

**WESTPORT TASKFORCE — REPORT**

*Matter of Public Interest*

**THE SPEAKER (Mr P.B. Watson)** informed the Assembly that he was in receipt within the prescribed time of a letter from the member for Vasse seeking to debate a matter of public interest.

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

**MS L. METTAM (Vasse)** [2.48 pm]: I move —

That this house condemns the McGowan government for its flawed Westport Taskforce report.

The Liberal Party and Nationals WA in opposition join a great many people around this state who have great concerns about the significant waste of taxpayer funds. An amount of \$18 million was committed to a process with a predetermined outcome. The taxpayers of Western Australia have every right to feel ripped off by a process that deliberately excluded an important proposed road project, that being Roe 8 and 9. This report has been fatally flawed from the very start. The fact that it completely ignored one of the great challenges facing the ports and the transport corridors—that is, Roe 8 and 9—means that this process should be condemned. The report states that the current capacity of the port of Fremantle is conservatively three times more than current demand. Investment in this port would see the capacity increase to 3.8 million 20-foot equivalent units in the future. The report also recognises that the significant constraint is in the transport corridor. At the same time, the Westport Taskforce failed to consider a road project that has \$1.2 billion on the table, has the potential to create 10 000 direct and indirect jobs and would provide great road safety outcomes for the congestion issues faced by the people of the south west metropolitan region. This issue is about politics over good governance. This issue and the concerns about missing objectives and the best outcomes for the state of Western Australia were on display on the weekend quite clearly at the WA Labor state conference when a motion was put forward about extending the life of Fremantle port. In *The West Australian* of Monday, 26 August, Nick Butterly wrote —

Transport Workers Union boss Tim Dawson claimed Labor staffers and MPs had their careers threatened if they did not tow the Government line.

That was about opposing a motion to extend the life of Fremantle port. He also wrote —

Significantly, two Labor state MPs—Kyle McGinn and Martin Pritchard—backed the plan, putting them at odds with Government policy.

What an extraordinary display we saw on the weekend. What chaos there was within Labor ranks about an approach to government policy that put politics over good governance. The reason for such concern is not only this government's approach to this issue in not analysing this important road project, but also what this project means to Fremantle port. Fremantle port has a long, 130-year history. It is important as it lends character to the City of Fremantle and it provides jobs, but we also know that Fremantle port provides great economic benefit to the state by way of \$60 million every year in tax and dividends. It is a multibillion-dollar facility and good governance suggests that we do not duplicate infrastructure ahead of time.

The obsession with shutting down Fremantle port has been illustrated by this government's approach to the Westport Taskforce, in which Fremantle port made up only two of the five options. The first option of a dedicated outer harbour is obviously the government's objective. When the now Treasurer was in opposition, he made a commitment to resign if the outer harbour did not happen. What is extraordinary is that although the government talks about the costs associated with developing Roe 8 and 9 in connection with the Westport report, it is fair to say that these allegations are quite unfair given that those costs were not analysed. It is also extraordinary that the number one option, the outer harbour, has no costings attached to it at all. Although some inflated costings have been attached to the Roe 8 and 9 road project, even though it has not been considered or analysed, the report provides no costings at all for an outer harbour, which we know would come with a conservative price tag of about \$5 billion to the state, which this state cannot afford, particularly when the current Fremantle port has a conservative capacity of three times the current demand. But it gets worse. Other issues have been raised in the community about this government's approach to the Westport Taskforce. The task force claims that there has been much consultation and that a great amount of work has been undertaken with stakeholders in the community. What is extraordinary is that despite this so-called consultative process, the blue highway was rammed in and became the third option. Adrian Evans from the Maritime Union of Australia stated —

“Only two of the five options even entertain Fremantle retaining its identity as a working port—and one of those two dubbed the ‘Blue Highway’ was never considered by the reference group and only introduced late into the process by Westport staff.” ...

I find that extraordinary for a process that is meant to be consultative and transparent. How on earth did the staff of Westport, when moving from 25 options down to five, shove in and implement the blue highway option at that

**Extract from Hansard**

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 28 August 2019]

p6011a-6020a

Ms Libby Mettam; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Terry Redman; Dr David Honey; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Simone McGurk;  
Mr Peter Tinley

---

last stage? Many believe that it probably had a lot to do with an effort by this committee and this government to appease the unions —

**Ms S.F. McGurk:** Where did you quote Adrian Evans from?

**The SPEAKER:** Minister!

**Ms L. METTAM:** I have an article here.

**Ms S.F. McGurk:** She did not outline it.

**The SPEAKER:** I does not matter. I call you to order for the first time.

**Ms S.F. McGurk:** By way of interjection, member, can you outline where you quoted Adrian Evans from?

**Ms L. METTAM:** No, I am not taking interjections. I will provide the quotes to Hansard, absolutely.

**Ms S.F. McGurk:** You did not outline the source.

**Ms L. METTAM:** It was referred to in an article in *The West Australian*. We are talking about slippery numbers, which is pretty consistent in this report.

We know that past Labor governments have form in this area. In 2007, the then Minister for Planning and Infrastructure, Hon Alannah MacTiernan, stated that she believed that Fremantle port would reach capacity in 2015. Now how wrong was that! Again, that is an ideological and political approach to shutting down Fremantle port to the detriment of this state. Further concern also exists about the extraordinary demand estimated in this report. This demand figure was even highlighted by Brad Pettit, the Mayor of the City of Fremantle, on one of those rare occasions when Brad Pettit and Gareth Parker actually agreed on something. I will quote the Mayor of Fremantle, who refers to the fact that the demand for capacity, according to the report, has basically tripled. He said —

“This has been the average for the last decade. Westport is predicting that this figure is going to radically change over the next 40 years, jumping to 1.1 TEU’s per person per year or around three times the current level of consumption per person ...

“This extreme jump in imported consumption sounds highly unlikely and highly undesirable.”

Again, there are inflated figures from a Labor government in an effort to shut Fremantle port, and that is the reason that this side of the house condemns the government for its flawed Westport Taskforce report. This is extraordinary. The Westport Taskforce and Labor’s commitment to the outer harbour was in many respects this government’s response to the obvious transport needs in the south west metropolitan area. But the reality is that what is outlined in the report creates greater challenges and transport issues. Shutting Fremantle port will obviously increase congestion in Fremantle, particularly if we are looking at high-density living. The government made a half effort with a Stirling Highway roundabout, which has raised concerns from the heavy haulage industry, and an upgrade to High Street, which falls well short of what is required in the south west metro area. If the government is going to increase density, it can add to that rehabilitation costs and the road demands required for a dedicated outer harbour. We have real concerns. The road demands and additional transport needs include the expansion of Anketell Road, nine grade separations on Tonkin Highway and the duplication of rail in the area, not forgetting the intrusion into Beeliar Regional Park, Wandi Nature Reserve and Jandakot Regional Park, and land acquisition. As I stated, this is not only a concern for the opposition, it is also felt in the community. People know that this report is fatally flawed. Paul Murray writes —

For most sensible people, the McGowan Government’s Westport process lost all credibility when it refused to factor the extension of the Roe Freeway—for which Federal funding is still available—into its projections for an outer harbour.

...

What has always been a highly political process has now become an economically dodgy one. Labor ideology should not be the determinant.

Gareth Parker writes —

This, unfortunately, is the charade of Westport, an incredibly detailed, incredibly expensive, and fatally flawed look at Perth and the South West’s future port needs.

...

... the inquiry was nobbled from the start, directed to exclude from its detailed projections and planning entirely the idea that Roe 8–9—a critical missing link to the port—would be built.

It is not just members on this side of the house; many people in the community recognise it. The big losers are the taxpayers, who invested so much money in a process that is fatally flawed, and one that ignores the transport corridors as highlighted in the report. The big losers are the people of the south west metropolitan area, who do not have any commitment from this government to address their significant road safety concerns. The government has provided only a roundabout at Stirling Highway and a minor upgrade to High Street. That is why this side of the house condemns the government for this fatally flawed report, which is unsound and a sham and should be condemned by all sides of this Parliament.

**DR M.D. NAHAN (Riverton)** [3.03 pm]: This is a real shame and a complete waste of \$18 million. By the way, this government has cut a lot of money from essential needs, including the \$18 million that it has cut this term from the two high schools in my electorate, Willetton Senior High School and Rossmoyne Senior High School, which were rated last week as the top two non-selective schools in the state. The government has wasted money. It may as well just pump money into the ocean, rather than invest it in quality education.

We know what the flaw is: it is the government's ideology. The government set up a Westport strategy that had good intent. For a long time, we have needed a group to independently, without political guidance, look at the long-term future needs of the port. It had potential, but the government left out Roe 8 and Roe 9. It nobbled it and turned it into a complete waste of money. When the Westport Taskforce went out to the community, including mine, everyone asked, "Where's Roe 8 and Roe 9?", and they were told that the task force was forced to exclude it. It spent most of its time in the community talking about something that was excluded from the review. The task force said it did the assessment of Roe 8 and Roe 9 and then the government came in, "Would Roe 8 have enabled Fremantle port to make the shortlist?", and it was added in without any data. This is a con job. This is a travesty of good government. This government was elected on the basis of gold standard accountability.

One of the great challenges is the outer harbour. We are not necessarily against it, but the questions are: Can it be built on environmental grounds? How much will it cost? Where will it be located? When will it be needed? No data was provided on the cost, yet the outer harbour model was rated number one because of various criteria, including —

Low environmental impact in comparison to other options.

Give me a break! We were here in 2005–06 when the previous Labor transport minister asked the government for \$1.5 billion for an outer harbour. The government of the day said, "Well, let's look at the environmental impact", and it did, and it said that of the four options considered, all would have a significant adverse impact on Cockburn Sound. It also said that each option would cause the accumulative threshold set by the Environmental Protection Authority for assessments of the sound to be exceeded for both seagrass and sand habitat that used to have seagrass. In other words, there were warning signs from environmental studies that the government could not build the facility, yet this study gives it a tick on environmental grounds. It reads —

Hydrodynamic impacts on Cockburn Sound still to be thoroughly tested.

Give me a break! The task force did not look at the environment—it was excluded.

The second major issue with the outer harbour is the cost, which was excluded—there is no costing! Give me a break! The government has spent \$20 million on this without addressing the fundamental issue. It left out Roe 8 and said that the top option is an outer harbour, but it did not look at the environmental impacts, it did not look at the hydrological impacts and it did not do any costings. You know what? The government did not look at the simple issue that Anketell Road goes through the Beeliar wetlands. I thought the government stopped Roe 8 on that basis. This is a joke! Hey, where are the government's accountability experts? Where is Mr Langoulant, the person who stands up to defend accountability in this state? He was a consultant and earned \$3 250 per day. I call that silence money. Why would somebody with such a good reputation as Ms Lockwood, and she had one, put her name to this rubbish? I put it to members that she earned \$438 000 to produce rubbish. She sold her soul on this. This is trash. The government is not fooling anybody. It will not fool the people in my electorate who want Roe 8 and who really want the government to put back the \$18 million that was ripped out from their schools to fund this rubbish.

**MR D.T. REDMAN (Warren–Blackwood)** [3.08 pm]: I also support the shadow Minister for Transport's motion and highlight the fact that when articles are put in the paper from op-eds railing against what has happened, we know that it has not passed the pub test. It is massively flawed. The government has already stopped Roe 8 and Roe 9, but it is choosing to put a bill through this Parliament to secure it without giving it proper scrutiny. Stand up. Make it transparent. Put it through Infrastructure WA. Do the assessments that should be done for the future interests of Western Australia. That does not do it. Even the chair of the Westport board says that the issue with Fremantle is not capacity, but transport infrastructure. She says that. Yet the government has absolutely denied the opportunity to put it through the independent organisation that it put up in order to assess and check that. It is massively out of play. The chair of the Westport board said that there is capacity at Fremantle for 20 years, yet the government still wants to drive this agenda, which is clearly coming from the left.

Ms Libby Mettam; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Terry Redman; Dr David Honey; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Simone McGurk;  
Mr Peter Tinley

---

It is a shame the member for Bunbury is not here, because going into the last election, he made some interesting comments. I will quote from the *South Western Times* of 20 August 2019, which states —

Prior to the ... 2017 State election, Mr Punch outlined in his “Plan for Bunbury” a desire to develop the role the port could play in the State’s freight task.

**Ms L. Mettam:** That’s been dropped.

**Mr D.T. REDMAN:** That is right. The same article states —

Bunbury MLA Don Punch said the Westport process had “unfolded exactly as I expected” ...

He was saying, “Let’s go out and tell the electorate that we’re going to make sure that we deal Bunbury right into the game. And by the way, Bunbury’s not there—it missed the cut—but it came out exactly as I expected.” That is misleading one’s electorate! It is a darn shame he is not here to be accountable for that. It missed the cut. We know where Bunbury and regional Western Australia sit in this. We know that the debate about the transport infrastructure that goes into Fremantle port has happened. Even blind Freddy could tell us that the blue highway is not going to stack up. How could we take containers into Fremantle port, put them onto a truck, take them on down to the barge, put them onto a barge, take the barge right round to Kwinana, take them off the barge, put them onto a truck and take them to where they are supposed to go? What do members think is going to happen with that? It even says at the bottom of a page of the report —

Further, the operational costs of this option are likely to be high ...

Surprise, surprise! Why does that even make the cut? As mentioned, that option came in late. That has come in from the left. We know that must be coming from the left, because it has gained a bit of power and is dealing itself into the game.

The other really interesting thing is that the minister talks about multi-criteria analysis. We know that just about everything that happened in the past was done under multi-criteria analysis, but that has been rolled out as a little headline figure. I think it is meant to confuse people who read the articles. I know one group that was not asked about the multi-criteria analysis, and that is the progressives. They are not interested in multi-criteria analysis! They tried to exert their influence on the weekend, but it did not happen. I wonder what the members for Belmont, Midland and Girrawheen think about that. Multi-criteria analysis did not deal them into the game because they also know it is flawed. We know that they are not going to stand up against what has been a very orchestrated report to deal to the government the outcomes it wants to see, rather than something that is pragmatic, efficient and meets the needs of transport in Western Australia. This is massively flawed. The Nationals WA and I support the motion that has been put up by the Liberal Party. The government needs to go back to the drawing board on this because, quite frankly, it is not good enough. Everyone is seeing through it. It does not pass the pub test.

**DR D.J. HONEY (Cottesloe)** [3.12 pm]: I join my colleagues in supporting this motion. As has been pointed out by my colleagues, there is a fundamental flaw. I know that some members have had an interest in this topic for quite some time, so I looked with keen interest at these reports and thought I would see some analysis and some facts and figures around all of this. Of course, what one does with any analysis is compare what we are doing now with what we are going to do differently in the future. This detailed analysis cost \$18 million, as the member for Riverton pointed out. That is a massive sum of taxpayers’ money. We are not talking about a few idle pennies here; we are talking about an amount of money that could make a real difference in other areas. I am looking at the member for North West Central, who could use that money very effectively to really help and change peoples’ lives.

**Mr A. Krsticevic:** It would help the people in Rockingham.

**Dr D.J. HONEY:** Yes, the homeless people in Rockingham could really use that money. We could do something meaningful to help those people. What do we see when we compare these options with the base option, which is to keep Fremantle harbour and use the substantial capacity that it has? The member for Fremantle knows that that harbour is utilised at about only 25 per cent of its ultimate capacity.

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

**Dr D.J. HONEY:** With very minor adjustments, that port could be at 50 per cent capacity. In fact, it could then be doubled further with some moderate expenditure. What do we see? The August 2019 *Westport Beacon* states —

**Westport did not consider the Roe 8/9 road corridor in our technical studies as the State Government made a firm commitment not to build it at the last State election.**

This is not an analysis of options; this is a political direction from the minister to the committee to come out with a conclusion. The government has excluded the safest and most economic option available to it; hence, this is a fundamentally flawed report.

**Extract from Hansard**

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 28 August 2019]

p6011a-6020a

Ms Libby Mettam; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Terry Redman; Dr David Honey; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Simone McGurk;  
Mr Peter Tinley

---

A lot of members on the other side of this place have a lot of time on their hands. They are bored witless. Look, there are a lot of them. That is one of the things that happens when a party has a thumping win at an election—people on the government side do not have a lot to do.

**Mrs R.M.J. Clarke:** Speak for yourself!

**Dr D.J. HONEY:** Not in this place, members; I know they are very busy out there.

Several members interjected.

**Dr D.J. HONEY:** It is not in this place. Let us get back to the topic. I am not sure that members opposite have looked at these reports, but I have. I care about this issue and I have looked at the reports. I know there are a lot of ecowarriors on that side of the house—a lot of people who express great concern about the environment. I am not sure that they have looked at the options.

Several members interjected.

**Dr D.J. HONEY:** I am seeking your protection, Madam Acting Speaker; I am getting a lot of interjections.

I refer to option 1 for the ecowarriors. I did a basic area calculation. One hundred and fifty hectares of Cockburn Sound would be occupied by option 1. If we go to option 2, 105 hectares of the seagrass and ocean floor in Cockburn Sound would be occupied. As we know, option 3 is just made-up nonsense—that was pointed out very well by the member for Warren–Blackwood. I will skip option 3, because it is rubbish. With option 4, 62 hectares—look at the map —

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** I am offering the member for Cottesloe my protection.

**Dr D.J. HONEY:** Thank you, Madam Acting Speaker; I am very grateful for your protection.

Under option 4, 62 hectares of seagrass would be decimated. Members should look at where it is. It is a kilometre offshore. It is smack bang in the middle of the breeding ground for fish, as was pointed out by our leader in some detail yesterday. Under “ecowarrior option 5”, 115.5 hectares of Cockburn Sound would be occupied. Members opposite who say that they care about the environment should look at the options their government is proposing. If we did not have a port or somewhere to go, the government might have to do that, but the simple reality is that everyone knows—the member for Cockburn knows—that Fremantle harbour is overwhelmingly the best economic option for the state to sustain its critical container transport into the foreseeable future. That is readily apparent. What would happen instead of that? It would cost an estimated \$6 billion, at least, of taxpayers’ money, which could otherwise be used for hospitals, schools, roads or other critical infrastructure and projects for this state. Perhaps a new maternity hospital could be amongst those other things. An amount of \$6 billion would be wasted on this folly.

The truth is that these Westport reports are not worth the paper they are written on, as pointed out by the member for Riverton. I am extraordinarily disappointed. I do not know how the members of that committee allowed themselves to be used in such a partisan, political way. These are a waste of taxpayers’ money. They simply reflect the minister’s partisan, political view. They are not a proper consideration of the available options. As I have said, we know that the best available option is to make sure that we have adequate transport options into Fremantle harbour—that is, Roe 8 and Roe 9, and then a proper connection into the port. All of that has been analysed in detail. I have reports with me, which are publicly available, that outline that in detail and give those options. It is extremely disappointing that the minister has gone down this path for purely partisan reasons and to the enormous detriment of the people of this state.

**MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan — Minister for Transport)** [3.19 pm]: The questions I have are: How did this government and Parliament operate before the economic mastermind of the member for Cottesloe hit this place? How did we know how to wake up and come to this place? How did we know how to operate until the mastermind came to this place? Again, that was an ignorant contribution. Members might have noticed the roads he mentioned—Roe 8, Roe 9 and Roe 10, but he did not mention Curtin Avenue, did he? He always seems to forget that little bit of his electorate. He always mentions Roe 8, Roe 9 and Roe 10, but he forgets to mention the roads in the western suburbs. Why is that? Like I said, he raised with me the importance of the bushland near the train track where we are building the next stage of the cyclepath, but he thinks the Beeliar wetlands are of no consequence whatsoever. He says, “Minister, make sure you are across that bushland next to that train track for the next stage of the cyclepath.” Yes, member; I will be across that. The member for Cottesloe rocked up to an announcement that he thought was a ribbon-cutting. He thought he was going to jump on a horse —

**Mr F.M. Logan:** Or a bike!

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** — or a bike and maybe crash through, Sydney Harbour Bridge–style. I was there talking to a few workers and this guy popped out of the bushes! Member for Cottesloe, I am not part of a government that has not

Ms Libby Mettam; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Terry Redman; Dr David Honey; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Simone McGurk;  
Mr Peter Tinley

---

delivered this project for many, many years. I do not know how we all operated before the member for Cottesloe came here, because the economic genius of him is just incredible! What I found most telling of the contribution made today by the member for Cottesloe and the member for Riverton in particular, and the other contributions, was the complete dismissal of Nicole Lockwood, as chair of the Westport Taskforce, and John Langoulant.

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

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** How much did the member for Riverton spend on financial advisers to sell Fremantle port? Member for Riverton, I have reports of \$22 million spent for financial advisers to sell Fremantle port and Utah Point. What happened to that, member for Riverton? The reason he does not like our plan is that it undermines his privatisation and toll road plans, because, remember, they work together. The privatisation of the port, which the opposition spent \$22 million investigating —

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

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms J.M. Freeman):** Member for Riverton, stop!

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** The privatisation of the port that the opposition spent millions and —

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

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

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** While the member for Riverton was paying consultants and going through the financials of Fremantle port, my school needed funding too. He spent up to \$20 million on financial advisers for that privatisation, and the Nationals WA was there clapping by the sidelines. The puppies of the government were selling the rail network and we are still dealing with the consequences of that. He was out there preparing the sale, but this undermines the sale and the toll road. That is what it does. The whole model that the member for Riverton was preparing was to give millions of dollars to consultants to sell Fremantle port, which was backed by a toll road that was going to raise billions of dollars. That is a fact. The toll road was going to be 86 kilometres. After projects like Gateway WA and NorthLink WA had already been funded, he was going to retrospectively apply a toll on those roads. That was his plan, and that is why the opposition did not release a business case to us because we would then have it —

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

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

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** — to show to everybody. Let us go through those facts.

**Mr D.C. Nalder:** Release the business case.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Release the business case? That business case would show not the —

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** All right, that is enough now. Are we all good? Members, just remember that you are all yelling across a Hansard reporter who is trying to take *Hansard*.

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

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

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** The Leader of the Opposition says to release the business case. She should defend her decision to not release the business case, which I have written to her about, regarding the Perth Freight Link. We have our documents out there; she has gone through them.

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

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member! Can you stop yelling across the chamber.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** I have two things to say about that. First, the Infrastructure Australia analysis showed that the opposition did not actually include building a new outer harbour as part of an analysis. Second, John Langoulant and Nicole Lockwood are the chair and deputy chair of Infrastructure WA. The member for Riverton has just come out saying that they are rubbish and they respond only to things that they are paid for and they have thrown away all their credibility. That is what the member for Riverton has said in this place. They are the head of Infrastructure WA and now he wants us to give those projects to them!

Let us go through the multi-criteria analysis —

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

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

**Extract from Hansard**

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 28 August 2019]

p6011a-6020a

Ms Libby Mettam; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Terry Redman; Dr David Honey; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Simone McGurk;  
Mr Peter Tinley

---

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** The member for Riverton, who for eight and a half years could not deliver this project, now comes in here as if —

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

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member for Riverton! I call you for the second time.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** The member for Riverton was there for eight and a half years. I do not know what he was doing.

**Mr W.J. Johnston:** Warming up the bulldozer!

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** He was warming up the bulldozer. I do not know what he was doing, but for eight and a half years, he could have managed to build that project.

**Ms J.J. Shaw:** Seat warmer.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** That is exactly right, member for Swan Hills.

The member for Warren–Blackwood might be concerned about multi-criteria analysis, but I actually think it is an important point. It looks at all the different aspects about the port, knowing that all of them have trade-offs. But which is the best one for WA's future? That is the work we have asked the task force to do. This whole idea —

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Members!

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** If the member for Warren–Blackwood actually read the *Westport Beacon's* analysis, he would know that it shows —

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

Several members interjected.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** It looks at an alternative road —

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

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

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Roe 8—I mean, honestly, if you guys do not understand —

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Minister, sit down. Can we stop? The member for Cottesloe asked for protection. I now want to afford that same protection to the minister.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** It looked at a road option for if Fremantle port were to grow continuously. It said, "That road option or the other road option would not make it stack up." In fact, Roe 8 and Roe 9 is a more expensive option, so it would have ranked lower in relation to the multi-criteria analysis. That is what the report says. It did not need to cost Roe 8–Roe 9, because the opposition had already costed it in respect of the technical analysis. That is what it actually says in the report.

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

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Go and read it. The member for Riverton should apologise today to Nicole Lockwood and John Langoulant. He should apologise. Nicole Lockwood was appointed to the Infrastructure Australia board not by a Labor government, but by a conservative government. It is an absolute disgrace.

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

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member for Riverton, stop!

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** It is an absolute disgrace that you sit here like a coward. Go out there and say it.

Once again, the member for Riverton has lost all perspective on this issue. He is embarrassed because for eight and a half years he could not deliver the road project. He sat there as Treasurer and spent \$22 million to sell a port and he is upset because we are not selling that port. That is what he is upset about. It is an absolute disgrace. He has to be calmed down by his colleagues because he has lost all perspective. The member for Riverton failed to deliver a project that he had committed to. He spent \$20 million on a privatisation plan and failed to deliver Roe 8–Roe 9, yet he came in here and most explicitly criticised—the worst criticism I have ever heard of heads of a task force or independent people—John Langoulant and Nicole Lockwood, who are doing their job. They are going through the analysis, consulting with the community and talking about stakeholder engagement. It has been widely acknowledged by all infrastructure bodies across Australia that it is one of the most extensive consultation processes ever, yet the opposition, when in government, drew up the Perth Freight Link on the back of an envelope after failing to deliver its commitments for eight and a half years.

Ms Libby Mettam; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Terry Redman; Dr David Honey; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Simone McGurk;  
Mr Peter Tinley

---

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

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Did members just hear the member for Bateman do some sort of noise that my seven-year-olds would not even do at the moment? They have outgrown that type of foolish behaviour.

Again, this is a desperate attempt. Today, it is Nicole Lockwood and John Langoulant. I do not know who it will be next week. But this is a refusal to accept that the world is moving on, that we have proper planning underway and that we are delivering on our commitments. That is something that the opposition cannot and never will accept.

I will go through all the other falsehoods that were said today. The member for Vasse referred to comments made by Hon Alannah MacTiernan about the life of the port, but refused to acknowledge that Troy Buswell, when he was Minister for Transport, said in 2014 or 2015 that the life of the Fremantle port would be 10 years. That is what he said. Let us go through it. The member for Vasse said that the Westport Taskforce completely dismissed Roe 8–Roe 9. No; go and read the *Westport Beacon*. She said that careers were threatened at the conference. When I was listening to the member for Vasse, I closed my eyes and her speech brought Sunday back. It could have been the Maritime Union of Australia talking, but it was the member for Vasse. It was so on message it was incredible. The member came in here and quoted the MUA—that is up to the member—and she dismissed John Langoulant and Nicole Lockwood. That is the modern Liberal Party, quoting the evidence provided by Christy Cain but dismissing—actually, not dismissing but, even worse, personally insulting—them today. Very bad words were said by the member for Riverton. The opposition said that the costs were not properly analysed. Again, members of the opposition have the idea that all they have to do with Fremantle is build Roe 8–Roe 9 and that is it. They still have the view that all they need to do to continue the growth at Fremantle forever is build Roe 8–Roe 9. They do not tell us exactly how they would get to the port, what they would have to do to Curtin Avenue or all the other road upgrades that they know would need to be undertaken. They do not tell us what further dredging would need to happen at Fremantle port, or about the extra berth capacity or the laydown areas. They do not tell us any of that—he impact on North Fremantle primarily. They do not come in and tell us the full picture. This report does and it says that Fremantle is not a cheap option. It is \$7 billion to \$8 billion worth. That is what it is. Members opposite say that Roe 8–Roe 9 is needed for the outer harbour. They still do not understand the road system. They do not understand the eastern corridor.

**Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup:** That is not true; we love it.

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

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Honestly, it is like Kermit, really. Both of them—it is like *The Muppets* over there. Those two angry men—the two muppets—sit there in the front row providing irrelevant comments.

They do not read the report; they come in and criticise the report. The other thing that I think is quite interesting is that the opposition was not only channelling the MUA and criticising Nicole Lockwood and John Langoulant, but also quoting from the Westport report in one section, saying, “I just want to quote the Westport report that says this”, and then in the next section saying, “It’s crap! It’s rubbish! I don’t believe it!” Members opposite either quote the Westport report and accept it or criticise the whole thing. They should not say, “I like this page; this page was really good because it said this, but then the next page was really bad and it shows that the whole report doesn’t make sense.” Does the member for Vasse like the report or not? She quoted it quite a bit. She quoted bits of it. How can someone do a good job in one bit and a bad job in another bit? She selectively quoted it, saying —

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Members!

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** What do you think of Nicole Lockwood, member for Vasse?

**Ms L. Mettam:** Read the motion. It is about what we think of you.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** The member for Riverton said that the report is rubbish. Where is your rubbish?

**Ms L. Mettam:** Use your 15 minutes and defend your rubbish.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Do you stand by the member for Riverton’s comments today?

**Ms L. Mettam:** We’re standing against you.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Do you stand by the member for Riverton’s comments today?

**Ms L. Mettam:** Do you stand by the report?

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** She is refusing to stand by the member for Riverton’s comments today.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms J.M. Freeman):** Members, it is not a debate across the floor. The Minister for Transport has the call. I understand, but you have had your opportunity, member for Vasse. You have put your point. The Minister for Transport has an opportunity to respond. Can we leave it at that. The member for Vasse cannot answer a question.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** The member for Vasse has refused, by way of interjection, to support the member for Riverton in his outrageous attack today on Nicole Lockwood and John Langoulant.



The other key point is that the member for Vasse came in and quoted the report and then went on to say that the report is rubbish. The other point just raised by the Minister for Water, which I had forgotten, is that Nicole Lockwood was also appointed by the Nationals WA to the Water Corporation board. Honestly, the opposition's complete attack on her is unfounded. She is one of the most professional consultants I have ever met. Members opposite do themselves no service by their attack on her.

**MS S.F. McGURK (Fremantle — Minister for Child Protection)** [3.37 pm]: Overwhelmingly, in the lead-up to the last state election, I got a lot of feedback about the Perth Freight Link and what people thought. It is true that everyone, many of them average citizens, became an expert when it came to freight management, port management, road infrastructure and environmental issues. But, overwhelmingly, what people said to us in the lead-up to the last state election was that they reacted against the Liberal–National Parties' chaotic infrastructure planning around Perth Freight Link. It was a joke. The previous government announced the so-called Perth Freight Link, which was Roe 8 and then Roe 9, which initially went down Stock Road and took out houses in Moody Glen. It then realised that this was a problem, because whole communities would be wiped out, and this caused the then government significant political heartache.

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

**Ms S.F. McGURK:** I am not taking the member's interjections.

That is not to say the businesses that it would interrupt. Then it went to the tunnel option, which, by the way, is the option that the opposition still sticks with, incredibly enough. That option would have a tunnel starting at the Southern Cross aged-care facility, going under the houses and schools of Hilton and White Gum Valley and coming up just before the river.

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

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

**Ms S.F. McGURK:** There was never a complete cost of the whole project. It was chaotic. There were leadership disputes between the then Minister for Transport and the Premier over this issue and its management.

When I was campaigning with the now member for Bicton, people in the suburbs told me what they thought about the chaotic handling of this project by the Liberal–National government. I guess members' actions speak volumes. If members of the former government were so confident of their proposal, they would release the business case and allow us to look at their decision-making, but, of course, they have failed to do that. We took a commitment to the last state election to do a detailed study of the long-term freight and transport logistics needs of the state. Through the Minister for Transport, we then appointed Nicole Lockwood. There has been quite a lot of discussion about her credentials. Obviously, at one stage, she was endorsed by the Liberal Party, because the former government appointed her to a number of boards. It recommended her for Infrastructure Western Australia and the Water Corporation. Her profile on *Business News* states —

Nicole Lockwood is an experienced non-executive director with a track record on regional, state and national boards focused on infrastructure, planning and regional development. She is principal of Lockwood Advisory and chair of the Westport Taskforce Steering Committee and the Freight and Logistics Council. She serves on the boards of the Water Corporation, Tourism WA, and Infrastructure Australia, Infrastructure WA, and is deputy chair of Leadership WA. Her earlier career spanned a range of fields including local government, regional economic development, law, events and corporate governance.

I think it is well understood that Nicole Lockwood not only has the detailed expertise in freight and logistics, but is widely respected. That is why it was important that she oversee the Westport process. I am amazed by the sorts of claims that have been made in this Parliament about Perth Freight Link and our future port needs. I am astounded by the superficial analysis and the laughable claims made by the opposition and, frankly, some media commentators and, as I said, thousands of citizen experts. Many in my electorate hold very passionate views. I hold very passionate views as well, but I do not claim to be an expert. I think it is important that the government takes expert advice on these issues when we are making billion-dollar decisions on behalf of the state. Just look at the jobs claims, for instance, regarding Perth Freight Link. In 2015, the member for Bateman said that Perth Freight Link was expected to create 2 400 construction jobs. In the lead-up to the 2017 election, that number magically increased to 3 360 jobs for Perth Freight Link. That figure of 3 360 jobs was then backed up by then Treasurer Mike Nahan. In 2017, the Minister for Transport, Bill Marmion, announced that the figure had increased again and 6 640 indirect and direct jobs would be created for the construction. Direct jobs and a total onsite workforce would lead to over 6 500 jobs, incredibly enough. Now we have heard it increase to 10 000 jobs. That is what Libby Mettam, the member for Vasse, said in Parliament this week. She said that Roe 8 and Roe 9 would create 10 000 jobs. How many jobs will this project create? Members opposite think of a figure and double it. It is a joke. In 2017, some of the claims made about Perth Freight Link were scrutinised in freedom of information documents. WAtoday reported —

**Extract from Hansard**

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 28 August 2019]

p6011a-6020a

Ms Libby Mettam; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Terry Redman; Dr David Honey; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Simone McGurk;  
Mr Peter Tinley

---

Major discrepancies between Roe 8's environmental report and its business case have raised concerns that the project is a rush job based on massaged figures that could hang WA taxpayers out to dry.

That report was released on the eve of the 2017 election. It also states —

Independent urban strategy consultant Mike Mouritz said he believed the FOI documents showed that Main Roads WA misused land use data to suggest a doubling of system usage within 20 years.

Mike Mouritz is a very credible urban strategy consultant! I do not think he ever made his way out of Queensland to make those claims. The article states that the FOI documents —

... reveal the enormous pressure placed on federal Department of Infrastructure and state Main Roads staff to assemble traffic forecasts for a major infrastructure project already awarded funding—the reverse of normal proceedings.

There has been some scrutiny of the work that the former government did. The more scrutiny, the more the figures and the claims folded like cards. The Westport process was designed to apply some rigour to this process. I am very confident, and I know other government members are very confident, in the leadership provided by Nicole Lockwood to properly scrutinise the whole process and the claims so that not only is taxpayer money well spent and responsibly spent, but also our freight and logistics needs will be best served into the future.

**MR P.C. TINLEY (Willagee — Minister for Housing)** [3.45 pm]: Here we are once again dealing with the fantasy created by those opposite that somehow this government has been asleep at the wheel in the way we approach infrastructure assessments and undertake the necessary work to achieve the outcomes that this growing state needs. Again, this is a fact-free zone. As the Minister for Transport and the Minister for Child Protection have already outlined, we can say whatever we want to in this debate. We can say 10 000 jobs. We can say that it is a flawed plan. Members opposite can say that Nicole Lockwood is unprofessional even though they appointed her to many things. They can say that Langoullant is a fool even though they had him as an Under Treasurer. I am fully expecting members to get to their feet at some point in the debate—because no doubt members will not let this go and will continue—and say that somehow Roe 8 and Roe 9 is going to cure cancer! The opposition will go to that ridiculous level to concoct an argument that somehow will support the idea that this government does not take seriously its obligation to plan infrastructure correctly.

The opposition has accused us of political ideology, but the reality, as the Minister for Transport said, is that the Liberal Party wants the port retained in Fremantle, and to build Roe 8 and Roe 9, so that it can sell the port. It wants to consign the urbanised people around Fremantle, through the complete change of the original use of that port and the land use around the port of Fremantle, to a future of more trucks, more traffic, more congestion, more risk. Even if the former government had built Roe 8, Roe 9 or Roe 10, or the eight lights we need to get through to get to the port, we know exactly what would come afterwards. We know exactly how the Liberal Party would want to pay for that road, and that is with tolls. Liberal Party members are on the record as saying it and it is in their DNA; they want to privatise single-use infrastructure, monopolise infrastructure and apply tolls to and impose more costs on the people of Western Australia. They want to consign the suburbs around the single-entry port to limited use over a long time. They are not serious about the future of this state.

When we look at it in a more open way, members opposite do not want a truly internationalised state. The opposition is against the state of Western Australia achieving its full potential. On Friday, I will launch this state's first-ever Asian engagement strategy. For the first time, we will articulate the ambition we have for our time zone and the markets to our north. Sixty per cent of the world's consuming class is to our north. Somebody is added to the middle class every five minutes in our time zone. To do that justice, and to achieve the outcomes we need for the people of Western Australia in a diversified economy, led well by this government with vision, we must make sure we have an internationally competitive port, an internationally competitive freight system and an internationally competitive approach. When members opposite want to start having their own views about the people of Western Australia, I look forward to hearing them, rather than the puerile, limited, partisan views of Ben Morton, who is sitting out there and telling them what to do and how to prosecute a campaign from inside Parliament, that serve not the people of Western Australia but just their own myopic view of what we ought to be doing as a state.

*Division*

Question put and a division taken, the Acting Speaker (Ms J.M. Freeman) casting her vote with the noes, with the following result —

**Extract from Hansard**  
[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 28 August 2019]  
p6011a-6020a

Ms Libby Mettam; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Terry Redman; Dr David Honey; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Simone McGurk;  
Mr Peter Tinley

---

Ayes (15)

Mrs L.M. Harvey  
Dr D.J. Honey  
Mr P.A. Katsambanis  
Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup

Mr A. Krsticevic  
Mr S.K. L'Estrange  
Mr R.S. Love  
Mr W.R. Marmion

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

Mr D.T. Redman  
Mr P.J. Rundle  
Mrs A.K. Hayden (*Teller*)

Noes (38)

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

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

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

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

---

Pairs

Mr K. O'Donnell

Mr P. Papalia

Question thus negatived.