

Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr Peter Tinley; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker;  
Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Matt Taylor

---

**PERTH FREIGHT LINK — NEW KWINANA PORT**

*Motion*

**MR M. MCGOWAN (Rockingham — Leader of the Opposition)** [4.00 pm]: I move —

That this house condemns the \$1.6 billion Perth Freight Link–Kwinana Freeway to Fremantle extension and the shocking way residents have been dealt with by the Minister for Transport, and calls on the government to implement a plan to get more freight onto rail and also commence planning for a new port in Kwinana.

This is a very important issue to many of our citizens. I understand that there are demands for freight access and demands for easy access to our ports. I am of the view that better options are available and there are better ways of dealing with the freight demands than the way this has been managed by the government. Those options need to be properly explored. The extraordinary amount of money that the commonwealth and the state are putting towards this project could be better and more efficiently used on alternative plans to the one that is being put in place. As a resident of the southern suburbs, I also understand that significant issues surround transport congestion, trucks on our roads and the like. I would like to see less congestion, fewer trucks on the road and more freight on rail. That is a large part of the solution to this problem that we are facing.

I want to start with the people involved in what the government is planning. Some of them are in the gallery today. They have come from Palmyra, Fremantle and Willagee. They will be impacted in the most dramatic ways imaginable by what is being planned for this road by the government. A few weeks ago I visited Moody Glen, a suburban street in Palmyra. It is full of families, seniors, retirees and children—an ordinary Australian suburban street with people happily going about their lives, people working and children playing on the street. It is a really wonderful microcosm of Australian society. I met a range of families whose homes are threatened with destruction by bulldozers as a consequence of the way this project is being proposed and managed. They are frightened for their future, for their family's future and for the homes that they have built and created over the last 20 or so years. The analogy was constantly drawn by people in the street to how similar the circumstance they are facing is to that of Darryl Kerrigan and the Kerrigans in that famous Australian movie *The Castle*. These people regard their homes as their castle. They raised their children in their homes and they have renovated their homes and, frankly, they have done a wonderful job. They are ordinary Australians—teachers, truck drivers, pensioners, secretaries; a range of people with ordinary occupations who make our society work effectively. They are basically under threat of their homes being destroyed by this road project. They bought their land and their homes without them ever being subject to a caveat or a reservation on the title that it could one day be resumed. I understand that certain homes have that caveat or reservation on the title document. Homes along certain sections of Canning Highway have reservation on their titles. The people's homes that will be impacted by this development have never had that reservation on the title. They bought their homes as freehold without reservation, expecting quiet enjoyment of their property for the remainder of their lives if that is what they chose to do. They are perplexed, shell-shocked and angry about the way they are being treated. I want to mention how they have been treated as a lesson in how a government should not act. These residents received a letter dated 20 April this year. It contained lots of information about the Perth Freight Link—the cost of it and what it will allegedly result in et cetera. One paragraph in it, seven paragraphs down, states —

This letter is to inform you that your property ... will be impacted by the PFL —  
Perth Freight Link —

works, under the current project concept alignment. Construction work on the project is due to begin in 2016 and be completed in 2019.

Most of the residents did not even read this letter. We know what it is like. We get letters all the time. We do not particularly pay attention to them all. One resident read it and she wondered what that paragraph meant. Phone calls were made. She asked what it meant. The advice that came back was, "This could mean that you lose your home." That is how these residents were communicated with. They called Main Roads and the advice that came back was that it means that the road reservation could expand and they could lose their homes. There were no knocks on the door from people explaining what was going on. There was no community meeting to enable people to understand. No explanation was given about any likely offer or removal costs or the like. All the residents got was a paragraph in a letter that was ambiguous at best. They had to find out about the future of their homes by making phone calls to the government. How appalling that the government would treat them that way! This is their private property. I support private property. Labor supports private property. We are a party in favour of private property. We see the Liberal Party treating private property owners with disdain. These are people's own homes.

Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr Peter Tinley; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Matt Taylor

---

The residents made a phone call. The advice they received was that they could lose their homes. The local MPs and the like were advised about this matter and took up the case, as we should. Firstly, all these people are in danger of losing their homes. Secondly, the management and planning of this issue has been absolutely chaotic and shambolic. We have had to drag information out of the government. In order to get advice on how many properties might be affected, we had to ask questions in the other house. It turns out that it is not just the houses in Moody Glen that might be knocked over but 77 owners of residential and commercial properties received the letter advising them that their property or their home may be gone as a consequence of this extension. Seventy-seven homes and properties will be impacted. That is an enormous number of properties, an enormous cost and an enormous number of families whose dreams will be adversely impacted in this manner.

We have had to ask questions in the other place to get to the bottom of this and to get information. We should remember that every one of those properties that will be knocked over borders another property. The owners of those properties never received a letter. They never received advice. Those people who live across the road from the homes or businesses that might be destroyed have not been consulted or asked. This extension potentially has a dramatic impact on hundreds of properties throughout this area and hundreds of families and businesses and their lives. These people have not been consulted. It is a shambolic, chaotic and, frankly, rude way to treat our fellow citizens.

Then we go to the time frame. Let us look at the information sheet put on its website by Main Roads. It states this, and I quote —

Construction of the project will be covered under two separate contracts:

- The first contract for Section One is expected to be awarded in September 2015
- The second contract for Section Two is expected to be awarded in December 2015

That is in a few months' time for the first one, and in eight months' time for the second one. These are our fellow citizens, and they are given that amount of warning about this project and about their future. The first contract will be in September this year and the second will be in December this year. They are given that very short time.

We then raised the issue and started to get the facts around it—hold on; we then started to get the unravelling is the point I want to make. The other day, when asked about it, the Minister for Transport said he is not convinced about the route. I am sorry, but it states here that the contracts are expected to be awarded in a few months. If the government is not convinced about the route, why is it signing the contracts in a few months? What sort of way is that to manage this issue if the government is not convinced about the route? There is then the discussion, which I think is a red herring, about building a tunnel. A tunnel! The government is actually throwing out there that it will build a tunnel under Fremantle. I assume it is expecting the tunnel to go up on the other side of the river into the container terminal. My understanding of the way we drive a car in a tunnel is that the gradient has to be at a certain angle. I think the maximum gradient is something like five or six per cent. Imagine that a tunnel goes under the river, and it then has to exit at about a 45-degree angle—in fact, almost a 90-degree angle—to get into the container terminal on the other side. The government is throwing out there that there will be a tunnel under the river that people will have to exit at a 90-degree angle to get into Fremantle port.

**Mr D.J. Kelly** interjected.

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** Honestly, we would need a jet-powered truck to do that. Is that the option we are considering here? If it is not, what is the option that we are considering? More importantly, should these issues not have been dealt with earlier than a few months before the contracts are due to be signed? Should those issues not have been dealt with and considered before we got to this point?

The minister said that he is not convinced about the route. But when asked about this issue on Sunday, the Premier said it was a fait accompli—the decision was made. I saw him on television on Sunday night saying that—the decision was made. All these mixed messages are going out there. There is no consultation with people and they are not informed. Different options are being thrown out there, I think just to try to hose the issue down; and now families' lives are being thrown into turmoil.

Another issue has emerged today that also has not been properly considered. This extension through Coolbellup and into Fremantle will terminate at the intersection of High Street and Stirling Highway. Anyone who knows this area will know that that is still a long way from Fremantle port. This six or eight-lane highway will finish, I would say, at least one or two kilometres from North Quay where the container terminal is, across the river. It is a long way from Fremantle port. The minister cannot deny that. I have not measured exactly how far it is, but it terminates at the intersection of High Street and Stirling Highway. It still has to get through East Fremantle, it still has to get across the river, and it still has to get through North Fremantle.

**Mr D.C. Nalder:** No, you are not right.

Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr Peter Tinley; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Matt Taylor

---

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** I have got the minister's map here.

**Mr D.C. Nalder:** You have got the grade separation wrong.

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** This is the minister's map. The minister has put out an information sheet dated May 2015, and it highlights in blue stage 2, and it concludes at either High Street or Marmion Street—it is hard to see exactly where. That is still a long way from the port in North Fremantle. It still has to get through a large part of East Fremantle and across the bridge.

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

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** The minister is saying Canning Highway, but that is not what his map shows.

**Mr D.C. Nalder:** It is closer to the port than Rockingham station is to Rockingham.

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** So the minister is making fun of these people in the gallery.

**Mr D.C. Nalder:** No, I am not.

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** That is what it sounds like.

**Mr D.C. Nalder:** No, I am not.

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** That is what it sounds like.

**Mr D.C. Nalder:** No, I am not. The only reason we have got this situation is because you sold off the reserve land.

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** No. The minister is making fun of them.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Minister!

**Mr D.C. Nalder:** You sold off the reserve land.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Minister! I am on my feet. Enough!

**Mr D.J. Kelly** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** I call you to order for the second time, member for Bassendean.

**Mr P.C. Tinley** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Does the member want to join him? I was not going to call anyone. I was talking and was interrupted by the member for Bassendean while on my feet, and I will not have my rulings questioned. I do not want to hear any more interjections across the chamber. The Leader of the Opposition has the call.

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** If the minister's maps are incorrect, maybe the maps that he has on his website need to be changed.

Anyway, there is still an enormous cost, because there is a bottleneck in East Fremantle that has not been dealt with. What is the additional cost of getting through East Fremantle and across the river and through North Fremantle to get to the port? I would expect that is hundreds of millions of dollars. In effect, we have to build a new bridge to do that. It is hundreds of millions of dollars in order to funnel that traffic in there. It is poorly conceived and poorly planned, because the government has not actually catered for that, and shambolic.

What is the alternative? As I said at the outset of my speech, we need to look at the future of this city in the long term. Rail has to be a major component. The minister seemed to say yesterday that our plan—Labor's aspiration of 30 per cent on rail, which would be world's best practice—is ridiculous. Why?

**Mr D.C. Nalder:** No. I said that still means 50 per cent on road.

**The SPEAKER:** Minister!

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** I will get to that. We are down now to about 10 per cent.

**Mr D.C. Nalder:** No, 14 per cent.

**Ms S.F. McGurk:** It is 13 per cent.

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** Now, 13 per cent of container movement is on rail. We are saying that we can more than double that by going to rail. There are ways that we can do that for a fraction of the cost of this \$1.625 billion-plus, or whatever it will cost, to go through East Fremantle, across the river and through North Fremantle. There are ways that we can do that to get better use of rail. Surely for the long-term future of the city we need to start doing it, not just talking about it.

The second point, and this is the real long-term solution—the 100-year solution—is that we need a new port in Kwinana. That was very much on the cards in mid-2008, and the then cabinet actually decided and settled upon

Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr Peter Tinley; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Matt Taylor

---

it. In the last seven years nothing has happened in that regard. This road will cost \$1.625 billion. When we add the hundreds of millions of dollars that it will cost to get this road into the port—the road that does not reach the port—the cost will be around \$2 billion. The government is spending \$2 billion, when the real long-term solution is a new port in Kwinana that will take the trucks, the traffic and the rail and give them an alternative. This should be about a long-term solution with a better use of public funds, not a relatively short-term solution. If the minister wants to get the trucks off Leach Highway and Canning Highway, and if he does not want the trucks to go through all those suburban areas to the east—through Riverton, perhaps Forrestfield, and some of those areas—and if he wants to make sure the people of Palmyra, Willagee, East Fremantle and North Fremantle are protected from this, the answer is clear. The answer is to have a proper plan and provide some proper funding by using some of this funding to create a new port in Kwinana, and to make sure that we get more freight onto rail in the meantime. That is the simple solution. That is what we are saying the minister needs to answer here today. I think the people in the gallery and all their neighbours deserve a proper, sensible and reasonable answer to this issue, and I think they and their children and grandchildren—indeed, all of us—would prefer a long-term solution to this freight issue confronting our state.

[Interruption from the gallery.]

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr N.W. Morton):** Members of the public gallery, we are more than happy and willing for you to sit here and watch proceedings, but you need to remain silent. Thank you.

**MS S.F. MCGURK (Fremantle) [4.20 pm]:** I understand that the requirements of this chamber are that people visiting the public gallery need to apply some restraint, but it is difficult for some of these residents when the day before Anzac Day they received a letter from Main Roads, and seven paragraphs into that letter they learnt that because of the Perth Freight Link, their houses could be impacted upon by a road that was due to be decided on and the contract signed by November this year, with construction to commence next year. That was the first these residents had heard that their homes were at risk. As the Leader of the Opposition has pointed out, many people who received the letter from Main Roads did not even read the detail because the message was hidden so far into the body of the letter. People were told their homes “could be impacted” by the Perth Freight Link, which is an extraordinary euphemism when in fact the actual message to those people was that their homes would be taken away. Therefore, you might forgive the people in the public gallery, Mr Acting Speaker, if they feel strongly about this issue, because it is about their homes, it is about their lives, it is about where they bring their kids up, it is about their community, it is about their neighbours and their friends, and it is about their street. They had no notice at all from the state government that the design of a route that would take their homes away was being embarked upon. It is also extraordinary that about 77 property owners received notice that their houses could be impacted by the Perth Freight Link, but the people who live across the road from those people did not receive a letter and still have not received individual letters or correspondence from Main Roads or the state government. They have received no notice at all. As a result of the plight of the residents of Palmyra and Willagee having been drawn to public attention, Main Roads has now sent a newsletter to residents in the area with a bit of information. That was the first piece of information received by residents apart from the 77 who received the letters I have just mentioned. It is just an extraordinary disregard for how those people were to receive the news.

Residents who received the letter were made the offer of being able to get in touch with Main Roads and set up a meeting to have the situation explained further. However, we have also learnt that it was not an easy exercise for residents to get in touch with departmental officials. Some of them had to call for a number of days before they were able to have a conversation with officials from Main Roads. Even when residents had conversations with departmental officials, they got no clear answers. That is because the government is hedging its bets, if you like. The Minister for Transport is hedging his bets saying the government is looking at a route for the Perth Freight Link that would go across Beeliar wetlands—Roe Highway 8—and down to Stock Road. The criticism of Roe 8 was always that it was a road to nowhere, because it would take people to Stock Road and go no further. However, the Perth Freight Link would go a bit further. As the Leader of the Opposition said, the route most commonly talked about—it is on Main Roads’ website and all the publicity—goes down Stock Road, along Leach Highway and down Stirling Highway. That is one proposed route, and the houses of the people I have talked about today, some of whom are represented in the public gallery, will be affected. But now the department and the minister are saying that they have not quite finalised the route. The contract will be signed in November and work will start next year, but the route has not been finalised. The Minister for Transport is a minister of the Crown; he is a minister of the state. This is a \$1.6 billion project and he should know where the road is going. He cannot expect to sign a contract in November and begin works next year if he does not now know the final route of the road. It is absolutely extraordinary.

I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that the proposed tunnel is a distraction. There was no public announcement or discussion about the tunnel. Constituents of mine who live around Clontarf Hill happened to see some drilling exercises going on in their neighbourhood. Some of those people have been very active in

Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr Peter Tinley; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Matt Taylor

---

protecting Clontarf Hill and the bushland around there, so they asked the workers doing the drilling what was happening and they were told that they worked for Main Roads and work was going on exploring whether there should be a tunnel. That is how residents in that area found out that the government was thinking about a tunnel.

Some people say that a tunnel might be preferable to a road, but I think that they are both very flawed plans for a number of reasons—not least of which is that we really need a second port. We do not need this amount of infrastructure going to Fremantle port, which has a limited life. We need a second port. There is no clarity about whether there will be a road or a tunnel, and there has been a lot of confusion on the part of those residents.

I have a copy of a letter that a constituent of the member for Willagee sent to the department outlining her concerns, and she made a number of good points. She made the following point regarding the receipt of the letter I referred to earlier —

Given the potential of the described works to significantly change people's lives by devaluing, or even taking over, longstanding residences, it is unacceptable that Main Roads did not have the courtesy to at least hold a local public information meeting to let us know about the project.

She made the point that Main Roads staff have proven near impossible to get in touch with. She also said that when she did manage to speak to a Main Roads officer, he was not able to reduce her concerns; in fact, he added to them. She then talked about the fact that there was no clarity about whether there will be a road or a tunnel. The letter then stated —

Why on earth would Main Roads write alarming letters before they have not even completed basic route planning? You have unnecessarily upset people and, in a material way, already compromised the value of their properties.

She makes a very good point. The letter stated she was then told the following by a departmental representative —

... residents will not be informed as to whether they will be affected by the new road, and to what extent, until November of this year.

That is when the contracts will be signed. People will not get any certainty about their houses until November when the contract is being signed. The letter continues —

Construction works are then due to commence by the middle of 2016. What that says is that we could potentially be in a situation of having just a little over six months to sell our properties and find somewhere else to live. That scenario is impractical and unethical. We face the prospect of not only being kicked out of the homes and suburb where we have spent many happy years to go somewhere new, but we could also be financially penalised for the privilege.

That resident of Jules Court, Willagee, a constituent of the member for Willagee, makes some very excellent points about the very shabby way that this government has treated the residents of Palmyra and Willagee. That is the way the residents have been treated.

I will briefly address the major problems we have with Perth Freight Link. It is not just that people's homes will be impacted and that the residents were not given much notice; people's homes will be impacted and the residents were not given much notice for a completely and utterly flawed project. Not a day goes past when the minister is not asked a question about this project and more of those flaws are brought to the public's attention. One of the big criticisms, as the Leader of the Opposition highlighted, is that the Perth Freight Link will go from where Kwinana Freeway meets Roe Highway, through the wetlands, down Stock Road, Leach Highway and Stirling Highway and then it will come to an abrupt halt at Stirling Bridge, which is already congested, but there is no money and no planning to take trucks across the bridge and through North Fremantle. There is no money at all. Today we heard the minister say that some planning is starting. The state budget has just been handed down and not a penny has been allocated to the Stirling Bridge or North Fremantle components of this plan. That is extraordinary. That is one problem with the plan.

Another problem with the plan is that it is billed as being a plan that will take trucks off Leach Highway and local roads. That is how it is being sold, particularly by the Treasurer, to his constituents in Riverton—that it will take trucks off Leach Highway. In fact, by increasing the size of Fremantle port and making the Perth Freight Link a toll road, there is every chance it will deliver more trucks onto Leach Highway and local roads. Under the government's proposal, Fremantle port's operation will increase by somewhere between 200 000 and 500 000 containers a year. That is a lot of containers a year; we think it is between two and a half and three times the size of Fremantle port's current size. The only real infrastructure to go in and out of that port is Perth Freight Link, which will stop at Stirling Highway and not continue through North Fremantle. Why would truck drivers pay a toll to use that road when they will sit in a car park at Stirling Bridge in North Fremantle? They will not; they will use alternative routes such as Leach Highway and local roads. That is a big flaw in the plan. The Premier

Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr Peter Tinley; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Matt Taylor

---

promised that there would be no toll roads in WA and, of course, it is another broken promise. This will be a toll road. Commonsense dictates that the trucking industry will not accept—people in the industry are saying this publicly—that tolls on the Perth Freight Link will apply only to trucks. Truck drivers believe that if cars are to use that road, they also should pay a toll. There are a lot of problems with the proposed Perth Freight Link. It comes down to very poor planning and poor decision-making on the part of this government. The Perth Freight Link should be abandoned and those precious infrastructure dollars should be put into planning for a second port where there is more than adequate capacity for good road and rail links.

The minister chose the wrong suburb to pick on when it picked on the people of Palmyra; they have a lot of fight in them. The Leader of the Opposition said that those residents were perplexed, angry and shell-shocked. I will tell him what; they are also determined. I and WA Labor will stand with them against their homes being impacted by this ridiculous freight link.

**MR P.C. TINLEY (Willagee)** [4.33 pm]: It is with pleasure that I rise to make a contribution and be heard in this place on behalf of the constituents of Willagee about this plan for a road to nowhere—a road to nowhere in two parts: it is a road to nowhere metaphorically and physically. We should not have a four-lane freeway, as far as we are told, running all the way from Muchea, grade separated through, and carving up, the remnant wetlands of Beeliar, driving a black scar cleaving my communities apart, to end up at a set of traffic lights at Canning Highway. It is a plan to nowhere because it goes directly to a dead end. Let us understand the size of the problem. The second part of the problem, apart from the physical aspects of the road to nowhere, is the metaphorical aspect. This is a road to nowhere because the government has no vision for the future of Western Australia. This government has no plan and no identified opportunities for my kids, my kids' kids and my constituents' kids to ensure they benefit from the economic opportunity and have access to that economic opportunity through sustainable growth of this state.

We have seen the worst budget ever delivered by the worst Treasurer in the history of this state—the seventh Treasurer in six years—and we have no plan and no vision to identify how we can take this state forward. All we have is a bandaid knee-jerk reaction to an in-tray problem that the Minister for Transport was given: can we spend this boon in money from the federal government, which believes only in roads and will not build one inch of rail? This government needs to stand accountable for the absolutely shocking state of the leadership it is providing for the businesses and communities of Western Australia. This black scar that will run through the seat of Willagee will absolutely destroy my communities. Let us not even bother with what will happen to the Beeliar wetlands—the absolute destruction of remnant wetlands, the aqualungs of the Swan coastal plain and internationally regarded nesting places for migratory birds. Those arguments have been made and they will continue to be made by people such as the member for Gosnells, who is very passionate about these issues and will always be able to articulate why we should preserve these sorts of natural endowments.

Let us talk about what this proposed highway will do to the lived heritage of the people of Willagee. Let us talk about what it will do to their employment prospects and their quality of life. If the Perth Freight Link is built, the Stock Road section, which is now stage 2 of the Perth Freight Link, or Roe 8 extension, whatever we want to call it, will have some 3 000 truck movements a day on weekdays. Out to 2050 it will have in the order of 12 000 to 13 000 truck movements on the basis of the projected requirement to meet the 2050 target of 3 000 containers. To put it in perspective, 700 000 containers a year currently go to the port, and we are talking about three million a year coming through by 2050. That is a huge problem that needs leadership and for this government to carefully think through what it is about to do before it consigns the people of Western Australia to more debt, more problems and more dysfunction around a community that has changed its use.

I refer to the change of use because on the day this colony was established, Fremantle port was the mercantile centre of the colony and that port's use was industrial. All the land and businesses in Fremantle town were stevedoring related to the importing and exporting of Western Australian goods. That is now no longer the case; the City of Fremantle is a suburban, residential, retail and recreational hub with vital tourist infrastructure for Western Australia and it is about to be consigned to become a complete mud heap on the basis of this government's desire for a bandaid solution as replacement for comprehensive leadership. The land use has changed. The thinking needs to change. The strategic direction needs to change. Fremantle port can no longer service the state's requirements for container traffic. I am not talking about all the port's work; I am talking about the major amount of containerised mercantile trade. This government is committing \$1.6 billion to a road to nowhere, and that amount will not be enough because when trucks travelling on that road to nowhere hit the Canning Highway lights, they will have three more sets of lights to go through and a level crossing before they can get anywhere near the port. We want to know what the Minister for Transport is going to do to finish that link and alleviate the absolute hell on the roads for people of East Fremantle and North Fremantle wanting to cross the river.

Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr Peter Tinley; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Matt Taylor

---

I also want to take up the case of small business. This government has a very good track record over the past six years of selling small business out, not supporting it in any way, breaking its promises on payroll tax et cetera and doing nothing to support its requirements. This is a very good example. Not only do the residents of Palmyra get these letters about the destruction of their homes, their community and their way of life, but also the businesses along Stock Road that have invested hundreds of thousands of dollars to develop their properties for undertaking trade and employing people in my electorate will potentially lose their premises. Letters from Main Roads were received by the Good Guys electrical store, a Harvey Norman store and Garbology, which is a unique recycling business. If the road reserve is driven through that area and takes any part of the frontage of those buildings, including car parks, those businesses will die, and the people who derive their livelihood from those businesses will be unemployed.

This road will drive a wedge between my communities, the likes of which no-one has ever seen in Western Australia. They may as well be on the freeway, looking at the river, with very few ways of getting across, because there is no provision whatsoever for footbridges or transits across Stock Road between Coolbellup and Hamilton Hill, and Hilton and Samson. They will be completely split apart. Additionally, the grade separation of these intersections will make it very difficult for people to get in and out of the suburbs around there. They will cut through roads that businesses rely on to get onto the main road, and the traffic management plans for this ill-conceived and poorly thought out plan will have a significant impact, as roads will be completely cut off from their current access to Stock Road.

This plan, such as it is, is a complete sham. Is it any wonder that the Minister for Transport is looking for alternatives such as tunnels? I would bet London to a brick that the \$1.6 billion will just be the beginning. Rubbery as the figures are, because of the limited transparency of this government, if we apply the same tunnelling cost estimate as was used for the airport rail link, which is an 8.5-kilometre tunnel costing \$2.21 billion, to the proposed tunnel on this road, whichever route it might take, of up to nine kilometres—we do not know where it will come out, but I hope it will go under the river—just the tunnel would cost \$2.34 billion, in addition to the already estimated \$1.6 billion. It would be the most expensive piece of road in Australia's history, and all for nothing.

The vision and leadership required to deliver the transport and distribution infrastructure for Western Australia up to 2050 lies in the outer harbour. It lies in people stopping to think for a moment, getting advice and deciding where that \$1.6 billion is best spent. Is it best spent on attracting private investment for the \$4 billion or \$5 billion required for the outer harbour and, by doing so, looking at the supporting infrastructure? Is that the best way? Rowley and Anketell Roads both go straight through from the freeway to the state's biggest industrial hub in Kwinana. Is that not a better place for the application of this business activity? I would say it was.

Not only do the residents of my community get a dirty great big black scar through their community, splitting it apart, they also get the pleasure of noise pollution. Stock Road, on the Hamilton Hill side or the Coolbellup side, is elevated from the suburb by up to 10 metres. The road runs on an elevation from the suburb in the order of 10 metres. No amount of sound attenuation, such as sound walls, trees or green walls, would mitigate the sound envelope carrying right across Coolbellup, Hamilton Hill, Spearwood, Samson and Hilton. It will be a devastating place to live. I dread the thought of trying to represent the people in my electorate and revealing the problems they have. The member for Cannington has all sorts of challenges representing people who are affected by airport noise, but that will be nothing. There are no curfews on trucks. There is no opportunity whatsoever for people to have the quiet enjoyment and the property rights that are enshrined in law by this place, because of the imposition this minister and this government are putting on them.

That is the noise, but do not forget the pollution. Modelling has been done, but I will not use the figures because they have not yet been qualified. With 12 000 and 13 000 truck movements a day of 18-wheel trucks doing 80-plus kilometres an hour down this grade-separated freeway, the diesel particulates will form a pollution plume across my suburbs that will be absolutely devastating. We stand by for compensation cases well into the future—out to 2050—for respiratory diseases and problems affecting particularly the old and the very young. The minister and the Premier need to take full responsibility for what they are consigning future generations of Western Australians to. It is an outrage that this government should impose itself on the people of Willagee, Palmyra, Fremantle, East Fremantle and North Fremantle, who will have to suffer from the near-sightedness and lack of vision of this government.

The Minister for Transport may well stand in a minute and attempt to blame the opposition for what he has to do. He may want to say that we deleted the eastern bypass. Because I do not get the right of reply to what the minister is going to verbal us for, I will tell the minister now, in anticipation, that that is ancient history. People do not want to hear his excuse that a previous government had undertaken something that the minister cannot accept. The decision of a previous government is no excuse for the minister to make poor planning decisions, exercise poor leadership and fail to stand up to the Premier and tell him that this is the wrong way to go.

Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr Peter Tinley; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Matt Taylor

---

I can tell the people of Willagee one thing for sure, without overreaching. If the government privatises Fremantle port, it will privatise Kwinana into the package, and we will lose all flexibility in the future in being able to control our own destiny. If a public monopoly is privatised, guess what? It is still a monopoly, and we will lose all sorts of flexibility, and the extra costs and charges on Western Australian businesses will again underscore how the government sold businesses in Western Australia down the river. I want the minister to guarantee, on a promise of resignation, that when the government privatises this port and Kwinana port, and consigns us to inflexibility for the next 50 years, he will not include in the package, regardless of what those spivs tell him, a toll road. The Perth Freight Link cannot be sold as a profit-making enterprise. That would be the absolute end of any flexibility and any hope that we might be able to drive an economic future that we can believe in. The minister has the opportunity now to make comments that will determine forever whether the history books will see him as someone who cares about the community.

The other point I will make before I sit down is that the member for Riverton has given his full-throated support to this project. He has been telling his constituents, since the day he was elected, that he was going to get the trucks off Leach Highway. I want to hear from the member for Riverton—I make a clear distinction from his role as Treasurer—about how many infringements have been given to truck drivers or companies on Leach Highway from Shelley Bridge to the freeway. I can tell him now that the answer is none. The member does not care. He wants to have all the headlines but none of the grunt work.

Instead of consigning this state to \$36 billion plus worth of debt, why does the Treasurer not show some vision and get together with his mate from Alfred Cove to see whether they can muscle up on the Premier and tell him that this port is no good? The one message I am telling everybody in my seat and everybody in Jandakot and everybody who will be affected by the Perth Freight Link is that the only way to stop this is by changing government.

**MR D.C. NALDER (Alfred Cove — Minister for Transport)** [4.49 pm]: Firstly, I want to say that we are very concerned about the implication on residents. I apologise to the residents for the way they received information, and I am not happy that it did not talk about options being considered. I also spend a lot of time in Fremantle and have a real strong attachment to it, and I go back to one of the football coaches who took us one night who said, “If you don’t understand where you come from, you can never understand where you’re going.” Let me be clear: in understanding the situation we have today, we have to understand how we got there. If we go back to the 1950s and 1960s, the Stephenson–Hepburn plan laid out the whole transport framework for Western Australia, and it has served this state exceptionally well.

The previous Labor government decided to annex some of the reserve that was set up for freight movement and sell it off to residential housing. If we carry that forward, the then planning and infrastructure minister, Alannah MacTiernan, also came out and said publicly that to be able to move transport and freight efficiently and effectively we need to consider a plan for Leach Highway and High Street. That was in 2008. The previous Labor government set about that plan. Before I even entered Parliament, all this had still been progressing, admittedly under the Liberal government, as a result of that freight route having been sold off for residential land. It continued to be progressed, to the point that when I came in as minister over a year ago, federal funding was already allocated for High Street and Leach Highway to be widened. That goes back to the Alannah MacTiernan plan that continued under this government.

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr N.W. Morton)**: Member for Warnbro, I have cautioned you a number of times. I do not want to have to call members to order. The Minister for Transport has the call; I want to listen to the Minister for Transport in the same way I wanted to listen to the Leader of the Opposition earlier. If you want to make a contribution, do so after the minister has finished.

**Mr D.C. NALDER**: When I came in as minister, discussions eventuated with our federal colleagues as to how the federal government could support us on some critical infrastructure projects. That is when Roe Highway stage 8 came up. We were looking at and ready to progress with the Leach Highway–High Street expansion. I said, “Look, if we’re going to do Roe 8, Roe 8 serves two purposes. It’s not a road to nowhere.” The first thing is that it connects to Stock Road. Stock Road is a gazetted six-lane road through to Kwinana for the future expansion of the port. Talking about the expansion of the port, I would like to check whether the member for Fremantle is suggesting that we shut down and close Fremantle port to put it all down in Kwinana.

**Ms S.F. McGurk**: No, I am not.

**Mr D.C. NALDER**: She is not. Is the member for Fremantle accepting that the capacity is around 1.3 million to 1.4 million containers?

Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr Peter Tinley; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Matt Taylor

---

**Ms S.F. McGurk:** No, it should be 1.2 million, which is what it has always been. Fremantle Port Authority is 1.2 million.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** I know it is between 1.3 million and 1.4 million, but let us just use the member's figure of 1.2 million, which is 500 000 containers more a year than is going through Fremantle port today. Fair enough?

**Ms S.F. McGurk:** Yes.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** Yet the member for Fremantle does not want us to spend anything on infrastructure to get those trucks off the local roads out of Fremantle.

Several members interjected.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** The member for Fremantle, her leader and the member for Willagee have just said this is the worst project, it is not worth doing, and it should be stopped and shifted towards the outer harbour.

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Minister, you did invite an interjection from the member for Fremantle, but not from other members. If you could direct your comments through the Chair so that we cannot have interjections across the chamber.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** I am just looking at the logic of their arguments and trying to understand what message they are actually sending. They are saying this project is a waste of time, but they acknowledge that another 500 000 containers—I believe it is more—need to come through Fremantle, and they do not want anything done to the existing infrastructure of roads to get those containers through to Kewdale and wherever they need to go.

Several members interjected.

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

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** I believe this project is critically important for the future expansion of Fremantle harbour.

I also acknowledge in this place that we need to do long-term planning around the outer harbour. I have no qualms about that. But I understand exactly where we are at today. The connection of Roe 8 through to Stock Road is going to cater towards that, because it is a gazetted six-lane reserve road all the way through to Latitude 32.

Comments were made about the Premier and me being on different planets or something because of the comments we have made. I quote the Premier —

Premier Colin Barnett said ... that the route had not yet been finalised and criticised Main Roads for sending the letters.

“I don't think that was handled well,” he said.

“There remains to be seen how many residents will be affected and the transport minister's also looking at the option of actually tunnelling it.

That is a quote from *BusinessNews Western Australia*.

We are working through this. When I came in, it was automatically thought that if we combined this as one project, Stock Road really would be the only change, and that has mostly commercial properties. Of the 77 properties, 35 are commercial properties and 42 are residential properties—I think I have them the right way around. Stock Road was added to it. I was not comfortable with it for a number of reasons, one of which was the impact on residential houses and commercial properties down there. I felt it was a less-than-efficient means. We had a reserve that was set aside to move freight to continue on down Roe 9. Because Labor sold that area, that has made it very difficult.

**Ms S.F. McGurk** interjected.

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

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** The majority of that reserve is still there. An article some months ago in *The Sunday Times* reported that we may be considering a tunnelling option and an article in the *Fremantle Herald* picked up on the trucks that were doing geotechnical surveys down the old corridor because we wanted to look at whether and how it could be done, and we wanted to provide information to the proponents so that they could cost it.

All sorts of assertions have been made by members opposite that just do not make a lot of sense. I do not know where they are coming from. They talk about the need to go to the outer harbour, but not spend one cent on this infrastructure while acknowledging that an increase of 500 000 containers will come through, and that is going to travel along existing congested roads and compete with the local traffic. I think it makes sense.

Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr Peter Tinley; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Matt Taylor

---

I have admitted for some time—I have been talking to my federal colleagues again—that there are too many projects in this state that we have tackled in various governments that sometimes fall over when we get to that last mile. I have identified that, and I have been in discussions with the federal government to see how we can deal with that. I will be in Sydney over the next two days with other transport ministers from around the country. I am meeting with Hon Jamie Briggs to further discuss this specific issue. We are looking at it, and I will provide more details as we advance discussions.

Comments were also made about toll roads and freight charges and the like. I made something very clear when I started to consider this as an opportunity and began discussions with the federal government. The federal government offered \$925 million on the basis that we establish a freight charge. I told the Premier at that time that I would only consider that only if we could create a win-win for industry. What I meant by that is that the productivity gains that the trucking industry experiences by the creation, development or construction of this freeway outweighs the toll charge. We need to understand the economic benefits that are derived specifically for the industry from not having to stop at lights. There are three areas here. A lot of petrol is used just at the stop lights; a lot of the fumes and the diesel emissions are a result of acceleration from the traffic lights. Not having to stop at lights saves around eight minutes and 45 seconds on an absolute freeway through to Kewdale. We know that time and fuel is saved and that therefore saves on maintenance, particularly for the brakes on heavy rigs. We have been working through these models to ensure that we can deliver something that is economically beneficial for the industry. We want to utilise some of that benefit—not all of it—to help fund this project to get these trucks off the road. The member argued against progressing with Perth Freight Link on the basis that it should go to the other harbour while acknowledging that another 500 000 containers will come through that harbour. The member said she would not do anything in that area.

Several members interjected.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** The member said she wanted all the money shifted and this project was a waste of time, and so did the Leader of the Opposition, who said it needed to go in the outer harbour, and to the infrastructure in the south. That is where I got confused. I wanted to know whether members opposite were planning to shut Fremantle port and shift totally to the outer harbour, because that is what sounded like to me. That is what I was trying to understand.

Several members interjected.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** We are working through the options. Although the Labor government is making all this noise now about supporting the Palmyra residents, where was Labor when it sold the land from that reserve? Where were members opposite when Alannah did that deal with Jim McGinty? They were nowhere; absolutely missing in action. Members opposite talk about their care and concern for the residents. The member for Willagee has not approached my office and I have not heard from the Leader of the Opposition to ask for any information or even to have a discussion.

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member for Warnbro! Members!

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** I have a meeting with residents to discuss what is going on and what we are trying to achieve. I am trying my best to fix a classic blunder by the Labor Party from when it was previously in government.

**Mr W.J. Johnston** interjected.

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

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** With the amount of container traffic that has to come through Fremantle port, we need to do something to get these trucks off the road. Members opposite commented on Roe 8 being a road to nowhere. Constructing this road has social, economic and environmental benefits.

Several members interjected.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** I would love to hear the member for Gosnells get up and support this.

**Mr C.J. Tallentire** interjected.

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

*Point of Order*

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** I know the minister is at the limits of his capacity —

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr P. Abetz):** That is not a point of order. Please resume your seat.

Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr Peter Tinley; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker;  
Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Matt Taylor

---

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** I was just making the point: I understand that he is at the limit of his capacity but when he asks for an interjection, it is unreasonable for him to then object to getting that interjection.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** He did not ask for an interjection.

Several members interjected.

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** If I could assist you —

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member, I am on my feet. The member said that he was interested to hear from the member for Gosnells, or for him to get on his feet; in other words, to make a contribution.

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Members, I am on my feet! Member for West Swan, I call you for the second time. The minister invited the member for Gosnells to make a contribution to the debate. That is how I understood it, and that is the way that the minister intended it. We look forward to the contribution from the member for Gosnells to the debate.

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Members, I am on my feet.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** The member for Cannington is questioning my capacity —

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Members! Member for West Swan, I call you again. You are now called for the third time. All points of order are to be heard in silence.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** I think he could show members in this house a little bit more respect by not being so derogatory.

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** That is not a point of order.

**Mr D.A. Templeman** interjected.

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

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** I ask you to direct the minister to make his comments through the Chair, as he is required to do by the standing orders. It would then make it easier, for example, if he wanted the member for Gosnells to get up after he speaks —

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member, that is not a point of order.

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** He would then say that he would invite the member to get up. I ask you to request that the minister comply with the standing orders and make his address to the Chair.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** That is not a point of order because the minister clearly stated that he invited a contribution from the member for Gosnells to the debate.

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** I thought that the member for Gosnells got to say what he wanted to say.

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** That is not a point of order.

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** I do not believe you have called the member for Gosnells.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** That is not a point of order.

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** My point of order is simply that irrespective of the exact words used by the minister, the fact of the matter was that he was goading the member for Gosnells; he was being provocative in his remarks, he was soliciting a response and he got a response. That is the way debate works in this house.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member, that is not a point of order.

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** I have not finished my point of order, so you do not know it yet. The fact of the matter is that the minister was asking for a response. When ministers or members on their feet do not want a response, they address their remarks to the Chair and they do not make provocative comments directly to a member.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** That is not a point of order. I have already addressed that matter. I will not take that as a point of order.

Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr Peter Tinley; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Matt Taylor

---

*Debate Resumed*

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** As I said, there are environmental, social and economic benefits in undertaking this project. It has a very strong benefit–cost ratio for the state. In fact, for every dollar that is spent on it, it will return around \$2.50 across the entire project.

Several members interjected.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** I want to touch on the environmental aspect. I have said before in this house that we are taking all these things very seriously. It has gone through an Environmental Protection Authority process and, as such, we are required to purchase a Bush Forever offset of 470 hectares. We have redirected the route on Roe 8 to minimise the impact on the wetlands. About six hectares have been affected.

**Mr C.J. Tallentire** interjected.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** We have asked the proponents about it and Main Roads Western Australia is providing instructions for engineering on lifting the road off the wetlands. We are working hard to have as minimal impact as we can on those wetlands. From an environmental perspective, creating this freeway system—we often refer to 2031—will remove 450 000 tonnes of carbon emissions. Environmentally, on the basis that we will be purchasing another 470 hectares of coastal plains to be a Bush Forever site, we know that we are making a serious contribution to this state.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Members, there are too many conversations taking place.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** In terms of social benefits, the long-term planning of this city always allowed for the construction of major hospitals between South Street and Roe Street. We know that South Street cannot cope with the demand of the traffic going through there. We know that the Murdoch precinct will have to cope on a daily basis with up to 35 000 workers and 115 000 visitors. We know that the corner of South Street and Murdoch Drive cannot cope with that level of traffic. The hospital was planned to be there because it was always going to be at the junction of two major arterials roads; it was set up that way for decades. In providing people with more access to those hospitals, we can create a northern entrance into the back of Fiona Stanley Hospital, and we can also provide to the people from Palmyra down to Fremantle more timely access to the best and biggest hospital in the state. When this is combined with taking trucks off Leach Highway, which carries many passenger commuters, we know that we are being socially responsible. The route was planned a long time ago. I have said in this place for a long time that I have not been comfortable with that route, and the moment we announced that we were going to do the Perth Freight Link, I have been talking about wanting to explore other options. We have gone out to tender with three proponents that we have instructed to take an innovative approach and explore the use of tunnels. Some of the tunnel options are still to be worked out. We are not talking about tunnelling under the existing route but potentially tunnelling under the old reserve and the houses that have been built over the top of that reserve. We are looking at a number of ways to alleviate —

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr P. Abetz):** Members, there are too many conversations going on. Can you please take them outside.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** Our desire is to create a world-class public transport system. I can assure members that we take the development of the outer harbour very seriously. We take the whole issue and impact upon people and small businesses along Stock Road, High Street and Leach Highway very seriously. I apologise for the type of communication that went out. As the minister I have to take responsibility for that, but I will meet with residents and talk them through the issues. When we made the announcement, Troy Buswell, who was the minister at the time, said that we may be able to build a tunnel all the way from Bayswater. He was laughed at by members on the other side and he was laughed at in the papers. Some people said that that would cost 10 times as much compared with building a railway over land. The tunnel option ended up being cheaper than the solution that Labor took to the last election, which actually did not get to the airport. The tunnel option was cheaper than the route that the Liberal Party took to the election. It could be said that we have broken a promise because we have changed the route, but we have found and delivered a far better outcome for communities in the eastern suburbs.

**Mr P. Papalia** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member for Warnbro, I call you for the second time.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** I use that point for the member for Warnbro to highlight that there was a lot of consternation —

**Mr P. Papalia** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Sorry, member for Warnbro; that call to order was for the first time.

Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr Peter Tinley; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Matt Taylor

---

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** I use that point about the Forrestfield–Airport Link project because there was a lot of criticism at the time that Troy Buswell was misleading people and it was a joke. We have been able to deliver a tunnel solution and I want that fully explored because, if we can do that, it will deliver a far better outcome for the community of Western Australia. I cannot put my hand on my heart today and say that that will be the outcome. I still say it is a crying shame that any reserve land that has been set aside, particularly for freight movement, gets sold off for residential purposes. That is a disgrace.

**Ms S.F. McGurk** interjected.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** The member for Fremantle wants to claim that we are better off spending the money elsewhere, yet she acknowledges that a minimum additional 500 000 containers will come through the port of Fremantle and she does not have a solution on how to cope with that. Members opposite talk about the last mile and how the traffic will be jammed up on Stirling Bridge, but they do not have a solution. They will not spend anything on a solution. They will spend it on the southern corridor but still keep the Fremantle port open. It is illogical —

**Mr P.C. Tinley:** Who said that?

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** The Leader of the Opposition said that.

**Mr P.C. Tinley** interjected.

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

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** Mr Acting Speaker —

**Ms S.F. McGurk:** You're desperate because you look like a fool.

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

*Point of Order*

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** I think that being referred to as a fool —

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr P. Abetz):** I think we have said that that is not an acceptable term. I ask the member to restrain herself. Let us move on.

*Debate Resumed*

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** We are laying down the foundations. We took over this state when members opposite claimed to have all these surpluses. The city was growing rapidly but they were not doing a thing. We came into government and found a city that was locked up, so we had to react. Now we are starting to lay down the foundations for the future. Members will see, and I have talked about it often in this house, a plan for not just 2.7 million people in 2031, but for 3.5 million people or five million people. We cannot build only public transport infrastructure because this is not just about moving people; we also need a freight network plan. We need to understand how people move around because we have tradesmen, retailers and freight that needs to move by road. We are committed to this plan. We have also talked about the desire to lift the freight movement to 30 per cent on rail, but as I shared in this house the other day —

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Members, there are too many conversations in the chamber. Please take them outside.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** We have had conversations with international rail corporations that have asked what our goals are. We have spent money in the last two years on increasing the spur line at the port. We have spent money on overtaking lanes to get greater capacity through that rail line. We mentioned the 30 per cent to them and they said that if we can get to 30 per cent, we would be working at world's best practice. I said to the Leader of the Opposition that that implies that 70 per cent of the containers coming through the port would still need to move by road if we were at world's best practice. We are developing plans but we cannot wait for those plans. We have to lay the foundations today, but we are also developing plans for the long term. We have reacted to the situation we found when we came into government and we are laying down plans to build infrastructure that will set up this city for decades to come.

**MR F.M. LOGAN (Cockburn)** [5.17 pm]: I am lucky enough to have been in this chamber for a significant amount of time and to have listened to the debate about Roe Highway stage 8, not the Perth Freight Link, and all this rubbish that has been previously put up by the Minister for Transport. He puts it up thinking that it is novel and that he is the font of all information and this is the first time this chamber has ever heard the information. We have had weeks and weeks of debate in this chamber about Roe Highway stage 8. The only issue that I take up

Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr Peter Tinley; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Matt Taylor

---

with the Liberal government is this: who the hell do you think you are? The government has come into this chamber and said that somehow Labor in government does not have a right to change plans. What does the government think this is—North Korea?

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

**Mr F.M. LOGAN:** Does the minister think that the Stephenson plan that was put in place for 50 years is there forever and that no government can change it? Does he think that no government can change its mind about transport routes, particularly the Stephenson highway, which, I might add, is 50 years out of date? Remember when people criticised the Stephenson plan? They criticised it because it would turn Perth into Los Angeles. It was a plan that was determined only about road transport. That is what the Stephenson plan was about and that is why it has been criticised and modified over the years.

Who the hell does the minister think he is? Does he think that only the Liberal Party in government has the right to build roads? When Labor is in government, why can we not say, "That plan is out of date. We are going to cancel roads. We are going to change roads?"

Several members interjected.

**Mr F.M. LOGAN:** Does the minister think we cannot do that?

**Dr M.D. Nahan:** You did a grubby deal.

**Mr F.M. LOGAN:** Who the hell does the minister think —

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Members on this side, I ask you to exercise restraint in the same way that I asked that of this side of the chamber before.

*Withdrawal of Remark*

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** The Treasurer called out at the member for Cockburn, "You did a grubby deal." I would ask him to withdraw that.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr P. Abetz):** I did not hear it so let us just move on.

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** Mr Acting Speaker, that is not the question I asked. I did not ask whether you heard it. I pointed out to you that that is what the Treasurer said. I am asking the Treasurer to withdraw that comment.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** Labor did a grubby deal to shut down its Fremantle eastern bypass.

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** That is not what the minister said.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Minister, that is not appropriate. You do not have the floor. The point of order is that the words "a grubby deal" are not acceptable.

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** No, that is not what was said. The minister looked at the member for Cockburn and said, "You did a grubby deal." He needs to withdraw that accusation against the member for Cockburn.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** I have been advised that the term "grubby deal" has been used on many occasions in this chamber. But for the sake of moving on, perhaps the minister might wish to withdraw if he wishes to.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** I wish to clarify: Labor did a grubby deal.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Move on, thank you.

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** Mr Acting Speaker, I draw your attention to the fact that the minister misled the house when he stood up, in defence of himself, and did not say that the member for Cockburn had done a grubby deal. He changed his commentary to "Labor did a grubby deal". I would ask you to refer that matter to the Speaker because that appears to have been a deliberate attempt to mislead the house. I would ask you to refer that matter to the Speaker.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** There is no point of order.

**Mr P.B. Watson** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member for Albany, you have no right to criticise the Speaker in this chamber except by substantive motion. I call you —

**Mr P.B. Watson:** Just wait for that.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member for Albany, I call you for the second time.

**Mr P.B. Watson** interjected.

Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr Peter Tinley; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Matt Taylor

---

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member for Albany, you just said “disgrace” again. I call you for the third time. It is not acceptable.

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** Mr Acting Speaker, can you explain to the house why “grubby deal” is parliamentary and why “disgrace” is unparliamentary because I have heard people use the word “disgrace” lots of times?

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member for Midland, I think you have been in this chamber long enough to know that when the Speaker makes a ruling, for any member to criticise the Speaker’s ruling is unacceptable, no matter what terminology you use.

*Debate Resumed*

**Mr F.M. LOGAN:** As I was saying, who the hell do members of the Liberal Party think they are? What a pompous arrogant bunch they are. Their view of the world is that the Stephenson plan, which was devised during their term of government in the 1960s, is the only plan that counts and it should never be changed unless they choose to change it. For example, the bridge between Stock Road and Dalkeith, which is part of the ring road, will not be built. The government will not build that because that would affect its own support base. But when a road goes through a wetland in a marginal seat, it wants to put a road straight through that. What reason should it give? It is the Stephenson plan and everybody must stick to it! We made it very clear during the Carpenter–Gallop government that we do not agree with that plan. We believe that it is 50 years out of date. We will cancel the Fremantle eastern bypass. That was our election commitment. In government we did it and what criticism do we get from the Minister for Transport? He asked why we did not go and tell the people of Palmyra. We did, and they voted Labor to support that very action.

If the minister wanted to talk about the Stephenson plan and how it all should be carried out, he should remember that the Stephenson plan does not finish at the freight link, Roe Highway stage 8, along Stock Road and go north. It continues all the way down to Hampton Road. Then it goes down Marine Terrace and smashes its way straight through the Western Australian Museum, right out to South Mole. Then there is a swing bridge and it continues up West Coast Highway. West Coast Highway is supposed to be a dual carriageway because the ring road was supposed to go right through the edge of Fremantle, smash its way through the existing part of Fremantle, over the river at the end of the harbour and straight up West Coast Highway. That is the Stephenson plan. The minister should look at it. Is he going to put that into place as well? No, he could not do that. That is probably just a little too far. But the government will build the Perth Freight Link. Why does the government want to build the Perth Freight Link? Because it is afraid of doing what it should have always done—that was raised over and again in debate in this house—and that is to upgrade Leach Highway. Leach Highway is the direct link between Kenwick and the port of Fremantle. It is a six-lane highway. It was built for trucks. If we ask any of the operators of trucks why they use Leach Highway, as they continue to do without being fined, as the member for Cannington already said in this house, even though they are not supposed to, it is because it is the quickest route between Kenwick and Fremantle. Why was it never upgraded and sound barriers put in place? Because the Liberal Party wanted to look after those Liberal areas and its mate Russell Aubrey, the mayor of the City of Melville. That is why it wants to shift all the trucks from Leach Highway and put them on a freight link.

The minister talked about alternatives. Earlier in debate, he talked about rail and how we simply could not put more container traffic on rail. I do not know where the minister has been but the number of containers going into the port of Fremantle by rail has declined since the Liberal government came to power. It is not a question of not being able to put containers on rail; of course we can. There are plenty of spots to put containers on rail. The rail link goes straight from Midland to Kenwick and directly into the port. The bridge and the rail line have been upgraded. An intermodal container transfer system has been put in place at the port of Fremantle. Is it used properly? No, it is not used properly. How many thousands of containers could be taken off the roads if that rail line is used properly?

**Mr M.H. Taylor:** A maximum of 30 per cent.

**Mr F.M. LOGAN:** We are not even anywhere near 30 per cent at the moment. That figure has declined since the Liberal Party came to power.

Let us look at the arguments put up by the Minister for Transport about the outer harbour. I do not know whether you remember, Mr Acting Speaker (Mr P. Abetz), but I know that the Leader of the Opposition knows about the deals done on the outer harbour at the end of the Court government. The Liberal Court government, of which the Premier was a member, wanted to have a private port at Kwinana. So, before it lost office in 2001, it did a deal with the Buckeridge Group of Companies, and another group that was a joint venture player with the Buckeridge group, to secure waterfront land in Kwinana for \$10 a square metre—\$10 a square metre for waterfront land! Did the Buckeridge group ever move ahead and build its port? No, it did not. It was locked in debate and dispute with the Labor governments over that whole period. Now I believe, Premier, that the Buckeridge group is in

Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr Peter Tinley; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Matt Taylor

---

negotiation with the government seeking a payout so that it can get out of that holding of waterfront land. I bet it is asking for more than \$10 a square metre. I bet it does not sell it back to the government at \$10 a square metre!

When the minister talks about the careful and environmentally sensitive way in which it will deal with the wetlands in Beeliar, and how it will be very careful about the bridging, or however it is going to do the freeway through the wetlands, it seems to have overlooked the fact that on two occasions, the Environmental Protection Authority rejected that road being built through those Ramsar-listed wetlands. That was on two occasions. But on the third occasion, now that the Liberal–Nationals are back in government, their political heavy influence on the EPA, by the minister, has ensured that the right outcome has come out of the EPA to allow this road to go ahead. That is the only reason why the government is doing it. It is because it got the right outcome from the EPA third time lucky. Unbelievable!

Labor has always opposed the extension of Roe Highway stage 8, whether it is called the Perth Freight Link or not. It has always opposed that. It is a road to nowhere. It is one of the worst possible options for Western Australia, even though the minister talks about the increase in the number of trucks that are on the roads. I have just one idea for the minister. Put one or two crane lifters in Bunbury harbour, and that will take 28 000 containers off the roads. We could prevent 28 000 containers every year from having to come from the south west into Fremantle harbour just by allowing a private company to put one container lifter in Bunbury harbour. There is an idea! But of course that is all too much for you guys, because the main objective is not to think outside the box. The government's main objective is to continue with its North Korean–style plan of 50 years ago, which is the Stephenson plan and the Stephenson highway—“We want to ram it through and we want to ram it through only in those areas that we choose.”

**Mr C.J. Barnett:** Yes, comrade!

**Mr F.M. LOGAN:** It is! That is exactly what it is, Premier! It is like dealing with North Korea—“We have a plan, and we are going to implement it come hell or high water.” It is crazy. It is massively expensive, it will not deliver the outcomes that are expected and it is an environmental blight on Western Australia.

**DR M.D. NAHAN (Riverton — Treasurer)** [5.34 pm]: This has been one of the most longstanding debates in the south of the river area, going on for over 15 years or more. It deals with many very important issues. The Perth Freight Link is just the latest, very good plan to address them all. First, it tries to address what we can do about the flow of trucks all the way through the city. Part of the Perth Freight Link—I do not think this is controversial—is to try to remove all the stoplights for truck movements coming from the east and the north through the city and through Kewdale to the port. That is a good idea on all bases—it saves costs, it saves pollution and it saves wear and tear on trucks. It is a good idea. Hopefully, it is not controversial, but we never know.

The second issue it tries to deal with is Roe 8. Yes, there was a plan. Western Australia and Perth has one of the most extensive planning processes—not only in Stephenson, but beyond that—of any city in the world, and when we have a plan, we try to adhere to it. We deviate from it carefully and for good reason. So, Roe 8, yes, there was a plan to have a highway—a ring-road—going through to Cottesloe and north. But this one was particularly going to the port, and this is what we are trying to avoid.

Why are we trying to do Roe 8? First, we have had this land gazetted for a long time, for a major road called Roe Highway. We built seven stages of it.

Several members interjected.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** Roe 7 was completed.

Several members interjected.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** By the state.

Several members interjected.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** By the state and the commonwealth.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Members! Settle down; the Treasurer has the floor.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** It was a long planned ring-road and we, the state, bought land to locate Fiona Stanley Hospital where it is built now, specifically because it was at the intersection of Kwinana Freeway and the eventual Roe Highway. We also built a very large complex that I hear 30 000 people are going to work at in one year.

**Dr A.D. Buti:** Not we—the state.

Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr Peter Tinley; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Matt Taylor

---

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** We built—collectively—the hospital, we built it for a reason and we located it at that place because Roe Highway was going to extend past Kwinana Freeway and Roe 8 was to be built. Is it controversial to have proper access to a hospital? I do not think so. When we came into government in 2008, we had a commitment to examine and, if possible, build Roe 8. We undertook the most extensive planning process for a road in this state's history. We spent nigh on \$25 million examining every possibility, and the Environmental Protection Authority approved it. I heard someone opposite say that the EPA has reviewed it before and has knocked it back twice. It has never done that. The EPA was asked by Hon Alannah MacTiernan to give its view on whether or not it would be passed, and the EPA said it would be difficult. It did not assess the data and it did not undertake a full review; she did not want to. Anyway, we have undertaken—the state, the EPA—the most extensive review of Roe 8. In fact, people opposite have repeatedly criticised us for the extent of the money that we spent on it. We did it. It was designed, and we looked at whether we could do it in an environmentally appropriate manner—offsets, all done—and it got the tick. It is a needed road.

Then the issue came up of how we can fund it. I have been criticised. In fact, I have just looked at the opposition's BrokenPromises website, and it has on it, "Failed to build Roe 8". So, it is criticising us. In the last election campaign I was criticised by the Labor candidate and the Labor Party for not building Roe 8. We were committed to it, and we pursued it, appropriately, and we also said that we would do it if it got environmental approval, which it has, and if we could get commonwealth funding, which we have. So, it is a longstanding road built into the planning of a major hospital. It has environmental approval and we have funding for it mostly from the commonwealth, and members opposite are saying do not build it. Why? It goes back in history, of course, to the Fremantle eastern bypass. Members claim to be principled in that action but that was a grubby deal. Members opposite did not do away with the Fremantle eastern bypass for a planning rule or to do away with cars so the area did not end up like Los Angeles. Members opposite did a grubby political deal for their own reasons. They excised the land and sold it for \$8 million. Someone made a pile out of that. I wonder who. They did a grubby deal and that is the source of the problem. People in Palmyra have to know why their houses are under threat. It is because the Labor Party excised the appropriate land from the road reserve. That is what is wrong.

**Mr P. Papalia** interjected.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** The Labor Party excised the land. It was an extensive debate.

**Mr C.J. Barnett:** It was a political decision. I was here at the time.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** Yes; it was a political decision—nothing to do with planning or good ideas. It was a grubby deal in Fremantle.

**Mr P. Papalia** interjected.

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

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** The issue is, after Roe 8, since we do not have the Fremantle eastern bypass, where do we go? Even if we do not build Roe 8, how do the trucks, whether they come down South Street or Leach Highway, get into the port—and the number is increasing? Alannah MacTiernan looked at this. She was against Roe 8 but she knew she had a problem. The roads, whether they be South Street or Leach Highway, were getting congested, particularly Stock Road. Something needed to be done, so Alannah MacTiernan went to the commonwealth government and got a large amount of funding—I cannot remember exactly how much—of between \$100 million and \$200 million to upgrade Stock Road and High Road into the port. In other words, even if we did not, members opposite would have the very same problem regardless of whether we built Roe 8 because they had to use Stock Road and expand either Leach Highway or High Road. The trucks have to get to the port and the existing facilities are inadequate, so what do we do? The cause of that is the Labor Party's decision to excise the Fremantle eastern bypass. The problem lies with members opposite. The solution is difficult. No matter how we do it, we must confront this. Is the option to do nothing? No. The Minister for Transport made it quite clear; the 500 000 containers are going to expand substantially in numbers. Even if 30 per cent of freight is carted on rail, which is very difficult because the good burghers of Fremantle complain about the length of the trains and the vibrations they cause—there are problems with that—there will be a substantial expansion in the number of containers to the port and existing facilities are inadequate. Members opposite cannot just say take all the money and stick it somewhere else, because the port's operations will expand, and it will be there for decades. So what do we do? Members opposite have no options.

**Mr D.C. Nalder:** No plans.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** Yes. They will only say take this money and do not affect our electorates. Let us be honest about this. This is all about shifting trucks and the problems on roads from Labor areas to Liberal areas. The problem is that when Labor members did away with the Fremantle eastern bypass, they did not have an option; trucks had to go through certain areas because the port of Fremantle is in the Labor area. They mucked up and this is the consequence and the people of Palmyra must know about this. They have to know that this is the

Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr Peter Tinley; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Matt Taylor

---

consequence of a grubby political deal, which was a serious mistake around one of the most important issues, and that was to get truck traffic into Fremantle.

I would like to make a couple of comments about the port of Fremantle, which we are looking to offer a 49-year lease for. The Leader of the Opposition commented about rates at the port of Melbourne going up. Twittering is dangerous and glibly reading emails on the internet is just as dangerous. The fact is that the port of Melbourne has not been sold. The stevedores that operate at the port of Melbourne have asked for an increase in its charges of 750 per cent. The port has not been sold; it is not officially on the market yet. If a 750 per cent increase has been offered, it will have been done by a Labor government, not by privatisation. I might add that any proposed increases at the port of Melbourne will have to go through the regulatory structure. Under competition law, the Essential Services Commission is required to assess whether increases are competitive or anticompetitive, so there is a check there. This whole argument about selling monopolies and using Melbourne as an example illustrates that the Leader of the Opposition has no clue about what he is doing or saying—none. He is just gassing. We are going through history and trying to address the building of a major truck traffic thoroughfare to meet transport needs to a hospital, the Kwinana outer port and the port of Fremantle. It is something that we cannot avoid. We wish it could go somewhere else but it cannot. Some people might complain about the wetlands, but we have addressed them through the environmental approach. However, the people of Palmyra should realise that their houses will be potentially impacted—they might not if the minister can find an alternative route—because a decade or so ago, Labor did a grubby deal to do away with the Fremantle eastern bypass. When governments do deals like that, they come back to haunt them, maybe not the people who made the deal, but those who are impacted by it. I think, as a Parliament, we should apologise to the people of Palmyra for the decisions of the previous Labor government, which, in a grubby deal, undermined an essential transport link to the Fremantle area.

**MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan)** [5.46 pm]: I want to make a couple of points in the time we have left. We again saw the Treasurer take no responsibility—a Treasurer who has nearly bankrupted the state and seen grubby deal after grubby deal whether it be the Pelago apartments or the Allia Venue Management at nib Stadium—grubby deal after grubby deal. He takes no responsibility.

**Mr C.J. Barnett** interjected.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** The Premier can stand up too, if he wants. The Treasurer takes no responsibility. He has come in here and made accusations. We heard that it is okay for a Liberal Party to change plans to delete roads through Dalkeith, but it is not okay for Labor to change plans. Members opposite said that Labor did nothing. I will quote the now Governor of Western Australia when she commented on what we did about getting trucks off roads and more freight on rail —

Fremantle Ports CEO Kerry Sanderson said the increased use of rail for transporting containers to and from Fremantle Inner Harbour was a gain for both port efficiency and for the environment.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Members, keep your conversations down please.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** It continues —

The increase from around 2% of containers by rail in 2002 to the current share of about 14.5% is very encouraging,” she said.

“The more containers that are transported by rail, the fewer trucks will be on the road, thereby reducing traffic congestion and truck noise in the community.”

She said that currently over a week there were on average three train movements a day, with more on weekdays and fewer on weekends.

Kerry Sanderson said the 2002 Metropolitan Freight Network Review target was to move 30% of containers by rail, instead of by road by 2012–13.

Under this Liberal government, nothing has happened about planning for rail, and that is why we have a problem on our roads. The government should take responsibility for it. Members opposite have been in government for seven years. If the Perth Freight Link was such a good idea, they would have built it already. If it was such a good idea, the Court government would have built it. The only reason the government is planning to build it is because Tony Abbott told it to. During the 2013 election, this was not the key promise. Metro Area Express was meant to be delivered by 2018, but it has been cancelled. Airport rail was meant to be delivered by 2018, but it has been cancelled. This project has leapfrogged those other two core election promises. We see chaotic transport planning again and again. The government promised two transport projects. It is not delivering them, as promised, and now it is leapfrogging them with this proposal. Time and again the Premier said that it was not a

Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr Peter Tinley; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Matt Taylor

---

priority to build this road; it was not to be delivered in the Premier's first term of government. Now the government is bulldozing people's homes and saying that contracts will be let by the end of this year.

Then there was the way this was communicated to Palmyra residents. While the Minister for Transport was having a photo opportunity in a call centre in Wanneroo, ringing people and telling them how to catch a bus, the government was sending letters to people saying that their houses were probably going to be demolished. While the minister has a photo opportunity telephoning residents in Wanneroo about what bus route is the best way to get into the city, the government is sending letters to people destroying their lives. Then the government comes in here and blames Labor. The government must take responsibility.

Time and again we have seen chaotic transport planning. This was not a core election promise. I went through the election costings, and it was not there. The government made two promises in transport that it is not delivering, and now, because Tony Abbott told it to, it is doing this project. It does not make sense, for all the reasons outlined by my colleagues, particularly the issue about port capacity and the need for further port facilities in the future. The government must take responsibility, but it is making it up as it goes along. Last week the minister did not even know what route the road will be taking. He was saying that it would be issuing contracts by the end of the year, and he does not know the route. Again and again, it is chaotic, dysfunctional government putting taxpayers at risk. However, in this case, it is impacting the lives of families, who were sitting there minding their own business until this letter arrived, because the government does not have the ability to communicate properly with those people.

**MR W.J. JOHNSTON (Cannington)** [5.52 pm]: This government reminds me of that TV program *The Games*. Remember the 100-metre track? The question was asked about how long the track was, and the reply was that it was about 100 metres long. This is a road to the port; where does it go? It goes near the port. It is not a road to the port. It is a ridiculous idea. The government is saying that it is delivering a freeway to the port. No, it is not; it is delivering a freeway to a set of traffic lights. How many trucks will be lined up behind those traffic lights? How long will it go? Will it be two kilometres of trucks parked at the traffic lights? Will it be three kilometres of trucks parked at the traffic lights? The government's plan is to deliver trucks to a set of traffic lights. That is the government's amazing plan to solve all these environmental issues: "We do not want trucks waiting at traffic lights, but we want them in a queue two kilometres long sitting at the traffic lights at Stirling Bridge." That is a great plan.

I remind everybody that even if this road was built, the shortest route between Kewdale and the port will still be Leach Highway. Trucks are supposed to be banned on Leach Highway today, yet not a single infringement notice has been issued. When I sit at the Manning Road and Leach Highway traffic lights watching trucks go back and forth to the port, I realise that not one minister in this government has done anything to enforce the law that bans those trucks. The Minister for Transport talks about all the trucks using South Street. This government banned the trucks on South Street. It was not the Labor government; the current Liberal government banned trucks using South Street west of the freeway. Minister, go and solve the problem of the trucks on South Street.

This is not about transport planning. This is a shambles. I remind members that Fremantle port is not in a Labor electorate. It is in the Premier's electorate—a Liberal electorate. If the government had any interest in getting trucks into and out of the port, it would build the Stephenson highway right through the middle of the Karrinyup golf course, around the lake and up to the freeway. That is the only way to get trucks on a freeway to the port of Fremantle. This is a plan to get trucks to traffic lights on Stirling Highway. That is the plan of the government—not a plan to get to the port, but a plan to get to traffic lights, so that the member for Riverton can go along and say that we are building this and it will get trucks off Leach Highway. It will not get trucks off Leach Highway, because the trucks that will be stuck at the traffic lights will see Leach Highway and realise that it is quicker to go down Leach Highway to get to Kewdale than to go round the freeway.

I will finish on the issue of the audacity of the government to claim that it built Roe Highway stages 6 and 7. What an embarrassment. Martin Whitely, the former member for Roleystone, won that seat because the Liberal Party did nothing about getting trucks off William Street, which is now in my electorate, in the suburb of Beckenham. The government was happy with years and years of having big trucks belting down a suburban street with houses, schools and shops on either side—it was truck after truck—and never built the highway. Only Labor does transport planning and integrated work. We have an integrated plan to solve transport problems by getting trucks off the highway. We are the only ones doing it. We will not build a freeway to a set of traffic lights. That is the most stupid thing ever suggested. Imagine that—\$1.8 billion to build a road to a set of traffic lights, and the government calls it a plan; it is an embarrassment.

**MR M.H. TAYLOR (Bateman)** [5.56 pm]: It is nice to have an opportunity to represent the desires of the electorate of Bateman on an important issue in the electorate. At the 2013 election, the construction of Roe Highway was the single biggest issue levelled at me through a survey.

Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr Peter Tinley; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker;  
Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Matt Taylor

---

**Ms R. Saffioti:** You didn't promise it.

**Mr M.H. TAYLOR:** We absolutely promised it.

I even had Labor people contacting me saying that they were voting for me because they wanted the construction of Roe Highway. I want to draw attention to some of the hypocrisy that is being levelled here today. I just cannot believe that the member for Willagee would say that Fremantle would become “a complete mud heap” if the Perth Freight Link were built. What a ridiculous statement. He said that it would drive a wedge between communities the likes of which has never been seen before. What sort of commentary is that about an important public debate? The one that really gets me is the “pleasure of noise pollution”, as the member for Willagee described it. Essentially, this is a “not in my backyard” issue. It all comes to a head when we remove the rubbish debate that has been brought by the opposition.

If the member for Willagee is so concerned about the residents of Coolbellup who bought houses, no doubt after 1955, right next to a dedicated freight route road reserve, why is he not representing his constituents on Leach Highway who live six metres away from trucks that stop and start up and down big hills on Leach Highway? They put out more pollution than they would if they were on a dedicated non-stop freight route, particularly between Kwinana Freeway and the port. I might add that it saves nine and a half minutes from Kwinana Freeway, and also represents \$8.15 in productivity savings. It is ridiculous that the opposition says that the trucks will not use that dedicated freight route. I live in the area, and I have seen trucks go down Marmion Street. They do not even use Leach Highway, because that is too congested. It might be the best route geographically—I am not sure; I have not looked into that—but when there are so many sets of traffic lights, there is no way trucks will use Leach Highway when they have the dedicated freight route. The whole argument is ridiculous.

I went for a tour of the site with the Premier. We were invited by somebody who wanted to show us the site. We went in there and had a great look. We were told that the road reserve would absolutely destroy the wetland.

I have been asked finish so that the opposition can call a division.

*Division*

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

Ayes (16)

Ms L.L. Baker	Mr D.J. Kelly	Mr P. Papalia	Mr C.J. Tallentire
Dr A.D. Buti	Mr F.M. Logan	Mr J.R. Quigley	Mr P.B. Watson
Ms J.M. Freeman	Mr M. McGowan	Ms M.M. Quirk	Mr B.S. Wyatt
Mr W.J. Johnston	Ms S.F. McGurk	Ms R. Saffioti	Mr D.A. Templeman ( <i>Teller</i> )

Noes (31)

Mr P. Abetz	Ms E. Evangel	Dr G.G. Jacobs	Dr M.D. Nahan
Mr F.A. Alban	Mr J.M. Francis	Mr S.K. L'Estrange	Mr D.C. Nalder
Mr C.J. Barnett	Mrs G.J. Godfrey	Mr R.S. Love	Mr J. Norberger
Mr I.C. Blayney	Mr B.J. Grylls	Mr W.R. Marmion	Mr A.J. Simpson
Mr I.M. Britza	Dr K.D. Hames	Mr J.E. McGrath	Mr M.H. Taylor
Mr M.J. Cowper	Mrs L.M. Harvey	Mr P.T. Miles	Mr T.K. Waldron
Mr J.H.D. Day	Mr C.D. Hatton	Ms A.R. Mitchell	Mr A. Krsticevic ( <i>Teller</i> )
Ms W.M. Duncan	Mr A.P. Jacob	Mr N.W. Morton	

---

Pairs

Ms J. Farrer	Mr G.M. Castrilli
Mr M.P. Murray	Ms M.J. Davies
Mr P.C. Tinley	Mr V.A. Catania
Mr R.H. Cook	Mr R.F. Johnson
Mrs M.H. Roberts	Mr D.T. Redman

Question thus negated.

*Sitting suspended from 6.04 to 7.00 pm*