

Mr Mike Board; Dr Janet Woollard; Speaker; Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Mr Jeremy Edwards; Mr Colin Barnett; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Deputy Speaker; Mr Terry Waldron; Mr Jim McGinty; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Acting Speaker; Mr Fran Logan

---

**FREMANTLE EASTERN BYPASS, DELETION FROM METROPOLITAN REGION SCHEME**

*Motion*

**MR M.F. BOARD** (Murdoch) [4.01 pm]: I move -

That this House condemns the State Government for failing to govern in the interest of Western Australians in relation to the proposed deletion of the Fremantle eastern bypass from the metropolitan region scheme.

This motion, which I have moved in private members' time, is very important. The Government's proposal will affect not only the southern suburbs, but also the total road and planning strategy for Perth. Without doubt, this is the single largest issue that has come before the people who live in the suburbs south of the river, because it threatens the amenities and environments of many communities. It also threatens many people's houses, lifestyles and access to other suburbs. It will affect schools, hospitals, aged-care facilities and residential developments in the area. This issue goes to the very heart of why people have chosen to live south of the river. The infrastructure of the areas in which those people live is also threatened by the Government's proposal. It will affect people's property values, and the family home is probably the single largest investment many of them have ever made. This is my tenth year as a member of Parliament. Many people have united to fight this issue, regardless of their political persuasion, because they believe that the Government's poor planning decisions will affect them.

I have moved this motion today to increase the Government's understanding of the effects that the deletion of the eastern bypass will have if adequate and substantial planning to meet the traffic and road freight network needs throughout the southern corridor are not taken into consideration. This issue is not new; it goes back some time. The growth of Perth, particularly the southern suburbs, has been built around the Stephenson plan that was put in place over 30 years ago. The development of the size and location of many suburbs, including Canning Vale, Leeming, Bibra Lake, North Lake, South Lake, Murdoch and Jandakot, has been planned around the road infrastructure of Leach Highway, South Street, the freeway and the proposed Roe Highway extension, which was intended to meet the Fremantle eastern bypass. The Government is proceeding to amend the metropolitan region scheme by deleting the reservation for the Fremantle eastern bypass, without making adequate provision for the huge amount of freight, truck and car traffic that travels through the southern corridor, and that is nothing short of total lunacy.

Ms A.J. MacTiernan: Where are those cars and trucks going now?

Mr M.F. BOARD: The minister will have the opportunity -

Ms A.J. MacTiernan: I want to make sure we answer the question.

Mr M.F. BOARD: I am talking about the proposed growth throughout that corridor. The Government's and Main Roads' plans show, and the minister has admitted, that trucks will travel on Roe Highway. The road network will be incomplete as a result of those trucks travelling on the existing parts of Roe Highway, particularly during the completion of stages 6 and 7, and it will not provide adequate access for road transport to the Fremantle or Kwinana ports. The original Stephenson plan was that a road network with a ring road around the outside of the Perth metropolitan region would be built to cater for the city's growth. That ring road included not only the Reid and Tonkin Highways, but also the Roe Highway, which would connect to the Fremantle eastern bypass, and then, by means of the Stirling Bridge, that would connect to the West Coast Highway. That ring road system would provide for the increase in and movement of traffic as the Perth metropolitan area grew. Deleting one part of that network will result in the whole network falling down, because it will remove a major cog in a very important part of it.

Members on this side of the House faced this situation before in 1992. Just prior to losing office, the previous Labor Government removed the Fremantle eastern bypass from the metropolitan region scheme in a desperate bid to gain votes. During the election, we made a commitment to reinstate the bypass so that the scheme would remain as it was originally intended and as it had been in place for 30 years. That scheme had catered for the growth of the metropolitan region. In 1993 we honoured that commitment, and we received a great deal of support throughout the metropolitan region. We received support from councils and the then Leader of the Opposition, Jim McGinty. At that time, he said publicly that he backed the bypass.

Ms A.J. MacTiernan: When was that?

Mr M.F. BOARD: That was in 1995. An article titled "McGinty now backs bypass" states -

**Extract from *Hansard***

[ASSEMBLY - Wednesday, 21 August 2002]

p413c-436a

Mr Mike Board; Dr Janet Woollard; Speaker; Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Mr Jeremy Edwards; Mr Colin Barnett; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Deputy Speaker; Mr Terry Waldron; Mr Jim McGinty; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Acting Speaker; Mr Fran Logan

---

The state government has earmarked \$27 million for the construction of Fremantle's eastern bypass, but work won't start for another four years.

The decision is expected to be welcomed by Fremantle MLA and opposition leader, Jim McGinty.

He told a gathering of certified practising accountants last week that he now supported the controversial highway.

If it is not built, Fremantle would face crisis management of its roads by the year 2000, he said.

Under the Lawrence Government, the road was taken off the drawing board in response to community protests.

It was promptly reinstated by planning minister Richard Lewis after the election of the Court government.

"My position five-and-a-half-years ago was one of opposition to the by pass, "Mr McGinty said.

"There have been three big changes in that time.

"Fremantle City Council now supports the concept; the western highway, to be built down Servetus Street, will channel traffic into Fremantle and the number of trucks travelling to Fremantle's port facilities will double in the next five years."

"My view has changed accordingly."

Mr McGinty said the future of Fremantle had been enhanced by the huge increase in the volume of trade at the port.

The Fremantle Port Authority was experiencing growth of 12 per cent each year and in seven years would double its trade figures.

This was putting big pressure not only on port facilities, but on the transport infrastructure.

The port was leading the nation in reform and economic efficiency.

Hon Jim McGinty, who was then Leader of the Opposition, totally supported the Government's move to reinstate the bypass in 1993. The above article was written in 1995.

The plan received support from a large number of people involved in politics and planning. Indeed, the minister may recall a document that was released by Main Roads WA in 1997, which summarises the Fremantle eastern bypass and describes it as a vital link to an integrated transport solution for the Perth metropolitan region. The summary states that the Fremantle eastern bypass will -

- Remove tens of thousands of motor cars, trucks and semi-trailers from local roads in Fremantle and Cockburn.
- Provide a vital north/south link in Perth's regional road network.
- Reduce accidents by up to 50 per cent on some local Fremantle roads
- Increase efficiency of commercial freight transit to and from Fremantle's port.
- Reduce vehicle operating cost by \$21 million over the next 30 years -

That was in 1997 - I am sure that the figure could be multiplied to reflect today's situation. The document continues -

- Save \$10 million in reduced vehicle accident costs.

That was the figure of the day. It continues -

- Save \$106 million in lost business and commercial travel time.
- Reduce existing and future traffic noise, vibration and congestion on Fremantle roads.
- Reduce travel time from areas south of Fremantle to the northern suburbs and to the Inner Harbour.
- Help to reduce vehicle emissions in Fremantle.
- Provide the opportunity to traffic calm Hampton Road.

That report was followed by another substantial document, which was released by Main Roads in 2000 - the freight network strategy - and which proposed not only the continuation of stages 7 and 8 of Roe Highway but also the construction of the Fremantle eastern bypass. The report stated that the bypass was a vital and necessary

Mr Mike Board; Dr Janet Woollard; Speaker; Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Mr Jeremy Edwards; Mr Colin Barnett; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Deputy Speaker; Mr Terry Waldron; Mr Jim McGinty; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Acting Speaker; Mr Fran Logan

---

link to meet the growth in road transport, particularly freight transport, in the Perth metropolitan region. One must ask why government departments have done a total backflip in such a short time. Why is the 2000 Perth metropolitan freight transport strategy - which had the support of dozens of government agencies - no longer a credible document? The report contained contributions from notable organisations and companies, all of which recommended the completion of the Roe Highway - including stage 8 - and the construction of the Fremantle eastern bypass as a necessary and important link to the overall strategy to access the port and bypass traffic congestion in Fremantle. They included the Fremantle Port Authority, Transport WA, Main Roads WA, the Department of Transport and Regional Services, Westrail, Sinclair Knight Mertz Pty Ltd, Robinson Consultants Pty Ltd, Halphern Glick and Maunsell Pty Ltd, and the Western Australian Planning Commission. Indeed, a 1996 select committee on heavy transport recommended the Fremantle eastern bypass. Why was all that advice, support and work from government agencies over the past 20 years discarded by one political decision? We know it was an election promise, but it was not based on any substantial planning. The decision is not backed up by transport analogy. It was a decision to remove the Fremantle eastern bypass from the metropolitan region scheme, and the removal of that link will create chaos throughout the southern corridor. The minister decided to put a new freight network strategy in place and to ignore the work that has been carried out over the past 20 years, and the support given unilaterally by councils, government departments and those who have an interest in freight transport. It has also decided to put in place a freight network group. However, by removing the part of the strategy that involved the Fremantle eastern bypass the Government has failed to consider the missing link. It has removed that link, but it still wants the group to resolve the problem. That is a bit like saying that there are 21 ways in which to cut off one's leg and that the best of those 21 options must be used. However, the end result will still mean that the leg is cut off. The freight situation will affect the southern corridor in exactly that way.

Twenty-one options came out of the freight network strategy, none of which is acceptable in residential developments, allows satisfactory truck movements, or builds on the plan put in place more than 30 years ago. I will examine a number of those strategies and options. The majority of the options require that the Roe Highway end at the Kwinana Freeway, although one proposal was made that stage 8 of Roe Highway continue through to Stock Road. What will happen once the 80 000 vehicle movements reach the intersection of Roe Highway and the Kwinana Freeway? Nobody, including the minister, can provide a satisfactory answer. The options are for the vehicles to turn north and use either Farrington Road or South Street, or go all the way to the Leach Highway. However, why would a truck driver travelling from Kewdale use the Roe Highway, only to then go back on the Leach Highway? That is a ludicrous proposal, and the community knows it. The reality is that although the minister says that there has never been a proposal by Main Roads to upgrade South Road or Leach Highway to freeway status, the indicative plans from the Department for Planning and Infrastructure - which I have with me - suggest otherwise. The minister will notice the logo on the nicely coloured map. On the right-hand side it refers to the freight network review, Roe Highway to Kwinana Freeway, with South Street upgrade to freeway standard.

This map also indicates that Leach Highway is to be upgraded to "freeway standard". It is the minister's own map. When people have indicated that that is possible under the freight network review she has accused them of misleading the community, bending the truth and not providing adequate information. Under these options the minister's plans indicate the possibility of upgrading South Street or Roe Highway to freeway standard. For members who are unaware of the difference between a highway and a freeway, freeways require overpasses and have restricted access. The suburban road infrastructure would change and inhibit access from suburbs, shopping centres and schools, which once had access to the highway. Although the maps show that not the whole of South Street or Leach Highway would be upgraded to freeway status, parts of it would. Some parts of what would be freeway run past hospices and hospitals, the university and age care facilities and they cut through major parts of residential areas. One map shows a proposal to take the road through Piney Lakes Reserve, an environmental icon south of the river, on which the Melville City Council has spent vast amounts of money. This proposal is built on the Government's aim to provide an environmental solution to the non-extension of stage 8 of Roe Highway and its link to the Fremantle eastern bypass.

If the minister spoke to freight people and people who drive trucks that move containers around this city of ours, she might expect to gain universal support for this freight network; but that would not be the case. In fact, the vast majority of truck drivers have called it absolute lunacy and asked why they would drive down Roe Highway to the Kwinana Freeway, turn north and go all the way back to Leach Highway, a designated truck route. They would not do that.

Ms A.J. MacTiernan: They would have to turn north to get onto Roe Highway.

Mr M.F. BOARD: They would stay on Roe Highway, which links with the eastern bypass, which was the original plan and which has support.

Mr Mike Board; Dr Janet Woollard; Speaker; Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Mr Jeremy Edwards; Mr Colin Barnett; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Deputy Speaker; Mr Terry Waldron; Mr Jim McGinty; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Acting Speaker; Mr Fran Logan

---

Ms A.J. MacTiernan interjected.

Mr M.F. BOARD: It does not have traffic lights on it and it does not pass through residential suburbs. That is the major change the minister is seeking to make. Why does the minister want to change the amenity for hundreds of thousands of people in large numbers of suburbs south of the river, when a plan and reservation have been in place for 30 years?

Ms A.J. MacTiernan: Do members opposite want us to reinstate the Stephenson plan? We will put it through Charlie Court's house if that is what you want.

Mr M.F. BOARD: Why do that? There is obviously a political advantage in deciding not to build the proposed bypass through Beaconsfield and White Gum Valley, although people have known for 30 years that it would be built. The Government has chosen to abandon it and to put at risk stages 7 and 8 of Roe Highway, which will result in chaos. Perhaps it is not the minister's intention to build stage 7 but to complete Roe Highway at South Street and put all that traffic -

Ms A.J. MacTiernan: You can't expect me to answer, given your mung bean behaviour in proposing to the federal Government that it withdraw the funding for stage 7. I cannot believe your mob was so silly.

Mr M.F. BOARD: That was not my proposal; it was the City of Melville's proposal. Does the minister understand why that occurred? That money was given to the State Government to complete Roe Highway to the ports.

Ms A.J. MacTiernan: That is what it will be spent on.

Mr M.F. BOARD: The minister will have the opportunity to respond. If those stages of Roe Highway are not built, she will have betrayed the intention of the Commonwealth funding. Stages 6 and 7 of Roe Highway should be completed simultaneously to avoid 80 000 cars using South Street, which could not cope with that much traffic. If that did occur, South Street would have huge problems and the minister would want to upgrade it by removing traffic lights and perhaps building some overpasses to alleviate some of the congestion. That would create a freeway environment on South Street by stealth, which is possibly what is in the back of her mind. Why would she do all that?

Ms A.J. MacTiernan: Where would Roe Highway stage 8 go?

Mr M.F. BOARD: Let us find a solution to stage 8 that will work. If the minister is concerned about the lakes and other environmental issues we should talk about them.

Ms A.J. MacTiernan: That is exactly what we are doing.

Mr M.F. BOARD: Why abandon the proposal to build a bypass and say that stage 8 of Roe Highway will not proceed and produce plans of something that will destroy the amenity for hundreds of thousands of people? I am sure that even members on the minister's side - the electorate of the Minister for Education would be greatly affected by the proposed plan - would not be happy to see hundreds of additional trucks using a road in residential areas as a result of a plan that has no resolution. If the minister wants to remove the Fremantle eastern bypass and find another route for stage 8 we should sit down and resolve it in a rational manner. It would be absolute lunacy to allow heavy trucks to be driven through residential suburbs contrary to all planning and environmental considerations. There is no way that people south of the river will be satisfied until a proper, reasonable solution is reached that meets not only the demands of the trucking network but also other traffic that will increase over the next 20 to 30 years.

Planning is about growth; it is not only about the issues of today. As the minister in charge of planning, the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure will know that planning is for the next 30 years, which was the basis of the Stephenson plan for Roe Highway. Why put all that at risk for what seems to be a short-term political objective? The minister needs to re-examine her position and the proposed strategies. She must bring together an unbiased and unstacked group of people who will consider these issues in a bipartisan way for the long-term future growth of the southern corridor, the port options and the increase in freight traffic.

The minister might think that her proposal is environmentally friendly, but all the previous reports have been examined and supported by the Environmental Protection Authority. It has supported the proposal for stage 8 of Roe Highway and the Fremantle eastern bypass. It is not as though they did not have support from the very bodies that are established to support the environment. The Government is happy to prostitute the environment of hundreds of thousands of people who have chosen to live in the area, rather than accept another decision that had the support of the Environmental Protection Authority. I assume that the Government will move the deletion of the eastern bypass via a major amendment to the metropolitan region scheme. If the Western Australian Planning Commission has its way, it will be a major amendment that will require EPA assessment. If

Mr Mike Board; Dr Janet Woollard; Speaker; Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Mr Jeremy Edwards; Mr Colin Barnett; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Deputy Speaker; Mr Terry Waldron; Mr Jim McGinty; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Acting Speaker; Mr Fran Logan

---

the EPA has the courage of its convictions, it will say to the minister that the deletion of the eastern bypass will adversely affect the environment for a large number of people. Has the minister considered that?

The minister has said that container movement will be by rail, and that rail is the solution. The Opposition encourages additional rail freight transport. However, the minister knows in her heart that will not happen for a long time. She knows that rail represents only a small percentage of total freight movements and the vast majority of containers moving in and out of Fremantle port, and any projected ports further south, are by road transport. The minister cannot hoodwink the Western Australian community about that. As much as the minister might like to encourage rail freight, the reality is that the vast majority of freight movements will be by truck, and truck movements will outstrip rail growth in large proportion. Previous studies have clearly indicated that and it has been set down in the transport strategies. For the minister to use hocus-pocus to reinvent those statistics, and to tell someone involved in the transport industry whose livelihood is freight movement that somehow this will change overnight because the Government has removed the Fremantle eastern bypass, is ludicrous. The minister knows that will not happen. The people who live south of the river will pay the penalty. These issues need to be considered.

In a balanced way, the Cities of Canning and Fremantle, and a large number of people within the city of Fremantle, and in particular some of the City of Fremantle's councillors, are all very concerned about the minister's long-term strategy; it makes no sense whatsoever. It has been brought about by a political decision to remove the bypass that connects at High Road and feeds into Rockingham. That was designed so that the northern movement of traffic would bypass the suburbs of Fremantle, to deal with the heavy traffic movement between the two ports, to feed over Stirling Bridge and to give greater access from Rockingham and the Kwinana-Fremantle strip to the northern suburbs via West Coast Highway. That was logical, and part of a plan that had been in place for 30 years. It is a pity that all of a sudden a card will be removed from this beautiful network and the whole pack will fall down; the potential result will be chaos.

The minister's proposition is politically naive. She thinks that she may be able to achieve this by stealth. If the Government thinks it saw people power come into operation with the Treasurer's proposed property tax, then "it ain't seen nothing yet!" People are resolved to fight this to the end in very large numbers. This is my tenth year in politics and I have never seen a hotter issue. This issue has united the community south of the river. I have not received more mail and e-mails in my office on any other issue or heard from more people from different political persuasions saying the same thing: this is absolute lunacy. This has received some media attention in the past six or eight weeks, but the minister should wait and see what happens in the next six months! People are resolved to fight this not only through the Parliament and in the community, but also in the courts. They will fight this all the way to protect their environment, their livelihood and the 30 years of work that has been done, particularly in the Cities of Canning and Melville, to build a quality lifestyle. That planning was based on the need for highways and major roads, but not for huge numbers of truck movements not only now but increasing in the future. This is a poor planning decision based on knee-jerk political decisions that favour a few people. The original planning decisions were put in place by forward-thinking people 30 years ago. People have been aware of those road reservations and have invested accordingly and built their lifestyles around them. In fact, the suburbs of the southern corridor have been built around the road network, including the Roe Highway.

I ask the minister to rethink her strategy and the way in which she has gone about this proposal. The minister should not sacrifice the amenity for hundreds of thousands of people. It is political suicide for the Labor Party. I give it some good advice now: if it thinks it will win some seats south of river, it is crazy. If the Government gets the one vote, one value legislation up, with additional seats south of the river, the Opposition will be rubbing its hands with glee. If the Government wants to be on this side of the Parliament at the next election, it should continue with this plan.

No single issue has united people more than the proposal that is before the Western Australian Planning Commission for the removal of the eastern bypass without any adequate, sensible proposal to substitute for that deletion. People are committed to fighting this lunacy. If the Government deletes the bypass, it should have a better system. It should not construct a railway through Bibra Lake; it should come up with a proposal that works. The proposal to route thousands of trucks through residential suburbs south of the river will not work. It will be on the Government's conscience. It will not succeed.

**DR J.M. WOOLLARD** (Alfred Cove) [4.37 pm]: This motion should read -

That this House condemns the State Government for failing to govern in the interests of Western Australians in relation to the proposed deletion of the Fremantle eastern bypass from the metropolitan region scheme without making alternative transport arrangements to ensure residential areas do not have increased traffic congestion and that environmental areas are protected.

Mr Mike Board; Dr Janet Woollard; Speaker; Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Mr Jeremy Edwards; Mr Colin Barnett; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Deputy Speaker; Mr Terry Waldron; Mr Jim McGinty; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Acting Speaker; Mr Fran Logan

---

I would like the member for Murdoch to consider that as an alteration to his motion.

I am pleased that the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure is in the House because I would like to know whether she has signed off on stage 6 of the Roe Highway bypass.

Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

[Quorum formed.]

Dr J.M. WOOLLARD: Mr Speaker, I drew your attention to the state of the House because I had hoped to get a response from the minister. She is very good at dancing around questions at question time when a question is put to her that she does not care to answer.

Deleting the eastern bypass without looking at alternative arrangements would not be a problem for stages 7 or 8, but for stage 6. I would like to know whether the minister has signed off on that stage. If the minister has not signed off with the contractors on stage 6, I can suggest a solution that I believe would be fair to residents who live south of the river. Stage 6 involves the deviation of Roe Highway from the railway line, which is the aspect of the project that starts to cause a problem. The member for Riverton is not concerned about that because, once stage 6 is completed, the traffic will move out of his area. However, it will move into the City of Melville.

Mr A.D. McRae interjected.

Dr J.M. WOOLLARD: I will take interjections at a later stage. As the minister will not sit down and answer a question, I will not take any interjections at the moment. The minister could choose to not sign off on that agreement. I am not sure whether the member for Murdoch or the City of Melville wanted to approach the federal Government to have the funding for stage 7 deleted. Stage 7 is not the problem. That move would amount to closing the stable door after the horse has bolted. The problem is stage 6 of Roe Highway. If the alignment of Roe Highway were to follow the railway line, the traffic would not deviate through the City of Melville.

A political battle is going on about moving the traffic congestion from a Labor seat to Liberal areas. That is what it looks like at the moment. The Government appears to be trying to move traffic away from Fremantle and into Melville, which is an area that has more Independent and Liberal-minded voters. Eighty per cent of the people in that area have traditionally been Liberal voters.

There are sensitive areas along Roe Highway. Stage 6 of the project extends from Nicholson Road to South Street. The problem with the Government saying that it will complete the project up to stage 7 is that it is pitting one environmental group against another. It is a case of divide and conquer. Some environmental groups want to save Bibra Lake and other people want to save Ken Hurst Park. If the Government were to reconsider the alignment of Roe Highway and move it back along the railway, neither Ken Hurst Park nor Bibra Lake would be affected, and people in the City of Melville would not have extra traffic on South Street and Leach Highway.

Anyone who looked at the map would see that if Roe Highway were to continue to the freeway, more traffic would go through the City of Melville. People who currently live along Leach Highway and South Street are unhappy about the trucks that go past. They might live one street back from Leach Highway, but they can still hear the noise of that traffic. They are concerned about that noise. The minister might state that it is her goal to increase rail transport, and that the trucks that go into Fremantle will not come out empty, but if the Government chose to look at the alignment of Roe Highway for stages 6 and 7, those problems would not arise.

I remind members that when this Government came to power last year, it said that it would listen to community concerns. It did not say that it would listen to community concerns only in Labor electorates, but that it would listen to the community. The community is very unhappy at the thought of Roe Highway stopping where it is currently planned to stop, and increased traffic going through the City of Melville.

Mr P.B. Watson interjected.

Dr J.M. WOOLLARD: Mr Speaker, I am not willing to take interjections from the rabble on the other side of the House.

The SPEAKER: The member for Alfred Cove has clearly stated that she does not wish to take any interjections. I ask members to respect that wish.

Dr J.M. WOOLLARD: I am, however, willing to take interjections from the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure, because it is difficult to discuss issues with her. I am not sure who are her advisers, but they are certainly not listening to what is happening in the community. I am pleased that this motion is before us today, because people have a right to know where the Government is coming from. It is difficult to get a response from the minister and the department. People are concerned about this issue, and rightly so. I ask the minister to

Mr Mike Board; Dr Janet Woollard; Speaker; Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Mr Jeremy Edwards; Mr Colin Barnett; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Deputy Speaker; Mr Terry Waldron; Mr Jim McGinty; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Acting Speaker; Mr Fran Logan

---

seriously consider calling back in the rail freight network and asking it to reconsider the alignment of Roe Highway and the option that it continue along the railway line instead of deviating from Nicholson Road.

Ms A.J. MacTiernan: Out of your electorate.

Dr J.M. WOOLLARD: Sorry, what did the minister say?

Ms A.J. MacTiernan: It's okay; I don't want to interrupt your flow.

Dr J.M. WOOLLARD: If Roe Highway were to continue along the railway line, there would be a sensitive area south of Bibra Lake. That section has residences on both sides of the railway line. Those people are currently unhappy about the noise emanating from the railway.

Ms A.J. MacTiernan: What would you do about that?

Dr J.M. WOOLLARD: The minister has some good staff in her department. If the minister put it to her staff that Roe Highway should be taken down either side of the railway line, the section of the highway that passes through the residential area could include a concrete roof and two concrete sides, which would -

Ms A.J. MacTiernan interjected.

Dr J.M. WOOLLARD: The minister is laughing! The minister says that she looks after people. What about the people who live in that area? They are not happy about the noise they currently experience. If the Roe Highway extension were to go through that area, they would be happy if it included a sound barrier. Any money the Government had to expend would come from the money it is putting into its coffers from the Fremantle eastern bypass. I support this motion, but I believe that it should be expanded to state that this House condemns the State Government for failing to govern in the interests of Western Australians in relation to the proposed deletion of the Fremantle eastern bypass from the metropolitan region scheme without making alternative transport arrangements to ensure residential areas do not have increased traffic congestion and environmental areas are protected. I move that amendment.

*Point of Order*

Ms K. HODSON-THOMAS: The member for Alfred Cove foreshadowed that she would move an amendment.

The SPEAKER: My recollection of the statement was that the member for Alfred Cove suggested that, somehow, an amendment would be made. I cannot recall any amendment being read. Perhaps a future speaker from that side of the House might wish to move an amendment, but I do not think that the member's amendment was appropriate in the form that it was moved.

*Debate Resumed*

**MR J.P.D. EDWARDS** (Greenough) [4.50 pm]: I support this motion, basically because of the somewhat hasty decision. I am sorry the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure is not in her seat, because I have some comments to make about consultation. I positively bask in the warm words of the minister every time she mentions the Geraldton southern transport corridor. I wait with almost eager anticipation to hear any other warm words she might bring into the debate every time the issue comes up. However, those words always have a sting in the tail: the minister always attacks the Leader of the Opposition because she knows there is a difference of opinion between him and me. That is something we both live with. However, as the minister rightly said, in my past life in local government I was a leader in that area, and it was important to us that that southern transport corridor went through. I do not agree that \$20 million was wasted on the development at Oakajee. That is there for the future; it is locked up and can be used at any time. I wandered off on that tack to deal with the issue of consultation. On this issue, there has been very little consultation. The consultation on the Geraldton southern transport corridor took place over some eight years, as the minister said, and I would not disagree with her. I know this, because I was involved in part of that process for quite some time.

I quote from my colleague in the other place, Hon Simon O'Brien -

The Gallop Labor Government has acted with breath-taking recklessness in its decision to delete the Fremantle Eastern Bypass from the Metropolitan Region Scheme.

The Government makes a lot of noise about consultation, open government, transparency and everything else. I question whether in this case the Government has adhered to those principles. I do not believe it has. It has been rushed. It was a political promise made before the election, and the minister is seeing that political promise through.

Mr Mike Board; Dr Janet Woollard; Speaker; Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Mr Jeremy Edwards; Mr Colin Barnett; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Deputy Speaker; Mr Terry Waldron; Mr Jim McGinty; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Acting Speaker; Mr Fran Logan

---

Ms A.J. MacTiernan: Where have you been for the past years? Where were you when the freight network conference was going on?

Mr J.P.D. EDWARDS: The minister will no doubt give me the opportunity to bask in some of her warm words a little later, when she gets up to speak. I am happy to wait and listen to that. I understand that the bypass has been around for about 40 years. Here we have a Government walking in and changing a planning issue that has been on the table for 40 years. I gather there is a reserve for that bypass to go through. The decision to remove the bypass will impact on many people. There is much ill feeling out in the community about it. Options were put forward through the freight network review, but the option for the Fremantle eastern bypass was not one of them. It seems a bit odd to have options when the main option is not allowed to be discussed. I will probably reiterate some of the points made by the member for Murdoch. I understand it will impact on many properties and businesses fronting South Street and Leach Highway, which may have to be purchased by the Government and demolished to allow for these roads to be upgraded to freeway status. Traffic congestion will increase by a large amount. Already 40 000 to 60 00 cars commute daily along Leach Highway, and between 30 000 and 50 000 commute daily on South Street. The plan I have seen seems to make very good commonsense in extending Roe Highway. If there is to be an impact on people on South Street and Leach Highway, the minister is buying herself a problem. She already has a problem, because there is already a large amount of anti-government feeling on this issue. The excessive noise and emissions created by trucks and cars travelling on both those roads, as well as Stock Road and High Street, will increase.

On the other side of the coin, completing Roe Highway stage 8 and the eastern bypass will allow freight to move from industrial regions to the east, particularly from the Welshpool and Kewdale industrial areas and south of the Fremantle port, without any disruption to the residents and businesses. There will also be no need to resume land, knock down buildings or impact on residents who have bought in that area over the years, expecting to be able to live a comfortable and happy life for ever after.

The question of consultation takes many forms, but I come back to it, because it is really the basis of my argument. As I said, the Government espouses consultation, but in this instance there has been very little of it. If this is a Government that acts on its principles, it is abusing those principles. I do not have a lot more to say, but I just wanted to make that brief comment, because the Government's decision has impacted on many people, who are obviously feeling prejudiced by it. It seems that the Government is hell-bent on going down that path, but it will come back and cause many problems.

Ms A.J. MacTiernan: Do you think the Government should break its election commitment on this issue?

Mr J.P.D. EDWARDS: The Government has broken so many election commitments that it really does not matter if it breaks one more, for heaven's sake. I remember the commitment the Government gave to not increase taxes and charges, and I have stood here countless times and said that. The minister should not come the raw prawn with me about breaking election promises. What a joke!

The minister must get out there and do what she is supposed to do in the way of consultation. I remember the eight years it took the previous Government to consult on the Geraldton southern transport corridor, and the minister would be aware that there are still problems up there. A small minority does not agree with what is being done, but they had an opportunity for more than eight years to discuss the issues. I suggest the Government needs to do the same thing in this issue.

**MS K. HODSON-THOMAS** (Carine) [4.57 pm]: I support the motion moved by the member for Murdoch. He has raised some very important issues, which largely impact on his electorate. That is why he led this debate today. There has been some discussion on why I did not lead the debate, given that I am the opposition spokesperson on transport. The member for Murdoch has drawn attention to some very clear problems that will arise as a result of the Fremantle eastern bypass being suddenly deleted by the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure. I am sure the minister has an eraser in her top drawer. If she does not like a road, she simply deletes it, and then picks up a pen and adds to existing road structures.

I attended only one of the consultations as part of the freight network review. Unfortunately, I was unable to attend all of them, due to other circumstances. I am aware, however, that during the discussions that took place on the occasion that I attended there were suggestions that Leach Highway and South Street would be upgraded to accommodate heavy vehicle transportation. That is the reason the City of Melville is very concerned about what will happen in its community, and rightfully so. It is no wonder it has engaged members of its community in trying to open the eyes of the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure to make her realise that it is a very poor planning decision. It is an absolute dud. In his speech during the Address-in-Reply debate, the Leader of the Opposition said that if the Government did not want to build the road, it should not build the road, but it should at least leave the reserve there.



Mr Mike Board; Dr Janet Woollard; Speaker; Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Mr Jeremy Edwards; Mr Colin Barnett; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Deputy Speaker; Mr Terry Waldron; Mr Jim McGinty; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Acting Speaker; Mr Fran Logan

---

Ms A.J. MacTiernan: You were not going to build it. We should just follow your advice and leave it on the map. We do not have to deal with the problem.

Ms K. HODSON-THOMAS: I am quite happy to take that inane interjection from the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure. I will take the opportunity to highlight an issue that affected me in my electorate of Carine. I refer to the extension of Reid Highway. It was a very difficult issue to manage. It required a great deal of community consultation and I needed to address some major concerns in the electorate about how it would be managed. It was not an easy task. It almost drove me to distraction, but I believed that the road should be built. I did not waiver from that. I told my electorate quite clearly that the road needed to go through.

Ms A.J. MacTiernan: We are saying that the Fremantle eastern bypass does not need to be built and we are not paying for it.

Ms K. HODSON-THOMAS: The minister will have her opportunity to speak. Let me explain something: when Pam Beggs was the then Minister for Transport, she determined that she would have one of the two last sections of Reid Highway built. A report was commissioned - I think it was the Maunsell report - to determine whether it was sound practice and whether the road should be built in two stages. The report indicated that the extension of Reid Highway should be built from Erindale Road to Marmion Avenue in one stage. The minister at the time, Pam Beggs, made the decision that it would be done in two stages. The report clearly articulated that that would cause major problems, and those major problems came to fruition. Subsequently, my electorate was impacted upon, because a local residential street became a de facto Reid Highway. That is an example of how something can be deleted or how something can be done differently from the way in which it should be done and as it was set out in plans that have been in existence for some 30 years. The minister will be moving traffic problems from one area to another.

Ms A.J. MacTiernan: This is an issue. Certainly, your Government did it with Roe Highway stage 3. It stopped it at one point and the traffic went through William Street. We understand the problem. What intrigues me is that the coalition Government had no plan to build Roe Highway stage 8. Roe Highway stage 8 would cost between \$160 million and \$576 million. In the 10-year forward estimates, the previous Government allocated \$25 million. It had no plan and no money to build the road.

Ms K. HODSON-THOMAS: In the same way, the minister has no money to do anything, because she is putting everything into railways. We know that and we will have an opportunity to discuss that on another occasion.

Mr A.D. McRae: Tell the truth.

Ms K. HODSON-THOMAS: I am telling the truth.

Ms A.J. MacTiernan: If you are serious about that point, you must understand that your Government's building program was not going to go beyond Roe Highway stage 7 either, because it had no money to do it.

Mrs C.L. Edwardes: That is absolute nonsense. Where is it in writing?

Ms A.J. MacTiernan: You had no money to do it.

Ms K. HODSON-THOMAS: The minister can make her own speech. I am sure that the member for Kingsley will also make her own speech. This has been on the planning books for some 30 years. The member for Murdoch has explained why it needs to remain there and why we need to ensure that suddenly we do not create enormous problems by diverting major freight and vehicle transportation onto South Street.

Unfortunately the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure has a total disregard for communities that will be impacted upon and affected by her decision. It is typical of the way she operates. It is unfortunate that she does not realise that the Fremantle eastern bypass was intended to provide a corridor for both freight and vehicle transport. The local communities that will be affected have not been involved in the process. The Minister for Planning and Infrastructure has stated that people were consulted during the freight network review. Yes, they were, and the communities situated near stage 8 of Roe Highway were involved, but nobody has involved the communities near Leach Highway and South Street.

Ms A.J. MacTiernan: That is absolute rubbish and nonsense. Do not go and tell lies in this Parliament.

Ms K. HODSON-THOMAS: I am not telling lies.

*Withdrawal of Remark*

Mr C.J. BARNETT: The Minister for Planning and Infrastructure quite inappropriately accused the member for Carine of telling lies. I ask that she withdraw that.

Ms A.J. MacTIERNAN: I merely advised the member not to tell lies. I do not think there is anything to withdraw. It is quite appropriate that I counsel the member for Carine not to tell lies.

Mr Mike Board; Dr Janet Woollard; Speaker; Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Mr Jeremy Edwards; Mr Colin Barnett; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Deputy Speaker; Mr Terry Waldron; Mr Jim McGinty; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Acting Speaker; Mr Fran Logan

---

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I ask the minister to withdraw that remark.

Ms A.J. MacTIERNAN: I withdraw it.

*Debate Resumed*

Ms K. HODSON-THOMAS: I believe that this is a very dumb decision by the minister. It is interesting that the minister's media release of 13 August 2002 reads -

Industry freight transport needs can be met by shifting more of the transport load to rail, better management of existing traffic and relatively minor upgrades.

The reference to relatively minor upgrades concerns me, because there is no way there can be relatively minor upgrades. Certainly, the transport industry was very heavily involved in the discussions on the freight network review; in fact, it obviously attended every one of the discussions. Quite clearly, the transport industry realised and articulated that it needed a freight network that would allow the smooth passage of heavy vehicles so that there would be no stopping and starting. Quite clearly, Leach Highway and South Street would have to be severely modified.

When I referred to local communities, perhaps the minister was right in saying that a few people were involved in those discussions, but certainly not all local communities were involved. There is no degree of truth in saying that all communities were involved in that process. I would certainly ask that the minister, before deleting the Fremantle eastern bypass route from the map, at least take some time to consult with those communities and come up with a better solution that directly engages those communities so that they have an opportunity to make their feelings known about it.

Earlier today the member for Murdoch referred to the "Fremantle Eastern Bypass Summary Report", which was commissioned in September 1997 with the title "A Vital Link In An Integrated Transport Solution For The Perth Metropolitan Region". I will refer to one passage in the document, because I believe it is quite critical that it be placed in *Hansard*. It states -

The Bypass will have regional road status and will form a vital part of Perth's regional road network. Regional roads are designed to link major activity areas within the region, such as major industrial and commercial centres, ports, airports and residential areas.

Regional roads are designed to cater for the safe, efficient movement of large commercial vehicles, service vehicles and longer distant private vehicle trips. They have fewer intersections and flatter gradients and fewer access points than local roads.

Clearly regional roads provide a much safer environment. That is critical. He also made the point that there will be a reduction in the number of accidents on our road network. In our local communities we should be concerned about that. That was the example I was trying to highlight when I was talking about Reid Highway. What happened with the construction of Reid Highway from Erindale Road through to the Mitchell Freeway was that it emptied all those vehicles onto a local road in my electorate - Old Balcatta Road - and then onto North Beach Road. At that time, in the vicinity of 19 000 vehicles were using that road daily. That road was not designed to accommodate that kind of traffic. Houses had been built along that road, and the residents were abused when they tried to get in and out of their driveways. It was a shemozzle. The fact that no-one was killed along that road is remarkable, but there were certainly a number of accidents there. It was critical that the Reid Highway extension be built in unison, but the Government of the day made a determination that it did not have the money and built only one part of it. For many years my community was dealt a savage blow and had to deal with all of these vehicles on their local roads. Now that Reid Highway has been built, the communities that were against the construction of that road have been largely placated and acknowledge the benefits of that road. There will always be minor problems and there will always be people who oppose change -

Ms A.J. MacTiernan: Sounds like the Opposition!

Ms K. HODSON-THOMAS: The minister is good! What I found really interesting in the member for Murdoch's discussion was the fact that the now Attorney General, the member for Fremantle, said in 1995 that he supported the bypass.

Ms A.J. MacTiernan: I caution you on that, because you need to find out who wrote the article that was quoted. The Attorney will speak later, and I think you will find that the credibility of that article is highly suspect.

Ms K. HODSON-THOMAS: The minister is always very good at quoting from newspaper clippings and accusing other people of saying things that they did not say.

Mrs C.L. Edwardes: Relying on folk stories!

Mr Mike Board; Dr Janet Woollard; Speaker; Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Mr Jeremy Edwards; Mr Colin Barnett; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Deputy Speaker; Mr Terry Waldron; Mr Jim McGinty; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Acting Speaker; Mr Fran Logan

---

Ms K. HODSON-THOMAS: I thank the member for Kingsley. My understanding is that the member for Murdoch quoted from a story in the Press. I do not know the date, but it was some time in 1995. I wrote down one quote, which is, "My view has changed accordingly." If I am misrepresenting the Attorney General, that is not my intention. However, the member for Murdoch quoted from that article.

Mr J.A. McGinty: I had a brief chat with the member for Murdoch outside. That is not an accurate representation of my position. I am not suggesting that you are in any sense misrepresenting me. You are quoting from the article, and that is what was said in the article. The author of the article was a staffer from former minister Graham Kierath's office, Wendy Evans, and she misrepresented me.

Mrs C.L. Edwardes: Did you write to her and say that?

Mr J.A. McGinty: I do not think I did at the time. I tend to take a fairly robust view of the media, and if it misrepresents me, so be it.

Mrs C.L. Edwardes: Did you write to any constituents who might have contacted you to say you had changed your mind?

Mr J.A. McGinty: I have never said I have changed my mind. I have said constantly in all the newsletters and everything else I put out in my electorate that I was the one who advocated its deletion. That has continued to be my view. I do not want to hold up the member -

Ms K. HODSON-THOMAS: Let us get this on the record and get it straight.

Mr J.A. McGinty: There was a time in about the mid 1990s when the Fremantle City Council changed its mind. I made the comment that if the view of my constituency had changed, I was prepared to review my position. That is as far as I ever went. The Fremantle City Council's position is now 100 per cent in support of the deletion of that road. That has been my constant view.

Ms K. HODSON-THOMAS: So the Attorney General supports the deletion at this time, and he would not think about leaving it in there just to ensure that proper planning takes place? My serious concern is that if we delete it and if at some future time rail does not meet the objectives that the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure is trying to achieve, we will have some serious freight problems on our roads, and that will impact on residential streets. If this Government does not want to build the Fremantle eastern bypass, I do not have a problem with that. However, if it deletes it, that will mean that at some future date we will never be able to make any changes. That will have some serious implications that we will have to address down the track, but there may be no way of remedying that situation.

Mr J.A. McGinty: My view is that it should be deleted from the metropolitan region scheme, the properties should be sold and there should be no possibility of ever building that road.

Ms K. HODSON-THOMAS: I thank the Attorney General for that update. I have concerns about that. That is foolhardy. The minister has indicated that it is her vision and plan to deliver at least 30 per cent of our freight via rail to the port over the next eight years. I have grave concerns about whether we will be able to achieve that, and about the impact of the remaining 70 per cent of our freight being carried on our roads. I urge the Government and the minister not to delete the Fremantle eastern bypass at this time until further investigation has been undertaken, and certainly to engage the local communities that will be affected by her proposal.

**MR T.K. WALDRON** (Wagin) [5.16 pm]: I support the motion. I say at the start that I probably do not have the same intricate knowledge of this subject as other members who have spoken, or the minister, but I think I do have some commonsense and practicality. This issue is very much about providing effective, safe and environmentally sound access to our port. We need to remember that the reason we have ports is to get our produce to the other States and the world. Our ports are very much about access. Sometimes we forget what our ports are about. At the moment, the State's road freight network is in big trouble because we have not addressed the critical issue of getting freight through the City of Fremantle and to the port. The port of Fremantle is a working port in the heart of a busy city. There is no efficient road transport access to that port. That is no doubt required, because it is the only port that can handle the State's massive number of sea containers. The port services all our industries, and to get their products through that port we must have road access.

The Fremantle eastern bypass and stage 8 of the Roe Highway is probably the missing link that we have to provide that access. If we refuse to acknowledge the significance of this bypass, we will create huge problems for the future. A major road crisis will loom as the port of Fremantle grows. The port of Fremantle is now growing at a rate of about 11 per cent per annum. Road transport, including heavy haulage, is expanding at a rate of about seven per cent per annum. If we do not go ahead with the Fremantle eastern bypass and continue to have inefficient access to the port, the result will be an inevitable increase in the cost of freight. We need to take

Mr Mike Board; Dr Janet Woollard; Speaker; Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Mr Jeremy Edwards; Mr Colin Barnett; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Deputy Speaker; Mr Terry Waldron; Mr Jim McGinty; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Acting Speaker; Mr Fran Logan

---

into consideration the fact that that cost will be passed on to our producers. Any increase in costs will also affect our exporters, who will potentially become uncompetitive. The global market is already highly competitive, so we do not need to add to that.

The proposed Fremantle eastern bypass follows a north-south road reserve and it links Hampton Road with proposed stage 8 of Roe Highway to intersect with the Kwinana Freeway. I understand that it has been in the metropolitan plan for some 40 years. Main Roads has spent several years acquiring approximately 40 houses along the road reserve. The previous coalition Government made the decision to fund and build the bypass. I acknowledge that the Labor Party has made an election commitment to shelve the project; however, it has not offered a sensible, safe or practical solution as an alternative to the increasing use by road freight traffic to the port of Fremantle. That is the crux of this matter. Road access to the Fremantle port is fundamentally flawed because without the eastern bypass, traffic will travel via Hampton and Stock Roads. Several other members have referred to South Street and Leach Highway. Enormous strains will be placed on those roads. They are dotted with traffic lights and have significant gradients, which the road freight industry considers to be major impediments to its business.

I will refer to road safety about which we hear so much. Obviously there is a road safety issue to consider when the number of trucks and wide loads that drive on roads that carry general traffic is increased. Mums and dads will travel in cars with their kids on roads that have more and more trucks with wide and heavy loads. The gradients of the roads must also be taken into account. Trucks with heavy loads take longer to stop at the traffic lights, which will create a dangerous situation. Recently I was told that the amount of freight carried on roads in Australia will greatly increase. It will increase by seven per cent in Western Australia, which will cause problems in the future. Residents and business proprietors who live along the route also consider the heavy traffic to be a major inconvenience. Labor has suggested removing the traffic lights and constructing grade separations at the major intersections to help the situation. I do not know how much that would cost because I have not seen an accurate estimate of the cost. I do not know whether it would be practical to do that in some areas.

Labor also wants to promote the idea of selling the land along the Fremantle eastern bypass to fund reconstruction of the Stock Road transport option. I am worried that this will forever end the opportunity to build direct and efficient road corridors to our port. That would be a real shame because one day, no matter what any of us thinks now, that will have to be done because we are so reliant on the port and the produce that must get there. This State exports primary produce and many other things. If we put off building direct and efficient road corridors to our ports, the cost will be much greater in the future. We could build them properly now, whereas the longer we do not build them, the more difficult it will be to do so in the future.

Some members have talked about stage 8 of Roe Highway, which was planned to run west from Kwinana Freeway, but which will not be built under the Government's proposal. Roe Highway was planned as a key component of a dedicated road transport access route to and from the Fremantle port. That seemed to be sensible and practical. Something will have to be done about that one day. The eastern bypass and the Roe Highway are part of the overall road freight solution. We talk about a solution for Perth; however, it is a solution for all Western Australians. It will benefit the people who deliver produce from throughout Western Australia and the people who access the port.

People who live in Perth will be affected because of the safety issues to which I have already referred. I lived in the member for Riverton's electorate for eight years. I travelled on those roads with my kids. The area has problems and this proposal will just make them worse. I am not saying that out of political emotion; I am saying it from my own experiences. It seems obvious to me that we will experience problems in the future. Stage 8 and other stages of the Roe Highway and the Fremantle eastern bypass have the ability to link the port of Fremantle, the Kwinana Freeway, Tonkin Highway and, ultimately, the Great Eastern, Great Northern and South Western Highways, which would make sense. It is imperative that the Government does not close off the option of the Fremantle eastern bypass because some day it will have to be built. In the meantime, we will have to deal with gridlock and safety issues for years to come.

The member for Murdoch said that we needed to find a better solution to the problem and the member for Carine suggested that we must continue to debate this matter. I urge members to do that before the Government proceeds any further with this project, which is supposed to benefit all of Western Australia. It is a serious matter that people will reflect on in the future. If we do not make the correct choice today, people will judge us unfavourably.

**MS A.J. MacTIERNAN** (Armadale - Minister for Planning and Infrastructure) [5.25 pm]: I appreciate the Opposition moving this motion. It is understandable that it has done so because this is a major issue. It is

**Extract from *Hansard***

[ASSEMBLY - Wednesday, 21 August 2002]

p413c-436a

Mr Mike Board; Dr Janet Woollard; Speaker; Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Mr Jeremy Edwards; Mr Colin Barnett; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Deputy Speaker; Mr Terry Waldron; Mr Jim McGinty; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Acting Speaker; Mr Fran Logan

---

appropriate to devote some time in Parliament to properly debate this major state planning development. However, having listened to the contributions from members opposite, I am reminded of Gough Whitlam when he said, "Comrades, we are amongst savages." We are clearly among intellectual savages when we look at the intellectual contributions made by members opposite.

The Opposition is genuinely concerned about this matter, and I do not doubt that. However, its thinking is rooted back in the early days of the Stephenson plan; members opposite have not moved on since then. They remind me of Mr Peter Woodward, who I quoted in question time today. He said, "Roads are the way to go. Back in those days we didn't worry much about the environment or the wetlands. We didn't worry about open space because roads are the way to go." Unfortunately, that is the only response from the Opposition. Members opposite have rightly identified a problem in the metropolitan area. As the member for Wagin said, we are experiencing a growth rate of approximately seven per cent in road freight each year, which must be accommodated. If our only response is to build more roads, when do we stop? If we build the Fremantle eastern bypass, in a few years we will have to make it wider or duplicate it like the Narrows Bridge. There is a better and more sophisticated way of approaching this issue.

I must correct some of the history of this issue. The nonsense that the Opposition has peddled, including the member for Wagin who has also fallen into error on this issue, is that the Stephenson plan included the Fremantle eastern bypass - it did not. The Fremantle eastern bypass was not part of the Stephenson plan that was presented in 1963. However, the Stephenson plan referred to the need to develop a western suburbs highway. It referred to the need to develop a further river crossing at Point Walter and Point Resolution. As we heard during question time today, following the resolution of the Stephenson plan, work commenced on planning that road. However, it was found that the road would need to go through the homes of some of our most worthy and influential citizens. It was at that point that the plans for the road were changed to the Fremantle eastern bypass. There was no great plan or logic to it. As I said in question time today, it was out of naked self-interest. Get this straight; the road was not referred to in the Stephenson plan. The proposal was off-loaded to the people of Fremantle after the rich and powerful decided they did not want the road going through their area.

Mr B.K. Masters: The rich and powerful like the member for Peel.

Ms A.J. MacTIERNAN: I do not think that the member for Peel is rich.

It is time this matter was put right; it was not in the Stephenson plan. Even if it was in the Stephenson plan, members should recall what Mr Woodward said in the quotation that was used during question time. He stated that wetlands used to be the focus for the building of roads because they were a good place to build roads. However, values have changed, and what were old swamps are now valued wetlands and areas that we seek to protect. During question time I also referred members to an interesting interview that was conducted with the former Premier, Richard Court, who made it clear that building the Fremantle eastern bypass was not a priority. There was no intention to build the bypass until a community consensus had been achieved. Anyone with any local knowledge knows that political consensus would never be achieved on the Fremantle eastern bypass. The previous Government had no intention of building the bypass. The matter was put back into the reserve of the former planning minister, Hon Richard Lewis, without a scintilla of consultation. The Labor Party has contested four elections with the undertaking that it would delete the proposed Fremantle eastern bypass. In 1990, 1993, 1996 and 2001, the Labor Party made its intentions clear to the electorate, and it has an obligation to meet its election commitment. Moreover, the Government is committed to this measure because it is the right way to go. Having made that decision in opposition, and having recognised the increasing freight problem and the lack of consensus in the community, the Labor Party pledged to conduct a metropolitan freight network review.

The Government decided that it would not deal with the issue in the manner that had been used in the past - the member for Carine quite rightly pointed to her travails in the planning of the Reid Highway - when it was approached in a segmented fashion. The previous Government isolated the issue into little pieces and looked at them separately. It did not look at the whole system, and it gave people the opportunity to comment only on their own little piece of the jigsaw. Conversely, this Government decided to open up the debate and to look at the whole network. Further, it decided to look at options that did not include existing roads. The Government wanted to engage the community, industry, environmentalists and local government in the review process. Obviously, such a process requires controlled numbers so we allowed for 130 people. In order to arrive -

Ms K. Hodson-Thomas: The group did not discuss the Fremantle eastern bypass.

Ms A.J. MacTIERNAN: It was discussed. However, it is true that the Government stated that it would not be constructing the Fremantle eastern bypass.

Mrs C.L. Edwardes interjected.

Mr Mike Board; Dr Janet Woollard; Speaker; Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Mr Jeremy Edwards; Mr Colin Barnett; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Deputy Speaker; Mr Terry Waldron; Mr Jim McGinty; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Acting Speaker; Mr Fran Logan

---

Ms A.J. MacTIERNAN: The Government has never ever resiled from the fact that it made it clear that the Fremantle eastern bypass would not be built. However, the coalition Government never intended to build it either.

Mrs C.L. Edwardes: That is not true.

Ms A.J. MacTIERNAN: Hold on! Does the member have any idea how much it will cost to build stage 8 of Roe Highway?

Ms K. Hodson-Thomas: Are you referring to me? You're making the speech -

Ms A.J. MacTIERNAN: No, the member for Carine does not know. If the overpass were used it would cost approximately \$160 million. If the tunnel were used - that was the other option - it would cost in excess of \$500 million. The previous Government allocated only \$25 million over 10 years. It had no intention of building stage 8 of Roe Highway. Therefore, there was no need to build the Fremantle eastern bypass.

There are serious problems on Leach Highway and Stock Road; however, the previous Government failed to address them. The coalition was, and still is, living in the fantasy of the Stephenson report - which should become known as the Stephenson-Court plan - and did not deal with the real issues. This Government decided that it would not live in the coalition Government's fantasy world, and would address the matter by involving the community in its discussions.

Ms K. Hodson-Thomas: The communities feel that they have not been engaged.

Ms A.J. MacTIERNAN: I accept that, because the Government has not completed the consultation process. Around 130 people were engaged in the process for over a year. It was an intensive project that involved bringing together representatives from the community, Leach Highway, local government and special representatives from the City of Melville, because they were very concerned about the issue. We did not require them to go through the normal Western Australian Local Government Association representation. The City of Melville was allowed two representatives because we realised its intense interest. We brought such people together to determine the community's values and to determine the environmental, social and economic issues that were at play. It was a positive experience, because, for the first time, environmental groups sat down with industry representatives for an extended period and learned the views of industry. Likewise, industry leaders sat down with union officials and Greensies and began to understand their world view.

Ms K. Hodson-Thomas: I do not think they understood their world view.

Ms A.J. MacTIERNAN: We made substantial progress in that regard.

I was amazed that the member for Murdoch stated that the Government had not consulted with industry. I will provide a run-down of the industry groups that were represented. They include the Sea Freight Council, the Transport Forum WA Inc, the Transport Workers Union of Australia, Catalyst Communication Rigging Pty Ltd, the Livestock Transporters Association of WA, the federal Livestock Transporters Association, the port operations task force, the Australian Railway Group, the Toll Group, Marley's Transport Pty Ltd, Mitchell Logistics, P&O Ports Ltd, Robinson Consultants Pty Ltd, Halpern Glick Maunsell Pty Ltd and the Institute of Engineers Australia, just to name a few. Moreover, there were also representatives from Green groups and from Greens (WA) members of Parliament. I am pleased that the member for Carine was able to attend one of the congresses.

We have made the process as open as possible. The Government is not arguing in any way, shape or form, that it has reached the end of the consultation process. That is why it is now going through the metropolitan region scheme process. We have decided not to go down the path chosen by the previous Government, even though we could introduce legislation to remove the Fremantle eastern bypass development. We would have no problem getting such legislation through the upper House. However, the Government wants to engage in proper consultation, and, through the Western Australian Planning Commission, there will be an extensive consultation period. In addition, two of my very able colleagues, the members for Riverton and Cockburn, will chair a committee that will look at the local impact. Having already formed an idea about the big strategy, the Government wants to drill down to determine the impact at the local level. That process will take place over the next six months. We must move away from the 1950s and 1960s way of thinking. I urge the Opposition, the National Party and the member for Alfred Cove to stop behaving like intellectual troglodytes. They must accept that there is another way. We must make very serious efforts to get our freight off roads and onto rail. We have set a target of 30 per cent, which we believe is achievable. At present three per cent of the cargo going to the port of Fremantle is carted by rail. Other States already cart 25 to 30 per cent by rail and they have a 40 per cent target. We are a long way behind the eight ball.

Mr Mike Board; Dr Janet Woollard; Speaker; Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Mr Jeremy Edwards; Mr Colin Barnett; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Deputy Speaker; Mr Terry Waldron; Mr Jim McGinty; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Acting Speaker; Mr Fran Logan

---

Dr J.M. Woollard: Will you take an interjection?

Ms A.J. MacTIERNAN: As long as it is intelligent.

Dr J.M. Woollard: Do you admit that Roe Highway and the railway east of Nicholson Road are in close proximity?

Ms A.J. MacTIERNAN: I am sorry, I thought the interjection would be on the point I am debating.

Mr T.K. Waldron: We are not against trying to increase the cartage of freight by rail; that can occur, but we must be practical.

Ms A.J. MacTIERNAN: Exactly.

Mr T.K. Waldron: We must see how long it will take to increase rail freight cartage and what can be provided in the meantime.

Ms A.J. MacTIERNAN: Of course; I understand that. However, if the Opposition were not labouring under the illusion that we were closing down the Fremantle eastern bypass and stage 8 of Roe Highway they would have a point. Those roads do not exist. We are not diverting traffic from roads onto other roads. They will not be built under our Government and I believe they would not be built under the member for Wagin's Government.

Mr T.K. Waldron: I understand that. I am talking about the future.

Ms A.J. MacTIERNAN: I have only a few minutes. The Government is serious and it is considering other strategies of which rail is only a part. This morning I had a very interesting discussion with Paul Little, the Managing Director of Toll. That company is very interested in the work we are doing. We are seeking tenders for the management of the rail terminal at the North Quay. An important aspect of that contract will be, for the first time, to report on how to get freight off road and onto rail. We are doing extensive work with the Sea Freight Council of Western Australia and with various private rail operators. They all understand that we must engage in this task of achieving a shift. While the Opposition is still living in the la la land of the 1960s, the private sector has moved on and now recognises that we need integrated transport planning. Companies such as Toll now have interests in road, rail, shipping and even aviation. Overarching all of that is its strong focus on logistics.

Logistics is the intellectual infrastructure of the transport system. That is one of the issues in the "Let us build more roads" approach that we have totally ignored. We must get smarter about the use of our infrastructure. As members know, 50 per cent of trucks going into Fremantle port carry loads in only one direction. We must turn that situation around. The Government believes that strategies can be implemented to achieve that, and consequently we are working with logistics companies and freight forwarders on that issue.

Mr D.F. Barron-Sullivan: How do you do that with livestock carriers?

Ms A.J. MacTIERNAN: They are not a major portion of the freight business. However, I am sure the truck drivers can think of things they could bring back. I am referring principally to containers. Related to that are land-use planning issues that we must address. It is clear that we need an inland container terminal. It is insane to have a great many containers held on expensive real estate in Fremantle. It is responsible for increases in traffic in and out of Fremantle. We would make very substantial gains by establishing a container terminal in Kewdale. We would also make substantial gains by considering establishing another container terminal to the north and possibly even near Kwinana.

We must also recognise that the growth of the Fremantle port is limited. In an environmental, logistical and infrastructure sense, we are planning for the development of an outer harbour to absorb that growth. The notion that a seven per cent increase in freight each year translates to a seven per cent increase in the number of trucks travelling to Fremantle is intellectually primitive. I urge members opposite to think more deeply and creatively about these problems.

Mr T.K. Waldron: You don't think there will be a substantial increase?

Ms A.J. MacTIERNAN: The amount of freight will increase but that does not necessarily translate to an increase in truck traffic. It does not mean that we can continue to rip down the suburbs around Fremantle to accommodate ever increasing loads. We must get smarter. We must stop that style of thinking. Another major flaw in the comments of members opposite is their failure to understand that a substantial proportion of the growth will head south. Much of the freight that will be carted along Roe Highway will go to the commercial precincts in Canning Vale, Jandakot, Kwinana, Hope Valley-Wattleup and the Australian marine complex at Jervoise Bay. That is where the growth will occur. I love this argument that our plans to cease constructing Roe Highway at stage 7 is fraught because people will have to turn north! If Roe Highway stage 8 were built they

Mr Mike Board; Dr Janet Woollard; Speaker; Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Mr Jeremy Edwards; Mr Colin Barnett; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Deputy Speaker; Mr Terry Waldron; Mr Jim McGinty; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Acting Speaker; Mr Fran Logan

---

would have to turn north or go down Leach Highway. I do not know what plans members opposite are looking at but they all involve a major turn north if they want to go to Fremantle via Roe Highway. A substantial part of growth will go down to Kwinana. Rather than living in the fantasy of the Stephenson-Court plan that was developed 30 years ago, we are intellectually engaging and addressing these issues. We are now planning the freight corridors for the Fremantle outer harbour. We do not want our children and our grandchildren to have to come back into this place and have the same old argy-bargy about the Fremantle outer harbour. We want to ensure that our planning caters for it.

I understand that the member for Carine has a genuine concern about the consultation process. We do not by any stretch of the imagination claim that consultation has been completed. Nor do we claim that all the minute detail of the local roads and how we protect local suburbs from this traffic has been addressed. That will be the responsibility of the committee chaired by my colleagues the member for Cockburn and the member for Riverton. I urge members opposite to start thinking a bit more creatively and understand that we must think intermodal, about a logistical solution, about land use planning solutions and that land use and transport planning must be integrated. We understand that this concept has not been accepted by members opposite. They have a planning spokesperson and a transport spokesperson because they cannot bring themselves to accept the idea of integration. However, in the fullness of time they will see that the private sector has moved down this path and that they will be left behind if they do not also embrace it.

**MR J.A. MCGINTY** (Fremantle - Attorney General) [5.49 pm]: I would like to make a brief contribution to this debate because at least part of this road proposal affects my electorate of Fremantle. I will start with a little of the recent history of this matter. In 1990, when I was elected to be the member for Fremantle, there were a number -

Mrs C.L. Edwardes: I doorknocked your sister in that campaign, if you remember rightly.

Mr J.A. MCGINTY: The member for Kingsley may not have persuaded her to vote for the Liberal Party, but I do not know whether she necessarily voted for me.

When I became the member for Fremantle in 1990, Fremantle was threatened by a number of major highways that were proposed to be constructed through the residential parts of the city. We are debating one of those highways tonight; that is, the proposed Fremantle eastern bypass, which I will deal with in more detail in a minute. The second of those was a proposal to straighten out a kink in Canning Highway as it ran through East Fremantle, which was known as the Canning Highway deviation. It was proposed to demolish a number of classic East Fremantle homes immediately to the south of Canning Highway as it ran through the town of East Fremantle. It involved the demolition of a number of houses that I think contribute significantly to the amenity of the town of East Fremantle. In my view, to have effected that demolition would have been criminal. That had been on the planning books for some time, and people in East Fremantle today are still grateful that during that election in 1990 we proposed to remove the Canning Highway deviation from the planning books, and we did that.

It is my memory that the third highway that was proposed would have been for the tail end of what would be the Roe Highway coming into Fremantle. I will illustrate to members how absolutely crazy this proposition was. Those members who know Fremantle will be familiar with Marine Terrace, which runs along the beach from South Beach, up past the Fremantle Sailing Club, the Fishing Boat Harbour, the Esplanade Hotel and right into the west end of Fremantle. Some of the planners in years gone by thought it was a good idea to have a highway running up that coastal strip and ending up in the west end of Fremantle - the historic heritage registered west end of Fremantle - because that is the best way to service Victoria Quay. That was on the planning books as well, and the Labor Party committed to deleting that highway from the planning books as well.

Mrs C.L. Edwardes: The plan for the end of the Roe Highway had changed sometime ago.

Mr J.A. MCGINTY: It was still on the planning books.

Mrs C.L. Edwardes: Not as I understand it.

Mr J.A. MCGINTY: My recollection is that when Hon Richard Lewis, as the planning minister in 1993, brought in a Bill to reinstate the Fremantle eastern bypass, the debate at the time was about reinstating the road reserve along Marine Terrace.

Mrs C.L. Edwardes: Roe 8 was to connect up somewhere near Rockingham Road, not in Fremantle.

Mr J.A. MCGINTY: The planning books also contained this extension along Marine Terrace into the west end of Fremantle to gain access to Victoria Quay. My recollection is subject to correction, and the member for Kingsley might be right, but I recall that the debate was still current. That particular road cut through Wilson



Mr Mike Board; Dr Janet Woollard; Speaker; Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Mr Jeremy Edwards; Mr Colin Barnett; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Deputy Speaker; Mr Terry Waldron; Mr Jim McGinty; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Acting Speaker; Mr Fran Logan

---

Park, which is immediately adjacent to South Beach. The real debate at the time was to save those houses and that park from the road reserve that was proposed to be put through that area. That is why I think it was done at that time. However, if someone said that did not occur, I would not be in a position to argue with him. Two of the three highways that were proposed to cut through the residential areas of Fremantle were removed at that time without controversy.

The remaining highway - the Fremantle eastern bypass - was to be a continuation of Stirling Highway and would cut through the suburbs of Fremantle, White Gum Valley, Beaconsfield and then continue further south through Clontarf Hill and down to Coogee, and it was attended by some considerable controversy. I advocated on that occasion the deletion of the Fremantle eastern bypass from the metropolitan region scheme, and Carmen Lawrence's Labor Government set in train the process to do that and amended the metropolitan region scheme in 1992 to delete the Fremantle eastern bypass from the metropolitan region scheme.

As we are all aware, at the beginning of 1993 there was a change of Government. That change of Government saw the Fremantle eastern bypass reinstated on the metropolitan region scheme by quite a unique manoeuvre. The then planning minister, Hon Richard Lewis, brought legislation into this House to override the metropolitan region scheme process of public consultation and to reinstate the Fremantle eastern bypass on the metropolitan region scheme.

Mrs C.L. Edwardes: While you say that is a unique method, it is also an option that the minister could have used on this occasion. It is open to do both: the MRS amendment, which is the path that the current minister chose to proceed with for the Fremantle bypass, or by way of legislation. It is not unheard of.

Mr J.A. McGINTY: The legislation would have been simple. It would have been a repeal of the 1993 legislation. That would have been achieved the legal effect of deleting the Fremantle eastern bypass from the metropolitan region scheme to undo what was done in 1993.

From time to time after that the Court Government threatened to build the Fremantle eastern bypass. However, every time a date was fixed, that date was deferred. I read from that that there were always far higher priorities and less political controversy surrounding projects other than the Fremantle eastern bypass. My impression of the eight years of the Court Government in this State was that there was never any real intention to build the Fremantle eastern bypass. The Labor Party, consistently throughout this period, continued with the policy that it adopted in 1990, which was to remove the Fremantle eastern bypass from the metropolitan region scheme and not to build that road.

The member for Murdoch read out an article, which I vaguely remember, written by Wendy Evans, who was a staffer with Hon Graham Kierath. She wrote an article that did not accurately reflect my position. Nonetheless, the member for Murdoch accurately reported what was written in that article.

Mrs C.L. Edwardes: Was she a staffer at the time?

Mr J.A. McGINTY: No. She was working for a newspaper at the time and subsequently went to work for him.

Mrs C.L. Edwardes: She was a journalist with Community Newspapers, not a staffer at the time?

Mr J.A. McGINTY: That is right. She wrote this article that was not a fair representation of my position. I said by way of interjection earlier that, as best I can recollect, the view that I put in the mid 1990s, at a time when it appeared that the Fremantle City Council might have changed its view and there did not seem to be the measure of community activism in opposition to the Fremantle eastern bypass, was that if there was no longer any substantial opposition to building the Fremantle eastern bypass - in other words, if my constituents were now happy to have the bypass built - I was prepared to consider that view as their representative. That was a view that I expressed on one occasion, and that resulted in an upsurge in community activism. It was clear that in my electorate of Fremantle opposition to the building of a bypass was profoundly strong. I have consistently advocated the deletion of the Fremantle eastern bypass from the metropolitan region scheme for, I believe, good reasons.

In 2001 we went to the election. The policy was clear: if the Labor Party won the election it would delete the Fremantle eastern bypass from the metropolitan region scheme, rezone the land, sell it and make sure that the threat of that road was once and for all permanently removed as a possibility in Fremantle. Today, for those members who have not been to Fremantle and seen the road reserve for the Fremantle eastern bypass, it is a wasteland. It cuts a swathe through those three suburbs of Fremantle, White Gum Valley and Beaconsfield. I support the view taken by the Government and expressed in this Chamber by my friend the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure that the Government's actions will, once and for all, remove a planning blight from Western Australia's most beautiful city. It is a significant, long piece of land that can be put to good community use. The

Mr Mike Board; Dr Janet Woollard; Speaker; Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Mr Jeremy Edwards; Mr Colin Barnett; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Deputy Speaker; Mr Terry Waldron; Mr Jim McGinty; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Acting Speaker; Mr Fran Logan

---

rezoning of the land and the amendment to the metropolitan region scheme have been set in train simultaneously. The Fremantle City Council supports the rezoning of this area, which is currently wasteland, for residential, commercial and community purposes. The rezoning is also strongly supported by my constituents, who want this road put to one side. I have lived with this issue for 12 years - since 1990. My constituents support the rezoning because of the effect it will have on the city. The majority of that land currently is government owned. Therefore, rates are not paid on that land. It is an ugly part of the city; however, if it were used for proper purposes, it would add to the beauty, enjoyment and amenity of the city of Fremantle.

The people of Fremantle are forward-thinking people. The 1960s idea of having a beautiful city bisected by freeways and highways is not a proposition that they find attractive. My constituents think of the future and not the past. They want a more people-friendly city, not one bisected by freeways and highways. For all those reasons, I oppose the motion that has been moved. I am sure that future generations will thank this Parliament for deleting the Fremantle eastern bypass from the metropolitan region scheme. The Government is looking forward and not backwards.

**MRS C.L. EDWARDES** (Kingsley) [6.01 pm]: I support the motion. I appreciate the response of the Attorney General because he provided far greater defence of and support for the Government's position than did the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure, which is unfortunate. This is a major decision. It involves not continuing with stage 8 of Roe Highway and deleting the Fremantle bypass road from the metropolitan region scheme. The Government should at least be able to tell the Parliament the reasons for making that decision. Instead of defending and supporting the Government's position, the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure took offence and attacked. In an attempt to bolster her own position, she endeavoured to belittle those members who had spoken before her. I agree with the minister: there must be a better way. There must be a better way than to just proceed down a path and say that the Government will not proceed any further with stage 8 of Roe Highway or the bypass road. Some folklore has been added as well. This project has been in the planning system for 30-odd years. It was said that the reason for the Fremantle bypass road was that people did not want the extension to run along the Stephenson Highway reserve. Good planning, with a mix of land use, transport and freight networks, is about long-term vision. There has to be a better way to plan than for a party to simply come to government and say that, because something was promised in 1990, it will be done now.

This will impact on some major suburbs and on Leach Highway, Stock Road and South Street; there will be an increase in traffic. The Government said that it would establish a committee, which would include two members of Parliament whose electorates would be impacted upon, to consult with the affected communities on how best to limit, restrict or minimise the impact of increased traffic on those roads. In response to a grievance by the member for Riverton, the minister acknowledged that there would be an impact on those areas. As such, to proceed with the metropolitan region scheme amendment and the rezoning by the Fremantle council, and to make sure that those two things happened together to reduce the time frame, without having ascertained the full impact and the concerns of the residents, is short-term thinking. Good planning must take into account the social issues, which are enormous for those people. They will not be happy with the traffic levels, and the associated noise and pollution. An increased number of vehicles will also be going along that road that are not only heavy transport, but are also carrying dangerous goods. There is a need for a strategy to restrict or minimise any risk to the residents from the increased traffic of hazardous goods.

The second factor of good planning is taking into account the economic impact. The minister has indicated that she believes that rail is definitely the way to go. I do not have any problems with that, but there seems to be a lack of reality in this. All of a sudden, everyone will jump onto rail. Where will the rail go? That is the real impact. With the increased use of containerisation, double handling must be avoided. If the cargo can be put on a truck, at the factory, in a container, should it be taken straight to the port, or must it then be put on a train? It is double handling.

Mr F.M. Logan: Most of the containers coming from the eastern States arrive by rail in Kenwick. It is a land-based rail port. There is a direct rail link between that inland port and Fremantle. There is no double handling.

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: While I acknowledge what the member for Cockburn has just said, there is also the reality that many other businesses in Western Australia use containers, which are not being factored into the situation. If the Government is looking after the main area, what about all the others? Their handling costs will be increased.

The other issue the minister raised was that the previous Government would not have proceeded with this project in any event; it was too hot a political issue. She is using that as a reason for making her decision. On 21 November 2000, the former Minister for Transport, Hon Murray Criddle, said in answer to a question from Hon Jim Scott that in the current state road program the award of the contract for the Fremantle eastern bypass was

Mr Mike Board; Dr Janet Woollard; Speaker; Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Mr Jeremy Edwards; Mr Colin Barnett; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Deputy Speaker; Mr Terry Waldron; Mr Jim McGinty; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Acting Speaker; Mr Fran Logan

---

scheduled for mid 2003. It had gone through the environmental assessment process, which had been tabled back in 1998. All the processes had been gone through. It is not true for the minister to say that the former Government had no intention of proceeding with that road. That is one of the furphies she is trying to blend into this debate, to justify her position. It is a nonsense. In November 2000 - two months before the election - the minister in the other place said that the project was scheduled for mid 2003.

Roe 8 is the final completion of the Roe Highway. Roe Highway is magnificent, because it is a ring road. Therefore, it enables much of the traffic to be taken out of the suburbs where it used to go. Roe Highway enables people and businesses to get more efficiently and economically to their destinations. In linking in with the economic aspect of the matter, if the speed and efficiency in the delivery of goods can be increased, taking into account the increased numbers of courier trucks that are now using those roads, this decision will impact on an enormous number of businesses. The Minister for Planning and Infrastructure says that drivers must turn north at the end of Roe 8 anyway to get to the port of Fremantle. Well, that can be done at the end of Roe 7. The truth is that trucks will not drive to the end of Roe 7 and then turn north to get to the port. They will use Leach Highway and South Street. Why will this Government not finish off Roe 7? Because of the increased number of traffic lights required. Drivers might as well drive straight along the route they are now using, because they will not go all the way around unless there is a purpose for doing so, such as that it will quickly get them closer to where they want to go.

Roe Highway and its link to the port of Fremantle was a good planning decision. It put into place all the interconnections between the social, the economic and the environmental issues. If there is an environmental issue with Roe 8 and Bibra Lake, there are always alternatives. The alternative is not just to go under the lake, as the minister said - I think that is what she said. The highway can be realigned to another road reserve, or a really light bridge with small footings could be built, as is done in Europe. This would be particularly useful in addressing the environmental aspect of this issue. To stop the extension of Roe Highway because Bibra Lake is in the middle of it is short-term thinking. It is vandalism to do so without considering the alternatives. The plan has not been subject to an environmental assessment. It could have been with the options being considered. More difficult issues than this have been dealt with and resolved. In this case the lake is being used as an excuse. The minister's thinking has been that the Government cannot do it, so it will not. The Government has found the matter too hard to deal with. Instead of re-routing the highway extension around the lake or over it, the Government has decided not to proceed with Roe 8 at all. Again, that is short-term thinking by the minister.

The minister said a number of things about the outcome of the freight network review congress. Out of the options that the congress considered, no new freeways were planned for south of the river. That was in response to a full-page advertisement by the City of Melville stating that by deleting Roe 8 - the Fremantle bypass - an upgrade was needed to other major arterial roads. The minister said that there would be no new freeways, but she wanted to respond to the City of Melville's advertisement. In the media release of 13 August the minister said that the recommendations endorsed by the second freight network congress included -

- increasing the share of freight carried by rail to and from Fremantle Port to 30 per cent from its current three per cent;

That is okay; it wants to increase the use of rail to transport freight. It stated that another recommendation was -

- using existing truck traffic more efficiently - currently up to 50 per cent of trucks accessing Fremantle Port are empty travelling in one direction;

That will help businesses! It continues -

- completing Roe Highway Stage 7 from South Street to Kwinana Freeway;
- implementing upgrades to Stock Road, Leach Highway and High Street to better accommodate freight traffic; and
- removing reservations for Roe Highway Stage 8 and the Fremantle Eastern Bypass.

I have two things to say about that. Firstly, as the minister has admitted tonight, the congress did not recommend the deletion of the Fremantle eastern bypass. In fact, it was a no vote. The minister directed the congress not to consider it because the Government was going to do it in any event; therefore, there was no need for the deletion of the Fremantle eastern bypass to be considered. The media release and the minister's other statements are wrong in that regard because, as she admitted tonight, she had already told the congress of the decision. Secondly, as we have heard tonight, in implementing the upgrade the idea was to sell off the land and use the money for an upgrade. That was stated in the minister's reply to the grievance by the member for Riverton. The land sell-off was to upgrade the roads. She said that was the recommendation of the congress. However, the

Mr Mike Board; Dr Janet Woollard; Speaker; Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Mr Jeremy Edwards; Mr Colin Barnett; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Deputy Speaker; Mr Terry Waldron; Mr Jim McGinty; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Acting Speaker; Mr Fran Logan

---

media release is headed "No new freeways planned for south of the river". What is the preferred option of the congress as shown in its recommendations? Its preferred option is option reference A1 -

**Roe Highway to Kwinana Freeway (R-7) in MRS Reservation/Stock Road upgrade**

- Upgrade Stock Road to freeway standard

That is what the congress recommended. In response to the concerns of the City of Melville the minister issued a media statement titled "No new freeways planned for south of the river". Once again, it is wrong.

Mr F.M. Logan: That is not quite correct.

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: I have the document here; the "Perth Freight Network Review". The proposals are ranked in order of average weighting. The congress supports the proposal with the lowest weighting, which is 1. The other proposals range from 3.5 to 10.8. It was the preferred option. The lower the number the better.

Mr F.M. Logan: It was not the preferred option but it was the one that emerged from the process as the most sustainable option.

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: The minister said the congress recommended the upgrades; it did, but to freeway standards. That is what the congress stated, but it did not discuss the deletion of the Fremantle bypass. The minister is wrong in continuing to state that. She admitted that tonight. The congress recommended the upgrade of Stock Road to freeway standards. What is the full impact of all this?

Mr A.D. McRae: The press release was in response to the City of Melville.

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: I said it was in response to its advertisement. At a good planning level this decision is political expediency. The Government wants to see the deletion of the bypass, so it will do it. After listening to the Attorney General I do not know how many people in the Fremantle area will be impacted upon directly by the freeway. What is behind the thinking is probably that it is government-owned and it is a good cash cow. It will impact on a lot of people. I will list the suburbs that will be impacted upon in members' electorates.

In her response to the grievance from the member for Riverton, the Minister identified the situation. She said that the Government has identified existing roads that need extensive work, that these include South Street, Leach Highway and Stock Road, and that if the Fremantle eastern bypass is not built, the situation will be even worse than that which exists now. The minister acknowledged that there is a current problem and there will be an even bigger future problem. What impact will it have on High Road in the electorate of the member for Riverton and on Nicholson Road? Those upgrades are to be effected. We want to know precisely how they are to be effected; how local communities can be protected from undue traffic; how some level of comfort and protection can be provided even for the people who live on the main roads such as Leach Highway and Stock Road. We will carefully examine the needs of the people of Parkwood, Willetton, Riverton, Lynwood, Leeming and Rossmoyne. Why on earth will the Government cause traffic to impact on those suburbs when probably very few people in Fremantle will be directly impacted upon? The only thing that I can think of is that money is needed to upgrade the roads in any event and the Government has found a little pocket of land that it can sell off and it can use the money from the sale to upgrade the roads. Another cash cow has been found. It is a politically expedient decision that does not take into account the real social issues and needs of those people and those communities.

**MR A.D. McRAE** (Riverton) [6.22 pm]: I think we have now descended into an *X Files* conspiracy theory.

Mr C.J. Barnett: You should represent your constituents. If you fail to do so, we will not.

Mr A.D. McRAE: I might mention to the Leader of the Opposition as he departs the Chamber that I have just been quoted as having raised a grievance on this matter more than two months ago in which I listed a whole raft of complex and interrelated issues pertaining to transport reform. That would indicate that I have been involved with this issue very closely for a long time; indeed, it was a matter of some debate in the lead-up to the 2001 election. My response to the member for Kingsley relates directly to whether we are dealing with transport issues and the needs of communities in a sustainable way or whether we are responding to an opportunistic political attack.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr J.P.D. Edwards): Members! Across-the-floor debate makes it very difficult for Hansard to hear the member on his feet.

Mr A.D. McRAE: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. I will give members a sense of some of the impacts that Roe Highway has on my electorate, why I continue to raise the issue directly with the minister and have raised it as a

Mr Mike Board; Dr Janet Woollard; Speaker; Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Mr Jeremy Edwards; Mr Colin Barnett; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Deputy Speaker; Mr Terry Waldron; Mr Jim McGinty; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Acting Speaker; Mr Fran Logan

---

grievance in the Parliament two months ago, and why I continue to contribute to the freight network review. I will start with an acknowledgment that the incomplete stage 3 of Roe Highway meant that William Street acted as a funnel that emptied a huge volume of freight onto Albany Highway. It is pretty clear that the desire line was from William Street onto Albany Highway, and then two major routes were sourced. The first route was Albany Highway to Leach Highway then through to either the port or the freeway and further south. The second route was from William Street onto Albany Highway and then immediately onto Nicholson Road and through to Canning Vale, which is the busiest industrial estate in the metropolitan region and the State. Indeed, the data provided to the freight network review committee confirms that the largest point-to-point freight traffic movements in the State are between Kewdale and Canning Vale, not as one would expect, between Kewdale and Fremantle, Canning Vale and Fremantle or Kewdale and Kwinana. That is because a major transport distribution network is situated in one of those two industrial estates at Kewdale and a major processing and product distribution and warehousing network is situated in the other estate at Canning Vale. They are the two major source points of freight traffic movement in not only the metropolitan region but also the State.

Mr E.S. Ripper: They are in our electorates.

Mr A.D. McRAE: Indeed. Canning Vale is in my electorate and Kewdale is in the electorate of the Deputy Premier and member for Belmont. The Deputy Premier has followed the debate in the Chamber with a great deal of interest and from time to time has put his oar into the debate to advance the interests and economic wellbeing of his community and, as is his responsibility, the State. For any of us to resort to a simple nimby approach would be to do a disservice to not only our electorates but also, in the longer term, the broader community of the State, which we are all charged to represent and respond to.

The completion of stage 3 resulted in the unfinished, unproductive and unhealthy situation of the traffic on William Street emptying onto Albany Highway. Stages 4 and 5 are under construction. Stage 5 finishes at Nicholson Road around Langford, Lynwood and Canning Vale - again, on the border of my electorate and the electorates of the members for Thornlie and Southern River. In spite of the now-absent member for Alfred Cove's assertion that the highway could be joined with the rail freight system at that point, the rail freight network and the stage 5 completion point at Nicholson Road are some distance apart. It would be impossible to join them at that point because of the density of the commercial and industrial development and road reserves that separate them. It is a nonsense suggestion from the member for Alfred Cove and is typical of her performance as I have observed it over the past six months and her inability to wrap her head around anything more complex than the most basic sum. Stage 6 will take Roe Highway from Nicholson Road to South Street, and stage 7 will take it from South Street to the freeway.

When we came to government it was clear that the original plan linked the construction of stages 6 and 7 as conjoined projects that should be run close together. There was to be a delay between the completion of stage 5 and the commencement of stage 6. I argued very strongly that that should not occur because it was bad transport planning and would damage the communities that would have no alternative transport flows to Roe Highway.

Mr T.K. Waldron: Did you argue that it should not be delayed?

Mr A.D. McRAE: Absolutely. I did that for very good reason: first, I was looking after my community; and, second, I knew that if there were to be a gap between any of the construction stages - it was clear there would always be some delays - it should be at a point around South Street. The second reason has nothing to do with my first motive of protecting my community but is related to efficient transport management. As I have outlined, we know that the major movement points of freight in this State are between Kewdale and Canning Vale. Having Roe Highway running past Canning Vale to South Street, north east to its connection with Orrong Road and further to Great Eastern and Great Northern Highways is a logical method of dealing with that major freight transport movement. Without that provision, the completion of stage 5 would cause an outpouring of freight through, as the member for Kingsley said - although she was erroneous in her context - High Road and its intersection with Nicholson Road. I was an advocate for disconnecting the conjoined stages 6 and 7 and making sure that stages 5 and 6 were more closely linked. I applaud the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure for recognising that it was possible to do that and continue with the freight network review and deal with the very complex and difficult decisions about what should be done with the freight network system from stages 7 and 8; that is, after it reaches the freeway. We would have no chance of dealing with either the transport demand or the needs of my community if stages 6 and 7 were coupled together. Therefore, I am pleased that the argument was seen to be valid and that we are now, as I understand it, on the verge of stage 6 being signed up and started. I welcome that, and as soon as possible. I understand that stage 5 will be completed before its scheduled completion date of April next year. That means that Roe Highway will begin to take shape. Those people in this Chamber, those in the Melville City Council and those others who are advocating a delay to the completion of Roe stage 7 have rocks in their heads.

Mr Mike Board; Dr Janet Woollard; Speaker; Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Mr Jeremy Edwards; Mr Colin Barnett; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Deputy Speaker; Mr Terry Waldron; Mr Jim McGinty; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Acting Speaker; Mr Fran Logan

---

Mrs C.L. Edwardes: What if Roe stage 7 can be re-drawn?

Mr A.D. McRAE: I will come to that. That is a good question from the member for Kingsley, and it is an important point in the discussion about my role. The member for Cockburn will also be speaking in this debate, and between the two of us we may be able to do a tag team act and give a better explanation of our intention and desire. I will deal with the substance of Roe stages 5, 6 and 7 for the moment. Those people who are aligning themselves with the Melville City Council and are lobbying the federal member for this area, the member for Tangney and federal Attorney General, Hon Daryl Williams, to seek to have federal funding as the partnership contribution to Roe stage 7 withdrawn or suspended have rocks in their heads. It is an insane proposition and will do serious damage to not only the transport network and the economy of Western Australia, but also the local community that these people are purporting to protect and represent.

I am sorry that the member for Murdoch, who moved this motion, and the member for Carine, who is the transport spokesperson for the Opposition, are not in the Chamber to hear the culmination of the debate on this motion that they have moved and support. It is a tragedy that they can stand in this Chamber and say on the public record, or say in the local paper, as the member for Murdoch has done this week, that this is not a political stunt or political action, yet are not in this Chamber as we speak. I bet the member for Carine and the member for Murdoch are at the City of Melville at a meeting with Hon Peter Foss.

Mrs C.L. Edwardes: The member for Murdoch has a prior commitment that is nowhere near the City of Melville, and the member for Carine is in her room listening to you at this very moment.

Mr A.D. McRAE: I am sure she is listening to me. I hope she is not watching that television show that some people in the other Chamber sometimes watch.

Ms A.J. MacTiernan: It is pretty poor that the member for Murdoch has not even bothered to listen to any portion of this debate. He is simply not interested. I will give the member for Carine her due. She has seriously engaged in the debate, listened to people from the other side and made serious points. All we had on the part of the member for Murdoch was a bit of grandstanding and no preparedness to either have debate by way of interjection or listen to the debate in the Chamber.

Mrs C.L. Edwardes: That is an unfair attack in his absence.

Mr A.D. McRAE: We see often enough people in this Chamber on both sides take advantage of a member's absence, for whatever reason. If a member moves a motion condemning the Government for its actions and then does not listen to the debate or is not present in the Chamber, he leaves himself open to criticism, or at the very least a question about whether he is on the job. In my view, if a member moves a motion and speaks in the debate, we can then validly ask: is he seriously following the matter as an issue of policy and of community and economic interest, or is it a political stunt? It may not be all that surprising to members to know that the member for Murdoch has some pretty close contacts with the City of Melville. Members of his staff are representatives on the City of Melville. Therefore, it is a bit cute for him to suggest that this is not a political campaign. I will not worry about that too much, but I want to reject once and for all the notion that members in this place are dealing with this debate rationally without a sniff of political advantage.

Mrs C.L. Edwardes: I think you would recognise though that there have been in the local papers a number of letters from people who are not representatives on the city council and letters from the progress association.

Mr A.D. McRAE: It is interesting that the member for Kingsley raised that matter. There was an interesting triumvirate photograph in the paper this week of representatives of the Rossmoyne, Riverton and Shelley Residents and Ratepayers Association. That association has said that it has been supported by and got its information from two members of the association who are also members of the City of Canning council. One of those members was also a strong supporter and campaign worker for my Liberal opponent at the last election. When any member in this place starts to talk about conspiracies, I will throw a few back at them. There are a few networks in this place that are not dealing with the subject matter. I accept that the member for Kingsley might have raised this matter innocently, but I will illustrate how much the network is beaver away at a little opportunity it has to belt McRae and the Labor Party. I will give an example of how the member for Kingsley has been led down the garden path. I accept she has been led there because she comes from a long way north and probably does not know the area very well.

Mrs C.L. Edwardes: I am in the area once a week.

Mr A.D. McRAE: So you are the cause of the problem!

The Minister for Planning and Infrastructure was forced to issue a statement saying that no freeways would be built south of the river, but not because of anything that came out of the freight network review. The member for

Mr Mike Board; Dr Janet Woollard; Speaker; Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Mr Jeremy Edwards; Mr Colin Barnett; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Deputy Speaker; Mr Terry Waldron; Mr Jim McGinty; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Acting Speaker; Mr Fran Logan

---

Kingsley would know, if she travels south that often, about an exchange of letters on whether we should involve lawyers. Indeed, the City of Melville distributed under the city's banner at public meetings letters downloaded from the Government's web site with South Street relabelled as "South Freeway", Leach Highway as "Leach Freeway" and Stock Road as "Stock Freeway" and saying that this was the Government's plan. Let us not be cute about this matter. The City of Melville clearly intended to mislead and dupe people in the district. It continued a scaremongering exercise designed not to inform, engage or cause public discussion but to enrage and cause concern to people who have a legitimate right to be involved in discussion about the future of their region. It was a disgraceful act on the part of the City of Melville, and I am horrified that it has not had the gumption and honesty to publicly acknowledge that it intentionally caused that distribution of misleading material. I hope some of the councillors read this material so that they know exactly what I think about them. I have told them one by one as I have come across them. I am running out of time. Are extensions possible under this debate, Mr Acting Speaker?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr J.P.D. Edwards): I am sorry, no.

Mr A.D. McRAE: I will make a couple of quick points in the three minutes I have left. I take my role on the local impacts committee very seriously. It has three main tasks: first, the alignment of stage 7 of the Roe Highway; secondly, the identification of traffic management improvements to Leach Highway, South Street, High Street in Fremantle and Stock Road; and, thirdly, to identify the improvements that can be made to roads and local districts to protect the amenity of the communities. For example, in my electorate Shelley Primary School was constructed prior to the building of Leach Highway and its playground backs onto Leach Highway. That school has a standard Department of Education fence on its border with Leach Highway. Only weeks ago three year 1 boys managed to clamber over the fence, because it is only a three-feet high post and rail iron pipe fence. A number of parents and citizen association members have raised that issue with me. That is a valid issue for a school to raise in the course of dealing with the local impacts of the Leach Highway traffic. The important issues to be dealt with include long-term planning, the amenity of the school, the security of our kids and the security of the education environment. I intend to pursue those issues with the local impacts committee. I have met with Rossmoyne Senior High School staff and parents. I have discussed various transport issues with the Herald Avenue senior citizens. As a member of the local impacts committee, I will take up with Main Roads and directly with the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure the issue of what we do on a temporary basis as Roe Highway finishes at Nicholson Road and proceeds on stage 6 down south. Traffic controls on High Road in Riverton will be needed. I take these matters very seriously. The local impacts committee will meet for the first time tomorrow. I urge all local community members and local government representatives to be directly involved in it and to make full use of this serious and useful process to make our communities safe as we deal with the economic needs of transport.

[Leave granted for the member's time to be extended.]

Mr C.J. Barnett: This is the member's "how I lost the seat of Riverton" speech.

Mr A.D. McRAE: It took me more than one speech to win the seat and I intend to be here for a very long time to annoy the hell out of the Leader of the Opposition. I take the privilege of representing the people of Riverton very seriously; it is a great honour and I will always work as hard and as well as I can to represent their interests.

The protection of a local community includes not only reducing the level of noise, but also dealing with traffic movements. For example, community members have said that issues for discussion include a reduction in the number of heavy transport stops and starts on Leach Highway and not increasing traffic speeds under any circumstances. I refer, in particular, to Vahland Avenue and High Road and Karel Avenue intersections on Leach Highway in my electorate. There are significant traffic light controls on Leach Highway. The tragedy is that we have not taken the time to ensure that they are synchronised. We must ensure that the local communities are not impacted upon by the trucks having to go through a hard braking exercise and long, slow start-ups, which are the cause of vibrations, exhaust pollution and a lot more noise. I take those issues seriously. The member for Cockburn and I will deal with them on the local impacts committee.

I will answer the member for Kingsley's question on why we are discussing the alignment of Roe Highway stage 7.

Mr J.P.D. Edwards: The minister drew it back from the environmental assessment process.

Mr A.D. McRAE: As far as I am aware, the Government has not submitted Roe Highway stage 7 for environmental assessment. The reason it has not done that is that a number of aspects must be analysed because of the deletion of Roe Highway stage 8 from its current alignment, including an analysis of the traffic destinations. When I say traffic, I am talking about not only freight traffic but also commercial and private

Mr Mike Board; Dr Janet Woollard; Speaker; Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Mr Jeremy Edwards; Mr Colin Barnett; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Deputy Speaker; Mr Terry Waldron; Mr Jim McGinty; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Acting Speaker; Mr Fran Logan

---

traffic. We must determine what type of traffic comes off Roe Highway and onto the freeway, the desire destination lines and the future traffic demand. The indicative data tells us that once Roe Highway goes past Canning Vale and connects to the freeway, well and truly more than 50 per cent of the heavy freight transport travels south. That heavy transport has no desire to get to O'Connor, Stock Road or the Fremantle inner-harbour port. It has a different desire line altogether. I want to test that. The minister, the member for Cockburn and I are all of one mind that that data needs further analysis. We want to be sure about it.

Mrs C.L. Edwardes: Why is Main Roads redrawing -

Mr A.D. McRAE: I have asked Main Roads - indeed, it will be presented to the local impacts committee tomorrow - to do three options; that is, a northern-most alignment within the potential reserve, a middle alignment and a southern alignment. We will examine those three options and pull out the data based on desire lines, traffic movement forecasts, road construction costs for other infrastructure around that area and the time scale to get through those sorts of approvals, because each of those has different environmental impacts and different impacts on the local community in Leeming, for example, immediately to the north. Each of those options must be assessed. I have asked for those three options to be examined to ensure that the process is simple and relatively straightforward. We are talking about a distance of only about one and a half to two kilometres. We must keep this in a simple form. It is a north, south or middle option. We will go through the data to understand what will be the best option for our future transport needs.

However, getting past Canning Vale is the trick. I plead with members to use whatever influence they have to stop the nonsense about not proceeding with Roe Highway stage 7. Anybody who continues to push that line is damning our communities to disaster.

**MR C.J. BARNETT** (Cottesloe - Leader of the Opposition) [6.46 pm]: In politics, we all recognise that boundaries of electorates change from time to time. However, it is a sound and general principle that members of Parliament will best represent their constituents if they live, if not in their electorates, at least in the broad vicinity of them. Among the Labor members opposite, the member for Thornlie does not live anywhere near her electorate, and neither does the member for Armadale. The member for Cockburn lives in my electorate - nowhere near his electorate. The member for Riverton lives in Mt Lawley - nowhere near his electorate. I am not sure about the member for Southern River; he may live in his electorate. My point is that the Labor members of Parliament much prefer to live in Liberal electorates or relatively affluent areas rather than in their own electorates.

Ms M.M. Quirk interjected.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: It is interesting, because if members live in their electorates, they understand some of the issues that affect real people. I live in my electorate.

Mr C.M. Brown: So do I.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Congratulations! That is good. Members do not have to live exactly in their electorates, but they should at least live in the broad area. Many members of the Labor Party live nowhere near their electorates. People think of the electorate of Cottesloe - my electorate - as being in the very affluent, leafy western suburbs. Do members know that virtually all the container transport goes through my electorate of Cottesloe to North Quay? Do members know that the live sheep exports from the agricultural area go entirely through my electorate? Most of the trade from the southern part of the State goes through the electorate of Cottesloe.

I will tell the House a little about the reality. In 1990-91, 120 000 containers went through my electorate to North Quay. In 2000-01, there were 354 000 containers; in other words, there has been nearly a threefold increase within a decade. The rate of growth of container trade through the port of Fremantle is 12.3 per cent a year. I do not have a calculator, but that indicates to me that the container trade is probably doubling every six or seven years. My point is that the volume of container trade is increasing at an almost exponential rate. The graph in my hand shows that from the mid 1990s the amount of container trade has increased. There has been a sharp discontinuity whereby container trade has increased.

I happen to live in a part of Perth that is old. In fact, my house backs onto Stirling Highway. The road reserve goes through the middle of our lounge room. The area is the product of the development of Perth and Fremantle in the early part of the previous century. Some roads in my electorate are not designed and will never be suitable for heavy vehicles. A road in my electorate called Curtin Avenue takes a significant part of the traffic generated by the port of Fremantle. According to the statistics of two or three years ago, Curtin Avenue was taking about 25 000 vehicles a day, of which one-quarter were commercial vehicles. If members stand on the corner of Eric



Mr Mike Board; Dr Janet Woollard; Speaker; Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Mr Jeremy Edwards; Mr Colin Barnett; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Deputy Speaker; Mr Terry Waldron; Mr Jim McGinty; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Acting Speaker; Mr Fran Logan

---

Street and Curtin Avenue, they will see a real example of a suburban road that was never designed or intended to take heavy vehicle traffic. They will see on those heavy vehicles not only a large number of containers but also big containers. Therefore, they will see a truck with a trailer - two large containers - hurtling down Curtin Avenue, where school kids are on bikes and mothers and fathers are trying to drop their kids at school. It is a dangerous and horrendous situation. It is simply the product of the growth of Perth. No-one is to blame for that. However, suburbs south of the river have the advantage of good planning dating from the Stephenson planning era. As the members for Murdoch and Kingsley explained, the suburbs were developed under a planning environment. Roads were built and reserves were put in place. There is an opportunity to avoid the Curtin Avenue-type roads. If the Government goes down this path, it will have more Curtin Avenue-type situations. Those situations are unavoidable in my electorate. However, members will have them all the way through their electorates, even though there is an opportunity to avoid them.

Road issues are difficult. The member for Carine described her experience with the Reid Highway extension, which circumvents a lake. It was very controversial. People are quite rightly concerned about the wetlands and the like. Why would they not be concerned? Road extensions are very controversial.

Mr F.M. Logan: Did you support the Curtin Avenue upgrade?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: When the issue of upgrading Curtin Avenue arose, I told my constituents that they would not get a solution to the problem of traffic volumes on Curtin Avenue simply because the Leighton peninsula is a natural isthmus of land that forms a natural bridge between the northern and southern suburbs. Traffic volumes will inevitably increase. I suggested to my electorate that Curtin Avenue be moved closer to the railway line on a new reserve. People are now saying that they wished they had supported me at the time. Currently, Curtin Avenue can take six lanes of traffic on its existing reserve.

Mr F.M. Logan: That was strenuously opposed.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I know that the member lives in the area. A lot of people are now saying that that was the better way to go, because Curtin Avenue can go from two lanes to six lanes without any planning change, and that is the problem. I will give an example. I often take my son to school and I cross into Curtin Avenue at the Eric Street lights. Last week a flat-decked truck went past. I am not being critical of the trucking company; it had done what was required. About 100 barrels of chlorine were strapped down securely on the truck. That is a dangerous cargo. Members know from their chemistry lessons what happens when chlorine mixes with water. It was probably destined for the mining industry. A cargo such as chlorine, which was obviously being handled with great care, should not travel through suburban areas. Those sorts of loads go through my electorate daily. I get some of the backwash. There will always be some backwash, because companies pick up containers from the port of Fremantle and distribute them to the north of the State and to industrial areas in the northern suburbs.

As members have said, the Fremantle eastern bypass has been in the planning process for 30 years. It is not good enough to say that Stock Road, Leach Highway or South Street will be upgraded. We know the sorts of roads we need. We do not need a freeway. We need a divided, two-lane road with a proper gutter system designed around it so that when a spill occurs it will be contained. We need a road that can handle that type of situation. We also do not want those large vehicles doing an unnecessary number of turns. If they roll or have an accident, it will be when they are trying to turn a corner. The sorts of proposals the Labor Party has put forward has traffic going this way and that way and twisting and turning through suburban streets. That is not a proper planning process. Any road proposal will be contentious; there is no doubt about that. I put to members quite objectively that of all the options, the Fremantle eastern bypass will have the least effect on the least number of people. There is no doubt that some people will be disadvantaged by it. No road project has been built that has not disadvantaged at least one group. However, the eastern bypass will disadvantage the smallest number of people. The property along the proposed route has been acquired by the State over many years. The road should be designed well and we must take cognisance of people's needs. We are not talking about a freeway bypass. We are talking about two lanes of divided landscaped road, like Marmion Avenue - roads that exist through the southern suburbs as a result of good planning. It should be designed to include gutters, drainage and good storage systems so that if an accident occurs it can be handled. We cannot avoid the reality that this State depends on farming and mining, which use chemicals. Those cargoes pass through the port of Fremantle and are distributed into the hinterland. The responsibility is to ensure they are transported through the metropolitan area with minimum risk, which requires purpose-built, well-designed roads. If the Labor Party goes down this path, it will create what I cannot avoid; namely, using Curtin Avenue in my electorate. I must live with that. The Government will create Curtin Avenue situations throughout the south metropolitan area when it does not need to do so, because alternatives exist. A good minister can look at the issues, find the best possible solution and minimise the problems.

Mr Mike Board; Dr Janet Woollard; Speaker; Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Mr Jeremy Edwards; Mr Colin Barnett; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Deputy Speaker; Mr Terry Waldron; Mr Jim McGinty; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Acting Speaker; Mr Fran Logan

---

As the member for Kingsley said earlier, the wetlands at Bibra Lake are without doubt environmentally important. There is a valid environmental issue. However, should we throw out all the planning processes because of an environmental issue? Surely a good minister would seek to minimise the impact of hazardous cargoes on large road trains such as B-doubles, and ensure that they are handled safely in the community. Let us address the issue of the wetlands. It may be that we do not build a causeway across the wetlands. However, as the member for Kingsley said, all sorts of road design options are available. This is not cutting-edge stuff. Plenty of road systems cross sensitive coastlines and wetlands. Thousands of precedents have been set throughout the world. Although it will cost more money, we must design a road system through those wetlands to minimise its effects on the environment. Perhaps the road system could be elevated to allow the fauna and flora to remain unaffected. If necessary, some money could be spent on the wetlands. The level of water is more vital to wetlands than the existence of a road.

It is a matter of designing the road properly. The Government is failing to address the issue of how to get the road through the wetlands with minimum environmental damage. That is not beyond the wit of mankind. If that issue were addressed, we would not have this potentially enormous problem. Members opposite should take me seriously and stand in my electorate in north Fremantle and watch trucks trying to navigate 90-degree turns. It is parlous.

Thirty years of debate occurred about redesigning Servetus Street in my electorate. I changed my view about Servetus Street when I was nearly run down by a truck while taking my child to school. I re-examined the issue and supported the redevelopment of that street, at a cost of approximately \$15 million. Although it was very expensive and controversial at the time, people in the area now say that it was the right decision. This Government should not make short-term, politically attractive decisions. It should address the real issue of how to build a road across the Bibra Lake wetlands without damaging them. That is the only problem. If the Government tackles that, the community will not be faced with Curtin Avenue situations throughout the southern suburbs.

**MR F.M. LOGAN** (Cockburn - Parliamentary Secretary) [6.58 pm]: As the minister and other people have said, this issue has been debated since the 1960s when the Stephenson plan was brought down. We should consider what the Fremantle eastern bypass would destroy if it were built. Adjacent to Rockingham and Cockburn Roads, near the Newmarket Hotel, is Clontarf Hill, which is the last limestone ridge in the Fremantle area to have escaped urbanisation. It is the last outcrop of native species in that area. The limestone ridge is a reminder of what Fremantle might have looked like prior to European occupation. The Fremantle eastern bypass would have carved straight through the middle of Clontarf Hill and destroyed its entire park and most of its vegetation. As we move further south, the Fremantle eastern bypass would be skirting along the eastern side of Manning Park, another long ridge that has not been built on but that has been affected by the grazing of sheep that used to be herded up on the side of the hill awaiting slaughter at Robb Jetty, and by other animals that were also destined for the abattoirs.

Debate interrupted, pursuant to standing orders.