control, and Liberal Party cannot stand that because it could not do that when it was in office. That is the reality. The thing Liberal Party members hate most is that we are doing things that they were unable to do. We are fixing problems the former government was unable to fix. We are achieving economic outcomes that the former government could not achieve. We are passing laws and bringing in reforms that the former government was incapable of doing. That is the reality and why Liberal Party members are so angry, sitting in opposition in their pathetic small numbers. That is the reality of the situation.

Mrs L.M. Harvey interjected.

The SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition!

Mr M. McGOWAN: The 13 members of the Liberal Party in the lower house of the Parliament of Western Australia—the smallest number ever—should be embarrassed and ashamed by the way that they conduct themselves. This motion today shows that they are juvenile, immature and useless, and I will not give it the time of day.

MRS M.H. ROBERTS (Midland — Minister for Police) [3.21 pm]: What an embarrassment this motion must be to members of the Liberal Party. The motion is similar to one the opposition brought in recently about methamphetamine use. Look at the Liberal Party’s record in office—it did nothing and denied that there was an issue. It said that there may be a problem with alcohol, but denied that there was a problem with methamphetamine. Under its watch, methamphetamine use in the community grew astronomically. I will say it again: in 2009, only 15 per cent of those who undertook urine analysis at the Perth watch house tested positive for methamphetamine. Seven years later, in 2016, it was 60 per cent. The percentage of detainees at the Perth watch house who tested positive for methamphetamine, which is a highly addictive drug and key driver of crime, increased from 15 per cent to 60 per cent.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members, we heard you in silence.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Make no mistake about who let methamphetamine get out of control—members opposite should be embarrassed. The hypocrisy of the motion that has been put before the house today is simply stunning.

Dr D.J. Honey interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Cottesloe, that is your credit from before.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: The Premier touched on the other theme. The opposition's strategy is to not do or say anything constructive; it is to take advantage and opportunity of other people's misery. They see on the TV someone who has been attacked or who is living homeless and they think, "Opportunity knocks! We can go into Parliament and use their situation to score some cheap political points." Shame on every single member opposite—they did nothing constructive in government and now they are just wreckers in opposition! Members opposite are wreckers who run down the community and target homeless people by calling them names —

The SPEAKER: Members for Vasse and Riverton, can you have your meeting outside, please.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Yes—meth zombie. How does that help the situation? Not at all. Members opposite run down our police and do not support them. They tell gross untruths and do not reflect on the Leader of the Opposition's embarrassing record in government. Let us go over it. Between 2009 and 2016, crime increased by 37 per cent. I do not think we have ever had such a huge increase in crime over such a short period in this state's history. Over that time, there was a 50 per cent increase in assaults. It was not a five or 10 per cent increase; it was a 50 per cent increase in assaults. There was a 70 per cent increase in threatening behaviour, 39 per cent increase in motor vehicle theft and 42 per cent increase in stealing. That is the Leader of the Opposition's record. I do not know how members opposite can come into the chamber and talk about crime and community safety.

Then, having delivered this total disaster, when we had the lowest police morale on record in this state and the number of officers responding to public calls for assistance effectively halved—response teams were cut in half and little by little more officers were added—the number of metropolitan policing districts, including Mandurah, was cut back to only four because of the former government's financial mismanagement. The district status was taken from and the traffic office was taken out of Mandurah. Officers were traipsing from one end of the metropolitan area to the other, and spending most of their time in vehicles and apologising to the public when they got to them.

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Dawesville, I call you to order for the second time. It will be a third in a minute!

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Response times blew out, crime rates went up and methamphetamine use was simply out of control. That is the record of the member for Scarborough and the Liberal Party in office. Shame on every single one of you.

Now members opposite come into the chamber and act as though people in the community being addicted to methamphetamine is a new issue. Guess what! Methamphetamine use is a driver of crime. That is not a revelation to anyone on this side of the house. I want to give my colleagues the opportunity to add to the debate on this motion, but I want to highlight that yet again today police have announced a couple of really significant seizures of illicit drugs. This government has delivered 120 additional people to the Western Australia Police Force to fight methamphetamine use. As a result of inquiries, a misuse of drug search warrant was executed in Alkimos on 20 August—not that long ago. Today, I inspected over 20 kilograms of methamphetamine, 4.8 kilograms of heroin and over \$1 million in cash that was seized in the last week. Later on that same day, a search warrant was executed at residential premises in Quinns Rocks, where police located another \$200 000 in cash, 6.81 grams of methamphetamine, cocaine, MDMA and cannabis. As a result of those investigations, a 47-year-old male and a 47-year-old female from Quinns Rocks have been charged with a range of offences.

The Western Australia Police Force has been targeting drug dealers like never before. It has been working with the Australian Crime Commission and other national and international agencies, and getting better results than ever before. I will finish with this. Today, I saw a huge industrial pill press that police had confiscated. The industrial-size pill press could produce up to 8 000 tablets an hour. The senior officer told me that he had seen one of these only once before in his 25-year policing career. It is the kind of pill press that prints out the little tablets that are distributed at festivals, nightclubs and other venues where young people go. I congratulate our police force in taking this misery off the streets.

Members: Hear! Hear!

MR F.M. LOGAN (Cockburn — Minister for Corrective Services) [3.28 pm]: The member for Hillarys sounds like a talking page of the *Herald Sun*. Every time he walks into this chamber, it is outrage! Everything is outrageous and terrible! He sounds like a talking front page of the *Herald Sun*. Remember, Liberal members interchange the words "meth zombies" and "homeless people" all the time. Let me remind the Leader of the Opposition and members opposite that those people who are addicted to meth have families. They are ordinary citizens of Western Australia who have an addiction. There are also people in this chamber whose families have suffered from addictions. When members opposite call people "meth zombies", remember that those families are listening to what they are saying. People in this chamber who have also suffered from the addiction of methamphetamine in their families are also listening to what they are saying. Members opposite need to be careful in what they say. The way in which they describe fellow Western Australians is an outrage. What policies have members opposite had in place to address them?

Mr A. Krsticevic: Through you!

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Through us? Let us go through our policies, member. They include: more police on the beat getting methamphetamine under control; more interdiction of meth supply, which members have just heard about from the Minister for Police, regarding demand; and, the first meth prison in the whole of Australia, in Wandoo, dealing with meth addiction, taken back from the private sector into the public sector, run cheaper as a meth addiction prison than it was under the private sector, and, with great outcomes.

Division

Question put and a division taken with the following result —

Ayes (19)

Mr I.C. Blayney
Mr V.A. Catania
Ms M.J. Davies
Mrs L.M. Harvey
Dr D.J. Honey

Mr P.A. Katsambanis
Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup
Mr A. Krsticevic
Mr S.K. L'Estrange
Mr R.S. Love

Mr W.R. Marmion
Mr J.E. McGrath
Ms L. Mettam
Dr M.D. Nahan
Mr D.C. Nalder

Mr K. O'Donnell
Mr D.T. Redman
Mr P.J. Rundle
Mrs A.K. Hayden (*Teller*)

Noes (35)

Ms L.L. Baker
Dr A.D. Buti
Mr J.N. Carey
Mrs R.M.J. Clarke
Mr M.J. Folkard
Ms J.M. Freeman
Ms E.L. Hamilton
Mr T.J. Healy
Mr M. Hughes

Mr W.J. Johnston
Mr D.J. Kelly
Mr F.M. Logan
Mr M. McGowan
Ms S.F. McGurk
Mr K.J.J. Michel
Mr S.A. Millman
Mr Y. Mubarakai
Mr M.P. Murray

Mrs L.M. O'Malley
Mr S.J. Price
Mr D.T. Punch
Mr J.R. Quigley
Ms M.M. Quirk
Mrs M.H. Roberts
Ms C.M. Rowe
Ms R. Saffioti
Ms A. Sanderson

Mrs J.M.C. Stojkovski
Mr C.J. Tallentire
Mr D.A. Templeman
Mr P.C. Tinley
Mr R.R. Whitby
Ms S.E. Winton
Mr B.S. Wyatt
Mr D.R. Michael (*Teller*)

Question thus negatived.

BILLS

Assent

Message from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the following bills —

1. Appropriation (Recurrent 2019–20) Bill 2019.
2. Appropriation (Capital 2019–20) Bill 2019.
3. Police Amendment (Medical Retirement) Bill 2019.
4. Road Traffic Amendment (Blood Alcohol Content) Bill 2019.

VOLUNTARY ASSISTED DYING BILL 2019

Appropriations

Message from the Governor received and read recommending appropriations for the bill.

PAPERS TABLED

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

ECONOMICS AND INDUSTRY STANDING COMMITTEE

*Inquiry into Short-Stay Accommodation — Extension of Reporting Date —
Statement by Acting Speaker*

THE ACTING SPEAKER (Ms S.E. Winton): I have received advice that the Economics and Industry Standing Committee has extended the reporting date on the inquiry into short-stay accommodation to 26 September 2019.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE — PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Standing Orders Suspension — Notice of Motion

Mr D.A. Templeman (Leader of the House) gave notice that at the next sitting of the house he would move —

That so much of standing orders be suspended as is necessary to enable private members' business to have priority from 4.00 to 8.00 pm on Wednesday, 28 August 2019.

McGOWAN GOVERNMENT — ECONOMIC MANAGEMENT

Notice of Motion

Mr D.C. Nalder gave notice that at the next sitting of the house he would move —

That this house condemns the divided McGowan Labor government for failing to deliver on its jobs bonanza and for implementing policy decisions that have damaged the economy and inflicted financial pain on Western Australia's struggling households.

MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE AND FOOD — PERFORMANCE
McGOWAN GOVERNMENT — ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE

Removal of Order — Statement by Speaker

THE ACTING SPEAKER (Ms S.E. Winton) [3.39 pm]: I inform members that in accordance with standing order 144A, the orders of the day that appeared on the last notice paper as private members' business orders of the day 1 and 2 have not been debated for more than 12 calendar months and have been removed from the notice paper.

METROPOLITAN REGION SCHEME (BEELIAR WETLANDS) BILL 2018

Third Reading

MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan — Minister for Planning) [3.40 pm]: I move —

That the bill be now read a third time.

DR M.D. NAHAN (Riverton) [3.40 pm]: We went through this bill at great length in both the debate on the second reading speech and at the consideration in detail stage. I have to describe this bill as the worst bill brought to this house by the McGowan government, and it has had some shockers. The Human Reproductive Technology and Surrogacy Legislation Amendment Bill 2018 was supposed to prevent discrimination, but we found out after a long-drawn-out period that it would cause discrimination. We teased out the various aspects of it, particularly in the upper house, and the Premier called that undemocratic and designed to stop voices. Anyway, that is a different one. The Western Australian Jobs Bill 2017 defined jobs in New Zealand as Western Australian. I have not seen the tectonic plates move very much but I think New Zealand is a different country from Australia and a different place from Western Australia. Probably the worst, from my perspective, because of its harm on the economy was the Duties Amendment (Additional Duty for Foreign Persons) Bill 2018 that, basically, has put a stop to foreign investment in high-rise and infill developments in the state and has not raised any money. Those are three examples of idiotic bills, but this one is the worst.

Let us go through some of the things that we teased out. The McGowan Labor government made an election commitment to do two things to Roe 8—not build it and rip up the contracts, which had been let, and redistribute those to some of the people involved in the contracts for other purposes. It has done that. It did not say that it would excise the land for the Beelihar wetlands from the road reserve, which is the intent of this bill. That was not an election commitment. More importantly, the government has gone out and abrogated the established planning processes. Let us recognise what that is. For decades and decades, this state has developed a planning process whereby road reserves and other things are based on a decision-making process that includes addressing people impacted over a process. Usually, amendments to the metropolitan region scheme go through an established process and take 24 months, and for good reason. We are changing use, rights of land, that fundamentally change how we live, how we build, how we develop and how we work. Also, people make investments on the basis of those long-term plans and changing them, as we are doing here, is an act that enhances sovereign risk. Ripping up contracts also creates sovereign risk. The government has decided that for part of the Beelihar wetlands, the right way for Roe 8 is to use a bill to expedite the excision. The reason given is that it is in a hurry. The remainder of the Roe 8 road reserve will go through the standard metropolitan region scheme. It has not come up with an adequate explanation for why we would treat one part of the road reserve one way and another part another way.

We have such an extensive process for considering planning changes because it is important to consult with the community and businesses that would be impacted. We look at the environmental impact of a change in land use. The Cities of Cockburn, Melville and, I believe, Kwinana, and, indeed, the South West Group consortium of councils, have undertaken work, which they have, hopefully, provided to the minister, and have said that if we do not build Roe 8, we will have to do these types of investments in adjacent roads. If we excise this road reserve, it will have impacts elsewhere. To our knowledge, that work has not been done except by the councils. When we ask about it, we learn that the government has not taken those issues on board or had any program. Once it excises the road reserve, what next? It is not so much about roads to the port, but the adjacent roads and right of way that affect the local community. When the government makes this decision, it has ramifications, as all planning decisions do. The local cities have said that if we do excise this road reserve, it will have an impact on them and they would have to invest in the vicinity of \$600 million of additional money on roads impacted that would have to take the traffic and the activity that would otherwise be on Roe 8.

The government has not addressed this issue. By rushing this bill through Parliament and not using the standard methodology for an amendment to the metropolitan region scheme, the government is telling the Cities of Kwinana, Melville and Cockburn that it does not care about the impact of its decisions on the communities that the councils and, hopefully, the government represents, and the impacts on the adjacent areas and other roads.

Another issue with the long debate on Roe 8 was that the Beelihar wetlands has some very sensitive areas, but a lot of it has been seriously degraded. Hope Road and a high-voltage line go through the area. The vegetation is regularly trimmed and pesticide is used to stop it from growing in the high-voltage line area. We also know from the assessment that the existing structure of Hope Road and the use of Horse Paddock Swamp, and others, have

led to significant degradation of the watertable and threaten flora and fauna of the area. It is not a stable and pristine area. There are threats to the area. One of the reasons that the Environmental Protection Authority approved Roe 8 was that the program for building Roe 8 would address a number of these existing deficiencies.

By excising the land from the road reserve, it should be incumbent upon the government—if we had followed the standard metropolitan region scheme amendment processes, it would have been considered—to consider issues such as the poor drainage of one area north of the right of way to the south of it. There are problems there. It should explore areas of asbestos pollution in areas that have been used as asbestos dumps. It should address the issue of oblong turtle transfers. When I raised the issue of turtles being smashed and killed on Hope Road, I was ridiculed by the minister. But this issue was raised just last week by the City of Cockburn when it found—this is a very important aspect of it—that it is a rare and endangered turtle species. For a variety of reasons, the female goes to dry land to lay the eggs, moves out of the swamp and crosses Hope Road to drier areas to lay the eggs, and they are being killed in substantial numbers along Hope Road. I might add that one of the ironies of this process is that this is an attempt to excise a road reserve, but it keeps an existing road reserve, Hope Road, through the area. According to the modelling that I have seen, the traffic on Hope Road will increase and, therefore, the threat to the oblong turtles will increase. If we went to the standard process of amending the metropolitan region scheme, these issues would be teased out and the government would be quite rightly asked what it will do to protect the turtles. The proponents for Roe 8 were asked that, and they addressed it.

The Environmental Protection Authority raised this as a major issue and required the previous government in this proposal for Roe 8 to address it. By skipping and avoiding the standard amendment process, this government fails to address this. It has a way of not addressing it. The irony of all this is that this is supposedly about protecting the wetlands. Turtles are a part of the wetlands, but this process is preserving into the future threats to the wetlands. Why would we do that? My assessment will take place. There is a range of problems—existing roads; existing high tension wire right-of-ways that are regulation trimmed; clear areas that have been used and abused as dumps; threats to the flora and fauna; and threats to the water movement under the Beeliar wetlands. As I said, it is not a pristine area. In this process, the government should have explained to us, and to the people of Western Australia, particularly those who enjoy the area, how it is going to fix up those. How is it going to address the real threats to the Beeliar wetlands that exist now in its current use that it is preserving? The Minister for Planning by choosing this process in this bill avoids addressing the real issues. It raises the question: what is the purpose of this? Apparently, because of her actions, it is not about the environmental value of the wetlands. Otherwise, she would have done that; why would she not?

The opposition moved two amendments. We raised the issue: is this about saving the Beeliar wetlands, as referred to in the title of the bill? Clearly, as I explained earlier, it is not. If the government was really concerned about the Beeliar wetlands, it would address it in the bill, firstly, by going through the metropolitan region scheme to identify and quantify them. It would have had reports from the EPA, and would have addressed the true issues raised by the South West Group of cities. However, it has not done what it should have done.

The government has two processes underway for the long-term transport planning in that area. The first is the Westport Taskforce, which has issued a report—and will issue a final report—since we last debated this bill in consideration in detail. The Westport strategy was a commitment of the government at the last election, and it promised to address the long-term planning needs for the harbour and its transport links. The Westport strategy has repeatedly stated that the limitations to the existing port, the port of Fremantle, are not the port itself. It can grow to over \$3 million to use. That is counter to what the government said during the election. Nevertheless, it said a lot of things before the election that turned out to be just fictional. When the government brought this bill to the house, it was told by the Westport strategy—its pet strategy—that the key weak link in access to the port of Fremantle was transport links, both rail and road. The question the opposition had was: why would the government bring a bill to this house to excise the land before the finalisation of that report? The report that it is spending \$20 million on—it is paying its advisory staff a large amount of wages—has a mandate to look at the links and the government is pre-empting it by excising the land in this bill. The McGowan government has pulled \$20 million out of schools in my electorate—\$11 million from a rebuild of Willetton Senior High School and \$2 million a year from reductions to students' funding. However, it is spending \$20 million on the Westport strategy, and it is just nobbling it. It is useless. We find in the most recent report last week that the Westport strategy was always told that it could look at the long-term plan, but that the long-term plan could not include Roe 8 and Roe 9, so the government nobbled it.

The report last week came out with a statement that if the government had included Roe 8 in its assessment, it would not have been part of it. I have never read a report that says it was instructed not to include a road, but that if it had included a road, it would not have done it. Twenty million dollars for that piece of rubbish? The government must be joking.

Dr D.J. Honey: Propaganda.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Propaganda. This issue goes to the heart and soul of the Labor Party, as we saw on the weekend. Large sections that know a lot about the port and transport links, such as working-class unions—the

Transport Workers' Union of Australia, the Maritime Union of Australia, the Construction, Forestry, Maritime, Mining and Energy Union—are all for Roe 8. It is the people who know nothing about it who are against it, but that is the Labor Party's problem. I do not really give a stuff about it, but nonetheless —

Dr D.J. Honey: Care.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Care—I do not care. That is a weak link to the soul of the Labor Party. However, what I can say is that Westport has said that its priority is an outer harbour, and that the outer harbour ranks highest, relative to the expanding port of Fremantle, than the other options, including on environmental grounds. We read in the fine print—actually, it is not fine print; it is quite blatant—that no environmental assessment is included of the outer harbour, ideological or otherwise. Westport says that a giant outer harbour, including millions of tonnes of dredging, will have less of an environmental impact than building Roe 8. You must be joking!

The point of this bill was to pre-empt the Westport strategy. The government just took \$20 million and threw it away. It also went to the last election—the opposition addressed this in an amendment to the bill—proposing that the major task of Infrastructure Western Australia was to take “politics out of infrastructure planning and develop a long-term coordinated plan”. I might add that two of the leading lights in the Westport strategy are the chairman and deputy chairman of Infrastructure WA, so they should know something about these issues. Why would we excise a road reserve that has been there for over 50 years when we do not know what our future option uses are before the strategy is even underway? We would not be doing it if we were really interested in long-term planning for the state. We definitely would not be doing it if we were interested in taking politics out of infrastructure planning. The government is injecting directly into it in the worst, most obtuse way I can remember. Indeed, this government has gone to great lengths to politicise virtually every aspect of infrastructure policy, starting with Roe 8. It is ripping up the contract and issuing new ones, and every other aspect of it. In other words, like the Westport strategy, this bill and the government's action have rendered Infrastructure Western Australia useless.

I assure the government that because of its actions, a future Liberal government will potentially ignore even the good work that Infrastructure WA might do, because the government has clearly instructed the Westport Taskforce and Infrastructure Western Australia not to look at all the issues—Roe 8, Roe 9 or certain things. In other words, right from the beginning, the government politicised Infrastructure WA and did something to nobble it. The whole purpose of Infrastructure Western Australia was to have long-term planning and to depoliticise it, and the government has done exactly the opposite. The government has stopped it from looking at the long term. The government has stopped it from looking at all the options. The government has injected its political views right into Infrastructure Western Australia's terms of reference. Why did it do it? The government should cancel Infrastructure Western Australia and tell its consultants to go home and get off the gravy train; the government has ruined them. That is what the government has done. It is a shame. I actually support the concept of Infrastructure WA. I have seen it work in New South Wales and Victoria, and I have definitely seen it work at the commonwealth level in Infrastructure Australia. But the government has ruined it, because the government cannot stop playing politics when establishing institutions. We have seen that almost every step of the way. Hopefully, we will not see that with the Voluntary Assisted Dying Bill.

The Beelihar wetlands bill has not only undermined the planning processes on amendments to the metropolitan region scheme, but also rendered the Westport Taskforce and Infrastructure Western Australia useless. The government should cancel it and make it go away. We were forced to reject the government's plan. When the Liberals next get into government—I hope we continue with Infrastructure WA—the plans put forward under this government's watch will be looked at with a great deal of scepticism and we will not necessarily commit to them. We cannot because this government politicised it. A clear lesson from this is that the Beelihar wetlands bill is not about protecting, enhancing and saving the Beelihar wetlands; it is basically an exercise in securing a political totem for sections that have given votes and funding to the Labor Party, whether that be people who own houses along the right of way and seek gains from the excision of the right of way or environmental activists, who saw money flow into their coffers in the campaign, and I have some examples. Maybe it is the return of the socialists to the Labor Party. I note the ALP has signed up to the new international movement and become socialists again. We saw the member for Bassendean, the Minister for Water, adhere to that today when he renationalised work in the Water Corporation. By the way, that was something he also tried to do with crayfish.

Mrs M.H. Roberts: Don't you like public sector workers?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Yes, I do. They are very valuable; I used to be one. But I tell the member that I am not a socialist like she is. The member for Midland is an official socialist. How does it feel?

Ms R. Saffioti: She's been called a lot of things but never a socialist.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: No. This is the new Labor Party mantra. The members are all socialists now. It is quite absurd and not true nonetheless.

One of the ironies is that during this whole debate there were many fellow travellers on this, including the Conservation Council of WA. It fought hard against Roe 8, supported the government and, I suggest, pushed it strongly, and has been a major proponent of this bill. Indeed, it had two full-time campaigners working against Roe 8. I remember in the second Environmental Protection Authority review, the Conservation Council of WA

spawned over 1 000 tick-and-flick complaints to the EPA, which slowed the process by six months. Indeed, it spawned over 2 000 submissions to the EPA and Main Roads on Roe 8. Recently, the EPA considered the environmental impact of Metronet, in particular the Thornlie–Cockburn line and the two sections of the Yanchep line. The EPA showed that the environmental impact of Metronet on Bush Forever sites will at least double by every major indicator. It will impact on flora and fauna, water, protected species and the Carnaby’s cockatoo. The impact of the Metronet project will be double the impact of Roe 8, but the Conservation Council of WA did not even make a submission to the Metronet assessments. When we contacted it, it did not even think about it: “Why would we do that?”

Ms R. Saffioti: You contacted them to make a submission?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Yes. I wanted to highlight hypocrisy.

Ms R. Saffioti: That’s bizarre!

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Yes. It claims to represent conservation groups in this state. Members would expect that a group that was really concerned about protecting the Beelihar wetlands or the environment in that area would make a submission, but it did not make a single one. It made over 2 000 submissions on the Beelihar wetlands, but not a single one on Metronet. Why not? It is the environment. I rang the council after the EPA report came out and I noticed that its name was not there, and nor were the names of any other environmental groups to speak of. Therefore, the Conservation Council of WA does not give a stuff about the impact on the environment. This is about politics, and those types of people are behind this bill. They are the types of people the minister is trying to pay off by ramming this bill through with inadequate consideration. The minister does not give a damn about the planning process, the outer harbour and the planning for ports, the long-term infrastructure planning for the state and the institutions that this government set up with the Westport strategy and Infrastructure WA. The government is paying off people, like the Conservation Council of WA, who campaigned for decades against something that would have had a relatively minor impact compared with the impacts of Metronet.

I might add that once this is excised, the Conservation Council, if it was really interested in the environment and the Beelihar wetlands, would be screaming at this government for failing to address the very many environmental issues that this bill leaves unanswered, such as the impacts on water, flora and fauna, Hope Road and the railway voltage line. A true group would actually be on our side on this and say, “You should’ve gone through the standard process”, but it has not. This is a terrible bill that should be, and I hope is, voted down in the upper house. This is a bill that sections of the Labor Party should campaign strongly against. Remember, this government is not our friend when it comes to long-term planning for ports and roads, addressing congestion in the south west and, more importantly, protecting the environment—the flora and fauna and water—in the Beelihar wetlands. It is basically out there paying off its voters. This is a narrow, unrepresentative group of people who have duped a lot of people who live in the area. The proponents of this have let us down.

This is a truly terrible bill. The minister made a couple of statements during the consideration in detail stage that I do not respect her. I respect her as a person and a member of Parliament, but ministers earn respect and this does not earn her any respect at all.

MS L. METTAM (Vasse) [4.08 pm]: I would also like to contribute to the third reading and to support the comments made by our lead speaker, the member for Riverton, who has outlined very articulately some of the great challenges and issues with the Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beelihar Wetlands) Bill 2018. It is an extraordinary piece of legislation that bypasses due process. It is a piece of legislation that once again illustrates economic vandalism by the McGowan Labor government. It ignores due process and a system of public consultation that would have taken up to two years and would have identified some of the significant issues in the south metropolitan region—a region that has had its transport and congestion issues ignored by this government. Afternoon commuters face congestion and a commute time that is 20 per cent above the metropolitan average. Trucks on Leach Highway have a crash rate of two to six times the average when compared with the number of crashes on other roads. This bill misses an opportunity. It removes not only the investment of —

Ms S. Winton interjected.

Ms L. METTAM: I am sorry, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Wanneroo, I do not think your interjections are welcome.

Ms L. METTAM: I cannot hear what she is saying. The important point is that —

Ms S.E. Winton: You didn’t do it in eight years; that’s the important point.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Wanneroo, I call you for the first time.

Ms L. METTAM: If the member for Wanneroo’s strongest argument against Roe 8 and 9 is that it was not achieved in eight years, perhaps it illustrates that she is a supporter of this important road project. Perhaps she is a great supporter of the \$1.2 billion.

Ms S. Winton interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Vasse!

Ms L. METTAM: It is just noise. I would prefer not to hear the interjections from the member for Wanneroo.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Carry on.

Ms L. METTAM: Perhaps she would take the opportunity of the \$1.2 billion that is on the table, ready for the important Roe 8 and 9 project—an investment that would create up to 10 000 direct and indirect jobs. It is one thing for a government not to invest in an important road infrastructure project such as this, but it is quite another for a government to make a decision to introduce a piece of legislation to bypass proper process and stop future governments from investing in an important road corridor such as Roe 8 and 9. That is why I stand with the Liberal opposition and the National Party in opposing this legislation.

The Liberal Party of Western Australia believes in building projects. We are a party that builds. We are a party that has invested in important projects and has transformed WA, after the previous Labor government had relegated our state to the unfortunate title of “Dullsville”. We were a government that invested in important projects such as Perth Stadium, Elizabeth Quay and Perth Children’s Hospital. We are a party that invests and supports investment. This legislation illustrates what the Labor Party represents—economic vandalism. It represents saying no to progress. Once again, as I stated, it is turning its back on the important transport issues facing those in the south metropolitan area.

We have seen Westport Taskforce’s recent report, which has been rubbished, and quite fairly so, by many commentators in the community.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, we need to keep this as a third reading contribution that is relevant to the bill. Do not bring in new arguments from your perspective. I am just redirecting you there a bit.

Ms L. METTAM: I go back to the bill and what it represents. According to Westport Taskforce’s 2014 report, the capacity of Fremantle port is at least 2.1 million 20-foot or equivalent units; more recently, we understand that that capacity could be as great as 3.8 million TEU. However, the transport corridor has been highlighted as the biggest constraint on that capacity. Those transport corridor issues would be addressed, quite obviously, by Roe 8 and 9—a project that has been effectively blocked by this legislation that has been so recklessly introduced by the McGowan government.

As I stated earlier, Labor governments have form in this area. As I raised in my contribution to the second reading debate, a previous Minister for Transport under the former Labor government blocked the proposed eastern bypass and the potential opportunities for Fremantle. This bill also represents a great deal of hypocrisy. The government has used an environmental argument to introduce this piece of legislation to stop Roe 8 and 9 from going ahead. However, environmental considerations have been flatly ignored in previous legislation. In the Thornlie–Cockburn Link, for example, 54.9 hectares of bushland, including 22.8 hectares of a Bush Forever site and cockatoo habitat, have been cleared as a result of that project being progressed. The Liberal opposition is highlighting the hypocrisy and the arguments around hypocrisy. How can one important transport corridor receive no environmental objection, yet another important piece of corridor that is important for transport and road safety issues—that is, Roe 8 and 9—receive so much inflammatory and significant environmental objection, at a cost to the people of the south metropolitan community?

The hypocrisy does not stop there. As the member for Riverton pointed out, by effectively ramming this legislation through and bypassing proper process, we have seen real threats to the oblong turtle, which will undoubtedly be threatened and will become a protected species as a result of the construction at Hope Road. There are real environmental impacts that have not been considered by this government. It is quite obvious from the debate during consideration in detail that there has been no consultation with the Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions or the Department of Water and Environment Regulation. That is another reason that the Liberal opposition objects to the process undertaken by this government.

By not pursuing Roe 8 and 9, the government is ignoring significant environmental benefits, such as the 450 000 tonnes of CO₂ that would have been reduced by 2031 as a result of removing 7 000 heavy vehicles or up to 74 000 light vehicles from local roads in the area—less fuel, less emissions, and better environmental outcomes. It is well understood that the Roe 8 and 9 project had received environmental approvals at both a state and federal level and had been tested in the Supreme Court and the High Court. The people of Western Australia should have a lot of confidence in the process that was followed. It is fair to say that in contrast with what we have seen here, the process was quite exhaustive and extremely thorough in what was a very important road project for the people of the south metropolitan region and for the transport industry as well.

Earlier I referred to the McGowan government’s hypocrisy. In my contribution to the second reading debate, I also touched on the fact that although this government uses community and environmentally based arguments, it does so selectively. We see that happening as well with its plans to urbanise sections of Whiteman Park as part of the Metronet project. This land was sold to the state government in the 1970s with an understanding that it would be dedicated to providing good community outcomes. In opposition at that time, the now Minister for Transport raised

concerns about consultation with the community on the process, the importance of Whiteman Park being dedicated to the community and ensuring that the community had its say on the park's usage. I also question the extent to which consultation has happened on the government's plans to urbanise a section of Whiteman Park around the Ellenbrook rail and what has been proposed. We know that in the past it has been disallowed by the Greens and by the opposition. I imagine that there is already a great deal of community concern about this government's lack of consultation on that issue.

Ms R. Saffioti: Seriously. This is the third reading.

Ms L. METTAM: This was raised in the second reading debate and it is an issue of hypocrisy. On the one hand, this government uses the environmental card and the community card when it suits it, and, on the other hand, it completely ignores —

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

Point of Order

Mr W.R. MARMION: I am trying to hear the speaker and I cannot hear her.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member. I do not think that is a point of order, but it is a good point. Would you like to continue on, member.

Debate Resumed

Ms L. METTAM: I think it is a very good point. This government continues to urbanise community land to pay for its budget blow-outs. We know that the cost of the Metronet has already blown out by over \$2 billion.

This legislation will hurt the community. It says to the south metropolitan region that this government does not care. This government is turning its back on this project in the short term and it is also inhibiting future governments from investing in Roe 8 and 9 at a time when \$1.2 billion is on the table. This project would be of great benefit to the electorates of not only Bicton and Cockburn, but also Riverton, Willagee, Jandakot and Fremantle. Roe 8 and 9 would be of significant benefit to the 5 000 students who attend schools along Leach Highway and in the local area and who, when travelling to school, have to compete with many of the trucks that also share that local road network. This legislation illustrates how this government is willing to turn its back on an opportunity to remove over 74 000 vehicles, including 7 000 trucks, from those local roads. This should be of great concern.

One of the issues raised during the consideration in detail stage was the role of Infrastructure WA. Earlier this year we heard in this place that the government wanted to introduce a greater level of transparency into infrastructure projects. This government wanted to establish a body that would give confidence to the people of Western Australia by helping to build a strong economy through improving infrastructure coordination and planning, encouraging investment and supporting job creation. But when the Liberal opposition moved a motion to have this legislation considered by a new body—Infrastructure WA—it was concerning to all of us when that motion received no support. If this government were serious about transparency and the infrastructure, transport and congestion issues faced by those in the south metropolitan region, one would think that it would have at least supported the motion proposed by the Liberal opposition. It is unfortunate but quite consistent with the government's behaviour so far through this process. We also moved a motion to see what the outcomes of the Westport Taskforce report were ahead of introducing this legislation. I question why the minister brought on consideration in detail of the bill ahead of the Westport Taskforce report being introduced. I am sure that many members on this side of the house would have liked to ask some questions about the limitations of the flawed Westport Taskforce report and their relationship to this bill. This is a legitimate point because it touches on the way in which the Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beelihar Wetlands) Bill was introduced.

As I stated earlier, this legislation is economic vandalism. It ignores the great efficiency gains for the freight industry that would have been created through supporting this transport corridor. This government is turning its back on the \$1.2 billion dedicated to the important Roe 8 and 9 infrastructure project—money that is still on the table as a result of the federal government's commitment to this road project. This legislation ignores the fact that in 2016, Infrastructure Australia recognised Roe 8 and 9 as the most strategically important road project in the country, beating 93 other projects at that time. The community of the south metropolitan region, the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Western Australia and the Western Roads Federation are concerned about the government's politicisation of this issue. There is a whole community of concern out there.

I stand with my Liberal colleagues in opposing this bill. During the second reading debate, I also talked about what would happen under this government's do-nothing approach. Main Roads WA undertook a report in 2016 that highlighted the impact on roads in the area of a do-nothing approach by a do-nothing government. The Main Roads Western Australia report looked at the section of Leach Highway between Carrington Road and Stock Road and recognised that by 2031 there would be an additional 15 000 vehicles on that stretch of road. The report also highlighted that there would be an additional 13 000 vehicles on the section between Stock Road and North Lake Road; an additional 13 000 vehicles on South Street between Stock Road and North Lake Road; and an additional 13 000 vehicles on Stock Road between South Street and Leach Highway. The government's approach to road

congestion, which is merely a High Street upgrade and a roundabout at Stirling Highway, does not nearly go far enough towards addressing the significant road safety and congestion issues in the south west metropolitan region, and that is absolutely why it has received such condemnation from not only members on this side of the house and many industry groups, but also many Labor Party members. We saw that on display on the weekend. There is obviously great concern within the Labor Party about the government's policy on and approach to transport. I expect that Hon Kyle McGinn, the member for Mining and Pastoral Region, and Martin Pritchard, who both walked out —

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, relevance! I think you are drawing a bit of a wide bow. Can you get back to the third reading topics that you previously covered.

Ms L. METTAM: When this important Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beelihar Wetlands) Bill 2018 goes to the upper house, we will all be keen and eager to see the level of support for the community and the level of opposition to the economic vandalism that it represents. It is fair to say that there is great concern about this legislation from not only this side of the house, but also industry. It is also important to recognise—I appreciate that I am not able to talk about the Westport report today—that Roe 8 and Roe 9 would have not only served the inner harbour, an inner harbour that has significant capacity for at least the next 30 years, but also supported a future outer harbour whenever one is economically viable and would have also supported the Kwinana industrial area. Importantly, Roe 8 and Roe 9 would support the community. They would have supported the more than 5 000 students who go to school in the local area and they would have supported the freight industry. Certainly, I was very interested to hear from the Nationals WA—the concerns extend much broader than Perth—about the needs of the freight industry and farmers' concern about seeing this important road project go ahead. Many businesses in the south west metropolitan region that I have spoken with have great concern about not only seeing the road congestion issues addressed, but also the government's alternative to address the congestion issue in these transport corridors.

I raised the issue of the proposed changes to Leach Highway as a heavy vehicle trunk in my second reading contribution. It could potentially have an impact on more than 70 homes and businesses in the local area. There is fair reason for the community to be outraged, and we should not be surprised that many homeowners in the area have their own placards calling for Roe 8 and Roe 9. The momentum is only building. I also believe that many people feel ripped off by this government. They feel that they have been sold a pup when it comes to the environmental issues that were originally raised about the Beelihar wetlands and Roe 8 and Roe 9 given that just 0.49 per cent of the wetlands would have been affected, that it was a top-down construction and that they would have had the benefit of cutting 450 000 tonnes of CO₂ due to reduced emissions as a result of heavy haulage vehicles not going through as many as 15 traffic lights. Those real environmental benefits were not acknowledged in the previous debate. At the time, the former government made a commitment to invest \$45 million in the restoration of this degraded area. It committed to invest in offsets in the Mandurah area that would have resulted in an area 1.5 times the size of Kings Park. Significant consideration of the environment was undertaken during planning for Roe 8 and Roe 9, and they received environmental approval at the state and federal level, which was tested in and supported by the Supreme and High Courts. This government has no consideration for proper process. It has bypassed community consultation. The oblong turtle will continue to be seriously threatened because Hope Road will be maintained. The oblong turtles were considered in the original Roe 8 and Roe 9 plan because Hope Road would have been deleted. These are some of the considerations as to why this bill is fatally flawed, similar to the Westport Taskforce and many other pieces of legislation. The member for Riverton talked about the Human Reproductive Technology and Surrogacy Legislation Amendment Bill, which has effectively been thrown out because it is fatally flawed. The Western Australian Jobs Bill was apparently about WA jobs, but it is also about jobs for New Zealand and other Australian states. They are a few of the issues that have been highlighted. I support opposition members. We cannot afford to turn our back on the important Roe 8 and Roe 9 projects, which would reduce congestion, improve road safety and increase efficiency for the transport industry. This legislation is economic vandalism and, once again, the government is willing to bypass proper process for its own political objectives, which will come at a great cost to this state.

MRS L.M. HARVEY (Scarborough — Leader of the Opposition) [4.39 pm]: I, too, rise to voice my objection to the Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beelihar Wetlands) Bill 2018. Other members have articulated significant reasons for it, but I would like to address a couple of the concerns that were raised during consideration in detail. A repetitive and deceptive catchcry seems to emerge from members on the government benches whenever we talk about this project. They repetitively say, "You didn't build it. Why didn't you build it? Why didn't you prioritise it over the years that you were in government?" There are good reasons for that.

Members would probably recall that when the Liberals took over government in September 2008, planning for the project commenced. In November 2009, the Environmental Protection Authority basically set the level of assessment required for the public environmental review. That was then released for public comment between June and September 2011. There were over 3 000 submissions—that is on the record. Then in June 2013, the EPA basically went into committee to consider its decision. Conditional approval for the project was granted on 13 September 2013. A process was followed. During the debate, we highlighted that the government has thwarted other processes in bringing this legislation forward. We took government in 2008, got the project significantly

commenced and started the EPA approval process, which was given conditional approval on 13 September. Then the fun started. The EPA approved the Roe Highway extension in 2013. The minister made his decision for approval of the project in July 2015—I think that might have been Minister Jacob at the time. Then there was an appeal to the Supreme Court, which in December 2015 ruled that the EPA approval was invalid. Once again, there was a stoppage in the ability of the government to start the project. There was an appeal to the Supreme Court in December 2015, and the Supreme Court ruled that the EPA approval was invalid. The Supreme Court judge at the time gave his reasons for ruling that the EPA approval was invalid. The government then went to the Court of Appeal, through the Supreme Court, in July 2016. In handing down its decision, the Court of Appeal unanimously agreed that there had been an error in judgement by the judge of the Supreme Court—there was an error at law in his judgement with respect to overturning the EPA approval and ruling it invalid. The appeal judges unanimously agreed that the EPA approval was valid. That then brings us to another appeal—an attempt by those opposed to the project to take it to the High Court.

While all these actions were in train, a responsible government would not continue to progress a project. We needed to allow the courts to consider these actions before making a decision to commence a project; we did not want to be in contempt of the High Court. However, the High Court dismissed the challenge on 16 December 2016. The government of the day had gone through many, many years of approval processes and planning; achieved the funding for the project; geared up with a tender process, with lots of companies employing people; and started the project. Then the protests started and we found ourselves in an election.

We have put on the record that those now occupying the government benches ran a very schmick campaign—they made the entire Roe 8–Roe 9 project out to be about freight and trucks. Yes, it is important for freight traffic. It is really important that we get those 74 000 light vehicles and 7 000 heavy vehicles off Leach Highway. There are 20 sets of traffic lights at which they need to stop and start between the Kwinana Freeway and Stock Road. There are 28 bus stops between the —

Mrs L.M. O'Malley interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Bicton! I do not think the Leader of the Opposition is indicating that she wants the interjection, so I think you should let her continue.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. Seventy-two per cent of crashes on Leach Highway are rear-end crashes because of the stop-start nature of the traffic. I drove down Leach Highway just yesterday. I drive down Leach Highway a lot, actually; I somehow find myself with business in the south metropolitan area. That is why I know that, as an opposition, we are onto a winner with this project. I drive up and down Leach Highway and I run the gauntlet between those trucks. There are container trucks and heavy vehicles. I see what motorists do; they cut in front of the trucks. At one stage, I was at the corner of Leach Highway and North Lake Road where some resurfacing had been done and the line markings were not complete. Vehicles that were desperate to try to get ahead did not realise that it was actually only three lanes of traffic, so they were going onto the shoulder of the road and queuing, cutting in front of the trucks, on a section of road that was basically going to end 10 metres past the intersection. It is really dangerous and disconcerting. That is what every commuter in every vehicle that uses Leach Highway endures on a daily basis. These are people who are trying to access the Murdoch health precinct or the educational and university precinct. They run this gauntlet every day. They get stuck in congestion on the Kwinana Freeway every day. Every day, their lives are made miserable as they sit in their vehicles and chew through their fuel as they try to get through that section of road that the Roe 8–Roe 9 project is designed to provide a solution for. That is why we are onto a winner.

One of the reasons the opposition will continue to progress this project and continue to campaign for it is that we are being continuously contacted by people who get stuck in that congestion all the way along Leach Highway. Driving along Leach Highway, the signs are out: “Build Roe 8–Roe 9; it makes sense”. That is what people in the community are telling us. Those who now occupy the government benches ran a dishonest campaign during the election period. We have been communicating with people from schools, such as Melville Senior High School, and various community groups. They are really annoyed that they were sold misinformation during that election. They are really annoyed that they were misled by members on that side during that campaign against the highway. It is quite disturbing to think that their view of politicians is so low that they actually believed that the incoming Labor government would say, “The project’s too far advanced. We can’t rip up the contract. It will progress.” That is what a lot of people living in that south metropolitan area have fed back to us in opposition—they knew what Labor members were saying, but they thought they would get to the point where they would not be able to rip up the contract because it was too far progressed. They have voter regret. They regret giving their vote to the Labor government, because they wanted that road to be built. It was pretty clear that they did not want our team to be in government—they particularly did not like our Premier at the time, and that was pretty obvious as we got out and about—but they still did want Roe 8–Roe 9. I acknowledge that there are disparate groups in the community—the groups that were mounting the challenges—that do not want the project. I accept that they have a view. But the vast majority of people—the silent majority—do not get involved in these campaigns and do not go to protests. They just go to the polls believing that they want to chuck out a government, which is what voters do—they throw a government out. They do not necessarily vote for an opposition.

The silent majority in the southern suburbs are furious about this road being cancelled. Every day that they are in their vehicles stuck in congestion, it reminds them that they made the wrong choice. That is why we will continue to push for Roe 8 and 9, and why the member for Tangney, Ben Morton, is campaigning on this project. He wants and is pushing for this project to be built in this term of the McGowan Labor government, and has ensured that the commonwealth is holding the funding to commence this project substantially.

Members on this side of the house do not understand why the government cannot get on to those clever engineers in Main Roads, because the clever engineers in New South Wales tunnel everywhere, build bridges and find solutions to these tricky and complex environmental problems that come with trying to retrofit important infrastructure in an urban environment. Around the world, engineers build these projects and preserve the environment, so why is the government not talking to those people and asking, “How can we have our cake and eat it, too? How can we build Roe 8 and Roe 9 and look after environmental considerations?” I think we can do it. I think we have some very clever engineers in Western Australia. The member for Nedlands knows many of them. I know that those engineers would be able to come up with a solution that would give congestion relief to commuters in the southern suburbs of Riverton, Willetton, Rossmoyne, Murdoch, Cockburn and even Fremantle, who are caught trying to get to the employment centres connected along the Roe 8 corridor. Those commuters also want this project. They were looking forward to having a link into the Roe 8 and Roe 9 project and a direct, seamless, traffic light-free commute to their places of work in the eastern corridor, but they have been denied that.

The government throws up excuses for abandoning this project. Yes, there is the environmental excuse. We have talked in great detail about the \$48 million that was set aside for environmental offsets and improvements to the Beelihar wetlands as part of this project, but that will not happen. The \$48 million that was going to go into improving environmental outcomes for those wetlands is off the table because the project is off the table, which is really sad. One would think that if the government were really committed to the integrity of the Beelihar wetlands, it would be stumping up funding for a project like the one we proposed. Our government at the time proposed to put in a series of boardwalks, birdwatching stations, interpretive signage with Noongar names for all the local plants and animals and outlining their purpose in Noongar culture, and a ranger program around for the wetlands, but we are not getting any of that either. The government has proven that its commitment to the environment is somewhat wishy-washy because it has not stumped up funding for that project.

The other excuse the government throws up is that Roe 8 and Roe 9 is a road that is only required for the continuation of activity at Fremantle port and will not be needed if we build an outer harbour. That is just wrong. Whether or not an outer harbour is built, Roe 8 and Roe 9 is needed to alleviate commuter congestion. That is the bulk of its purpose. We know that it will be a massive improvement for freight traffic, because trucks will not have to stop and start at all those traffic lights, whether they are going to Fremantle port or another port—this visionary, imaginary port that is still being planned for—but the project is needed regardless. To link Roe 8 and Roe 9 directly to the future of the Fremantle port, or a new outer harbour at Kwinana, is also a nonsense.

Then we have the environmental hypocrisy of that position. I am a keen recreational fisher. Recreational fishers care for the environment. Cockburn Sound has lost over 70 per cent, or it might be 80 per cent, of its seagrass. Seagrass is the fish nursery for the fish species in the entire metropolitan west coast bioregion—that is, snapper, mulloway, dhuiies. All those species of fish lay their eggs in the water, which then sink and stick to the seagrass. If there is no seagrass for the eggs to stick to, they float away into the ether, and that is our fishery completely ruined. If we do not have the fish nursery—the habitat for our fish to lay their eggs—we will lose our fishery, and that will be a complete tragedy. That will be the outcome if we have any further destruction of the seagrass beds in Cockburn Sound, and that is why the group called the Fish Army, led by Mike Pritchard, is ramped up and ready to oppose the outer harbour.

Ms R. Saffioti: Do you talk to them?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Yes, I do talk to them.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Excuse me, member, I just warn you to keep —

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members! I am sorry but I am trying to have a discussion with the member on her feet about the relevance of her contribution. Can you keep to the third reading and not raise any other issues.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I am happy with your direction, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The government will have to address those concerns if it wants to build the outer harbour. Another option floated is whether Fremantle port has a future—with or without Roe 8 or Roe 9. Today, the Premier read from a report that says that Fremantle is a less than desirable option into the future. If the government wants to shut down port activity, build condominiums and have urban infill around Fremantle harbour, those people will need to get around the city. If we are going to increase the population in Fremantle without giving people the option to commute east-west, like Roe 8 and Roe 9—Leach Highway is already congested to the point of being almost unworkable—

what will happen? It is all well and good to say that we are going to create this wonderful harbour precinct and have high-value residential moving in, but those people need to get around the city and they need roads to do that. We are not quite in the era of *The Jetsons* yet, when we can fly around the city easily! People need roads because they need to get around in motor vehicles and on public transport. Roe 8 and Roe 9 provides a solution for that.

The other reason that we objected to this bill is because the government did not follow the metropolitan region scheme amendment process. We talked at great length about how the metropolitan region scheme is usually amended. I will remind members of that process. There are normally 10 steps in an MRS amendment process. The first step is the Western Australian Planning Commission making a resolution to amend the metropolitan region scheme and referring it to the Environmental Protection Authority. The second step is the EPA determining the level of environmental assessment. The third step is preparing an environmental review if required. The fourth step is the WAPC submitting to the minister for consent to advertise. The fifth is advertising the amendment, seeking public comment. The sixth step is the WAPC considering submissions and making recommendations. Then the environmental conditions are incorporated if required. The Governor then approves the amendment. Then it is considered by Parliament. Finally, the amendment takes effect in the MRS. None of those steps were followed and the government has not undertaken the usual level of consultation one would expect when removing an important road reservation that may be required for the future of Perth. Once it is gone; it is gone and there will be no opportunity to revisit it. We do not know the future prospects for construction that might enable tunnelling, or whatever it might be, to allow for an alternative to the Roe 8 and Roe 9 project, but once the MRS is amended to remove this road reservation, it is gone forever. The opposition believes that that is not in the best interest for the future of Western Australia. It may be needed. The government can remain committed to not building the road, but removing it, deleting it from the metropolitan region scheme forever, is an act of planning vandalism. One of the points we raised is the hypocrisy of the government. Its Infrastructure Western Australia legislation will set up a body to independently assess infrastructure needs, requirements and priorities for the state by an independent panel of people who can, separate from the political process, assess the infrastructure needs of the state, prioritise them and make recommendations to the government, of whatever flavour, about those priorities to then go to Infrastructure Australia to be assessed. Infrastructure WA did not exist in the previous term of government, but Infrastructure Australia did, and it ranked the Roe 8–Roe 9 project as the highest priority in Australia because of what it would deliver for commuters and freight efficiency. It ranked it as priority 1. Infrastructure WA is not committed to consider it. It is not even permitted to consider whether this legislation is appropriate and whether the Roe 8–Roe 9 road reservation may be required in the future. It has not been given an opportunity to consider this at all. What is the point of having Infrastructure WA if the government is going to take away a \$2 billion road infrastructure project that was given the number one priority by the federal infrastructure body? What is the point of having Infrastructure WA if it is excluded from deliberating on important deletions from the MRS, such as what we are considering in Parliament at the moment?

The opposition has done its job. We have done our job very well. We have listened to the community on this project. We accept that we did not build it, but we were given one hurdle after another, after another—the Supreme Court challenge and the Court of Appeal challenge. We went through the appropriate Environmental Protection Authority approval process. We went through the appropriate process, went out to consultation to all and sundry and had the EPA as an independent assessor look at this project and in the first instance either approve it or not approve it. The EPA approved it and put appropriate conditions in place to mitigate for any environmental issues that may arise as a result of the project. We followed the appropriate process and in doing so perhaps we should have had more of a cavalier approach to process, such as this minister has, and disregarded all that appropriate process, cut out a couple of steps and decide to build it anyway. Perhaps we should have done that. Perhaps we should have started building it, and then fought the appeal processes through the court while we were constructing it. Then the road would be substantially underway by now and commuters in south metropolitan suburbs such as Southern River, Thornlie and Gosnells who also want this project would know that there would be some relief for them on their commute east–west, because this project was coming. We did not abandon process. That is not how we rock; it is not how we roll. We do not abandon process and make political decisions about road infrastructure. A plan was in place that has been in place in this state for over 55 years to facilitate a freight route around the CBD. If members go to any well-planned city in the world, they will see that there is a circle route around the CBD that facilitates freight movement.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, members!

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: That is what every modern city has. That is what Roe 8 and Roe 9 would have achieved. The 55 years in planning started with Roe 1 and Roe 2. When we got to Roe 7, the condition of the commonwealth funding commitment to Roe 7 was that the then Labor government remained committed to leaving the Roe 8 reservation in the scheme. That commitment was made. The minister who made that commitment is still a member of this cabinet. But her word to the commonwealth agency in 2007 to keep the Roe 8 reservation in the scheme is worth nothing today, because she abandoned that by supporting this legislation, this act of planning vandalism that will take out that road reservation forever. Imagine that. She gave her word to the commonwealth agency and

commonwealth members of Parliament and ministers at the time, took millions of dollars' worth of infrastructure funding to build Roe 7 on the condition that the state government leaves the Roe 8 reservation in the scheme, and then 12 years later said, "What I said 12 years ago doesn't matter. I gave you my word 12 years ago, that was our agreement, but times have changed and we don't want that anymore. I will be part of a cabinet that makes a decision that removes the Roe 8 reservation, completely contrary to my cabinet decision in 2007." It is completely contrary. That is what the minister in the other place Hon Alannah MacTiernan has done in being part of this decision.

Mr T.J. Healy: Didn't you promise not to raise TAFE fees?

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member, I do not think the Leader of the Opposition is taking interjections.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I am sure the member for Southern River is going to get up. I will not interject on the member; I am not rude like he is.

In closing, I would like to say that we have explained a multitude of reasons to have the government change its mind on this act of planning vandalism. We will do whatever we can in the other place to prevent this legislation from going through. We are working on the sensible heads in the Legislative Council because the government does not have the numbers. The leader of government business in the other place will not stoop so low as to speak to members of the crossbench to try to garner their support for any of this legislation, so we will work with them; they are very sensible. They see the removal of the road reservation for Roe 8 and Roe 9 as the act of planning vandalism that it is and they are opposed to it, for the same reasons that we are. Firstly, the proper process has not been followed; the government has not properly consulted. That is the first big reason. Secondly, the government has no solution for the commuter congestion that people in the southern suburbs are experiencing every day. Roe 8 and Roe 9 is the only solution that will work. Thirdly, all those people who use Leach Highway—the truckers, container traffic and heavy haulage vehicle drivers—want a safer solution, and Roe 8 would deliver a road safety solution like no other, by providing an opportunity to take away the stop-start nature of heavy vehicle traffic, and therefore other commuter traffic, on Leach Highway. It would solve the road safety problem. The government has no solution on the table to solve that road safety problem and no solution for alternative access to an outer harbour, should it ever be built, or continued access into the Fremantle port. Finally, the government does not even have the intestinal fortitude to test this legislation with the Infrastructure WA independent assessment process. These are all reasons that we are opposed to this bill. I will be voting against it, and I will be talking to every single one of those intelligent crossbenchers and Liberal and National members in the upper house to ensure that this legislation does not get through. One thing I forgot to mention was the other reason that this road reservation is needed. All our regional grain producers and pastoralists who are trying to get their animals to market want a seamless journey. When people who transport sheep in a vehicle, for example, have to stop and start, it is not the best from an animal husbandry point of view. But if they had a seamless route to Fremantle port, it would improve the efficiency for our farmers and pastoralists, it would improve the efficiency for truck traffic and it would improve the animal husbandry for those animals that have been moved. There are many reasons not to do this, minister. I know that she is not listening to us, or the commuters who are talking to us, but we will keep campaigning because the yellow-and-black signs on Leach Highway keep us motivated.

DR D.J. HONEY (Cottesloe) [5.09 pm]: I rise to make a contribution on the Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Bill 2018. Establishing a park in the Roe 8 extension route is an act of complete economic vandalism and completely ignores the safety of road users in the southern suburbs. When I came into this place, I was interested to see legislation coming before Parliament. Sometimes, legislation comes before us and we look at it and say, "Look, I do not agree with it, but I can see why the government is doing it." The minister would know that I thought that parts of the Strata Titles Amendment Bill were okay and I could say, "Yes, I support those." I did not agree with the parts of the bill that gave the balance of power to developers, but I could understand why the minister was doing it. She stated quite clearly that she saw it as a way of activating more housing development in the state. I did not agree with that. I did not think that the balance was right, and there was some effort—I give the government credit—to improve that balance. I think it could have been improved more, but I respect that the minister had, from her perspective, good reasons for doing it. When I look at this bill, I cannot see any of that. This is pure vandalism for some purpose other than the wellbeing of the people of this state.

Let us look at the economic aspect of this bill. We all know that the inner harbour at Fremantle port is absolutely critical to the wellbeing of the state. Essentially, all the containers go in and out of this state through that port. People focus on flat screen televisions and air conditioners going through that port, but people who have studied this in more detail will know that that port is an absolutely crucial portal for the exports of this state. Those exports have to compete with all the return traffic that is coming back through the port. I went through some simple calculations, but I think they bear repeating. If we look at a three per cent compound increase in traffic through the port of Fremantle, in 10 years, that is a 36 per cent increase in freight through Fremantle harbour. I have given the government credit for it; I think the government has done surprisingly well, better than people expected, in getting some freight on rail. We know from all the experts that the best the government will ever do with rail out of Fremantle harbour is around 30 per cent. That is about an eight per cent increase in container freight by rail.

What does that mean? It means a 28 per cent increase in container traffic by road. Let us not worry about the 7 700 truck movements we have today. We are going to see a 28 per cent increase in freight through that port. The government will do nothing. In 10 years—nothing. There is no way that there can be any meaningful development on an outer harbour in 10 years. I will dwell on that later. The member for Riverton and others have gone through that in some detail. That means one of two things. We will have absolute chaos and Armageddon on those southern roads, trying to jam that extra 28 per cent of freight through the roads that exist and every other road the poor drivers can possibly find. It is extremely unlikely they will be able to do that. What will the government do? This government will restrain the economy of this state because we will not be able to get container traffic through Fremantle.

The government has made a bit about some road improvements. A roundabout and some slip lanes will essentially do nothing to improve the flow of traffic into that port. They will do nothing for the number of interactions that car drivers have with traffic travelling down Leach Highway and South Street. Those improvements will not stop accidents. We have heard it already. It has been said today and it bears repeating: Leach Highway has double the average number of truck versus other vehicle accidents in metropolitan Perth. That is no surprise. An enormous number of trucks go down that road. Roe Highway after the freeway exit has six times the average number of accidents than in the rest of Perth—that is, other vehicle versus truck accidents. When we talk about this being an important matter economically and safety-wise, it is a real safety issue. It is about people either getting smashed into by a truck or smashing into a truck. Just imagine, members, if that traffic is expected to increase by 28 per cent over the next 10 years. Just imagine the accidents we are going to see. The number of accidents will go up exponentially. It will not be a 30 per cent increase. If we double the traffic, there could be four times the number of accidents. That is the rough mathematics of it.

When I say that the government does not care about the safety of people in the southern suburbs, it is demonstrable. It could not possibly bring in a bill to stop the completion of Roe 8 and Roe 9 and proper access into the port and also care about people. The government does not care about the state economy. It does not care about people being injured in accidents. The great tragedy—members on this side of the house and I take absolutely no pleasure in saying this—is that people will die because of that decision, and that is horrendous. As I said, we take no delight in that, minister, but I would say, in normal circumstances, the minister would be concerned about that.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, members!

Dr D.J. HONEY: Minister, I am surprised —

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, minister!

Dr D.J. HONEY: I am surprised that the minister would ignore that. I am surprised that she would be part of making a decision that will have a profound impact on this state's economy and the safety of road users in the southern suburbs of this city. As I said, this is economic vandalism and it completely ignores the safety of road users in the southern suburbs of Perth.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, members!

Dr D.J. HONEY: As I said, that increase —

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.C. Blayney): I will have to start calling people, reluctantly, if you continue. Member, are you taking interjections?

Dr D.J. HONEY: No. There is too much to talk about.

Let us dwell on the topic of safety, because it sounds as though some members care about safety.

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

Dr D.J. HONEY: I am glad that members opposite are activated on this topic. It sounds as though some of them care about safety. Let us talk about safety in the context of the consequences of this bill. I suspect that a significant number of members opposite have no idea what the alternative plan is for this bill and no idea what has already been done. But I have raised it before and I will raise it again. This is a surprise to pretty much every person with whom I have discussed it, but Roe Highway now exits between Murdoch University and the hospital precinct. That is where it goes. Let me tell members where the member for Bicton and other members opposite are putting 7 700 trucks a day—this is where the great majority of them will go—adjacent to the St John of God Murdoch Hospital entrance. That includes the community hospice, the Wexford Medical Centre, dermatology services, WA Cardiology and the orthopaedic clinic. The government is putting the trucks right in the spot where people turn into Fiona Stanley Hospital. That includes the education —

Mr S.A. Millman interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Mount Lawley, this is your last warning.

Dr D.J. HONEY: That includes the education building, the emergency department and the Harry Perkins Institute of Medical Research, and also the cyclists trying to get across the road, and students, lecturers and visitors trying to turn into the university. The list does not end there: HeartsWest, the State Rehabilitation Service and Murdoch Police Station are also located there. The poor old police have to get out in an emergency when there are trucks tearing down the road. Murdoch Fire Station is another critical emergency service for that area that will be interacting with 7 700 and more vehicle movements a day. That is what it is now, not what it will be in 10 years' time. South Metropolitan TAFE is another education institute on the Murdoch campus. Wandoo Rehabilitation Prison is there. Prison vans and staff move in and out of the facility. The Melville State Emergency Service is another critical service that will have to interact with all those vehicles on a daily basis. The Animal Resource Centre is there—with people who actually care about animals, unlike those on the other side—along with Wesfarmers Chemicals, Energy and Fertilisers, the Telethon Community Cinemas Murdoch and Orthocell Ltd. The trucks will be sent along there. Roe 8 and 9 was not going to allow that because no-one in their right mind would have contemplated doing this, but that is what the government has done, and that is what the completion of Roe 8 and 9 would have prevented.

Dr M.D. Nahan: Your data comes down to 10 trucks a minute through that thing.

Dr D.J. HONEY: Ten trucks a minute. I thank the member for Riverton; I am obliged to him. Members should imagine their kids going to Murdoch University, or imagine themselves having had a procedure in the hospital and having to interact with that traffic when they come out. It will be chaos because the Roe Highway extension will be a parking lot for trucks. They will not be able to get through the lights at South Street. It will be an absolute unmitigated nightmare. It is not a concern just for the people, but for the truck drivers. I have a deep empathy for truck drivers. They do a difficult job. They carry Australia. Truck drivers are not oblivious to the risk of having accidents. They care passionately about it. It worries them sick. Truck drivers are on the edge the whole time, sitting on their brakes, waiting to slam on the brakes so they do not run into someone, because they know that there are people in the cars in front of them and they do not want to hurt them. That is why they are so passionate about this. That is why the truck drivers are saying, "For goodness sake, government, have a second thought about this one. Yes, you had a rush of blood. Yep, you had a bit of success in the election campaign with it, but now we want you to have a second thought about this and let us go ahead with Roe 8 and 9." Members, how the government funds it is its business. However, the unequivocal truth is that Roe 8 and 9 is the only practical solution to prevent the issues we have talked about.

We talk about the apparent justification of the environment, and the hypocrisy of that has been pointed out. Let us consider the environmental impact assessment of the Yanchep rail extension. I have not heard a peep from the other side on this matter—not a peep from members on the other side who wave their environmental credentials all over the place. They are out there caring for the environment. They do not want Roe 8 to go through the Beeliar wetlands because they are such great environmental warriors. Let us look at the environmental impact statement for the Yanchep rail extension. What are the potential impacts? Permanent loss of native vegetation and permanent loss of threatened ecological communities —

Point of Order

Mr S.A. MILLMAN: Yanchep is completely irrelevant to the Beeliar wetlands. Mr Acting Speaker, I ask you to direct the member to return to his contribution to the third reading debate, with particular regard to Roe 8 and 9.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.C. Blayney): Yes, member, I would ask you in the third reading debate to stay close to the subject.

Debate Resumed

Dr D.J. HONEY: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. The reason I am going through this is that we are told that this bill is about a key environmental issue—that is, not causing harm to that part of the Beeliar wetlands. We already know that that part of the Beeliar wetlands is highly degraded. We already know that the larger part of it is an easement for the powerline. Anyone who has bothered to go there—it is clear that members opposite have not—would know that about 200 metres to the south of it is Hope Road, which goes right through the middle and has a two to three-metre raised platform, which makes it a complete joke. In the other projects, 53.19 hectares of remnant native vegetation will be cleared. Where is the voice from the other side on that one? Where is the outrage over that? The member for Riverton did a very good job of pointing out the absolute hypocrisy of the rent-a-crowd the government had before the election. Do members know where they are on those important environmental impacts? They are missing. They are nowhere to be seen—not a peep; not a sound. It is clear that they were not serious about it. They were just political hacks for the Labor Party.

I gave my speech in the second reading debate. It was a relevant comparison. Through its infill policy, in 10 years this government will account for 37 000 hectares of tree canopy being destroyed in Perth.

Point of Order

Mr S.J. PRICE: This is a third reading debate and the speech needs to be confined to either the contents of the bill or the discussion that was undertaken during the consideration in detail stage. It is not an opportunity to rehash a speech in the second reading debate.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.C. Blayney): Yes, I remind the member for Cottesloe that I would appreciate it if he confined himself to the discussion.

Debate Resumed

Dr D.J. HONEY: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. It is apparent that members opposite do not care about the environment and they do not want to hear it discussed. They are absolutely hypocritical in suggesting that environmental considerations are anything to do with the motivation of this bill. I am prepared to accept that most of the time when the government introduces legislation, there is some justification for it. There is no justification for this bill outside of raw political purposes—outside of simply trying to reignite a successful campaign before the last election. I am sure you will not allow me to go into an analysis of the state government, Mr Acting Speaker; however, it is clear that it is in deep trouble internally and in deep trouble with the electorate.

[Quorum formed.]

Dr D.J. HONEY: It is clear that this bill has nothing to do with the environment. We heard during earlier debate and questions asked that the plan that was developed previously was an excellent plan to minimise any environmental impact, which goes further to prove that this is not an environmental bill at all. It is purely for political purposes to garner favour with certain groups that people were looking at before.

Several speakers pointed out very well some issues with the legislation. This is not just an issue about trucks. Trucks are vitally important. Trucks are important to the economic wellbeing of this state; however, people being able to get to and from work is also vitally important. We will see not only a substantial increase in truck movements, but also a greater increase in car movements. That is an area in which the government is completely missing in action. What are the plans of this government to deal with that enormous increase in vehicle traffic? Some people catch the train, but the overwhelming majority do not, and in 10 years' time, unless electric vehicles really get a move on, the situation will be exactly the same.

The minister made a lot of moment in her response to questions when we went into the consideration in detail stage about the issues of traffic through the southern suburbs. The only analysis that I believe is available on this is in the "Developing Transport Networks; Delivering Safer Roads" report that was published in 2016. I will go through those estimates. In 2021, the total vehicle movements down Curtin Avenue and Stirling Highway is estimated at 52 000, with only 3 200 of that being trucks, which is significant. Trucks are significant, but only 3 200—six per cent—are trucks and 94 per cent is general traffic, commuters and other commercial traffic, not trucks carrying containers. In 2031, the estimated total will be 69 000 vehicles—17 000 more vehicles over that period—which is a 33 per cent increase in commercial and commuter traffic along that road. With a 17 000 increase in general traffic, the estimated increase in truck traffic is 700, so it goes from 3 200 to 3 900 trucks, and that models the government's "no Roe 8" option. Including Roe 8 in the model means the numbers vary slightly, but, essentially, it is the same issue.

What is the problem on the roads? The commercial and safety problems are trucks on roads, but the other problem for the state is that enormous 25 per cent increase in commuter traffic. If we took all the trucks off the road, there would be a 25 per cent increase in commuter traffic on Stirling Highway and Curtin Avenue. I asked the minister about this, but the government has no plans. There is nothing in the forward estimates. The minister was talking about the cyclepath, and she knows that I give credit where credit is due. I gave the minister good credit in extending the cycleway, and I am really looking forward to that going further. But I do not give the minister any credit for this decision because of the estimated 25 per cent increase in commercial and commuter traffic along Curtin Avenue and Stirling Highway but the government has no plan at all. Whether the government builds the southern port tomorrow will make no difference whatsoever, because all of those butchers, bakers, candlestick makers, mums and dads, and people commuting to and from their workplaces are going to have to drive down those roads and it is going to be absolute chaos.

I asked the minister what her plans were to deal with that issue. I provided some suggestions. Again, as was outlined earlier by the Leader of the Opposition, there are excellent engineering solutions in places like Sydney. I encourage the minister to go to San Diego and see how it dealt with the major traffic issues there. Tunnels are a fantastic, low-cost solution for traffic and congestion through areas, especially with established buildings. There are good engineering solutions and I support the Leader of the Opposition's comment that the government has the option to look at those other solutions. The completion of Roe 8 and Roe 9 thereby improving the link through to the Fremantle port is an absolutely critical project for the safety of all road users in the southern suburbs and the economic wellbeing of the state.

Let us come back to the economic wellbeing of the state. Fremantle port is owned by all of the taxpayers in Western Australia. It is a multibillion-dollar asset that is owned by all of us. Imagine if a person had

a multibillion-dollar asset and someone said to them, “Spending virtually no money, we can double the productivity of that asset, and by the way, you expend a fraction of the money of an outer harbour—in fact, you can take this port up to four times its current capacity.” Members, that is our asset. In spending a relatively small amount of money, we can potentially improve the productivity of that asset by up to four times. But even if we do not do that, if members talk to people at Fremantle port, they are essentially saying, “With very little effort whatsoever, other than getting more product in there, we can double the capacity of the port. That is our multibillion-dollar asset.” Imagine a person with a business saying, “Yep, I’ve got \$5 billion invested in my business, but, you know what? Blow it! I can increase it. I can double the productivity of it for very little money, but blow that! No. I am going to build one 20, 30 kilometres away, ’cos, you know, I want to; ’cos I don’t want to put a road through here that’s got an imaginary environmental issue that can’t be solved. So I’m going to go and do that.” No-one in their right mind would say that.

If I had a conversation with an ordinary member of the community who is not necessarily tied into these issues and asked them about these sorts of things, they would say, “You what?” They would be dumbfounded. This is a government that said it is capital limited. It is a government that says it wants to pay off state debt and that that is its priority. It wants to pay off state debt, but it also wants to build on some critical existing infrastructure to improve the state. This government that says it is focused on debt reduction and responsible environmental management but is going to spend \$6 billion—that is the estimate I heard—when it has an asset that is only one-quarter used. Members should hear crickets when that comment is made, because it is profound. The government says that it is struggling for money for a new women’s hospital in Perth, but I tell members that \$6 billion would build a pretty swanky new women’s hospital, would it not? The government says it wants to push forward with other critical transport and infrastructure project, but part of that \$6 billion would do a pretty good job of that. The member for Carine told horrendous stories about the outcome for people who are out there on the streets and that the Premier cannot find a solution for a lovely family who are down south.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.C. Blayney): Member for Cottesloe, I think that has veered well and truly off the track. I will ask the member to come back to the issue of Roe 8 and 9. Thank you.

Dr D.J. HONEY: Thank you very much, Mr Acting Speaker. I greatly appreciate your guidance.

What we have is a multibillion-dollar asset that we own and that this government controls on behalf of this state that can be substantially expanded for very, very limited expenditure, simply so we have proper freight transport access into it. But the government says, “No, we are going to ignore that. We are going to have some ships come in every now and then and will turn it into townhouses, or something.” We know that that was looked at by the previous government. It does not recover a fraction of the value of that asset as a working port. In my previous life, I had a lot to do with unions. By and large, I found that a lot of the unions had pretty sensible folk in them. But on this issue, they are trying to give the government guidance. They are trying to say to the government, “Guys, you’re our friends; we pay for you; we support you, but we want you to look at this again.” They are doing it for a good reason because they know the basic arithmetic. They know that spending \$5 billion or \$6 billion on a new port that cannot be ready for at least 10 years is folly. They know that we should be maximising the value of the Fremantle port asset for the people of Western Australia so that the government can then use that money for its other projects.

If the government wants to put on a hard hat and open things, great. Go and open that brand spanking new women’s hospital. The people of Perth would welcome it. Go and put in that other critical infrastructure that the state needs. Talking about our friends from the regions—I do not want to go too far down this path—all of our regional friends know that a few billion dollars in the regional areas could transform the regional centres of Western Australia. The government should go and spend it there. The minister could get all the credit for it. The minister would have a hard hat on and a fluoro jacket. The minister would be out there doing the opening. The government should do that, because putting in this bill to stop Roe 8 and Roe 9, to starve, essentially, Fremantle of proper expansion and proper utilisation and to then spend billions of dollars on a harbour to the south is absolute folly. It is pretty straightforward what this bill demonstrates about this government. The truth is that this government does not care about the safety of families in the southern suburbs who are using those roads. If it did, it would be doing something substantial—not some little made-up bandaids thing, whereby a kid has taken a crayon and drawn a few lines on a map. It would be doing something substantial to take a substantial amount of traffic off those highways. It would not look at the 25 or 30 per cent increase in traffic that we have seen in the figures and allow that to happen. This government is doing nothing about that. It does not care about the safety of families and communities in the southern suburbs. It does not care about the welfare of truck drivers. I will not go through it again—I am conscious of sticking to the bill—but truck drivers have an enormously stressful job, and that stress is made worse by traffic congestion. This project was about giving truck drivers a better working life. The stress of that working life leads to a range of negative outcomes for truck drivers.

This government does not care about job creation; we have heard that from all members. There is \$1.2 billion, and that is just for Roe 8. If we go through with Roe 9 and the extension to the port, we know that there will ultimately

be more on the table, but let us stick to the \$1.2 billion. This government does not care about job creation, because it does not want this project to go through. The federal government has a sensible head. It has said, “This project is absolutely critical. It’s crucial for Australia, it’s crucial for Western Australia, and we want it to go through.” It is clear that this state government does not care about job creation.

The government does not care about the economic growth of this state. As we stand, the growth of this state is going to be constrained in the next 10 years. I refer to those new lithium exporters—it looks like we will get a couple down in Kwinana now—and the nickel sulphate and other exporters. There is a raft of industries that are looking to establish down at Kwinana. They will not have any extra port capacity in the south. They will have to put their product in containers out through the port of Fremantle, as they do now, in case the minister did not know. That is where those specialist mineral products go out.

It demonstrates the rank hypocrisy of this government claiming that this is an environmental project, when its other decisions are destroying thousands and thousands of hectares of trees across the city of Perth. It illustrates that this is a ruse by this government for purely political purposes—to garner support from disparate groups that it activated before the last state election in the hope that it can pull off a victory in this state election. We have seen through this. As our leader said, we are working really hard. We know that the greater majority of the members in the upper house and some sensible heads on the government side of the house see this as absolute folly. This bill should be defeated, and we will do everything in our power to make sure it is. We will do everything in our power to make sure that this state is not held back by a reckless bill like this.

MR V.A. CATANIA (North West Central) [5.42 pm]: It is amazing how four pieces of paper are causing all sorts of problems for this government. Four little bits of paper are causing not only problems for the Labor Party, but also a severe problem for the people of Western Australia, our industries and the people who use transportation to head to Fremantle port. It sends a clear message that regional ports in this state are not part of this government’s way forward.

Everything that we have heard in the debate around this bill is about trying to protect these wetlands, which will cause all sorts of chaos on the road if we go forward with this bill. Members of the Nationals WA spoke in this house during the debate on this bill and said, “Put this bill through Infrastructure Western Australia. Put Fremantle port and the outer harbour through Infrastructure WA.” The response from the Premier when this bill was read in was that Infrastructure WA had not been formed. But now it has been formed.

The Premier said —

The role of Infrastructure Western Australia would be to provide advice to government on prospective infrastructure projects.

I do not know what a prospective infrastructure project is, but when we talk about billions and billions of dollars for the state—I have heard \$6 billion for the outer harbour—the reality is that is only a projected cost. There are a lot of other associated costs along with that, so we are looking at \$10 billion plus. Does that not warrant going through Infrastructure WA to see what the best option is, not only for transport, exports and imports, but also to look after the taxpayers’ dollar? Every question time, we get up and ask, “Why haven’t you fixed this? Why haven’t you done that?” The answer is, “We can’t, because of the debt.” Hang on a second: how can the government say that on one hand, and then on the other hand look to build these projects worth billions of dollars—like I said, something that could possibly cost \$10 billion or more of taxpayers’ money—when we have an asset sitting there that is only a quarter utilised? More importantly, politically, the government has set up an infrastructure body to evaluate major infrastructure projects for the state. However, two projects that I can think of that together are potentially worth \$20 billion—that is, Metronet and the outer harbour—are not going through the Infrastructure WA committee, which has been set up by this government and is now operational. Why is that the case? Is it perhaps to protect where the Deputy Premier’s seat is, or Cockburn or Bicton? Are they the seats?

Dr M.D. Nahan: Willagee?

Mr V.A. CATANIA: Is it Willagee? Is it political? This bill comprises four pieces of paper. The government’s own members are like this chamber—half of them are not here. Half of the Labor Party does not believe that this is the way to go. We need to be able to complete Roe 8 and Roe 9 and make sure that we can maximise Fremantle harbour’s potential.

Members opposite are failing to see that we have growth in the regions. We have the ports of Esperance, Albany, Bunbury and Geraldton; in the Pilbara, we have Karratha and Port Hedland; and all the way up to Wyndham. There are opportunities to perhaps utilise that \$6 billion—I say \$10 billion in today’s monetary terms—to expand those ports to ensure that, for example, the containers that come into Fremantle port and have to go up the Great Northern Highway or the North West Coastal Highway can instead be delivered through Karratha or Port Hedland. How about looking at investing in our regional ports to ensure that we do not need to waste any taxpayers’ money in developing the outer harbour, ensuring that Fremantle can realise its potential, and any expansion, Minister for Transport, is through the regions? It is absolutely commonsense. Develop the road networks, rail and ports in regional Western Australia—there is the answer. The answer is not an outer harbour.

We moved a motion in this house back in November 2018, in which I said —

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

That this house calls on the McGowan government to defer its Beeliar wetlands bill 2018 until it establishes the independent infrastructure of WA body to assess transport infrastructure necessary to service Fremantle port in the future.

This motion was moved by the National Party last year. The response was obviously inadequate, because of four pieces of paper, which not only are causing members opposite a hell of a lot of trouble internally, but also will put pressure on future governments, because this is not going to be done in this government's term. I would say that the outer harbour will never be built, because any government with commonsense, whether it be next term or the term after, will say that it is not cost effective for taxpayers in Western Australia. This is not realistic. This does not meet the needs of Western Australia. The answer is always going to be to grow the port of Fremantle and regional ports, not to waste billions of dollars of taxpayers' money. I say "waste" because we do not know what is going to happen. This government has established Infrastructure WA to evaluate these projects and their benefit to the taxpayers of Western Australia.

Mr P.J. Rundle: It is on the laptop.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: It is on a laptop or the back of a napkin. I cannot see why Infrastructure WA cannot evaluate this bill and the infrastructure that it will affect—Roe 8 and 9, the Fremantle port and the outer harbour. No-one with any commonsense, any respect for the taxpayers of Western Australia or any knowledge of roads, ports, trucks, exports or imports can support this bill in its present form. Members on this side of the house—the Nationals WA and the Liberal Party—will be joining forces to oppose it. We know that we are not going to win the vote in this house, but in the other place it will be a different story. It will be a win for the people of Western Australia. It will potentially save the taxpayer in the order of \$10 million today—not in five or 10 years' time. It could save a lot more money, but, as I said, this bill will never get through. This is a political stunt that is backfiring. The government's dogged approach to this is going to backfire. It did not win the election on this issue and everyone knows it. Everyone knows why this side of the house lost the election. We are opposing this bill because we know that it will cost the government politically. It does not make sense and it does not suit the needs of or look after the people of Western Australia.

Point of Order

Mr S.J. PRICE: The member has been talking about four pages consistently since he started his speech. There is an issue of relevance. The bill does not mention Roe 8 and 9, nor does it mention Infrastructure Australia, the outer harbour or the Fremantle port. The member has not touched on one clause contained in the bill or any discussion that was undertaken during the second reading debate. I do not think he has actually read the bill. If he continues on like this, you need to sit him down.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.C. Blayney): Thank you, members. I will bring you back to the subject of the bill, thank you, member for North West Central.

Debate Resumed

Mr V.A. CATANIA: The member is right. I apologise. It is actually only three pieces of paper because one is a title page. Government members are fighting over three bits of paper. On page 3 of the bill, clause 5(2) states —

Nothing in this Act affects the operation of the Planning Act with respect to amendments to the Metropolitan Region Scheme as amended by this Act.

That is the problem and what we on this side of the house are concerned about. This government is amending something that does not need to —

Ms R. Saffioti: This is good. You should be leader. Why aren't you leader? You should be deputy leader.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: It is the Premier's leadership that is being torn apart by three bits of paper.

Ms R. Saffioti: Where did you go for a week when you tried to take the job? Where did you disappear to for a week?

Mr V.A. CATANIA: I had influenza, if the minister would like to know. This is not about our leadership because we are not in government. Members opposite are in government. It is all about their leadership, which is being questioned.

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, members. I ask that the member for North West Central come back to the subject of the bill, please. We have seven minutes left and I would like the member to finish talking about the subject of the bill.

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister!

Mr V.A. CATANIA: When it comes to this and the changes to the —

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister, I will have to call you soon.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: We know what this bill is about. As I said, the government is trying to change the planning act to suit its political needs. This bill is not right for the local communities surrounding Roe 8 and 9 and the Fremantle port, and it is not right for future governments, so why would anyone support it? It is commonsense. If we put aside the politics and what is happening in this chamber, the reasons put forward by the Maritime Union of Australia and Transport Workers' Union of Australia are actually valid.

Ms R. Saffioti: Why don't you ask Mr Acting Speaker whether he will support you as leader? It's just another vote.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: The minister is making me stray away from the bill.

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, minister. Member, will you ignore interjections and just talk to me, thank you.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: These three bits of paper are causing leadership tensions on the other side. They are going to cost the member for Bicton her seat. It is going to have an impact on the seat of Fremantle. The member for Willagee is also going to be impacted by this. Do members know what? It is an election issue. Members opposite have made it an election issue now because this bill has no commonsense attached to it whatsoever.

Point of Order

Mrs L.M. O'MALLEY: What is the relevance?

Several members interjected.

Mrs L.M. O'MALLEY: I know, relevance.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.C. Blayney): Order!

Debate Resumed

Mr V.A. CATANIA: The relevance is that the member is going to lose her seat.

Mrs L.M. O'Malley interjected

Mr V.A. CATANIA: No. The joke is that this bill is trying to hoodwink the people of Western Australia. It is a dangerous bill, but it can be repealed by an incoming government, which this side of the house will do when it comes into government. We all know that that can be done. We all know that the outer harbour is never going to be built. If the government actually had any vigour or credibility behind the outer harbour plan and what it is trying to push forward, it would get the body that it established to look at it. What has it got to hide? What does it fear? The government fears that someone will actually find out that this three-page bill—it is probably only two and a half pages of material—will result in a huge amount of taxpayers' money being spent and that will cause problems into the future. If we look at what the Premier sent out, it is amazing to see what a person says prior to an election compared with what they say when they get into government.

Ms R. Saffioti: Particularly for you! It's amazing what you stood for before an election and where you crossed to afterwards.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: But I represent my community, and the government is not doing that in this bill. It is not doing what is right for the people of Western Australia.

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, minister.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: The minister's leader said that an independent advisory body—Infrastructure WA—will report on all major projects, and that projects costing more than \$100 million will be subject to a transparent cost-benefit analysis. These words were spoken by the Premier. Why is he not following through on a project that will cost in the order of, as I said, \$6 billion—it is probably worth \$10 billion—and Metronet, which is worth another \$10 billion? Why are they not being reviewed by that body?

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: The minister can be childish and say that, but I am asking a genuine question: why has the government not put this project through its own infrastructure body, which is meant to be transparent, to look at the cost-benefit analysis and ensure that taxpayers are getting the best deal possible? I am not hiding any agenda. I believe the Premier would say something like that, and I am saying, "Okay; you've said that. That sounds good to me, but why aren't you doing it? What's the fear? What is this government hiding?" That is the point that we on this side of the house are making.

Point of Order

Mr S.J. PRICE: Sit down, mate!

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.C. Blayney): Member for Forrestfield, that is my job.

Mr S.J. PRICE: Once again, I have to talk about relevance. When the member did not quite succeed in the takeover of the National Party—I do not need to say a number—and he had that week off, he missed the opportunity to make his contribution to the second reading debate, so he is trying to do it now. Can we get him back on to the bill?

The ACTING SPEAKER: Sorry, member, there is no point of order. Member, I remind you that you are talking to those three pieces of paper there.

Debate Resumed

Mr V.A. CATANIA: Yes. As I said, the National Party is not going to support this bill. We put forward a motion to say that this needs to go through Infrastructure WA, and this government is not going to do that. We support the Liberal Party because —

Dr A.D. Buti interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Oh, no, don't you start!

Mr V.A. CATANIA: — the right thing to do is to ensure that the taxpayers of Western Australia get the best benefit. There is plenty of scope in the Fremantle port, and Roe 8 and 9 is needed for the safety of the people of Western Australia.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members, given the hour, I will vacate the chair until the ringing of the bells.

Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.00 pm

Mr V.A. CATANIA: I have looked at this three-page piece of legislation and have quoted it intently, may I say. This bill will cost taxpayers a huge amount of money in the long run. I do not think the outer harbour will ever be built. During the dinner break, I was reflecting on the fact that the previous government, which I was a part of, had proposed the Perth Freight Link, and I came across a document entitled “Construction of Perth Freight Link”. The document refers to the environmental benefits of the Perth Freight Link and states that although around 100 hectares of native vegetation will be impacted, more than 400 hectares of native vegetation is proposed to be purchased as an environmental offset. That is a logical and responsible way of ensuring that we look after the environment. The document states also that the proposed new freight route will benefit the community. It will enable trucks to bypass 14 sets of traffic lights, resulting in less delay and frustration for drivers, and there will be 500 fewer trucks per day on sections of Leach Highway. That will be a great outcome. It will increase safety for drivers and the community; reduce the cost of haulage, help protect the environment and save taxpayers' money. Fremantle port has a projected lifespan of 20 to 25 years. There is no need to spend money on the outer harbour. The former government's transport plan is also a logical way forward for regional areas such as Geraldton, Bunbury, Albany, Esperance and the Pilbara.

[Quorum formed.]

Mr V.A. CATANIA: As I said, we need to utilise the opportunities in regional Western Australia to ensure that we can grow the resources sector and tourism. We need to improve our port infrastructure in regional Western Australia. I do not know why the government needs to rush this legislation through the Parliament. This piece of legislation has significant flaws. As has been indicated by the Liberal Party, and also by me on behalf of the Nationals WA, we will not be supporting this legislation in the other place. This piece of legislation, albeit just three pages long, has caused major division, not only in the community and the transport and logistics industry, but also internally in the Labor Party. What the government is proposing in this legislation is not popular. It is not right. It will not get through the other place. I urge the crossbench members to reflect on this extremely important piece of legislation. This legislation needs to be defeated. We need to apply some commonsense and come up with a plan for transport logistics in Western Australia that will maximise the opportunity for growth outside the Perth metropolitan region. We need to look to the regions to provide a solution when Fremantle port reaches capacity in 20 to 25 years. The government and the Minister for Transport need to reflect on the fact that this bill will not get past the other house.

What are the government's options? We on this side will be happy to take this to the people of Western Australia as an election issue. The Perth Freight Link makes commonsense. It will meet the needs of the people of Western Australia. It will help reduce congestion and danger on Roe Highway. It will provide an action plan for our regional port infrastructure into the future. If the government has \$6 billion or \$10 billion that is burning a hole in its back pocket, it should use that money to grow our regional ports and help bring transport infrastructure closer to where it is needed. There has been talk about a container port in the north of Western Australia, whether at Karratha or Port Hedland. It is crazy that cargo ships travel down the coast and past the north west of this state to the port of Fremantle, and that cargo is then trucked back up north. It makes sense to either develop Anketell port

at Karratha or look at ways of expanding Port Hedland port. Geraldton port provides a great opportunity to access the midwest. We need to ensure that the materials and infrastructure needed by resource companies and the community are in people's backyards, not hundreds or thousands of kilometres away.

As I said, this is a flawed bill that does not protect the environment. The environmental outcome from the Perth Freight Link is much better than this outcome, because the other options that the government is looking at are just not realistic, and will never happen. To quote Seinfeld, this is about nothing.

Mr D.R. Michael: You want to build the road to nowhere.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: This is about nothing. When we look at who is left in the room here, where is Costanza? There he is, sitting over there. I am looking for Kramer but I do not believe he is here at the moment. It is clear that this is an episode about nothing.

Mr M.P. Murray: If you'd stayed on this side, you might have had some influence, but by being over that side, you're hopeless.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: What was that? This actually affects the member for Collie–Preston's patch, and he should be advocating for Bunbury port to be expanded to cater for future growth and new industries. I know that he has been advocating to get rid of the coal industry in his patch, because that is the Labor Party's policy, but how about advocating for the expansion of Bunbury port to look at new industries to cater for the electorate of Collie–Preston?

We can keep going and rehashing, but I just want to say this: the National Party does not support this bill. We asked from the outset whether the government is serious about looking at Perth's infrastructure needs, as the Premier said when he was Leader of the Opposition —

An independent advisory body, Infrastructure WA, will report on all major projects. Projects costing more than \$100million will be subject to a transparent cost–benefit analysis.

This is why people have trouble with politicians, because they say one thing and do another, and that is what this Premier has done.

Mr M.P. Murray: At least he didn't swap sides. What a person to say that—you of all people! You swapped sides. What's the difference?

Mr V.A. CATANIA: The difference is that I actually delivered for my community, as I said I would. As a Labor member, I said that I would do X, Y Z, but I could not do it as a Labor member, so I did it as a National Party member, and it delivered that X, Y, Z. That is the difference. The Premier said one thing —

Mr M.P. Murray: It is a pack of lies. You never had the ticker.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: I know that the member for Collie–Preston wanted to come across back then as well, but he said that he was too old. Maybe he is too old now. There is a spare seat behind me—come across, because I know you want to! I do not have much time left, but it is great to see the member for Collie–Preston still in the chamber at this time of night.

As I said, this measure should have gone through Infrastructure Western Australia. We moved that motion last year, and we are sticking by it, because if we want to be open and transparent —

Mr D.A. Templeman: How's that other motion you had?

Mr V.A. CATANIA: There is Costanza! I knew he would pop up. There he is. He can start talking to Elaine there, next to him. As I said, it is an episode about nothing, and that is what we have in this bill. The way to keep everyone in this chamber happy, and perhaps have some opportunity of getting this bill through the other place, is to refer it to Infrastructure WA. How about that? I will give the government an opportunity. If it refers the bill to Infrastructure Western Australia, perhaps we will pass it through this place and then it can go to the other house, and perhaps the other place can consider it after the report has been handed down to see whether this really is transparent and whether this really is about ensuring that a cost–benefit analysis has been achieved. Then everyone could see whether this is the best way forward for the taxpayers of Western Australia, for our imports and exports, for people who utilise Roe Highway and for our heavy haulage. Let us do something that the government is not very good at—look to regional Western Australia for the answer to future growth needs of this state and our ports. Let us look to regional WA as an answer, in time, once Fremantle port reaches its capacity, of which only one-third is being met at the moment. It is commonsense. This side is all about commonsense. I challenge the government to put this bill through Infrastructure WA and then we can have a real debate about whether it is good value for the taxpayer.

MRS L.M. O'MALLEY (Bicton) [7.15 pm] In adding my contribution to the third reading debate on the Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beelihar Wetlands) Bill 2018, I will do what members opposite have failed to do so far—speak to the bill. In particular, I will refer to page 2, clause 4(1) under “Metropolitan Region Scheme amended”, which reads —

The Metropolitan Region Scheme is amended by reserving the land shaded dark green on the Plan as “Parks and Recreation”.

Before I go on to expand on clause 4(1) and speak further on what this bill is about, I will first outline what this bill is not about. This bill is not about Roe 8, Roe 9, the failed Perth Freight Link or the opposition's obsession with toll roads, and it is not about the outer harbor. This is about an act to amend the metropolitan region scheme to change the reservation of certain land in the Beeliar wetlands and for related purposes. This bill recognises the environmental, cultural and social significance of one of the few remaining remnant wetlands of the Swan coastal plain. Much has been spoken of in both second and third reading contributions about the environment within the area of wetlands that this bill aims to protect. This bill is focused exclusively on the issue of wetlands protection.

I would like to assist members opposite in their understanding of this bill by providing the following definition. Wetlands are areas where water covers the soil, or is present either at or near the surface of the soil all year or for varying periods during the year, including during the growing season. Wetlands are not static things; they are living, breathing changeable environments and, yes, member for Cottesloe—although he is absent, I would still like to make this statement—sometimes they are dry. Any loss of any wetland can have devastating effects, as highlighted in the following extract from the Cockburn Wetlands Education Centre's website —

The Beeliar Wetlands is the name given to the two chains of wetlands that run parallel to the west coast of Western Australia. While one chain of lakes is saline, the other is freshwater. The wetlands are located towards the southwest portion of metropolitan Perth within the larger Beeliar Regional Park.

The wetlands on the Swan Coastal Plain and in particular the Beeliar Wetlands are a surface expression of the underlying groundwater. There is still much to be learnt about the effects of climate change on our wetlands. What the data shows us is that for about the last 40 years we have been receiving less rain.

Members opposite remind us, falsely, as it turns out, that only a small portion of wetlands would be impacted should Roe 8 progress. My point is that even if a very small percentage of the wetlands will be impacted, it will have devastating effects across the broader chain. The website continues —

Groundwater levels have never been static, decreasing during summer and increasing when recharged with winter rain as water makes its way through the soil to groundwater. With decreasing rainfall, the groundwater recharge has decreased and levels have dropped. Together with the decreasing recharge, there has also been incessant removal of groundwater to supplement our supply of drinking water.

Although some may look at the wetlands of Beeliar in isolation, we should not do that. They are part of a very important environmental, social and cultural chain throughout the whole Swan coastal plain on which we all rely very heavily for our drinking water in light of the considerable impact of our drying climate.

In most cases, this has led to our wetlands drying out more often or for prolonged periods each year. However, bear in mind that a drying wetland is natural and it is during the drying times that the intrepid birds fly in from Siberia to eat the bugs out of the mud. It is tricky business and, honestly, none of us has the whole story. The unpredictable changes in the lakes due to drying and filling have also complicated our revegetation efforts. Although, in general, we are allowing for increased dry conditions and adjusting the zones in which we plant, on several occasions we have been caught with heavy summer and spring rains inundating some areas. These conditions highlight the need for adaptive management.

I would like to speak briefly to the 10-year management plan. I had the absolute pleasure to chair the rehabilitating Roe 8 working group, which brought together community members; people from Main Roads Western Australia; and me, representing government and other agencies. We worked for months and months to come up with an adaptive management plan to rehabilitate the Beeliar wetlands areas that were devastated prior to the election. It is incredibly important that although in the scheme of things some might say it is a reasonably small percentage, it is an absolutely vital part of the chain that I referred to earlier.

Not only the wetlands and wetland vegetation are affected by the lowering watertable, but also many of our bushland features depend on groundwater for survival. Changes in global climate may well be a contributing factor to lower groundwater levels. However—this is the important bit, people; it is a shame there are not many members opposite to hear this—healthy, well-maintained wetlands can also be a key tool in our efforts to lessen the impact of climate change on other systems. One of the systems reliant on the health of wetlands and other environmental areas is our own system of humanity. We rely greatly on every aspect of our natural environment. We will take a closer look at the Beeliar wetlands and how climate change has impacted some of the wetland functions. The hydrology is changing. The Beeliar wetlands depend on seasonal rain to recharge. Over the years, the amount of precipitation has fluctuated, which has caused alterations in wetlands, which impacts the distribution of native plant species within the wetlands.

I refer to the loss of biodiversity, which is incredibly important. It is absolutely horrifying to hear members opposite denigrate that area and devalue it by saying that it is simply a wasteland. That is the way they have referred to Horse Paddock Swamp. There is an incredible amount of biodiversity in that very small area. I urge members to go down to the wetlands, walk through the area and have a good look at what is there, what was lost and what is now regenerating.

On carbon loss, many of the wetlands are experiencing a dry spell and territorialisation. Carbon trapped within the soil is released back into the atmosphere. There is further loss of capacity to capture and trap carbon in the atmosphere due to the growing number of dysfunctional and degraded wetlands. I think we have heard a few times that our bushland and wetlands are like the lungs of the earth that help us to continue to exist on this land. Members opposite have talked about the ability of the natural environment to continually adapt, but it cannot do that. At some time, we will suffer the inevitable consequences of that approach.

This Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Bill will protect this area now and into the future for generations. It will protect the vital east–west flora and fauna corridor and create important and sustainable parkland. That is what this is about. Great attempts have been made to move away from the purpose of the bill, but its purpose is very simple; it is about creating parkland and a recreation reserve forever.

Clause 4(1) will enable the creation of this corridor, an important piece of natural infrastructure endorsed by the peak local community group, the Cockburn Community Wildlife Corridor group. The corridor group sees itself as a vital avenue through which this east–west corridor can be realised. The broader vision is for that important corridor. It is referred to as the waves to the wetland in its entirety. It will take a long time to get there but these are very passionate and committed people. It could become the Kings Park of the south. It is a big and important vision. In creating this parkland under this bill, we can realise some of the cultural significance. There are definitely plans for recognition of local Aboriginal culture within the space. The need for pathways for cycling and walking is recognised. Passive and active recreation could also be realised through the creation of this parkland. Basically, the corridor group sees this as becoming a link between the Fremantle coast and Bibra Lake and that there be important and sustainable areas of natural bushland and parks that form this beautiful corridor. It is home to the majestic Carnaby's black-cockatoo, shy bandicoots and stunning flowers. The corridor is nestled within the urban environment alongside homes and existing roads. Another really important aspect of sustainable natural bushland is the links that are created around homes and where people reside and recreate. It creates a great sense of ownership and respect for that area when it is connected in and near homes, schools and the like, so it is incredibly important.

I also want to refer to previous speakers' references to environmental offsets. Another thing that makes me quite agitated is the flippant reference such as, "It's okay if we build this road, there'll be an offset." I have an extract from the *Elsevier Biological Conservation Journal Homepage*, which refers to environmental offsets and states, in part —

Environmental offsets are used increasingly as a conservation tool to balance demands of development and environment but there is little evidence that offsets are effective. Our study assessed the effectiveness of the offset package developed for the Roe Highway Extension, in Western Australia, for Carnaby's black cockatoo, red-tailed black cockatoo and southern brown bandicoot. Black cockatoos were accounted for in the offset requirements, while Southern brown bandicoots were accounted for in the mitigation requirements of the approval but not the offset requirements. The development was cancelled after partial clearing and has not been completed. Pre-development consultant surveys were examined in relation to the offset requirements ... The offset sites provided 64% of the black cockatoo habitat required by the Commonwealth offset requirements, and were of a lower quality. Similarly, undergrowth vegetation ... varied between the development and offset sites, indicating the offset proposal approval criteria 'similar or better quality' was not met.

I have a longstanding vision of someone dressed in a Carnaby's black-cockatoo costume at a Roe 8 site during a protest. He was holding a sign that pretty much said it all with the words, "Please point me to my offset". How would a living creature know which way to go to ensure that they were protected?

I have another vision that will always be in my mind. When I was campaigning in a park in Melville in the lead-up to the election, we saw a mob of black cockatoos in one of the trees before we headed off to do some doorknocking. It was such an incredible sight but it was really traumatic because those birds should not have been there. They should have been in Beeliar, because that is where they were meant to be. They were starving in Bicton because there was no habitat for them where they were supposed to be. They were coming to Bicton and shredding cape lilacs and other trees because there was no forage where they should have been.

It goes without saying that I am incredibly supportive of this bill and really proud to see it come into this house. I look forward to its transition. I look forward to the sensible members on the crossbench supporting the bill in the upper house.

MR T.J. HEALY (Southern River) [7.30 pm]: I wish to make a very short contribution to the debate. I will be casting my vote with the ayes to approve the Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Bill 2018. Earlier today the Leader of the Opposition very kindly asked me to make a contribution to this debate. During the third reading, I am absolutely happy to discuss why this bill is important. At the last election, through this bill and through this Parliament, Western Australia has continued to say no to the toll road that would have been the Roe 8, 9 and 10 unicorn plan or fantasy land of the Liberal Party to fix all the road problems throughout Western Australia.

We have been through hours of Liberal Party filibustering. We have been through the first and second readings and the consideration in detail stage. It was wonderful to hear the member for Riverton argue his points on this matter as the lead speaker for the Liberal opposition. As many members would know, the member for Churchlands is a former teacher of mine. I would like to acknowledge former students of the member for Churchlands in the Speaker's gallery, who are listening to this debate tonight. All the debates have focused on the fact that at the last election we promised not to build this road. The opposition is unhappy that we are keeping our promise. Members should remember that it was going to be a toll road. My community of Southern River has to use Roe Highway. We did not want it to be a toll road. We also said that if the Liberal and National Parties won the election, they would have started building it. It would have taken three to four years. Roe 9 was potentially unfunded and unplanned. Maybe that would have taken another four to five years to build. Roe 10 was going to include either a bridge or a tunnel—we still do not know which. We are talking about significant amounts of time. Is Leach Highway a congested, busy road? Yes, it is. Is Roe Highway a nice road? Yes, it is. I remember when Roe 7 was built. It changed my life. It was great. Unfortunately, if a toll road had been created, we would have spent 15 years building a road to nowhere. If it had all been done at once, perhaps it would be different. If the opposition had said that it would not be a toll road, perhaps it would be different. Its own research showed that it would not take trucks off the road.

The \$1.2 billion of federal money—this mystical money that the opposition says is available—is not available. It is to be used on certain projects. Let us spend it on regional roads. We have said that there are dangerous roads in our community. If \$1.2 billion is available to be spent on roads, let us spend it in the electorates of the members for Roe and Geraldton. The Labor Party has the most country members of Parliament. We are very happy, including the member for Mandurah—the semiurban rural member—to spend the money in rural Mandurah. The member for Baldivis also represents a regional area. We are happy to spend the money in those areas. Please tell Ben Morton not to progress the plan if it is a toll road and if it will take so long, and simply say, “If there is \$1.2 billion, we are happy to spend it on regional roads.” On behalf of the people in my suburbs of Canning Vale, Huntingdale, Southern River and Gosnells, we continue to say no to the toll road. Thank you very much, Acting Speaker.

MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan — Minister for Transport) [7.34 pm] — in reply: I rise to conclude the debate on the Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliiar Wetlands) Bill 2018. I thank everyone for their contributions. I have listened intently this afternoon. I have written notes and I will be responding to many of the issues that were raised. I thank the member for Bicton for her contribution and her commitment to her community, which is profound and deep. I think she represents her community well every time she speaks in this place, given her knowledge of the issue, her first-hand experience and her connection with her local community.

I want to address some of the issues that were raised this afternoon. Some of the members who raised those issues are not here; they are obviously in the dining room. A number of interesting points were made this evening. The member for Riverton rang the conservation commission and asked why it did not oppose Metronet, which is an interesting thing for the member for Riverton —

Dr M.D. Nahan: The Conservation Council.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Sorry; the Conservation Council of Western Australia. He rang up and said, “Why didn't you oppose the Metronet project?”

Dr M.D. Nahan: No, I didn't.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Pardon?

Dr M.D. Nahan: I asked them whether they made a submission to the EPA.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Somehow the member for Riverton is out there trying to stop Metronet projects. That is what he was doing. He was trying to create agitation. It was a bizarre thing to do.

Dr M.D. Nahan: That's the problem, minister; you can't tell the truth.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I ask you to withdraw, member.

Withdrawal of Remark

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: The comments made by the member for Riverton are not appropriate and he should withdraw. He is impugning the character of the minister.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.C. Blayney): Member for Riverton, I will have to ask you to withdraw those comments.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I withdraw it and ask her now to start telling the truth.

The ACTING SPEAKER: No. Just withdraw.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I withdraw.

Debate Resumed

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It has taken one minute for the member for Riverton to lose his cool again on this project.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Can we move on.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Sure. I am just going through the claim made by the member for Riverton during his speech on the third reading. He rang the Conservation Council and said, “Why didn’t you oppose the Metronet project?” That is what the member for Riverton is up to now.

Point of Order

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: I believe the minister is verballing and making stuff up. She is not actually going by the correct version of *Hansard*, and she should not be misleading Parliament or *Hansard*.

Mr M.P. MURRAY: Under what section, please?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.C. Blayney): Minister, it is not necessary to provide a reference in the standing orders.

Debate Resumed

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Given the number of claims and accusations made by speakers on the other side, which I sat and listened to—I think I interjected a little on the member for North West Central —

The ACTING SPEAKER: Will you stop verballing.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I will not verbal. I interjected. I do not think I interjected on the Liberal Party speakers much at all.

Mrs A.K. Hayden: You did quite a bit. You did a bit on the member for Cottesloe.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Probably less than the member for Darling Range has already done in my first two minutes.

We heard about the Leader of the Opposition working with the Fish Army, which I was a bit surprised by. The Leader of the Opposition is working with the Fish Army on this issue. She knows them well, and works with them. I am sure she did not mean to say it, but I understand that this group has links with the Maritime Union of Australia and has also tried to infiltrate the Labor Party in the past couple of weeks.

Dr M.D. Nahan: I thought the MUA was part of the Labor Party.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Listen to what I am saying about the Fish Army. Is the member for Riverton working hand in glove with the Fish Army?

Dr M.D. Nahan: You just continue.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Are you, member for Riverton?

Dr M.D. Nahan: They are part of the Labor Party.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Are you, member for Riverton?

Dr M.D. Nahan: The MUA is a central part of the Labor Party.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Because now we get a bit more of an insight into what is happening on that side. One of the worst claims made by the member for Cottesloe was that people will die. I have heard people stand in this place and say that on a number of issues—people will die in bushfires and on the roads. As I have said before, every month there are a number of deaths on regional and metro roads. Some of those road improvements have been on drawing boards for a number of years. The previous government did not deliver them. When someone dies on those roads, do I say that it is due to the Liberal Party? Do I say that? Of course not. It was absolutely disgraceful for the member for Cottesloe to say that people will die. The former government promised to build the Ellenbrook rail line. When anyone dies on those roads leading up to Ellenbrook, do I say, “It’s because the Ellenbrook rail line wasn’t built”? Of course not. It was a disgraceful thing to say.

Regarding the cycling community, we know what happened with Grant Street, which is in the electorate of Cottesloe. The previous government ignored it. I have never made accusations about who is accountable for people dying in that circumstance. It is disgraceful to say that people will die and I will be responsible. On every road where people die as a result of road accidents, I do not say it is because the Liberal Party did not fix that road in its eight and a half years in government. It was a disgraceful, gutter accusation to make. I actually think that the member for Cottesloe is not in touch with modern society and modern community. He is stuck in the 1960s. It was absolutely disgraceful.

I will go through the member for Cottesloe’s contribution. I wish he were here. He claimed that tunnels are somehow low-cost alternatives. On what planet does the member for Cottesloe reside?

Several members interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: This is, again, the hypocrisy of members on the other side: they do not care about the environment unless it is in their electorate. We are building a bike path in Cottesloe. When I was in Cottesloe, the member for Cottesloe came up to me and asked, “Have you spoken to the Friends of Mosman Park about that future bike path?” The Friends of Mosman Park are concerned about the bike path adjacent to the rail line. I understand their concerns, but why would the member for Cottesloe mention the greenery that is where we are going to build a bike path but he does not care about the Beeliar wetlands? Members opposite opposed the wave park, as the member for Bicton did, but she has been consistent in her opposition—it was because of amenity. Members opposite opposed a wave park. Why?

Point of Order

Mr D.C. NALDER: My understanding is that the third reading needs to stick to the elements of the bill. Mr Acting Speaker, I would ask that you redirect the minister accordingly.

Ms S. Winton interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.C. Blayney): Thank you, member for Wanneroo!

Within certain boundaries, you can address the comments that were made, but the minister’s focus should be on the bill.

Debate Resumed

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Sure. The member for Cottesloe is concerned about the bushland that will have to be removed to build a bike path, but he does not care about the Beeliar wetlands. He said, “It’s fine to destroy the Beeliar wetlands but you’ve got to be careful about this bushland.” Members opposite opposed a wave park. Why? Because it would affect the amenity of their local community.

Point of Order

Mr D.C. NALDER: I do not remember anybody from this side of the house mentioning the wave park. It has nothing to do with the bill, which is about the Beeliar wetlands. In accordance with what has occurred all afternoon about redirecting members to the elements of the bill, I request that the minister be told to do the same.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.C. Blayney): I will repeat: you may address the comments that people made when they were addressing the bill, but your main focus in the third reading should be on the bill itself.

Debate Resumed

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Sure. I know there will be some sensitivity because people opposed that, but were happy to support Roe 8 and Roe 9 through the wetlands.

The member for Cottesloe said tunnels are a low-cost solution. Another view from the other side—I think the member for North West Central also raised this—was that keeping Fremantle growing exponentially forever is similar to a no-cost solution. As described in the *Westport Beacon*, the reality is that it will cost between \$7 billion and \$8 billion. In all this debate, the Liberal Party is still circa 2000 and I do not know what year, but it has not used facts in its analysis. Its whole idea is that somehow Fremantle port expanding forever is a no-cost solution, that no infrastructure upgrades would be needed in the port, and that birds and other things would not be impacted. It is absolutely false that it would not impact on North Fremantle in any way. The report shows that direct road links, together with associated infrastructure at the port, together with the other road links, would cost up to \$7 billion or \$8 billion. The Liberal Party’s plan is to spend \$7 billion to \$8 billion on Fremantle. We have an alternative plan, and that is the outer harbour. That work is being undertaken at the moment.

I want to address the cost. The member for Cottesloe also said that Roe 8 would have cost \$1.2 billion and that Roe 9 would go to the port. Again, that is absolutely wrong. It shows a lack of understanding of what is before the Liberal Party and the policy it adopted. Roe 9 would not have gone to the port; it would have gone on the other side —

Mr D.C. Nalder: It joins up to Stirling Highway. It is what we have always said.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It does not reach the port.

Mr D.C. Nalder: It joins Stirling Highway.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I am addressing the member for Cottesloe’s comments, member for Bateman.

Mr D.C. Nalder: It does reach the port.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Roe 9 does not reach the port.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, members! In general, the minister did hear other people in silence. I would appreciate it if you could do the same.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Roe 9 does not reach the port. Members opposite cannot be convinced about that. It will involve a new Stirling Highway bridge and either —

Mr D.C. Nalder: It needs it irrespective of the port. The bridge is needed for cars. Check with Main Roads.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: What was your plan?

Mr D.C. Nalder: Check with Main Roads.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I actually checked with Main Roads. Was your plan to tunnel under the river?

Mr D.C. Nalder: No, it was not.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: That was your plan.

Mr D.C. Nalder: No, it was not.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It was. I checked the transport plan, member for Bateman.

Mr D.C. Nalder: Look in *Hansard*.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: You know what Main Roads is saying: we need another river crossing between Fremantle and Perth. That is what you adopted in your transport plan.

Mr D.C. Nalder: No. You're talking now about Stock Road north. That has nothing to do with how you get into the port. It was duplication of the bridge. I am in *Hansard* as saying it. That was the plan.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We are talking about commuter traffic. The commuter traffic is all about going east–west and accessing the other side of the river. Your plan was to tunnel under the river.

Mr D.C. Nalder: No, it was not; it was duplication of the bridge. Go and check with Main Roads.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: How much was duplication of the bridge going to cost? Is that something you are still committed to?

Mr D.C. Nalder: It is all in *Hansard*.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: How much?

Mr D.C. Nalder: It was estimated at \$500 million. It was to widen the bridge and then tuck under Tydeman Road.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: How much?

Mr D.C. Nalder: It was \$500 million.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: So, \$500 million, member for Bicton—and, of course, all the trucks. Talking about those areas as well, all the trucks and impacts that would continue to have —

Mr D.C. Nalder: I also said it is required irrespective of the port.

Point of Order

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: The minister is attempting to conclude the third reading debate but continues to be interrupted by the member for Bateman.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.C. Blayney): Point taken, Leader of the House. Minister, direct your comments directly to me so that you do not engage with opposition members.

Debate Resumed

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Sure, Mr Acting Speaker.

What the opposition is actually going to commit to is coming out now. As we continue to push this issue, we will see the cost of what it is proposing getting higher and higher. That is the reality.

Mr D.C. Nalder interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Bateman, I will have to call you if you keep interjecting.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Now we are starting to acknowledge Roe 10, the third stage of the Perth Freight Link.

Another interesting thing that came out in the third reading debate was the Leader of the Opposition saying that the problem was that the Labor Party made the Perth Freight Link project all about freight. We did not call it the Perth Freight Link; it was all about freight because it was called the Perth Freight Link. The former government called the project the Perth Freight Link and then accused us of being misleading about it because we said it was all about freight, when it was called the Perth Freight Link and was based on a heavy user toll charge raking in, I understand, billions of dollars. That was proposed and that is exactly what Infrastructure Australia saw. If the opposition wants to give us the authority to look at that business case so we can double-check it, I am happy to do so.

Mr D.C. Nalder: You're talking about tolls. Are we going to get a debate about tolls?

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, member. I do not think it is good to bring new arguments into the debate.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: As I said, now it has come out. There will be the duplication of Stirling Bridge and Curtin Avenue if Fremantle port is kept forever. I do not see why not; it is part of the plan. Why would there be a duplication of Stirling Bridge and not Curtin Avenue?

Mr D.C. Nalder: Have a look at the transport plan.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I know about the transport plan. Would Curtin Avenue be duplicated if Fremantle port was going to be kept forever? I think the answer is yes.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, members!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The answer is yes. The member for Cottesloe needs to explain the duplication of Curtin Avenue to his community. He has to explain that.

I turn to the issue of reservations. I have gone through and asked more questions. Why did the Liberal Party reduce the reservation on Stirling Highway in the lead-up to the last election? Why did the Liberal Party do that? Why did it think it was okay to reduce the road reservation going through the western suburbs? Why did it not proceed with the Curtin Avenue duplication when it was funded in 2012? Why not? It is because it affected its constituents; that is why not. The Liberal Party reduced the Stirling Highway reservation of 80 metres. Why did it do that? Why did it take out that road reservation? It is because it affected its constituents. Why did the Liberal Party not proceed with Curtin Avenue, even though it was funded in the 2012 budget? It is because it affected its constituents.

The Liberal Party says it is pro-roads, but it did not build the roads it had funded and, of course, it never built Roe 8 and Roe 9. The Leader of the Opposition tried to give a history of how everyone else somehow was to blame for Roe 8 and Roe 9 not being built. The Leader of the Opposition said the Liberal Party was elected in 2008 and started planning, and in 2015 someone appealed something. What happened in those seven years? Why could the Liberal Party not progress it in seven years? We know it is because the then Premier did not see it as a priority. We know that is the case. In October 2013, Colin Barnett declared that the Roe Highway stage 8 extension would not be built in that term of government. The Liberal Party did not think it was a priority. The Leader of the Opposition tried to explain that in eight and a half years, everyone was blocking the government; there were appeals and there was this and that. The Liberal Party was elected in 2008 and the first time there was, in a sense, an appeal in that process was in 2015, so in seven years the Liberal government did not get on with it, but now the Liberal opposition says it is a massive priority.

I am glad that the Nationals WA stood up today, because there is apparently \$1.2 billion from the federal government sitting on the table. I say let us invest it now in the regional run-off-road crashes program. I heard the member for Pilbara advocating for that very strongly on radio in the north. He made really good points that were then, of course, backed up by some other key people in the region too. Everyone acknowledges that we are not building Roe 8 and Roe 9. The federal government has apparently given us that \$1.2 billion. Apparently, it is sitting there ready for something. Let us get on with it!

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup: Earning interest!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It is earning interest! We will take the interest and spend it on regional roads. As I said, the regional run-off-road crashes program is a really good program for regional WA to reduce —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, members!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: There is \$1.2 billion sitting there, member for Collie–Preston. Does the member for Collie–Preston think that that money could be spent on regional roads?

Mr M.P. Murray: Saving country lives.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Exactly! Therefore, I cannot believe the National Party says that it wants another metro road project that the Liberal Party says is not about freight anyway. That is the contradiction upon contradiction that is happening. Unfortunately, the member for Vasse is not here either.

Mr J.E. McGrath: She is on her way down. She has been in a meeting.

Mrs A.K. Hayden: She is here.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Is she here?

Mrs A.K. Hayden: Like all your members are!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I thank the member for Darling Range for a great contribution once again!

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, members!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We are still looking! We are looking for our members, as we are looking for the member for Darling Range's Kalamunda small business. We are still looking for that Kalamunda small business. We are looking for that business that the member for Darling Range promoted. She said she ran a Kalamunda small business. When she was running for mayor, she promoted that she was running a Kalamunda small business.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We are still looking for that one!

The member for Vasse basically said that Bussell Highway is going to be the number one priority. I am saying that there is \$1.2 billion on the table, so we could use some of that for the Bussell Highway duplication.

Mr M.P. Murray: That the member for Vasse did not advocate for before the last election.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Exactly, the one that she ignored when she was in government. Now there is \$1.2 billion on the table, let us spend that on Bussell Highway. Why would the member for Vasse not support that? We are not building Roe 8 and Roe 9; I think we have made that point pretty clear. We are doing these other initiatives that I will go through. Why would the member for Vasse not support that? Why would she not support regional roads spending? Why would we not use that money on regional roads? Does the member for Bunbury not think that we should use it for spending on regional roads? That \$1.2 billion could be spent on regional roads at the moment, could it not, member for Murray-Wellington?

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup: Cookernup!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Cookernup is doing very well!

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup: For such a small population, so much is happening! It has got a postcode now! Got some other stuff.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It has a sign. First, it had a sign, now it has a postcode and soon it will have a new train station. Cookernup has advanced very, very far under this government!

But again, the opposition does not refer to anything we are doing—the enormous improvements we have had with freight on rail, intermodal development, improvements to High Street and, of course, the plan we are undertaking for the outer harbour.

The opposition talks about the southern suburbs being ignored, member for Jandakot. He is not in his seat, and so he cannot respond, but I will just point to him generally anyway! How is that Armadale Road project going, member for Armadale?

Dr A.D. Buti: Brilliant, fantastic!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We are about to start work on the Armadale Road-North Lake Road bridge, too, member for Jandakot.

Dr A.D. Buti interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member for Jandakot cannot speak, but the member for Armadale said it is great; it is fantastic. There is Karel Avenue. I remember the infamous day. That is the third infamous day I have had with federal politicians on the side of the road. Karel Avenue is a great project. It is a huge bottleneck and we are fixing it.

Ms S. Winton interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I am just talking about the southern suburbs at the moment. I will be hitting the north very soon.

In the southern suburbs, where the opposition says we are not doing anything, we are probably doing the most, with freeway widenings and the smart freeway project—the list goes on.

Member for Wanneroo, the work on the widening has been finished and the two interchanges, which —

Point of Order

Mr D.C. NALDER: I have tolerated this for as long as I could, but this has got —

Several members interjected.

Mr D.C. NALDER: This is a point of order. It should be heard in silence. We have gone well beyond the bill, which is about the Beeliar wetlands. I have given the minister a lot of leniency, but we are now hearing about Wanneroo, which is nowhere near the Beeliar wetlands.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.C. Blayney): There is no point of order, but, minister, I draw you back to the bill, thank you.

Debate Resumed

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: This is about a direct comment made by the member for Vasse, who said, “We do things. We build things. The other side stops doing things.” She is saying that we should stop a project that is under construction—that is, the Wanneroo Road–Joondalup Drive overpass now. The member for Vasse stood next to a potential mayoral candidate and said that we should “end this destructive program that no-one wants”. That is what the opposition said about a road project in the northern suburbs. It is interesting, is it not? It shows the hypocrisy of members on the other side. We had a plan, took it to the election and are now implementing it.

We have road projects across the state and a real plan to deal with freight going into Fremantle. That is what we are on about. Let us look at the timing of what is happening and some advertising in local papers. This is all about the Melville council elections and Liberal Party members making sure that their mate gets re-elected. That is all it is. The timing is incredible. The move that they are trying in Wanneroo —

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister, I draw you back to the bill, please.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We want to save the Beeliar wetlands. We are doing that while members of the Liberal Party are campaigning for their council mates to become mayors across the suburbs. They used Wanneroo Road as a platform, but this is an example that is all about the council elections —

Point of Order

Mr D.C. NALDER: Mr Acting Speaker, you have asked her to come back to the bill. I point out that this bill has nothing to do with council elections.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.C. Blayney): Minister, I once again bring you back to the bill, please.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The Cockburn council is being very supportive of this process.

Mr D.C. NALDER: We are still hearing about councils. You have requested and I ask that —
Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister, the bill is not about local government. It is about the Beeliar wetlands. I ask you to come back to the Beeliar wetlands.

Debate Resumed

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I am saying that the Cockburn council is working with us on the Roe 9 reservation and is very supportive of the bill before us at the moment. I am saying that.

In relation to the Beeliar bill, the Cockburn council, which I know you guys are trying to manoeuvre to change, is very supportive of the approach.

Mr J.E. McGrath: Joe Francis for mayor!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Joe Francis for mayor? That is interesting

The ACTING SPEAKER: That certainly stopped the debate, did it not?

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, members!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Information from the other side is coming out! Members may have missed it, but the member for Riverton rang the Conservation Council of Western Australia and asked why it did not oppose Metronet projects, and the Leader of the Opposition is working with the Fish Army on some issues. I want to say that what is happening to the member for Bicton on social media right now is disgraceful.

Dr M.D. Nahan interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Has the member for Riverton seen what is happening to the member for Bicton?

Dr M.D. Nahan: I have seen what you do.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member for Riverton should not ridicule that if he does not know what he is talking about. Does he condone someone’s family being used?

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Ms S. Winton interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Wanneroo!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Does the member for Riverton support a member’s family being used in a fake social media account? Does the member for Riverton support this grubby and dirty little project?

Point of Order

Mr D.C. NALDER: I ask that the minister come back to the bill. It is about the Beeliar wetlands and she keeps going way off track.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr R.S. Love): Members! I have not yet ruled on the point of order. As to the point of order, minister, could you bring your contribution back to the bill itself.

Debate Resumed

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member for Bicton spoke on this bill and is a key supporter of this bill. She and her family are now being attacked on social media because of her support for the Beeliar wetlands. That is disgraceful.

Dr M.D. Nahan interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Ms S. Winton interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Wanneroo, I call you to order for the second time.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I think the member should check who is linked to that page and should reflect on his support for that type of attack on the member for Bicton.

This is a bill about Western Australia's future. It supports the preservation of the wetlands. It is consistent with our election commitment and delivers on it. We are keeping our promise to all those people who trusted us to preserve the wetlands and develop a freight and trade future for Western Australia.

Division

Question put and a division taken, the Acting Speaker (Mr R.S. Love) casting his vote with the noes, with the following result —

Ayes (31)

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

Noes (19)

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

Question thus passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

House adjourned at 8.09 pm
