

**PERTH FREIGHT LINK — GOVERNMENT JUSTIFICATION**

*Matter of Public Interest*

**THE SPEAKER (Mr M.W. Sutherland)** informed the Assembly that he was in receipt within the prescribed time of a letter from the member for West Swan seeking to debate a matter of public interest.

[In compliance with standing orders, at least five members rose in their places.]

**MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan)** [3.13 pm]: I move —

That this house condemns the Liberal–National government for its latest flawed justification for the Perth Freight Link project.

I take us back a couple of weeks to Friday, 22 April when the Western Australian opposition heard that a major transport announcement was to be made on the Saturday. We thought it could be the public transport plan, the one we had been waiting seven and a half years to see, but little did we know that we were about to see the Minister for Transport’s big sell of the Perth Freight Link project—and what a big sell it was. He attempted to sell the most flawed infrastructure project ever thought of in this state.

**Mr D.J. Kelly:** Except for MAX.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Yes, but the government is now saying that the roads are too narrow for the Metro Area Express. It was a big sell. On that weekend we saw report after report seeking to justify this project. Over that weekend the minister reminded me of a snake-oil salesman standing there with his PFL tonic water—the PFL, which would fix all problems. “You have a problem with congestion? That’s okay; PFL tonic water will sort that out.” “You have a problem with road safety? The PFL tonic water will sort it out.” “If you’ve got a problem with your house price and it has stabilised a bit, the PFL will help house prices to increase by 86 per cent.” That is what the minister said. This magical potion was to fix all manner of problems in our transport system. In looking at exactly what the minister was referring to, like Dorothy, we poked behind the curtain, and what did we see? We saw the minister, a typewriter and a Queensland property consultant. Like Toto, who ran behind the curtain, we saw that it was not actually a magical wizard; it was just a man.

**Mr W.J. Johnston:** Some guy with a fax machine.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Exactly. When we peered behind the curtain, there was a minister, a typewriter and a Queensland property consultant who compiled those so-called independent reports. We were very disappointed. We thought that finally there would be some real justification for spending \$2 billion of taxpayers’ money, but all we saw was a smoke-and-mirrors attempt to convince people that this project was any good.

I will go through the two reports released on that weekend. The situation was staggering. We heard that a new report was coming. On the Saturday, we were waiting, ready for *The Weekend West* to be delivered. What did we read? I quote from an article in *The Weekend West* of Saturday, 23 April —

... according to new information to be released today on the state’s most contentious road project, the freight link will benefit all.

I was ready, waiting for this new information. The minister never went out that day, but what did we see? We saw a Main Roads report with a foreword by the minister himself titled “Perth Freight Link Narrative: Revision Six”. It was the government’s own internal document, which contained errors, being sold as a new independent report to justify spending \$2 billion. I will go through it because the more we read it, the more we realise just what a failed attempt occurred on that weekend. Let us go through some key points. It was referred to as a narrative. This independent report resulted from someone in the department or the minister’s office pulling together ideas in an attempt to sell it as an independent report, so here we go —

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

**The SPEAKER:** Minister!

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** It states that the Perth Freight Link is an \$85 million strategic freight route between Fremantle port and Muchea, and an essential component in the long-planned integrated freight transport system for Perth. Long planned? When was the first time the Perth Freight Link appeared on any planning document? It was 2014. It is not long planned. It continues by stating that the Perth Freight Link will —

A member interjected.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** This is your foreword, minister—increase property values in the vicinity of as much as 50 per cent.

The following day his media statement said they would increase by 86 per cent. I am not sure what to believe—his foreword or his media statement. I want to go through it.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Peter Tinley; Speaker; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Ben Wyatt

---

**Mr D.C. Nalder:** Neither of them—the independent report.

Several members interjected.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** I am coming to that.

**The SPEAKER:** Members, thank you!

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** I am coming to the Matusik report; it is independent all right!

Another report states that this road infrastructure project will deliver to the outer harbour and the Kwinana Marine Industrial Centre. If a person driving pulls left out of the potential Roe 8 highway, I do not know how many traffic lights it would take to get there. I drove it the other day and it does not seem to be ready to be part of any freight link at this stage.

This report contains a map of the Perth Freight Link that shows that this project has been pulled together from little individual projects and called a freight link. There is a massive gap on Tonkin Highway. Driving south on Tonkin Highway, traffic goes from three lanes into two lanes. That will be the minister's freight link—there will be traffic congestion of the highest order in that corridor. I refer again to the report. The other key point of course is that the Perth Freight Link will not actually reach the port.

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

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Bassendean, you are not helping.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** This report states that that map is out of scope and not to worry about the route from Stirling Bridge to Fremantle port because a couple of hundred thousand dollars will be spent on some traffic lights that will fix the problem. The government will spend \$2 billion on a road to take trucks to a set of traffic lights and then spend a couple of hundred thousand dollars that will fix it magically. It is incredible what can be done with improved turning lanes. That is after the government will spend \$2 billion to siphon trucks to that point. Another key point is “Error! Bookmark not defined”. That is the level of expertise in this independent report!

There was that report and I thought: “Okay, that's over. We have been hit with the Perth Freight Link big sell.” Then, I pick up *The Sunday Times* and, my goodness, there is an article about another report—the Matusik report. I love the Matusik report. *The Sunday Times* reported that a new study had been announced by the government. The minister put out a media release that announced the Matusik report on Sunday, but the Matusik report was announced on the front page of *The West Australian* in November last year. How did that happen? Did the minister's federal colleagues, who actually run the show over here, such as Mathias Cormann, sit down with some Canberra-based journalists and give them the Matusik report? I think that is what happened. I think Mathias Cormann said to the minister, “Dean, you have to go out and sell this Matusik report; it's a cracker. Everyone is going to make millions out of a tunnel.” So, on Sunday, the minister did that. He released the Matusik report; that is, the Matusik report that had been released in November last year. There are many parts to the Matusik report. The minister's media statement states that house values will increase by up to 86 per cent. When the minister stood at the Esplanade on that Sunday describing the project, he said that he was not there to espouse an 86 per cent rise in land values, but the minister's own media release that day stated that there would be an 86 per cent increase in house values.

Before I went out that day, I did some research, so I could understand exactly what Matusik is. Matusik is a Queensland property consultancy. I have a lot of relatives in the real estate game. This is like Daniel Andrews justifying a \$10 billion project in Victoria according to what a property consultant or real estate agent in Western Australia said. It just would not happen. How did Matusik get this work? Did the work go out to tender? No. Matusik was selected to provide a report. I went through Matusik's website. Matusik might be a very good property consultant, but I do not think its report should be used to justify a \$2 billion infrastructure project. I do not think the government should do that. Government members should be embarrassed that the minister has wheeled out a Queensland property consultant's report to justify a \$2 billion infrastructure project. I went through the Matusik website and found that Matusik gives people cleanskin outlook reports. The website states —

Get any Matusik Market Outlook report as a clean skin. Brand it; add a front cover; make it yours!

The minister's media statement claims there will be an 86 per cent increase in land values, but when he was questioned on it, he said that it was not his figure and that he was not espousing an 86 per cent increase. That is the figure the minister gave *The Sunday Times* and it was in his media statement. It does not stack up. The big sell did not work. The big sell raises more questions than it answers. The minister still has not told us what he will do with the bridge.

**Mr D.C. Nalder:** Yes, I have.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Peter Tinley; Speaker; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Ben Wyatt

---

**The SPEAKER:** Minister!

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Sorry, the minister has told us that he is not going to anything to the bridge. He will fix a couple of traffic lights and somehow that will reduce congestion. That is absolutely false. The minister's position on placard loads has changed completely. The minister said that there could be technology that would allow placard loads to be taken through the tunnel. He said that on camera. Of course, now, placard loads are not going through the tunnel. I want to make a key point: the minister's policy is to increase trade through the port fourfold. That means four times more placard loads travelling on Leach Highway. More dangerous goods will travel along Leach Highway under the government's policy. Government members talk about road safety, but they want four times more placard loads to travel on Leach Highway—that is their plan.

Again, as we saw today when we tried to explain the Metro Area Express project, the government is all over the place. I understand that governments do reports on all sorts of things, but I fundamentally disagree with basing an entire project on a report. The minister is trying to convince the electorate—a guy who he has just duded—to vote for the Liberal Party because their house values will increase. That is what the minister is trying to do. It was a sop to the current member for Bateman, because the minister took his seat. The minister told the electorate not to worry, he will save the day, because he has a report that states that everybody in the member for Bateman's electorate will have an increase in house prices. That is what the minister tried to do, but no-one has bought it. The report states that sometimes there are big increases but —

We stress that current local end prices ... might not rise as much as our findings suggest. All of our case studies are based on infrastructure provision which took place many years ago, at a time when end price points were more affordable than today.

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

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Does the minister really want to compare Perth Freight Link with Lane Cove Tunnel? Honestly, if the minister does not believe that it was extraordinarily naive to base his entire project on this report, I do not know what else we can do here. This is not good public policy and there are so many issues relating to this project.

In relation to the contract, I took the opportunity to read the Victorian Auditor-General's report on governments signing contracts on the eve of elections. The report states that it is financially reckless for governments to sign contracts on projects that are not supported by both sides of the Parliament on the eve of an election. I warn government members that this project will be on their heads. The public does not support this project; it does not make economic, financial or environmental sense; and it does not make sense for transport.

**MS S.F. MCGURK (Fremantle)** [3.28 pm]: It is extraordinary, each time another chapter is added to the Perth Freight Link debacle it becomes more and more incredible—it is astounding. The latest chapter on this government trying to sell the concept that a tunnel will be beneficial to the residents of Hilton, Beaconsfield and White Gum Valley is extraordinary. We have known about the Perth Freight Link project for two years. It was announced just after the 2014 federal budget. No-one had heard of the Perth Freight Link project prior to that, least of all any of the planners who put together our planning documents or the residents who will be affected by the Perth Freight Link.

A couple of months after the announcement of the Perth Freight Link, people in Palmyra got a letter from Main Roads Western Australia that stated that their properties might be impacted by the freight link and that they should get in touch. "Impacted" is a euphemism for "you might lose your house". The residents of Moody Glen and other Palmyra residents were saying, "How can this be? Our houses are not on a road reserve; how could it be that we are about to lose our houses for this extraordinary project?" At the same time, after creating a whole lot of uncertainty for those residents, the minister said, "I don't mind tunnels. I'm a bit partial to a tunnel, so I have asked the department to look at the possibility of tunnelling through the old Fremantle eastern bypass route." That would have impacted on the residents of Hamilton Hill and the area around Clontarf Road. Despite saying that and creating a huge amount of uncertainty and concern for those residents, the minister has never bothered to meet with the residents of Hamilton Hill.

The contracts went out for Roe Highway stage 8 and the second stage of the Perth Freight Link, whether it was the road or tunnel option, and we started to hear rumours that the most straightforward thing to do after Roe 8 would be to build a diagonal tunnel. Those rumours were confirmed in November 2015 by a rather breathless front page of *The West Australian* that reported that the property price increases predicted by a Queensland property analyst would be significant for the residents of Hilton, Beaconsfield and White Gum Valley and that house values could increase by more than 80 per cent if the tunnel option was adopted for stage 2 of the Perth Freight Link. That is just ridiculous. Shane Wright, writing for *The West Australian*, regurgitated that report, but if members read it, they will see that it is embarrassing. It did not consider the alternatives. It did not

Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Peter Tinley; Speaker; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Ben Wyatt

---

consider the option of taking freight away from the metropolitan area to the outer harbour; it considered only a tunnel or road option. After the November report, a sensible view was adopted by the residents of Bromley Road, Hilton. The article reads —

John Partlon said the tunnel plan was a farce because Fremantle port did not have the capacity to support it. He said houses would have to be demolished and others would be at risk of damage during the construction ...

The article further reads —

... Kate Iwanowski, who unsuccessfully petitioned Main Roads for a noise barrier, agreed ...

“Don’t spend billions of dollars on infrastructure to a port that can’t support future growth,” Ms Iwanowski said.

A very sensible approach was taken by the Hilton residents who did not buy the rather enthusiastic projected house price increases. Exactly the same report was released in April 2016 and, extraordinarily enough, it got another run. The flaws in that report are numerous and it contains many qualifications. Incredibly, a property analyst has predicted that this tunnel could improve road safety. We have been told absolutely nothing about the effects on road safety. A sensible approach was again taken by the residents. Palmyra resident Tania Smirke was asked on 720 ABC Perth whether she was happy that the tunnel option was to be adopted rather than the road option that would have impacted on her house. According to my notes, she said —

No; I think all this will result in a funnel —

Not a tunnel, but a funnel —

to Stirling Bridge. It will be a car park at Stirling Bridge; it already is now. We need an outer harbour. The community supported us when our houses were going to be impacted, and we will support the residents that are going to be impacted by a tunnel. We will support them.

Quite opposite to the divisive approach of this government and the Mayor of Melville, who say, “Let’s just move your problems down Leach Highway and we’ll give them to the residents impacted by the Perth Freight Link”, the residents of my community are saying, “No, all this is wrong; we need a better solution, and the solution is the outer harbour.” I have to ask why the government is doing this. It can be only to get a better price from the sale of Fremantle port. The government is now openly talking about there being more than two million containers a year in and out of Fremantle harbour—between three and four times the current number—after the opening of the Perth Freight Link. That will mean more dangerous goods on Leach Highway and in the northern suburbs, and more diesel fumes. The sensible solution, as the electorate knows, is to plan and build the outer harbour.

**MR D.C. NALDER (Alfred Cove — Minister for Transport)** [3.35 pm]: I have really looked forward to getting up and correcting some of the myths and misinformation that has been put into the marketplace by the opposition over a period of time. I will provide some background to the situation we are facing with the Perth Freight Link.

Under the previous Labor government, a disgraceful decision was taken to sell off the Fremantle eastern bypass. Subsequent to that decision, the then Minister for Planning and Infrastructure put out a press release in early 2008 that stated that, as a result, the government would need to plan for trucks moving through the southern suburbs and that the government had started the planning process to upgrade High Street and Leach Highway. The then government seemed to forget that those Palmyra residents would be affected by the planning work that was undertaken by the former minister for the Department of Planning and Infrastructure, Alannah MacTiernan. That was because the Fremantle Eastern Bypass was sold off; what a disgraceful decision! Members, the people of South Fremantle—I know a lot of them well—are suffering today with trucks that come down Hampton Road because there is no Fremantle Eastern Bypass. The trucks have to go down there from Cockburn, through to the port.

Several members interjected.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** That impacts on the member for Fremantle’s constituents who live in that area.

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Cockburn, put your name down to speak.

Several members interjected.

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

**Mr P. Papalia** interjected.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Peter Tinley; Speaker; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Ben Wyatt

---

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Warnbro, I call you to order for the second time, I believe.

**Mr P. Papalia:** First time.

**The SPEAKER:** Second time.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** I think those opposite seem to forget, and they do not like the truth.

The federal government—there was a long-term commitment from the Liberal government—recommended that people not buy that land because it would be needed. We have tried to work through to find the best solution. We agree with the former Minister for Planning and Infrastructure because something is needed in the southern suburbs because the intersections through those southern suburbs will fail. Something has to happen. The federal government committed to provide support to complete Roe stage 8; I will come back to why that is important. That meant we needed to connect it up, and that was the Stock Road solution, which I never felt comfortable with. At the time I explained to the Premier that I wanted to explore other options, and I have done so.

I can categorically say that the Perth Freight Link will save lives. Let me explain why.

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Willagee.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** By the end of this, I believe that any rational person would sit here and say, “Why on earth wouldn’t you do this project?” It will save lives, and there are a couple of reasons for that.

Several members interjected.

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

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** The traffic modelling for South Street and Murdoch Drive shows that it is going to become very congested, and it is going to put at risk people who are trying to get through to the hospital in emergency situations.

**Mr P.C. Tinley:** Table it!

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** I will.

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

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

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** The other issue we have, and the biggest issue for trucks moving through our communities, is the intersections. We currently have the intersection of North Lake Road and Leach Highway as number 11. I stood in this Parliament when Labor argued that the freight route should continue all the way down Leach Highway, yet there are houses that back onto Leach Highway, so we are going to have increasing volumes of trucks coming down Leach Highway past houses that have been battleaxed and have two driveways per block, backing onto a highway with freight trucks coming through. We have never said that that is a wise decision. We said that moving trucks away from traffic lights and intersections would dramatically reduce interactions, and the number of interactions involving trucks on Leach Highway is more than double that of the metropolitan average. This will save lives. By creating a better link from the southern entrance, we actually create a better link to Jandakot Airport; the Royal Flying Doctor Service lands there. This will allow people to get in.

Let me talk a little about the Matusik Property Insights report; I want to move on to that because it actually talks about a major reduction —

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

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Cannington!

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** The member for Cannington can get up and make his point.

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

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

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** I would like to talk about this report just for a minute. I had a meeting with the Property Council of Australia WA and at that same meeting were representatives from the Real Estate Institute of Western Australia. Nigel Satterley from Satterley Property Group also happened to be at the meeting. I sat down and asked them a broad question: is there any way we could do an analysis to understand the impact of infrastructure on our communities? They said yes, there was. I asked if they were able to help prepare a report and response.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Peter Tinley; Speaker; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Ben Wyatt

---

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Victoria Park, I call you to order for the first time. I do not want to hear the wall of noise; I think everybody wants to hear this debate.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** Representatives of the Department of Transport were also in the room with us when we were talking about getting a better understanding from the marketplace of what the likely impacts would be. I think that is a natural and responsible question to ask. I asked who would be the appropriate people to do an analysis on this report, and they recommended Matusik, amongst others. One of the things they insisted on was that, if an independent property specialist—they provided the recommendations—came to Western Australia to do an analysis, they would support such a report only if that independent analyst worked with them on it. I have followed up with the Property Council and the Real Estate Institute of Western Australia to see whether they are comfortable supporting the findings of this report.

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for West Swan! Members! Member for Butler, I call you to order for the first time.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** If members want to go and speak to the Property Council and the Real Estate Institute of Western Australia, they can be my guest; I encourage them to do so.

**Ms R. Saffioti** interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for West Swan, I call you to order now for the third time.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** At the end of this I will table that report because people have asked why we are coming out with it. We have never actually made it public; we are making the document public so that everybody can go through it and actually understand. I openly encourage any resident or anyone in the community who is going to be impacted by the development of this infrastructure project to go in with an open mind and explore all the arguments on this piece of infrastructure. I encourage them to do so. This report and all the others are sitting on the Main Roads website.

As part of this process, we looked at the movement of vehicles. The reports talk about easing congestion. With regard to the report, I admit that the member for West Swan has a draft version that has errors in it, but there is a final version on the Main Roads website, and I am happy for anyone to explore it. It talks about the modelling on traffic flows. The member for Willagee wanted to understand the modelling around traffic flows as a result of this piece of infrastructure. I will table these reports. They show us projections of what will actually occur in 2021 and 2031 if we construct the extension of Roe Highway through Roe 8 and the Fremantle tunnel and, alternatively, what will happen if we do nothing. It will dramatically reduce congestion on surrounding highways and roads.

One of the things we have talked about is what happens on roads like South Street and access to Murdoch Drive. If we construct the extension, by 2021 we will see a reduction of traffic along South Street from 40 000 vehicles a day down to 28 000. It will open up opportunities for us to explore other things we can do through there, like rapid transit solutions down to Fremantle; that is mentioned in this report. We will dramatically decrease —

Several members interjected.

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

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** We are talking about 81 000 vehicles a day between North Lake Road and Kwinana Freeway by 2021, and if they do not go through there, they will be going through all the other suburban roads and highways. Of that number, 6 900 will be trucks. I agree that the term “Perth Freight Link” creates the impression that it is all about trucks. I have talked about this in this house before.

*Point of Order*

**Mr P.C. TINLEY:** I know the minister is referring to a piece of paper in his hand. It seems like an official document, and I request him to table the document.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** Yes, Mr Speaker, I said I would like to table them when I finish referring to them.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you; that has cleared that one up.

*Debate Resumed*

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** If the member for Willagee listens all the way through, he might learn something. I have projections for both 2021 and 2031. I have shared this information in this house before: 86 per cent of the benefit under the cost–benefit ratio is actually for vehicles other than trucks, but the productivity gains for the trucking industry are large. By moving these trucks away from traffic lights and easing up the traffic flow, the

Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Peter Tinley; Speaker; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Ben Wyatt

---

productivity gains are large. It is interesting, because we have been working with the trucking industry for some time, and it has come out in support of this project and is happy to pay a freight charge on the basis that it is a win-win situation.

We have explored the benefits right across the 85 kilometres from Muchea all the way through to Fremantle, and we have looked at productivity measures such as time saved, fuel saved and maintenance saved, and we are talking in excess of one dollar per kilometre in benefits in the modelling to date. We are talking about using a portion of that to fund the state's contribution, and this is where it gets interesting. We have here an economic model that can potentially fund this infrastructure; I have never seen anything like it from the opposition, ever. We have the support of the industry to continue to explore this and get it right, and we are talking about a win-win situation. I have heard the opposition go out and laud its plan for jobs for Western Australia and creating jobs. I encourage anybody to read through —

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

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

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** I encourage anyone in the community to start reading that plan and tell me any tangible benefit in it towards employment. It is full of motherhood statements; there is nothing tangible. I tell members that this infrastructure will deliver 2 400 direct jobs and 10 000 indirect jobs. If members opposite take this project away, they will take 12 500 jobs out of the system for Perth. Let me come to the outer harbour.

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Fremantle, I have been very lenient with you; I call you to order for the third time.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** I am going to make sure that a third document is tabled because it was commissioned under the former Labor government. Maybe members opposite would like to read it. We have said that we have a desire, at the appropriate time, to move the port to the outer harbour but we have also said that Fremantle port's capacity is much higher than the number that opposition members have been espousing. In this place, I have said that the issue is not around Fremantle port's capacity; the issue is the capacity that we, as a community, are prepared to accept at Fremantle port. I refer to "Fremantle Ports Outer Harbour Project", a report that was commissioned for the Department for Planning and Infrastructure by the Environmental Protection Authority. I will table this report but I want to refer to it. It is very important because it shows the flaws in the arguments of members opposite. Four options were considered, including an island base and an island-land base type solution; there were four different scenarios. I quote a passage in the report —

In large part because of the scale of the dredging and reclamation requirements of any of the options, the Outer Harbour Project has the potential to adversely affect a substantial portion of the eastern-shelf of Cockburn Sound. Based on current information, it is not yet possible to form the view that construction and operational impacts for any of the options within Cockburn Sound are likely to be acceptable.

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Warnbro, there is plenty of time on the clock. Get up and talk about it.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** I want to give members a sense of how large this thing is. When we talk about Beeliar wetlands—I will come to the environment—we are talking about bridging over six hectares.

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Fremantle, is up to you now; if you want to have a rest, carry on.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** I will table these facts. Option 1 was for 337 hectares of seagrass that would be impacted; it goes up to just under 400 hectares for option 2—397.85 hectares.

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Members!

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** This is an EPA report—a strategic assessment commissioned by the then Labor government into the probability. We want to explore an outer harbour solution but we are saying that this is not a quick fix.

**Ms R. Saffioti:** What you're doing is corrupt.

*Withdrawal of Remark*

**The SPEAKER:** Withdraw that, member for West Swan.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** I withdraw.

*Suspension of Member*

**The SPEAKER:** Right, leave the chamber please; thank you. You have been called to order three times.

[The member for West Swan left the chamber.]

*Debate Resumed*

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** This report was commissioned by the then Labor government. We want to explore it, but we are saying that we have capacity and time to work through it responsibly. There is no need to rush and we should not rush this. The work that needs to happen in Cockburn Sound needs to be considered very carefully. The project cannot just be cancelled and work start immediately on the outer harbour.

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

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

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** The commitment of members opposite is that they will cancel this project and start work on the outer harbour immediately. Any responsible government needs to go through a proper process on the environmental impacts of the outer harbour. We are saying that we have time to do that properly; members opposite want to rush it. If we can get through the environment process, it will take—from the advice that I have—a minimum of four years. Mangles Bay marina is much larger and longer than that. If members look at the Beeliar wetlands, they will know that we are talking about bridging over six hectares and it has taken three years. We are talking about 300 to 400 hectares in Cockburn Sound. It is disgraceful if members opposite think that they can turn around and cancel this project and shift it to the outer harbour in a short period. I can tell members that it will take four years and it will take another six years before the first container is moved down there. In that time, Fremantle will block up. All the roads down there and all the intersections will fail. Members opposite talk about creating jobs; jobs cannot be created down there —

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

**The SPEAKER:** I have asked one person to leave. The member for Fremantle has been called three times; I am giving you a chance. If you shout out again, you are going to leave.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** Members opposite cannot cancel this project and create jobs down there for at least 10 years. Members opposite are purporting nonsense and I am telling them that if they read this report, they better read it in detail and in full. Members opposite better stop misleading—like Scott Ludlam did in his report—the community and start giving it the facts. It is disgraceful.

Let us talk about the last mile into the inner harbour.

Several members interjected.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** Here we go. The plans have been done for the last mile into the inner harbour. I stood in this house before and said that it will cost in the vicinity of half a billion dollars. It is hilarious that members opposite in this chamber criticise us for doing this project but then they criticise us for not doing the last bit; it does not make one iota of sense. We will complete this project by doing the last mile. Let us have a look at the facts. We have the Main Roads modelling—I have said this in the press—that states that we can fix the intersection. We can do minor capital works on the intersection of Canning and Stirling Highways and the level of traffic will get back to what we have today only by 2026. It buys us time. As a responsible government, we have to prioritise the projects. If I can spend \$3 million, \$4 million or \$5 million to fix an intersection that will give us 10 years, it will allow me to relocate that half a billion dollars across to a public transport project. If that allows me to consider a public transport project, at this point in time, I would say that it is the right decision for this government to take. The plans are done and they can be done at any time. However, from a prioritisation perspective, it is not the right time. We can do that work and I can tell members that Stirling Bridge is not about trucks coming across it; it is about the cars. In the next 10 years, we are going to have to do the work anyway. I told members that on a benefit–cost ratio, it does not change—it changes 0.1—if we take the harbour out of it altogether. This project is important irrespective of what happens with the harbour. I have said that over and again. Now I would like to wrap up to give some other people the opportunity to speak.

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

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Albany!

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** I have said from the outset—this is a conversation I had with the Premier—that I was not happy with the option that we were left by Alannah MacTiernan of coming down High Street and Leach Highway. I said to the Premier at the time that I wanted to go away and explore opportunities and options

to see whether there was a better solution that we could provide for the community. I said to the Premier at the time that this would mean I would cop a fair bit of heat for a year until I had this all worked through because I did not have the alternative solution. I have said in this house that I look forward to the day when I can put on the table one version of the truth.

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** I withheld a final report until I had all the facts together and it could be dealt with all at once. Members opposite want to take a scattergun approach in trying to pull this infrastructure apart. They move from road to rail, to the last mile, the outer harbour and Beeliar wetlands. Let me tell members, for those who are really concerned about the environment, we are bridging over six hectares and we are impacting 30 hectares of virgin bush and around 60 hectares of degraded bush—100 hectares of sand. We still have to do the work to get the project approved but the opposition's project impacts over 400 hectares of coastal plain land. I know the site that is being negotiated. It will be a great habitat on the coastal plain—far greater than what we are impacting in the six hectares of wetlands that we are bridging over.

In a 10-year period over 400 000 tonnes of carbon emissions will be saved. If members opposite are serious about the environment, they need to look at all aspects here. We will manage this environmentally responsibly. We will save lives, create jobs and reduce congestion. What is the opposition offering, because what I have heard is absolutely nothing at all? With that, I would like to table these four pieces.

**The SPEAKER:** Can you just tell us what you are tabling, please?

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** Mr Speaker, I will table "Developing Transport Networks; Delivering Safer Roads."

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you; just let the minister finish!

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** It comes from that report, which the member for member for Willagee was asking me to table. It is the road modelling at 2021 and 2031, if we did nothing or we complete this project by extending Roe Highway and the Fremantle tunnel. I also put the Matusik Property Insights report on the table. I have talked to the CEOs or the heads of both organisations and I am more than comfortable that the Property Council of Australia and the Real Estate Institute of Western Australia are happy to support the findings of this report. I do not purport to be a property expert, but when I have those organisations supporting the findings of it, it makes me feel comfortable. I encourage everybody to read it. Finally, I table a report that was commissioned under the then Labor government looking at four port options in Cockburn Sound. Labor members themselves said that this is going to be hard to deliver, and that is something that we need to work through very carefully, which we have said for some time.

Leave granted. [See papers 4142 to 4145.]

*Point of Order*

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** The last document is already a tabled paper. I wonder whether it can be a tabled paper twice.

**The SPEAKER:** I do not know, but we will table it anyway, just out of abundant caution. Thank you very much.

*Debate Resumed*

**MR P.C. TINLEY (Willagee)** [4.01 pm]: I rise to support this motion and to put paid to the idea that this report in some way is a comprehensive endorsement of this government's failed plan for the Perth Freight Link. It is nothing short of a sham document by a sham minister in a sham government. The government is no better than a Gold Coast real estate spiv by tabling this report, relying on it, leaking it and getting third party endorsement. The minister is getting his transport advice from property people. That shows the sort of intellectual diligence that he has over this and the management of the state's transport plan. The minister has no particular vision, strategy or purpose for an inbound or outbound freight strategy for the state of Western Australia other than to save the seats of sitting Liberal members. That is all.

These reports and this report are instructive in one thing—what it leaves out. It outlines about an up to 86 per cent improvement in property values of section 2 of the government's Perth Freight Link, but it omits the three suburbs on which it will have the most impact. What do I say to the electors in my seat, in the suburbs of Coolbellup, North Lake and Bibra Lake, when the government drives a six-lane black scar through their suburbs? What is going to happen to the property values in those three suburbs? It is very convenient of the minister to use this report to satisfy the syllogistic argument, a stupid argument, that somehow the Perth Freight

Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Peter Tinley; Speaker; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Ben Wyatt

---

Link, which is not a freight link, is in some way actually a benefit to the residents of Western Australia. What the minister did not talk about is the Environmental Protection Authority approval the government will need when it puts a road tunnel through there and the diesel particulates come out of those stacks into the suburbs of the residents we represent.

We heard in the Parliament today how the government has constrained the road reserve of the western suburbs because, god forbid, we could have a little bit of extra traffic in the western suburbs! It is all right for the Labor suburbs to hold the trucks; it is all right for the Labor suburbs and for the people of the southern suburbs of this city to suffer under the boot of this government—the poor financial management and the mismanagement of this government. I have to go down and front the electors of Coolbellup, Bibra Lake and North Lake and the people of Western Australia and explain to them that their property and amenity will be stripped from them through the Beeliar wetlands. How are we going to have a future that they can actually believe in? I am really disappointed that the minister is happy to use this report but he will not use one tabled by the Senate of Australia, written after exhaustive investigation by qualified experts on the value of the Perth Freight Link.

I will refer members to the report. There was no dissenting report—no minority report. Members might have a go at us or at the Green senators, but they should have a go at the deputy chair, Senator Heffernan, Senator Gallacher, Senator Chris Back, our own, and Linda Reynolds who also participated in that very same inquiry, who had the opportunity to put a dissenting report, a minority report, but they did not. Their silence was endorsement of the fact that the ambition that this government has to wreck the lives of people in the southern suburbs, to destroy the value of their property and to ruin their lives and the wetlands of the south is just completely baseless in its hope of achieving anything remotely designed to produce an inbound–outbound freight strategy that will survive. The government has had eight years to work on the outer harbour and all it can do is produce a report from the last Labor government about four options. What has the minister done about releasing the modelling that was done subsequent to that report? He has done nothing—zero. The member for Cannington has had an freedom of information request to the minister’s office for some time now for the traffic modelling for the Perth Freight Link. The minister will not release it. Why will he not release it? He is full of secrecy.

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

**Mr P.C. TINLEY:** Not extracts—the full report. Not selective quoting, like the minister did today—not selective reports from \$37 000 puff pieces. Cut-and-paste cleanskin endorsement is something that is just complete and utter garbage and a waste of space for this state.

**DR M.D. NAHAN (Riverton — Treasurer)** [4.06 pm]: I am very happy to make a few comments on this issue. No other issue illustrates the incapacity and inappropriateness of Labor to govern the state. I will go through the history of it as the Minister for Transport went through some. The road, Roe 8 to the port—the port has existed, and will continue to exist, for a long time—has been planned for more than 60 years and we have, in series, built Roe Highway through to the port. It did not just originate there; it has been planned for 60 years. It started with Alannah MacTiernan excising the road reserve for a base political reason to placate interest groups and give commercial value to the adjacent land holders. It was a huge windfall to those landowners. Then she inhibited developing a clear roadway to the port. She then tried to address this, because there are literally hundreds of thousands of trucks in increasing numbers, pouring through the suburbs—your suburbs, my suburbs, the minister’s suburbs and the member for Bateman’s suburbs. We have to do something about it. What is the opposition’s plan? Nothing. It has no plan to address the growth in the volume of truck traffic and the volume of traffic going through those suburbs, except to build an outer harbour, which I will get to. There is no plan and there are no issues. Alannah MacTiernan tried. She put some subsidies on rail. It did not work very well; we got it up to 14 per cent, which is the highest percentage of containers coming into any port in Australia on rail. We are still subsidising that very heavily. She then decided to improve the High Road–Leach Highway access, and she got the Rudd government to put \$100 million aside for it. That was the basis for the second phase of our first Perth Freight Link—Alannah MacTiernan and the Labor party’s policy. It included the demolition of houses along the way. All Main Roads did was to take Alannah MacTiernan’s policy and to start implementing it. That is when the opposition wrote to the householders. It is the opposition’s policy. It was its policy that did that. It was a dog of a policy, and everything the opposition has done with this project has been faulty.

**Mr P. Papalia** interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Warnbro! I have told you to speak if you want to.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** In 2005–06, Alannah MacTiernan, with the completion of Roe 7, agreed to build Roe 8 with the federal government, but then it reneged and undermined it. She then said, “Let’s move to the outer harbour.”

Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Peter Tinley; Speaker; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Ben Wyatt

---

She did a lot of work on that and came up with four plans, and then she did it and quite rightly said, “Can we build an outer harbour?” So she got the Environmental Protection Authority to do it.

*Point of Order*

**Ms M.M. QUIRK:** I think the minister should be referring to Hon Alannah MacTiernan as the former minister, not as “she”.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you. Treasurer.

*Debate Resumed*

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** The former minister then asked the Environmental Protection Authority to look at the possibility of an outer harbour and the Minister for Transport reiterated some of them. On completion of the report, an article dated 22 September 2006 stated that Alannah MacTiernan admitted that the port might not be viable. These people are saying that we should stop using the port of Fremantle, we should not improve the roads to the port and we should focus on the outer harbour, and are not even questioning the difficulties and the environmental concerns. The opposition expresses great concerns about areas in the Beeliar wetlands but does not express any concern, despite the evidence that it should, about the outer harbour. The members for Warnbro, Rockingham and Kwinana supposedly represent the people along the sound, but they do not give a damn. They just want to put a giant outer harbour in the middle of the sound right now. Do it!

**Mr P.T. Miles:** Environmental vandals.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** They are vandals. They claim to be environmentalists. One thing we can say is that if the member for Gosnells had anything to do with it, he would stop them. He would say no to an outer harbour.

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** We have had enough biff. Hansard has to record this.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** The outer harbour will destroy up to 400 hectares of seagrass, but the opposition does not care. It does not ask, “Is this possible? Should we investigate it?” No. More importantly, the outer harbour was always considered to be an overflow port; that is, the port of Fremantle will continue to operate for four years at in excess of 1.2 million twenty-foot equivalent units. There is no option. What is the opposition going to do about the trucks and traffic flowing into the port of Fremantle? Nothing. Who is leading the charge? It is the member for Fremantle. She says that we should keep the trucks rolling. She does not care. She says that we should keep the port going. She does not care. The port of Fremantle, under the existing plans, will continue to operate as a port for decades. No plans have existed for a completely separate harbour. The outer harbour has always been treated as and designed to be an overflow port, even if it could be built, which means that the port of Fremantle would continue. What is the opposition going to do about the operations of the port of Fremantle into future decades even if we build the outer harbour? Nothing. What are we trying to do? We are trying to improve the flow of traffic through the electorates that those opposite represent. Why are members opposite working against their own constituencies? Why are they trying to harm the sound? It is because they do not give a damn. All they want to do is put out propaganda. That is the Labor Party.

**Mr S.K. L’Estrange:** Cheap political points.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** It is making cheap political points. That is the Labor Party—the party that should never be in government because it would run this state down. It has no leadership ability. It is just a political operative. We have a plan to improve the truck and ordinary traffic to the port of Fremantle.

**MR B.S. WYATT (Victoria Park)** [4.14 pm]: Both the Minister for Transport and the member for Riverton spent their entire time blaming —

**Mr S.K. L’Estrange** interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** I do not want to hear from you.

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** — Alannah MacTiernan. It was the previous Labor government’s fault! I ask the Minister for Health why Perth Freight Link has not been mentioned in one budget or planning document since the Liberal Party has been in power. It was not mentioned in one budget speech or key planning document. The government’s key planning document, “Perth and Peel@3.5 million”, does not mention it. Yet the government says that this is all a debacle from Alannah MacTiernan. This financial Armageddon is going to hit us if we do not build Perth Freight Link. There has been silence from the government for eight years.

Several members interjected.

**Extract from *Hansard***  
[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 10 May 2016]  
p2528a-2539a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Peter Tinley; Speaker; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Ben Wyatt

---

**The SPEAKER:** There was plenty of noise from this side when the Treasurer was talking, but I do not want any noise from this side when the member for Victoria Park is talking.

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** There was eight years of silence because the financial Armageddon did not exist. Now the government is looking to retrofit an argument. The Treasurer should be embarrassed that the Minister for Transport has come in here with a document prepared by a Queensland real estate agent. That is his argument—a document prepared by a real estate agent from Queensland.

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

**The SPEAKER:** Treasurer, I call you to order for the first time. We have two minutes to go. I want to hear this in silence.

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** That is what the great economist from the Institute of Public Affairs is relying on—a Queensland real estate agent who not only talks about 86 per cent increases in property prices, because, apparently, it is a property plan now, not a transport plan, but also makes comments about the likely casualties we are going to see on our roads. I do not even know whether this bloke made it to Western Australia. Did he? I do not think he did. I think this bloke looked at a few things on Google. He said that he looked at databases from Google Maps and Main Roads Western Australia—all useful things—and this is the Treasurer's document. Heavens above!

I wrote down what the Minister for Transport said as I was stunned. He said, "I sat there with REIWA and I sat there with the Australian Property Council and I asked them, 'Is there any way we can do an analysis and understand the impact of infrastructure in our communities?'" Yes, there is. We have been doing it for years. The Treasurer can go to the Economic Regulation Authority; it will do a pretty good job. He can go to Treasury; it will do a pretty good job. Instead he went to Matusik, some dude in Queensland who makes a habit out of predicting property prices in Melbourne, the Sunshine Coast and Sydney. That is his justification. It is clear that he did not make it over to the west coast to even analyse or look at the roads we are talking about. I am interested in whether the Deputy Premier backs the statistics around road crashes and fatalities that Mr Matusik is apparently commenting on. Despite being silent on this issue for eight years, if the Treasurer is going to commit \$2 billion of public money to a project, he should explain it. John Day, the Minister for Health, just said during question time that the government is spending \$500 000 on the Quadriplegic Centre. He spent \$38 000 on this joke. He should do his job.

*Division*

Question put and a division taken with the following result —

Ayes (18)

Ms L.L. Baker	Mr D.J. Kelly	Mr P. Papalia	Mr P.B. Watson
Mr R.H. Cook	Mr F.M. Logan	Ms M.M. Quirk	Mr B.S. Wyatt
Ms J. Farrer	Mr M. McGowan	Mrs M.H. Roberts	Mr D.A. Templeman ( <i>Teller</i> )
Ms J.M. Freeman	Ms S.F. McGurk	Mr C.J. Tallentire	
Mr W.J. Johnston	Mr M.P. Murray	Mr P.C. Tinley	

Noes (34)

Mr P. Abetz	Mr J.H.D. Day	Mr R.F. Johnson	Dr M.D. Nahan
Mr F.A. Alban	Ms W.M. Duncan	Mr S.K. L'Estrange	Mr J. Norberger
Mr C.J. Barnett	Mr J.M. Francis	Mr R.S. Love	Mr D.T. Redman
Mr I.C. Blayney	Mrs G.J. Godfrey	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 G.M. Castrilli	Mrs L.M. Harvey	Ms L. Mettam	Mr T.K. Waldron
Mr V.A. Catania	Mr C.D. Hatton	Mr P.T. Miles	Mr A. Krsticevic ( <i>Teller</i> )
Mr M.J. Cowper	Mr A.P. Jacob	Ms A.R. Mitchell	
Ms M.J. Davies	Dr G.G. Jacobs	Mr N.W. Morton	

Pairs

Mr J.R. Quigley	Mr B.J. Grylls
Dr A.D. Buti	Ms E. Evangel

Question thus negatived.