

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

RAILWAY (FORRESTFIELD–AIRPORT LINK) BILL 2015

Second Reading

Resumed from 22 April.

MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan) [3.10 pm]: It is with great pleasure that I stand today on behalf of the Australian Labor Party to support the Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill 2015. Unlike the Liberal Party, we do not oppose rail lines; we build them. It is in our DNA to build rail lines, unlike the Liberal Party that gave us broken promise after broken promise!

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr P. Abetz): Members!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The people of Forrestfield and Belmont have to know that they can trust only Labor to deliver rail because the Liberal Party does not know how to build rail. Let us face it: this project is basically a part of Metronet. The only reason we are in this place debating this legislation is because of Labor, as the Metronet policy at the state election got Liberal Party members so scared that they were rushing around matching us here and there. This was the key Labor project that the Liberal Party matched. It had no intention of announcing this during the election until Labor did. We therefore support the rail line to Forrestfield because it was our idea. Only Labor can be trusted to deliver rail. This Liberal Party was opposed to and voted against the Mandurah rail line. Now Liberal Party members stand and say that the car parks are not big enough—the hypocrisy!

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members! Member for Wanneroo!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I will go through bit by bit by bit why the public cannot trust the Liberal Party on public transport and rail. The public cannot trust Liberal Party members on rail because they do not believe in it.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: No, they hate it!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: They hate rail.

Mr D.J. Kelly: And they hate the people who catch rail!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I think that is exactly right. Seven years in from the election and we are still waiting for the Liberal Party plan.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Churchlands!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We are still waiting for the Liberal Party plan seven years in. The hapless Minister for Transport criticises Labor for building the Mandurah rail line for retrofitting. Oh my goodness! The guys who wanted to use buses, who wanted to send the rail line along the Kenwick deviation and who opposed the Mandurah rail line came into this place saying, “Oh, you didn’t build it to Mandurah.” I do not know! The member for Mandurah has never complained that it does not go to Mandurah. I visited it the other day and it seemed to be in Mandurah. I was down there at the Mandurah train station helping our candidate for Canning, the one that the Minister for Transport apparently thinks does not exist. He criticises us because he has to retrofit the station as we did not build car parks. Is he off the planet? Honestly! The Liberal Party has no credibility on rail. The only reason we are in this place debating the rail line to Forrestfield is that Labor forced the Liberal Party into it. It had no plan to do this and we forced it into it.

I want to show people the level of planning the Liberal Party had on the Forrestfield rail line, as it is really quite interesting to note. Through some estimates committee hearings we got some copies of submissions to Infrastructure Australia. We got the submissions that were sent to the then Minister for Transport, Hon Troy Buswell. These were the plans that were being worked up by the Department of Transport; projects into which the department had actually put some time and effort. Look: there was a proposal for the Ellenbrook bus rapid transit system. The department said that perhaps it should submit that project to Infrastructure Australia at a cost of \$86 million. The light rail project was put on the priority list for \$1.5 billion, although I think it started at \$1 billion. The Yanchep passenger rail extension appears in a briefing note sent from the department to the minister saying, “These are the projects we’ve done a lot of work on that we believe have some funding priority.” The submissions were therefore for the Ellenbrook bus rapid transit system for \$86 million, the light

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

rail for \$1.5 billion and the Yanchep passenger rail system—it had done some work on that, member for Butler—for \$500 million. Then scratched at the bottom by the then minister, who knew that Labor was planning an airport route, was, “Airport rail link”. That is the level of analysis done by the Liberal Party on this project just for the election. “Airport rail link” scribbled by the minister on the bottom of an Infrastructure Australia submission to the department is the level of preparation done by this government. How about this: “Airport rail link” in handwriting? I understand that Hon Ken Travers is talking to people at Perth Airport and perhaps I should cover myself a little bit. It was only because Labor promised it that those guys over on the other side had to try to match us. That is why we are here today.

Let us consider question time today. The government cannot even get the planning right. It has one station to properly plan and it cannot even get that right. Its own agencies are criticising its plan about the Forrestfield rail station. Let us go through it. There are 10 reasons why we cannot trust the Liberal Party on public transport.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: Only 10!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: They are just for this term of government in the past eight years.

In doing a bit of research, I came across a 2008 Liberal Party transport plan in a transport election policy document. I want to outline what the Liberal Party promised to the people of WA in 2008. Back in 2008 it promised that a Liberal government would deliver a blueprint for a future integrated public transport system, including planning for rail services from Fremantle to the southern rail line; a new rail service to Ellenbrook; extension of the northern suburbs line to Butler, Brighton and Alkimos and beyond; extending the Armadale rail line to Byford and examining the case to Mundijong; and the extension of high speed future services to Bunbury with possible extension of tourist services to Busselton.

Those projects are nowhere to be seen.

Mr F.A. Alban: Tell us about your great achievements in your two terms of government.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Okay, I will.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Mr F.A. Alban interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Swan Hills!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I just want to let the member for Swan Hills know the outline of events for today. First, I will outline the government’s failures; second, outline our achievements; and third, discuss the particulars about the bill. That is the order of events and I hope all members are comfortable with that for today.

The second failure is the Liberal Party plan for the first 100 days of government. Everybody will be surprised to learn that one of the Liberal Party’s key priorities for the first 100 days of government was to immediately commence work on developing a blueprint for an integrated public transport system. That was in the first 100 days. It is seven years later, and still there is no integrated plan for WA. How many days is that? I did not have time to count, but it is more than 100 days since the 2008 election, and still we have no integrated plan. My good friend the member for Warnbro tells me it is 2 555 days.

Can anyone guess the third reason why we cannot trust the Liberals on public transport and rail?

A member interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The Ellenbrook rail line! I am glad the member for Swan Hills is here.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members! Member for Armadale!

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Swan Hills, I will have to call you for the first time if you do not desist. Members, through the Chair, thank you.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I should have called you twice, member for Albany, for questioning the ruling of the Chair. I will do that if you like.

Mr P.B. Watson interjected.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

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

Dr A.D. Buti interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Armadale, I call you for the second time. I will not tolerate any reflecting on the Chair.

Mr P.B. Watson interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Albany, I call you for the second time. Member for West Swan, you have the call.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. I want to reflect upon the fact that —

Mr P.B. Watson interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Albany, I call you for the third time. That is unacceptable.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I hope the treatment is fair on both sides, Mr Acting Speaker.

Mr C.J. Barnett interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Oh, back to being the most unpopular leader in Australia, Premier? He must have been happy about last night!

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We know that the transport policy released by the Liberal Party said that it would build the Ellenbrook rail line.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Point of Order

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Mr Acting Speaker, I note that you called the member for Albany to order three times for interjecting, yet the member for Swan Hills and the Premier continued to interject, and I note that they have not been called to order and certainly have not had their names recorded. I believe the member for Armadale just asked for some fairness here, and I would, by way of point of order, ask for the same.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr P. Abetz): The reason the member for Albany was called three times was not for interjecting but for calling into question the ruling of the Chair. That is why he was called. I will not tolerate any calling into question the ruling of the Chair; otherwise, we will have total chaos here. I have been very lenient in terms of interjections in this debate. The member for West Swan has been quite energetic in her presentation and there was a lot of additional comment from her side and some feedback from the other side. There were plenty of interjections —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members, I am on my feet, and if I am on my feet, I will not tolerate any interjections, member for Armadale. You know the standing orders. I have allowed a fair bit of interplay, and it was all done in good spirit, but I will not tolerate any calling into question the ruling of the Chair.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Can I just get some clarification here? If a member gives a very energetic speech, they just have to cop interjections. Is that your ruling?

The ACTING SPEAKER: No, it is not. What I said was that there was plenty of additional comment from the member for West Swan's side and there was some backwards and forwards. I allowed quite a bit of that from both sides, but enough is enough. The member for West Swan now has the floor and I will not allow any further interjections.

Debate Resumed

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. There is a comment I could make, but I will not.

The Ellenbrook rail line was committed to by the Liberal Party in 2008 in a brochure distributed by the member for Swan Hills. Once again, it claimed that the Liberals would build a rail line to Ellenbrook.

Mr B.S. Wyatt interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member for Swan Hills —

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Victoria Park! The member for West Swan has the call.

Point of Order

Dr A.D. BUTI: Mr Acting Speaker, I seek your guidance. The member for Swan Hills has interjected nonstop, and the Premier has interjected on our side. The member for Victoria Park was speaking to his own colleague and you are warning him not to speak! This is incredible direction by you!

The ACTING SPEAKER: I said I had allowed a fair bit of interplay and then said no more. I just said that and that is why I said the member for West Swan has the call and that I would not allow any further interjections. The member for Victoria Park was the very first one to interject, so I called out to him and asked him to desist.

Dr A.D. BUTI: Mr Acting Speaker, I seek some guidance —

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Armadale, I am on my feet and I will not tolerate interjections when I am on my feet. I call you to order for the third time.

Dr A.D. BUTI: Mr Acting Speaker, can you give us some guidance? When someone from the same side as the member on their feet wishes to speak to them, is that an interjection?

The ACTING SPEAKER: That is an interjection, yes.

Dr A.D. BUTI: So you will be calling, from now on, anyone who seeks to speak to a colleague on their feet. Will that be your ruling?

The ACTING SPEAKER: My ruling has been that because things got out of control, I would not allow any further interjections.

Dr A.D. BUTI: Mr Acting Speaker, I seek your guidance. Can you please give us a clear ruling: if a colleague seeks to speak to someone on their feet, will you be calling that as an interjection from now on?

The ACTING SPEAKER: It depends on the nature of the interjection. I will deal with each case on its merits.

Dr A.D. BUTI: I think it would be best if I leave.

The ACTING SPEAKER: You may leave; that is up to you.

Debate Resumed

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I return to the issue, which is the Ellenbrook rail line promised in 2008. The member for Swan Hills said that a future Liberal government would build a rail line to Ellenbrook. The Liberal Party's costings, released during that election campaign, said that the Ellenbrook rail line would commence in 2010–11. An article that appeared in *The West Australian* also reported that the Liberal Party had committed to an Ellenbrook rail line. It stated —

And yes, in the longer term in 2015, it's a long time away, yes (we will) build the spur line through Ellenbrook.

Again and again there have been promises to build the rail line to Ellenbrook, but still there is nothing. Even worse, we have heard spurious arguments from the government about why it is not doing it, apart from the Premier's dislike for the member for Swan Hills. Never has the government produced actual evidence to suggest that there are not enough people to warrant building a rail line to Ellenbrook. This is a clear broken promise. The government lied to the people of Ellenbrook and has never apologised for it. Again and again, we see clear examples of the government failing to deliver a core commitment to the people of Ellenbrook. The government has no comprehension of growth in that area—absolutely none. Its lack of credibility on public transport rests, above everything else, on the fact that it has failed to deliver for the people of Ellenbrook and has never apologised and, even worse, has made things up to justify its clear broken promise. Everyone across the state will remember that and will understand what the government has done to Ellenbrook and the fact that Ellenbrook deserves a rail line.

I turn now to the fourth reason why we cannot trust the government on public transport: the Ellenbrook bus rapid transit system. Remember that one?

Mr C.J. Barnett: We didn't commit to it.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Honestly. Is he interjecting, Mr Acting Speaker?

The ACTING SPEAKER: He is, as was the member for Bassendean.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I do not mind a little interjection, but do not call our side if you do not call the other side. I do not mind a bit of it, but do not call our side —

Point of Order

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Mr Acting Speaker, successive members on the other side have canvassed your rulings. Under the standing orders they have the capacity to formally canvass the ruling; if they wish to do so, they should do so.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: It is somewhat ironic that it was actually the Premier who was interjecting then and was not called to order, whereas the member for Victoria Park made a positive contribution by way of his interjection, which was supported by the member, and he was called to order. I think this beautifully illustrates the point, especially given that you said you would accept no more interjections on the member for West Swan, yet you continued to let the Premier interject. I know he is the Premier of the state, but in this Parliament he should be treated the same as every one of us when it comes to the standing orders.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I absolutely agree with you, member for Midland, but the member for Bassendean was actually the first one to interject and I allowed a little bit of interjection. I just simply called the name of the member for Victoria Park at the time; I did not actually put him down as having been called in that sense. I was simply saying, “Please desist.” So let us get on with it. Member for West Swan, you have the floor.

Debate Resumed

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I am talking about the 10 reasons why we cannot trust the Liberal Party. I will keep going with the order of events, just in case the member for Swan Hills is concerned.

The next one is the Ellenbrook bus rapid transport system. This was a priority project announced in 2011. Members will remember the “Public Transport in Perth in 2031” master plan that was released by the then Minister for Transport, Hon Troy Buswell. In a media statement dated 14 July 2011, the minister said —

“Our first priority for the implementation of this type of service is for Ellenbrook, where projected passenger numbers show a Bus Rapid Transit service from Ellenbrook and Bassendean, and across to Morley is feasible.”

Mr Buswell went on to say that the Liberal Party would spend \$11 million to progress that announcement. The then Minister for Transport also put out a media statement dated 7 August 2012 and headed “Ellenbrook BRT concept design under way”. In the lead-up to the election, the Liberal Party was committed to the BRT. I will tell members what happened to the BRT. Remember, a week before the election, the Liberal Party briefed the City of Swan on the BRT. It was about to announce it. It had spent money on graphic artists. It had prepared a plastic wrap that could be wrapped around a bus so that it would look as though it was an Ellenbrook BRT. The Liberal Party had signs saying that the BRT was coming to Ellenbrook. The Public Transport Authority was spending money on behalf of the Liberal Party to prepare propaganda for the election campaign and re-announce the Ellenbrook rail line. However, Metronet scared the Liberal Party into proposing a rail line to the airport. It scared it away from doing the BRT to Ellenbrook, because everyone would have known that a bus rapid transport system could not match a rail line to Ellenbrook. That is the fourth reason that we cannot trust this Liberal Party on public transport.

I want to talk now about an all-time favourite, MAX, or the Metro Area Express. That was announced in 2011 as a priority project. Let us talk about that. That was a transformational project to redefine travel and development plans, with a light rail from Mirrabooka to the CBD.

Mr D.J. Kelly: Did they have a launch?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I think they did have a launch. We all remember the launch. It was in late 2012. I remember the media conference, when they told people to buy land in Mirrabooka. When asked about the cost, we were told it would be north of \$1 billion. Before the launch of that project in 2011, Mr Buswell said the following —

... the stage one implementation of a light rail system from Perth to Mirrabooka would be necessary to facilitate the growing demand for public transport in that area.

“There are a lot of people from that area that currently come into the city directly on bus ...

“So it will take pressure off the heavy rail line and the pressure off congestion in inner-city areas, so we frankly think it gives the best bang for buck.”

The Liberal Party said that the light rail stacked up, and, in late 2012, it launched it. Do members remember that? It was before the Liberal Party state conference as we recall. The Liberal Party needed a media announcement,

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

so it created this light rail project. It cobbled it together and gave it a name—before it even knew where it would be going. As I said, I knew this was a poorly planned project when members of the Liberal Party were walking along Hay Street Mall and saying that light rail is coming to Hay Street Mall. I thought at the time, “Gee; that would be a pretty tight fit.” I am not a public transport expert, but I thought it would be a pretty tight fit to stick a light rail system in Hay Street Mall. A lot of people got excited about it, but I did not think it was going to work. The City of Perth finally cottoned on and put big models in Hay Street Mall and complained about it. This was the Liberal Party’s commitment, and it featured predominantly in its campaign for three key seats at the time of the 2013 election—the seat of Perth, the seat of Mount Lawley and the seat of Morley. I have not singled out the member for Morley —

Mr P. Papalia: Do they make light rail in the Punjab?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: They probably do now after he has ordered a few carriages!

The member for Morley distributed a lot of stuff through people’s letterboxes. One of them caught my eye. That is when he said that the \$1.8 billion MAX—Perth’s first light rail network—will be delivered in 2018. There was an open letter from the Premier and the member for Morley together—I am not sure whether we will see that again—saying that Perth will have for the first time a light rail system. However, that has now gone, never to be seen again. It is in the scrapheap of projects that members opposite wheel out to try to win an election, but they then say after the election that those promises do not need to be taken seriously. The Premier said that people should not worry about particular commitments; it is just the vibe. No-one in Morley would have voted for this government because of that announcement; it was just the vibe. However, the vibe has changed a bit, and hopefully people will continue to vote according to the vibe.

The sixth is the extension of the rail line to Yanchep.

Ms L.L. Baker: What’s happening there?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Not much, member for Maylands. It is like all the other projects that are wheeled out before an election to try to win a seat. Not much is happening there. Growth is continuing in that area. We had a great meeting with the City of Wanneroo just a couple of weeks ago about the massive growth that is happening in our outer suburbs, whether it be the northern corridor, the north-eastern corridor, the south-western corridor or the south-eastern corridor. That massive growth requires infrastructure.

The extension of the rail line to Yanchep was one of the priority projects outlined by the Liberal Party in 2011. This was to be another transformational project. I refer to a very good article by Gareth Parker in July 2011 headed “Rail extension to Yanchep a priority”. The article has a picture of some very happy and excited families from Yanchep and Two Rocks saying they welcome the move for this rail line, because the bus service is too infrequent. I suspect they are still waiting for that rail line.

In August 2012, in the lead-up to the state election, Mr Buswell said —

“We are in heavy planning now to push that railway line further north to Yanchep,” ... “That planning work is happening and conversations are now ongoing between the Government and the landowners in that area.

“Extension of the line north to Yanchep is an important opportunity for us to get a railway line in ahead of the development front.”

I reiterate that. The then Minister for Transport said —

“Extension of the line north to Yanchep is an important opportunity for us to get a railway line in ahead of the development front.”

That is novel! It is not happening! Again and again, expectations are built and commitments are made, and there is a failure to deliver. That is happening all over the place. The member for the north metropolitan area is saying that the government is continuing to delay the Yanchep line because not enough people live there. Again and again, there is complete confusion and mayhem from this government when it comes to the delivery of public transport.

I come now to number seven. This was another promise where the Liberal Party had done all the preparation—it had employed the graphic artist, it had the pictures done, and it pretty much had all the media propaganda ready. Can anyone guess what that project was? I invite an injection from the other side. Mr Acting Speaker (Mr P. Abetz), you might want to jump in on this one, because it is one of your favourites. Can anyone guess what this one was?

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton;
Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter
Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms
Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

Mr D.J. Kelly: Is it something to do with Thornlie?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It is the Thornlie rail line extension to Cockburn. In previous weeks the government was awarding contracts to get works done for the Forrestfield–Airport Link, such as the graphic artwork. This link is quite interesting. For value for money, it is a pretty worthwhile project. It opens up development in that corridor. It is not only the beginning of the Metronet circle route, but also, because of a lack of planning around the sports stadium, it is necessary to get people to the stadium. That is another key reason that the Labor Party believes it is a priority project and why my good friends the members for Gosnells and Cannington were out there looking at the existing Thornlie station—the station the Labor government built—saying that that link is quite important. It will help people in that area have greater connectivity and also make the stadium work. Again, this is because of the government’s chaotic management of public transport in this state. The government is building a stadium that will see people shovelled through the city stations, creating enormous issues accommodating them, because the government has not planned properly. I was talking about the Thornlie rail extension. It was good to read these comments from the Premier in July. He gets reported, because sometimes people believe what he says. The report stated that Premier Colin Barnett recently said in an interview that the Thornlie to Cockburn railway line was a short-term number one priority.

Mr D.J. Kelly: In other words, it will never happen!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: That is exactly right—it will never happen! I will quote the member for Southern River, the Acting Speaker, who in 2011 said he appreciated it was part of the Liberal Party’s blueprint. The member for Southern River has to realise that the Liberal Party does not build rail lines until it is dragged kicking and screaming to them by the Labor Party. The Liberal Party does not build rail lines until the Labor Party initiates them or drags members opposite kicking and screaming to them.

I refer to number eight on this list, which is another one of my favourites—the extension to Byford. Members will remember that in 2008 the Liberal Party released its transport policy in the run-up to an election in which it was desperate to win the seat of Serpentine–Jarrahdale, as it was then. The Liberal Party committed to extending the Armadale line to Byford and to examining the case for a service to Mundijong. Liberal Party members commented on that at the time. I refer to the *Serpentine–Jarrahdale Examiner* in which the late Mr Don Randall is quoted as saying that he believed there was a need for a rail station in Byford. Hon Simon O’Brien, the Minister for Transport at the time, said that information from the Public Transport Authority did not support the addition of a railway station at Byford. The government committed to something that it had no intention to deliver, which was the extension of the rail line to Byford.

I was at Byford a few months ago to meet the local councils. The government is creating traffic congestion by neglecting the enormous growth that is occurring in these areas. Building railway lines should be the bread and butter of government; it should not be a special event. Building a railway station should not be a special event; it should be something that is done as part of government. That is what Labor governments do—they build public transport as part of everyday government and everyday budgeting. It is not something that occurs every eight or nine years; Labor governments do that each year, because if that is not done, our infrastructure lags behind. This government has made Western Australia lag behind. That is why the Labor Party has come out with its Metronet plan. The Labor Party believes that a priority of the Labor Party is to deliver infrastructure to the suburbs that this government has forgotten about.

I will reiterate some of the comments of the Minister for Planning today. I think it is bizarre that the Minister for Planning and the Premier are standing beside the proposed site for a 32-storey luxury residential apartment tower near the waterfront when the suburbs are being neglected. That is bizarre. The government should go back to the suburbs, where people trusted the Liberal Party—but never again! They will not trust the Liberal Party again! People in the suburbs trusted the Liberal–National government to deliver core infrastructure, but it has let them down. People are dealing with traffic congestion across our suburbs and whether that is on Armadale Road or Gnangara Road, on Lord Street or at level crossings, these things should be fixed. We cannot afford not to do that. As I said, the government has an obsession with development in the city. I can understand the development of public amenities, but a 32-storey residential high-value block of units in the city? The government says that people will be employed to build them. Of course they will, but people would be employed to build a rail line to Ellenbrook and a rail extension between Thornlie and Cockburn too! It is all a matter of the priorities. This government has shown again and again its failure to deliver basic priorities. Those are eight reasons, under the leadership of this Premier, that we cannot trust this party to deliver rail in WA.

I have two more reasons I want to mention. I want to mention the fact that we cannot trust the Liberal Party because it closes rail lines, it does not build them. The Liberal Party closed the Fremantle rail line, and it was the

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

Labor government that reopened it. I go to reason 10: The Liberal Party opposed the Mandurah rail line, which is one of the most successful projects in WA.

Mr P. Papalia: It was transformational.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It was transformational, nation-building, whatever you call it! I noticed a couple of weeks ago on Twitter that the new Prime Minister sent a photo of himself catching a train. It was funny, because I recall that it was the Monday after the Labor Party had announced Metronet, and the state Minister for Transport was saying that rail was not the answer, yet our new Prime Minister was loving it and sending a photo on Twitter of himself catching the train from the Esplanade station all the way to Mandurah and talking about how great this project is. That project was delivered by a Labor government and opposed by the Liberal Party.

Let us talk about the Mandurah rail line. The New MetroRail project primarily included three projects—the 72-kilometre rail line to Mandurah, the extension to Clarkson and the spur line to Thornlie. MetroRail was transformational. It included the two new beautiful underground stations—Perth underground station and Esplanade station. In 2008, after 11 weeks, the railway had a weekday average of 41 000 patrons, whereas previously 16 000 people had used the bus routes from the suburbs into the city. Within a year, the railway was carrying 55 000 passengers a day.

Mr N.W. Morton: Wasn't it delayed?

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Forrestfield!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: How about the government's project, member for Forrestfield? The government has not even started its project; it has already been delayed for two years. Seriously, the member has got to be kidding! The government's project has been delayed; it has not even started! The Liberal Party promised it for 2018. The member for Forrestfield has no idea. Western Australians would not be getting a train station if it was not for the Labor Party.

Mr N.W. Morton interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Forrestfield, I am on my feet. I call you for the second time.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It must give the member for Forrestfield some confidence knowing that he has the Minister for Transport by his side selling the Forrestfield rail line. It must give him a lot of confidence. He is the guy helping him sell that project.

Let us go through the Perth–Mandurah rail line. As we said, there is the Perth–Mandurah rail line; the New MetroRail project, including a four-kilometre extension, \$1.66 billion, including a four-kilometre extension from Currabine to Clarkson; a 3.4-kilometre line from Cannington to Thornlie; 31 new three-car railcar sets; and 11 new railway stations, including The Esplanade Station, the Perth foreshore and the new underground station at William Street. It was a massive project. I want to go through the third reading to see what was said about support for the Railway (Jandakot to Perth) Bill. The Liberal Party opposed the Mandurah rail line bill. The then Minister for Planning and Infrastructure, Hon Alannah MacTiernan, said that there had been about 22 hours debate on the legislation and members opposite said that the government was rushing it. The Liberal Party tried to delay it by sending it to a committee. The Liberal Party tried to do whatever it could to kill it off. I refer to the Premier's comments on the new route—not the Kenwick deviation, but the direct route for the Mandurah rail line. The following comment was made by the member for Cottesloe —

Who, if anyone, will benefit from the Government's unilateral decision to change the route of the railway? The minister has emphasised the fact that 12 minutes will be saved on the trip from Mandurah to Perth. I am sure that is true. However, who really benefits from saving 12 minutes?

That was the Premier's argument against the re-routed, direct, fast service to Mandurah. As I said, no-one can argue the success of the Perth–Mandurah rail line. The only person I have ever heard try to argue that was the Minister for Transport when he said that we did not go to Mandurah, and where else did we not go? Rockingham.

Mr P. Papalia: We didn't build enough car parks.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We did not build enough car parks.

I remember when a certain businessperson who was a supporter of the Liberal Party was quoted on the front page of *The West Australian* as saying, "I drove from Mandurah and there was no-one down there."

Mr M. McGowan: Willy Packer.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It was Willy Packer.

The West Australian was a different being at that stage. It was on the front page at the time. A rich businessman saying that no-one lives down there made the front page, and it was part of the constant argument against the Mandurah rail line. It was intense. The then minister was under very much pressure. A Liberal Party business associate argued against it every step of the way and now people are saying our car parks are not big enough. Even we underestimated the success of the Mandurah rail line. It was very popular, but this Liberal Party was against it.

Mr C.J. Barnett: We started building it.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Honestly! No-one believes you.

Mr C.J. Barnett: It's true.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Whatever! In your dreamland, Premier—go and live in it.

Mr C.J. Barnett interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Go back to Toodyay where you can barbecue in your dreamland.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Through the Chair, please.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: He can interject on me and I have to reply to him through the Chair, is that correct?

The ACTING SPEAKER: Just continue.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: He can —

The ACTING SPEAKER: You called on him and he responded and I let that go.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: While I am on my feet, do I have to respond to him through the Chair?

The ACTING SPEAKER: I am just calling this back to order, thank you very much.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Okay, fair enough.

This is a Liberal Party that does not understand rail. It is seven years in. As we said, we have many achievements. We upgraded stations. We built the Greenwood station. We have built many things, including the Kelmscott station. The list is enormous. We reopened the Fremantle rail line, electrified the Perth rail network and built the Currambine railway. Of course, we built the northern suburbs rail line. The list of public transport achievements is so great that I forgot for a second that we built the northern suburbs rail line. I will go through it again because I missed that. We reopened the Fremantle line, electrified the Perth rail network, built the Perth–Currambine railway, built the extension from Currambine to Clarkson, built the Perth–Mandurah rail line —

Mr F.M. Logan: We built the Fremantle–Armadale rail line and successive Liberal governments closed them all.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: That is right.

Mr F.M. Logan: When you said we were the only party that built rail lines, if you go back in history, we are. The only ones who closed them down were the Liberals.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We built the rail line to Thornlie and constructed new rail stations on existing lines at Armadale, Bassendean, Gosnells, Greenwood, Kelmscott and Victoria Park. We did a lot of work on not only expanding our rail network, but also improving the existing network. As I said, this is in our DNA. The Liberal Party does not understand it; it does not get it. It is dragged kicking and screaming to any rail commitment.

I refer to part of our new Metronet plan, which involves also outlining our priority projects. As I said, our suburbs need these projects. Due to congestion, particularly in the fast-growing urban centres, we need public transport. We cannot lag 10 to 20 years behind. We will be creating problems for future generations unless we are committed to delivering the public transport people deserve. As part of our new Metronet commitments, we are focusing on existing level crossings. We believe that fixing level crossings in our suburbs can achieve three things. It can improve road safety, particularly, as I said, on rail lines with a lot of heavy traffic—for example, the Armadale line. By fixing level crossings, we will be seeking to improve road safety, to reduce congestion and to provide avenues for urban redevelopment. Everyone in the development industry is telling me that the “Perth and Peel@3.5 million” policy will not do enough to provide housing for our future generations. We need to be a lot smarter about infill. We cannot tell people to just subdivide their blocks and we will reach a target. It

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

is not happening. We have to look at where governments have invested in infrastructure over time. We do not have to go past the Armadale–Midland line to understand the under-utilisation of that infrastructure in our housing and planning policy. There are train stations after train stations, and where the trains stop, there is some housing and normally some rundown commercial properties, but no real density. We talk a lot about safety on rail lines and at train stations. I am a key believer that increasing patronage and usage and making sure our train stations become hubs of activity help to improve safety. In that case, more people will use them and that will continue to make stations thrive. The stations are there; they have been there for decades and we have not maximised development around them. We have allowed ad hoc developments to be built where they should not be built. Someone from the development industry told me that density should be where it is deserved. We need to look at where there is already strong public transport and where public transport is planned and plan to ensure density occurs around those stations. To have any chance of delivering on the 47 per cent infill targets, we need to be far more strategic in how we plan our suburbs. Metronet is not just a transport policy; it is a planning policy. It is about how we plan our suburbs into the future, letting people know that we will build railway lines here and that we will build stations in this proximity. Let us sit down and work on those plans around those stations now. Let us get it right, because we cannot continue to miss opportunities. The funding available to WA is scarce. The state has increased net debt to such a degree that we have to be much smarter about our infrastructure spend. We have to maximise our spending on Metronet, to achieve not only transport outcomes, but also planning outcomes, and that is why we are so committed to an integrated, coordinated plan for our suburbs. Without it, we will continue to create congestion hotspots throughout the suburbs. The member for Mandurah is back and I note that the Minister for Transport believes that the Mandurah rail line does not go to Mandurah, member for Mandurah!

Anyway, I particularly want to turn to the Forrestfield–Airport Link railway project. I thank the advisers for the briefing on this matter, which was a couple of weeks ago now as we thought this issue would be brought on then. In consideration in detail I will go through many of the questions we have following that briefing and also about the proposed route, but now I want to outline some of the key issues. We support the rail line and the new station. We believe the Forrestfield station should be the jewel in the crown of this rail line. Done well it can create a new precinct to house people in the future and also link with the eastern suburbs, in particular the hills. However, I have no confidence in what the government has done so far. I cannot believe that it is three years since the election and the state government planning agency—the Metropolitan Redevelopment Authority—has not taken a more active role. I do not understand why this process is being allowed to drag on and create so many issues. I have gone through the agenda discussed last night at the Development and Infrastructure Services Committee meeting. I also want to outline the concerns that a number of people from the member for Forrestfield’s electorate have come to see me about. I started taking an interest in the plan around the rail station; that is how I started getting interested in what was happening there. I then heard from a number of other parties, particularly planners involved in industry, who raised other concerns with me about the planning objectives around the station. As I said, I do not think the objectives of either side of politics differ, but I think the government’s implementation and its capacity to deliver is all over the place. The first issue that was raised with me was the car park situation. I understand we have to build car parks. Of course we have to build car parks, but, again, there is the matter of how landowners are being dealt with. The shire has picked up on that concern and asked that the Public Transport Authority do better. Land is, in effect, being sterilised possibly for decades by the way the government is going about the structure of its car park process. Again, this is an issue on which people who come to see me are completely disenchanted with the Liberal Party, because it is a party that is purported to look after landowners, but in key projects such as this, it is not. Effectively, land is being sterilised for decades and there is no process to get out of it. I will raise that a bit more in the consideration in detail stage.

I am deeply concerned about the government’s delivery of this project. Ultimately, I think the PTA is very good at delivering rail lines, so I will not question that, but I am concerned about the precincts. To tell the truth, I am concerned about the interaction with Perth Airport and the two other stations, and I will outline that, because, honestly, I am a bit worried that Perth Airport is not totally on board with this project—the key beneficiary is not totally on board.

Mrs G.J. Godfrey: They have publicly said they are.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I know that Perth Airport probably has; if a rail line is built for it, it will publicly say to go ahead. However, I do not know what further contribution, facilitation or effort it will make to the planning. Anyway, I will go through that in the consideration in detail stage. However, I am concerned about what seems to be a complete lack of coordination from within government. The Minister for Planning swung around during question time and said it was a draft plan and that these things can be corrected, but it is basically three years since the commitment was made. As I said, this precinct should be the jewel in the crown. It is the first precinct

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton;
Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter
Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms
Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

we are building—hopefully we will build it as stage 1 of Metronet. It is the first precinct that really starts to encompass modern precinct planning. We have moved on a bit—everyone has—about how to get density around stations. I do not want this to become a lost opportunity.

Let us go to some of the criticisms raised in the Development and Infrastructure Services Committee meeting agenda. The PTA's concerns included —

- An appropriate buffer from the freight yard should be maintained
- Development within the station precinct should be undertaken in close consultation with the PTA ...
- It is not PTA's responsibility to ensure noise mitigation for any future development
- The staging of the car parking provisions should be offset by the high quality TOD development, undertaken in close consult with the PTA
- ...
- Transperth services have a number of concerns in relation to the provision of bus services

This is the minister's own agency. Main Roads' concerns included —

- Roe Highway/Berkshire Road interchange that is currently under construction did not factor in the proposed land use changes

This is Main Roads commenting on the fact that a road was basically planned and constructed after this was announced, but the proposed land-use changes around the precinct were not factored in. Further Main Roads' concerns include —

- Possible overpass of Sultana Road over the Roe Highway to be used as a residential distributor if the eastern side is developed would have to be financed through developer contributions
- ...
- The development will have to comply with ... "Road and rail transport ...

Concerns from the Department of Planning included —

- Reference should be made to the draft Northe-East Dub-regional Framework including a site opportunities/constraints plan and a consolidated local/regional context plan.
- District centres should be supported by a retail needs assessment ...
- Forecast housing/employment/land use yields and demographics should be included.

Further Department of Planning concerns are —

Traffic Impact Assessment

- Being a TOD precinct, it is necessary to take a measured approach to major movement network intervention so as not to induce further demand.
- ...
- Roundabouts and traffic signals need to be used in appropriate locations ...

The concerns from the Department of Planning go on and on. Basically every private sector organisation that uses the rail sector in particular is opposing the project.

I turn to Fremantle Ports, which has obviously gone through some issues with the developments there. Its concerns include —

- Mixed use zone is located less than 100m from the freight railway line and high density residential less than 200m which has the potential for land use conflict

The document goes on to state that all the final work needs to include further noise modelling.

I understand that all these issues can be worked through over time, but I do not understand why it is three years since the election and these concerns are out there. Why is the state government not playing a lead role in making sure that, as I said, the Forrestfield station is the jewel in the crown? It should be the station we all look to. Basically, it is helping to justify a \$2 billion investment of taxpayers' money. It is the key station driving catchment numbers and also many of the patronage numbers. It has been suggested that the rail service will pick up a lot of passengers from Kalamunda and other areas. Therefore, we must ensure that the connectivity, for

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

example, the bus network and the road network, will work well with the new station. Remember, this will be one of the biggest car parks—I think the biggest car park—on our rail network. The minister’s response to a question in question time today about the road network was along the lines of, “Who cares about these road interchanges; they are a few kilometres away.” Given that the government is building the biggest car park on our network, one would think it would want to work out how it is coordinated with the road interchanges and the road network. As I said, until I was approached, I really thought it was all going well.

I believe that the PTA can deliver a very good rail line; it did a very good job on the Perth–Mandurah rail line, which was far more complex than the city project. If we just reflect on that, a tunnel through the city, including two stations, completely transformed the area. It completely bemuses me when people go around saying that Labor did nothing for the city as they emerge from the Esplanade train station or the Perth underground station. The government’s only success in government accommodation was 140 William Street—the deal which the former member for Vasse said was corrupt. The government keeps using it as the only example of any value-for-money project delivered on government accommodation in the state. We could compare that with some of the deals the Nationals have struck in the country. Not only was it never corrupt—it went out to a proper tender process—but also it is driving value for money, which the government continues. Every media release on government accommodation and value for money says that one40william is the driving success built because of the Perth–Mandurah rail line. People do not quite understand that one40william was built as part of the Perth–Mandurah rail line. In a sense, the most successful redevelopment alongside any of the existing train stations was that very good redevelopment of that part of the city—and of course all the eateries have popped up since then. Maybe the new Prime Minister took a photo of that train station, too; I cannot recall. I know I did but I am not sure the new Prime Minister did.

We support this bill. We support it because the Forrestfield rail line is being built because of Labor. If it was not for Labor, the Liberal Party would never have committed to it. Everyone knows that. We support it. Everyone out there knows that the Liberal Party’s heart is not in public transport. I think the minister said that 42 per cent of all vehicles on our roads are commercial vehicles. It is a staggering number. I cannot wait for him to justify that figure. His justification for not building rail lines is that 42 per cent of all traffic on our roads are commercial vehicles.

Mr D.C. Nalder: Will you take an interjection?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: No, because that is what the minister said.

Mr D.C. Nalder: You’re actually misleading now.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The minister can respond when he replies to the second reading debate. The Premier called me too delicate. That will be a first. I have been called a lot of things; “delicate” is probably not one of them!

We support the rail line. We built the northern suburbs rail line and we built the Mandurah rail line.

Mr F.A. Alban: That was nearly 20 years ago. Have you got something new lined up?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We have; it is called Metronet, and it is coming to a town near you, member for Swan Hills! Actually, the majority of the member’s new electorate will be serviced by Metronet.

Mr D.C. Nalder: Are you committing to it?

Mr P. Papalia: Of course we are.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Tricky, tricky—coming from the Liberal Party, which basically lied to everybody in the suburbs about every one of its election commitments. Does it want to extract something from us? The Liberal Party should give us a break! It promised people that they will be catching light rail on Fitzgerald Street by 2018. It promised people in Forrestfield that they would be catching a train on the airport line by 2018. It promised the people of Ellenbrook that they would be catching a train on the rail line by 2015. It promised the people of Ellenbrook that they would have a bus rapid transit system. The Liberal Party made a promise to the people of Yanchep. Our credibility will outstrip that of the Liberal Party any day on public transport. Bring on the debate! We will debate this issue day upon day upon day. We are seeing this minister trying to sell public transport. We have a plan.

Mr P.T. Miles interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms L.L. Baker): Member for Wanneroo, I know it is difficult to hear because of the member for Warnbro yelling across the chamber as well, but between the two of you, if you could just keep quiet for 60 seconds, we will get to the end of the speech of the member for West Swan.

Several members interjected.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

The ACTING SPEAKER: I mean this. Please, do not interject.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: To quote Ross Lyon, we will debate this issue anywhere, any time. The member for Swan Hills should not interject about the Ellenbrook rail line because his entire electorate will be covered by our commitment. We are 100 per cent committed to delivering rail. The Liberal Party has let down Western Australia. We will not let down Western Australia like the Liberal Party does. The only reason the bill is before us is that the Liberal Party tried to match us during the election campaign. We all know it. The Liberal Party gave the background to the journos on it. We know what happened. Menzies House gave the background to the journos. The Liberal Party was scared by our Metronet policy, and it tried to match us on this one. Labor is 100 per cent committed to rail.

MR N.W. MORTON (Forrestfield) [4.16 pm]: I rise to make a contribution to this most excellent piece of legislation, the Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill 2015, before the house this afternoon. I guess that was an hour of my life that I will never ever get back. Unfortunately, because I was on the speaking roster, I had to sit in this place and endure the speech of the member for West Swan, as she now leaves the chamber. I did want to issue her a challenge. She has left, so I will issue it in her absentia. I want her to stand in this place, if she has the intestinal fortitude, and apologise to the chamber for her opening marks when she said that this Liberal–National government will not be building this train line. Yes, we will build this train line.

Mr P. Papalia: You won't be in office, mate; you won't be here.

Mr N.W. MORTON: I am pretty sure the election is in March 2017. I will get the abacus out for the member because I know he is a bit light on upstairs. Just to make it crystal clear for you, champ, we are starting construction next year—2016. The election will be in 2017. I know that is a very difficult concept for members opposite to grasp. I know they are worried that this Liberal–National government is investing in rail and investing in the eastern metropolitan suburbs. Listen to them squeal, Madam Acting Speaker. The opposition neglected the eastern suburbs for years. Now is the time for members opposite to list their achievements in the east metropolitan region. There is silence. Now is their chance to land that killer blow. I am listening. I hear nothing. They have done nothing for east metro. All they have done is neglect the east. They have neglected my community.

Mr F.M. Logan: Midland redevelopment.

Mr N.W. MORTON: I ask the member to name what the government has done in my electorate. It has done nothing.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members! Member for Forrestfield, I appreciate the strategy of involving the other side of the house in your debate, but you cannot then continue to yell over the top if they do interject. I think it would be most appropriate if you address your comments through the Chair. Member for Warnbro, I call you for the first time.

Mr N.W. MORTON: Thank you, Madam Acting Speaker. I was just giving members opposite a chance to list the number of things they had done and there was silence.

Let me get back to this project.

Several members interjected.

Mr N.W. MORTON: Members opposite were laughing about the use of the word “transformational” as they continue to interject. They were continuing to laugh about the use of the word —

Mr F.M. Logan interjected.

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

Mr N.W. MORTON: Members opposite were laughing about the use of the word “transformational”, but this is truly a transformational project for the east metropolitan region, and particularly for my community in Forrestfield.

Let us have a look at what the project creates, achieves and delivers for my community: a new train station—in fact, three new train stations across the project. At the Forrestfield train station there will be a minimum of 2 000 and up to 2 500 car bays and a major bus interchange; I think it will become the second-largest in the network. Importantly, the Forrestfield–Airport Link will create a 20-minute commute to the CBD. The project will involve two twin-bored tunnels, each about 8.5 kilometres long, which will travel under the Swan River and re-emerge at Bayswater train station. We are undertaking a truly detailed engineering feat and I commend the Public Transport Authority for what it is delivering with this project. It really is exciting.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

Mr D.J. Kelly interjected.

Mr N.W. MORTON: Of course, this project will then drive development in and around Forrestfield train station. It will be very exciting to see what that delivers for the community.

Mr D.J. Kelly interjected.

Mr N.W. MORTON: Some of the development concept plans that are circulating include commercial and residential spaces.

Mr D.J. Kelly interjected.

Mr N.W. MORTON: Do you have an off-button, mate? Or do you just continually dribble? Please; if you want to talk, seek the call later.

There will be commercial spaces, including new retail areas and shops. I imagine that there will be coffee shops, restaurants and bars, and things that the people of the foothills of Perth have not had—certainly, they did not have them under the member for Bassendean’s government. They will certainly have access to amenities that they have not had before, driven by the Forrestfield–Airport Link and the development that will occur in and around that precinct. That is a fantastic outcome for my community and for the eastern metropolitan region, and it is a fantastic outcome delivered by the Liberal–National government.

Several members interjected.

Mr N.W. MORTON: Wow! The member for Bassendean really does not grasp the idea of a sod-turning ceremony next year, does he? He really does not grasp the idea of construction starting in 2016. Far out; that is unbelievable!

Mr D.J. Kelly interjected.

Mr N.W. MORTON: This will truly change the look of the east metropolitan region and it certainly will change the amenities that people have access to. I do not want Forrestfield to be just a journey’s end. I want Forrestfield to be a destination—somewhere where people want to go, where we create an active space that has pop-up markets or outdoor cinemas in the summertime, somewhere that business people can enjoy during the week and mums and dads and families can enjoy on the weekends. I want the space to be enticing and appealing, for not only the local community, but also people in greater Perth and the metropolitan region. I want that for my community and that is what we are delivering with this project. I will stand here any day of the week. You guys can criticise and interject as much as you like, but we are delivering results for the east metropolitan region and the community of Forrestfield, and I am 110 per cent proud of that fact—110 per cent.

Let us look at a couple of things —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Excuse me, members! Member for Swan Hills, I think you have had a couple of calls. No; you have had only one, so I will give you two—not at once; one on top of the one you have. Now you have two. Would you please not yell across the chamber.

Mr N.W. MORTON: I want to touch on some of the things that this legislation enshrines. There are a couple of major points: the railway enabling legislation for the Forrestfield–Airport Link, once enacted, will authorise construction and delivery of the project. It will also authorise ongoing maintenance of the infrastructure, which obviously is very important. This bill will also pave the way for the work that needs to take place on Perth Airport land. Of course, the state government has received five strong expressions-of-interest submissions for the Forrestfield–Airport Link project. I believe that is now down to three through the submission process. The passing of this enabling legislation as soon as possible will provide more certainty for the private sector proponents that will be selected for tender of the works. Everyone will recall recently that when the Victorian Labor government came to power, it effectively ripped up contracts. We do not want that to happen here in Western Australia. This is an excellent project. We want to make sure that the private sector proponents that will deliver this project have certainty that it will occur and, of course, to deal with the other things that I have mentioned.

I sort of touched on this matter before, but actions speak louder than words. Again, I want to focus on the fact that when the Labor Party was in government, it did absolutely nothing for my community—absolutely nothing. I have sat here for the last two-and-a-half years and listened to them denigrate and dismiss this project. I have heard them talk down the eastern suburbs. It is disgraceful. When it had a chance, it did absolutely nothing—not a thing—except treat my community, as members opposite continue to, with contempt and neglect. This

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

government, this cabinet and this Premier have seen the need in the east metropolitan region—my electorate, and my good friend the member for Belmont’s electorate—and have tackled that challenge by delivering this important infrastructure.

I really do hope that people in my community realise by now that if I say I am going to do something for my community, I get on and do it. I want to highlight some of those things, for the record. I promised a number of things to my community and I want to demonstrate to them the fact that I have delivered the things that I promised. Upgrades to the Maddington and Kenwick train stations—delivered. Upgrades to East Kenwick Primary School, Maida Vale Primary School, Forrestfield Primary School, Darling Range Sports College—delivered. In fact, just last month after advocating to the Minister for Education, Woodlupine Primary School received a \$1.4 million upgrade, which is fantastic. A noise wall along Roe Highway in High Wycombe was promised and delivered.

A couple of weeks ago, I had the pleasure of opening a new skate park in Forrestfield—delivered. Upgrades to Hartfield Park are being delivered as we speak. Fixing the Berkshire Road–Roe Highway intersection, which the member for West Swan seemed to think will negatively impact on traffic movements—I do not know what planet she got that from—is a fantastic outcome. Again, that is being delivered by this government. Do not underestimate the importance and significance of delivering that outcome for that intersection. As the Minister for Transport said in question time today, it is a black spot in our road network and there is an accident there, on average, every 10 days. Lots of people talked about it but no-one got on and did it; this government is doing it. That is an excellent outcome for road users, be it commercial users or mums and dads transiting through that interchange. It is an excellent outcome for my community.

Finally, I promised my community a train line, and that is what we are delivering. The Leader of the Opposition comes out and bangs on, “Me too, me too! We’ll do it too!” But he has sat here for the last two and half years—“Oscar the Grouch”—being negative about everything. He was negative about Elizabeth Quay, about the Perth City Link, about the Perth Stadium and about our train solutions. Then he thought, “Hang on; here’s an opportunity to dust off that old Labor rail fail thought bubble and drag it back out again, and I will try to trick the punters, telling them we have got a new idea!” Members opposite do not have any new ideas. They are stuck in the past. As I said before, the Leader of the Opposition acts like Oscar the Grouch, so he might as well just jump back in his bin and let us get on with it. Can members opposite give us a time frame for all these projects that they rabbit on about? No—silence again. Can members opposite give a costing? No—silence again. They have no idea. They come in here with spin and propaganda, and try to deceive the people of Western Australia. They are a joke.

Mr J.R. Quigley: You can be the stationmaster after the election.

Mr N.W. MORTON: Yes, I will see if the member is not retired.

This statement was an absolute pearler from the Leader of the Opposition: a couple of weekends ago he said, “I won’t be the Premier that cuts the ribbon, but I will be the Premier that starts it.” Absolutely wrong!

Several members interjected.

Mr N.W. MORTON: Yes, it is a great line if members want to demonstrate how out of touch they are. I will tell members who will be the Premier: Colin Barnett. I will tell them who will be the Minister for Transport: Dean Nalder. And I will tell them who the local member will be: Nathan Morton. We will be out there in the second half of next year, turning the sod on this fantastic project, which will deliver real outcomes and real amenities to my community. Members opposite can continue to laugh; it just shows their ongoing contempt for my community. The current Premier will be the Premier, the current Minister for Transport will be the Minister for Transport, and I will be the local member who gets this project underway. The opposition is out of touch and completely wrong.

In closing, I just want to say that it is this Liberal–National government that has seen the need in East Metropolitan Region—Forrestfield, Belmont and surrounding suburbs like Kalamunda and Gooseberry Hill—and it is this Liberal–National government, this cabinet and this Premier that has taken up this challenge after decades and decades of neglect, and we are delivering real outcomes for my community. That is something I am extremely proud of and I most certainly commend this legislation to the house.

MR M. McGOWAN (Rockingham — Leader of the Opposition) [4.30 pm]: I rise to support the Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill 2015 and also to endorse the commentary by the member for West Swan, who is the shadow Minister for Transport; Planning, in relation to this legislation. I understand the

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

theatre of Parliament, particularly for new members who come in and mislead and come up with all sorts of unusual exaggerations —

Mr J.H.D. Day: Of course you'd never do that!

Mr M. McGOWAN: Perhaps once I did, when I was a new member of Parliament, member for Kalamunda; but these days, I am more seasoned and experienced. I just want to put on the record my views about this bill and indicate that the opposition supports this piece of legislation and will be voting for it. That is plain English for all members, including new members of Parliament: I am speaking on behalf of the opposition and that is our unanimous point of view. I think that is a quite plain and reasonable thing to say. When I endorse the legislation the government has brought into this place, I get negative interjections across the chamber, which is an interesting phenomenon. So stuck are members opposite in a negative mindset that, even when I say that I endorse their legislation, they still yell silly things out across the chamber, as the member for Forrestfield is currently doing.

I would like to juxtapose my position on this legislation with that of an opposition leader back in 2002. When the Railway (Jandakot to Perth) Bill 2002 came before the house, the then opposition leader did not support it. The Leader of the Opposition in 2002 raised every argument under the sun against the construction of the rail line from Perth to Mandurah, and the extension of the spur line to Thornlie. He argued that the tunnel would disrupt the central business district and implied that the buildings above the tunnel might fall down. He even questioned whether anyone knew where the underground building ties were. He said that the problem with putting a tunnel through that area was that probably no-one knew where the building ties were. He expressed all sorts of concerns about the construction of the rail line to Mandurah and the undergrounding of the rail line through the city, which has been really quite important for the development of the city and also, I think, for the liveability of the suburbs for people who want to work in the city and live in the suburbs. He also made a speech that went on for a considerable time—probably an hour or so—expressing concern about every single aspect of the construction of the railway from Mandurah to Perth. The opposition leader at that time is the current Premier, and it is there in black and white. He expressed concerns, but he went further than just expressing concerns—he voted against it. It is one thing to express concern and to say that these are the issues and to then support the legislation with the caveat that the issues need to be sorted out, but he did not do that. He expressed his concerns and then he voted against the legislation. Before he voted against it, he tried to have it referred to a select committee.

That was 12 or so years ago. I remember it; I was here at that time and I remember it very well because, of course, that rail line was going to service my own electorate, and my electorate has benefited enormously from the extension of the rail line. The line comes into my electorate at Rockingham and the station, in my view, is relatively well sited. When we retrofit these things, as we do, we can never come up with a perfect location for a station, but if we had put the station right next to the shopping centre in Rockingham, we would have had all the problems with the boom gates as trains came through the middle of the city, and that would have been a significant issue. In hindsight, I think the right decision was made in that the station is in Rockingham but not right in the city centre; it is certainly not on the outskirts, but probably a kilometre or so from the city centre. It is easy to get to, easy to park in and easy to access. It would have been a mistake to have had boom gates going up and down all the time in the centre of town. I know that the council at the time wanted that, but I think in hindsight it would have been a mistake.

The point I am making is that I am an opposition leader who is endorsing this piece of legislation, and the opposition will vote for it. Back in 2002 when a bigger, much more extensive and more transformational project than this came before the Parliament, the then opposition leader—the current Premier—and the Liberal Party voted against it in this house. That is a matter of public record.

Mr C.J. Barnett: We voted against the change in the route. I think the project's successful; I don't doubt that for a moment, but the change in the route was the issue we were pursuing. We had been advised in government that the route down the freeway was not viable. Different advice came to you, and I think it has worked out for the better—it has. The planning under the Court government was different —

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

Mr M. McGOWAN: The Premier was not Minister for Transport at that time. If he were to ask the current federal member for Perth, she would tell him that when she arrived as Minister for Transport and asked about these issues, the plan was pulled out of the drawer and she was told, "Here it is; this is the way to do it." The Premier wanted to deviate the rail line south across to the Armadale line. If he were to ask anyone in any of the suburbs directly south of here—half a million people, at least—what they would have preferred, they would tell him that they preferred the option that was adopted. The point I am making once again is that we are

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

a constructive opposition that is voting for this legislation. When the Premier was opposition leader, he was a destructive opposition leader, leading a destructive opposition that voted against a very important and transformational —

Mr C.J. Barnett interjected.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Oh, there he goes. Apparently it is personal for me to raise in this place what happened 10 years ago. It is personally embarrassing, perhaps.

While we are on the subject of that era, what I would like to see—this is topical—is the new Prime Minister of Australia endorsing urban rail. I would like to see him reject the policy of the departed Prime Minister of yesterday, and make sure that the commonwealth government contributes to urban rail. I would like to see him abandon the flawed, failed captain’s call of the Perth Freight Link. I would like to see him devote the \$1 billion that the commonwealth government is putting towards that project towards urban rail in Perth. That is what I would like to see the new Prime Minister do.

He is not off to a good start with the Premier. In an article that appeared in *The West Australian* today, the Premier said that to topple an elected and serving Prime Minister in his first term of office was not something to be proud of. The article states —

Asked if Abbott had been the victim of treachery, —

Mr C.J. Barnett: Treachery—you said “Treasury”.

Mr M. McGOWAN: We have all been victims of Treasury! That was a Freudian slip; I am still suffering years later! The article states —

Asked if Abbott had been the victim of treachery, Mr Barnett said: “I am not going to use words like that, I think there has been some duplicity, I’d use that word. And there’s probably been some disloyalty.”

...

“I think it’s probably part of the insular and isolated nature of Canberra. People spend too much time there, they spend too much time chatting and having coffees and going out to dinner and they develop this intrigue.

Who could he be talking about? Who has coffee and chats and goes to dinner in Canberra? Who might have gone to see the former Prime Minister yesterday and told him he no longer had her support? He is talking about Julie Bishop. How this ties in—I must admit it is a tenuous tie!—is that it goes back to the era when the Premier voted against the railway, when Julie Bishop was going to be his successor. It was in that era. Julie Bishop was going to come in and take over the Western Australian branch of the Liberal Party, go into the seat of Nedlands and come in here as opposition leader and take over the Premier’s position —

Mr C.J. Barnett interjected.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Or Cottesloe—or whichever seat it might have been.

Several members interjected.

Mr M. McGOWAN: It was going to be Nedlands, because Richard Court was going to retire, and she was going to take the seat. There it is. I think I am right there.

Mr C.J. Barnett: No, you are wrong.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Then tell us.

Mr C.J. Barnett: You have got it wrong. Talk to the member for Victoria Park and he will explain it to you.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: He was off to Curtin and Julie was off to Cottesloe.

Several members interjected.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Then who was off to Curtin? The Premier was!

Mr C.J. Barnett: I could have if I had wanted to.

Mr M. McGOWAN: But the Premier did not want to.

Mr C.J. Barnett: No.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

Mr M. McGOWAN: I have not heard that version before. I remember that the Premier reacted badly. I remember that he stood in front of the building and said things like, “What’s wrong with me?”, and, “I’ve earned it.”

Mr C.J. Barnett: No, I didn’t.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Yes, he did.

Mr C.J. Barnett: That’s incorrect

Mr M. McGOWAN: He did. He went public and he was unhappy at that point in time.

Mr C.J. Barnett: I said I had choked on my Weeties! That’s what I said.

Mr J.H.D. Day: I was a little surprised when I read it on the front page of *The West Australian* midweek!

Mr W.J. Johnston: In a story written by the editor!

Mr M. McGOWAN: Indeed.

Mr C.J. Barnett: You should read what Paul Murray wrote subsequently, and he got a ruling from the Press Council.

Mr M. McGOWAN: What was that?

Mr C.J. Barnett: You claim to be a historian of politics and you don’t know what happened.

Mr M. McGOWAN: What was that? I was not in the meetings, admittedly.

Mr C.J. Barnett: There were not any meetings, not with me.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members, let us get back to the bill.

Mr M. McGOWAN: I am bringing this back to the bill, Madam Acting Speaker.

Point of Order

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Madam Acting Speaker, I am very happy if people want to debate the history of the 2001 election. I am happy to do that. If members opposite wish to debate the change of leadership and the virtues of Malcolm Turnbull versus Bill Shorten, I am happy to debate that. But it is not relevant to the Forrestfield–Airport Link bill.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms L.L. Baker): Thank you, Premier. I concur. Leader of the Opposition, can we return to the bill.

Debate Resumed

Mr M. McGOWAN: I suppose part of the reason I was talking about that matter is that I was drawn into it because of the Premier’s cryptic allusions to the things that happened at that time. He led us on and led us on and led us on, and then he took a point of order on me, Madam Acting Speaker. Apparently he was going to be the member for Curtin at one point and Julie Bishop was going to come in at the state level, but instead she stayed over there being “duplicitous and disloyal”, to quote the Premier.

Mr C.J. Barnett interjected.

Mr M. McGOWAN: I know, because the Premier did as he always does—he did not quite say her name, but I think everyone knows whom he was referring to.

Mr C.J. Barnett: I am happy to debate anyone in federal politics, if you want to move a motion or an MPI, and we will again debate the qualities of Bill Shorten. If you want to bring that on, we are happy to do that. But that is not relevant to this bill.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, Premier. Yes, I do agree. Member, please keep to the bill.

Mr M. McGOWAN: I agree, Madam Acting Speaker, and that is why I did not call her duplicitous or disloyal. The Premier referred to members of the federal Parliament in that way, and I can only assume he was talking about the person who led the plot. That is my assumption in relation to these issues. However, I will draw it back to the bill because the historical reference I realise was somewhat tenuous.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

Mr M. McGOWAN: I would say this to the federal government: now is the time to overturn that policy. Now is the time to ditch that flawed road project. Now is the time for the commonwealth government to contribute money to urban rail in Western Australia. The state government has already funded this particular plan, admittedly by debt. Therefore, I think it is unlikely that the commonwealth would put money into a plan that is already funded. I think the commonwealth would say that it wants to look for something new. There is a new plan out there. I announced it a few weekends ago. That is the Metronet plan. That is an integrated and coordinated plan. I would urge the new Prime Minister to look at our plan. He comes from Sydney. He is well connected with rail services across Sydney. The people in Sydney understand the problem of trying to retrofit rail services once development is in place. I have no doubt that Malcolm Turnbull would understand the merit of the plan that we put forward the other weekend. That plan would connect Byford and Thornlie to the Mandurah line. It would connect up to Yanchep. It would connect up to Ellenbrook. It would remove some of the awful rail crossings and provide some new stations in high-need areas around Perth. It would make sure that our suburbs are easier to live in. It would connect our suburbs more effectively and efficiently than is currently the case.

If I were the Premier, I would say to Mr Turnbull, “Here is a real plan, and here are some projects that you might like to fund with all the money that you are throwing at the Perth Freight Link.” Malcolm Turnbull will come over here. He might well be over here on Friday to assist with Mr Hastie’s campaign in Canning. If I were the Premier, I would ask for a meeting with Mr Turnbull, and I would say, “This Perth Freight Link is rapidly turning into a dog. We do not know where it is going. It does not meet the port. It does not fix the long-term transport needs of Perth. It will create a toll road system in Perth for the first time ever. It will mean that trucks with additional trailers at the back of them will be going through the streets of Perth. Maybe there is a better solution here.” I would not expect him to announce it on Friday. However, I would say to him, “There are better options for commonwealth expenditure than the one that you have committed to.” That was Tony Abbott’s plan. The king is dead. Long live the king, as John Howard said. I would say, “That was Mr Abbott’s plan, but we now have a new plan—Labor’s plan for Metronet—and we should adopt that plan.” That is what I would say if I were the Premier of Western Australia. I would say, “We want to adopt Labor’s plan, because it has some great ideas, and we should put some resources into that.”

I suppose it has to be said that because the Forrestfield line will connect to the airport and Belmont, and to Forrestfield, we support it. However, considerable effort needs to be made when it comes to the employment and residential options, particularly in Forrestfield, in relation to the station. I believe there has been insufficient communication with the people in that area. I went out to the site of the proposed station. I have been there twice. One of the local business operators leaned over the fence and said he had absolutely no idea what was going to happen.

Mr N.W. Morton: He did not tell that to me.

Mr M. McGOWAN: He probably does not talk to the member for Forrestfield. I do not think he talks to the member. He would not talk to the member for Forrestfield, because the member is a bit of a disrespectful and rude person. That is probably why he does not talk to him.

[Member’s time extended.]

Mr M. McGOWAN: He probably does not talk to the member for Forrestfield —

Mr N.W. Morton interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Forrestfield!

Mr M. McGOWAN: The member’s predecessors were very forceful with members on my side of the house —

Point of Order

Mr N.W. MORTON: Mr Acting Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is making an accusation that is completely untrue.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.M. Britza): The point of order needs to be heard in silence.

Mr N.W. MORTON: Do you want me to make it again, Mr Acting Speaker?

The ACTING SPEAKER: Yes, please.

Mr N.W. MORTON: The Leader of the Opposition is making a completely untrue and unfounded statement and I am simply correcting the record.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Mr Acting Speaker, there is no point of order, because he has not said what standing order he is relating it to. If the member is trying to engage in a debate through making a point of order, that is clearly against both the standing orders and the practice and procedures of the Parliament.

The ACTING SPEAKER: When members of Parliament in this chamber are on their feet, stuff is said all the time—good, bad and ugly. The member is on his feet and he can say whatever he wants to. We listen to it whether we like it or not, and I ask that you refrain from butting in.

Debate Resumed

Mr M. McGOWAN: That is a very good ruling, Mr Acting Speaker.

When I went out to the location of the proposed Forrestfield train station, this gentleman put his head over the fence and said that he owned a property, but he had had no communication about the future of the property, how it will be developed and whether it will be compulsorily acquired. He referred to all those issues. I note that the member for West Swan was referring to submissions made to the Shire of Kalamunda on the development of the structure plan in Forrestfield. She was referring to submissions by government agencies to the Kalamunda council. Government agencies have been expressing concerns over the planning for the station. I would not like people to misinterpret this, because I know a lot of verballing and deliberate misinterpretation goes on in this place: the opposition supports the plan but thinks that the development opportunities in Forrestfield have not been undertaken properly. The evidence the opposition has for that is none other than submissions to the Kalamunda council from the Public Transport Authority, Main Roads Western Australia and other government agencies. The Public Transport Authority stated —

- Transperth services have a number of concerns in relation to the provision of bus services

Main Roads WA stated —

- Roe Highway/Berkshire Road interchange that is currently under construction did not factor in the proposed land use changes

A bunch of government agencies have been expressing concerns about the management of this area with the Kalamunda council, which is managing the development of this station. That is a real concern. The government is developing a station at the end of a rail line in an area that is basically zoned light industrial; it has an airport on one side and a light industrial area on the other. The government needs real grunt behind developing that land. It cannot just leave it in this haphazard manner. The state needs to work with the Kalamunda council and perhaps the Metropolitan Redevelopment Authority on this. How that area is developed to maximise the benefits from building a rail line to that community is a serious issue.

Mr J.H.D. Day: I can assure you the state is working with the Kalamunda shire council through the Department of Planning.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Why are the agencies of the minister responsible for building the railway objecting to the plan of the railway the government is building? I would have thought those issues might have been resolved before it got to the Kalamunda council process. I would have thought that each of the agencies might have communicated with each other —

Ms R. Saffioti: And the Department of Planning.

Mr M. McGOWAN: — and the Department of Planning. Thank you, member for West Swan. This is a once-in-a-generation opportunity, with \$2 billion or thereabouts going into this project, and it cannot be messed up. There are all of those issues that I just mentioned.

The other thing I will talk about has to be said. The member for West Swan was very forceful about rail development in Perth and the record of various governments. Each government has developed its own projects. Every government has done some good projects and every government has done some bad ones. One thing that is absolutely true is that previous Labor governments have done very, very well with rail projects. That is a true statement. The great pleasure I take out of the Mandurah rail line—I was involved as a parliamentary secretary and a member whose electorate was impacted—is that it was built without adding debt. This very significant piece of infrastructure was built without putting it on the credit card. In hindsight, particularly compared with projects in recent years, that was quite an extraordinary achievement. We would not get out of a project like that now for double the price. These days it would cost double to do something as remarkable as that which was done back then. I take pride out of what was done by that transformational project. It did amazing things for my electorate of Rockingham, and for Mandurah and communities along the route from the centre of Perth.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

The Labor government doubled the rolling stock and kept debt at record low levels, so it is possible to do these things. The Labor Party committed to a rail project before the 2001 election. It did not specify the route, and after the election it turned out it was changed to bring it straight up the freeway. I remember having a meeting with Geoff Gallop and Alannah MacTiernan, who wanted my views on it as one of the members down that part of the world. I told them to absolutely go straight up the freeway. I remember that route was subject to some agitation because it was slightly different and had some risk attached to it. I remember Geoff Gallop, in particular, was nervous about it, but I was absolutely firm that it had to happen. The Labor Party committed to rail before an election—not the exact route, but to a rail line linking the southern suburbs. That is a different situation from the Metro Area Express light rail proposal. It has to be said that MAX light rail has been an awful example of how the government has handled a broken election promise after an election. It has been a shocking example of how that happens. It was a government commitment before the election, and although the government said it was dependent on federal funding, Troy Buswell said that if the state did not get federal funding, it would build it anyway. The government set a time frame of a year or two, but after the election, in a budget, it basically abandoned the project.

Mr C.J. Barnett: That is not true.

Mr M. McGOWAN: No, no; the government's language has moved everywhere. The current Minister for Transport went over to Singapore or somewhere to look at buses, and he said that buses were just as good as trains. He said it and said it. He said that the bus option to Mirrabooka would be just as good as the light rail option. Do members remember the City Link project? Half of the light rail proposal—Nedlands across to Victoria Park—has dropped off; it has just disappeared. The Minister for Transport has been talking about the bus route to Mirrabooka. The government's language went everywhere. In question time after question time the opposition asked the minister what he was doing; it was relatively easy to do. The government's language went everywhere and the minister talked about buses. The other day I heard the Premier say that light rail had been delayed until after the next election. That is the latest form of words from the Premier. I do not believe the Premier, and I am pretty sure the people of Perth and Victoria Park, and suburbs across to Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital and up to Mirrabooka, will be very sceptical about any such commitment that the government might make after the next election. Frankly, the Premier made an ironclad, written-in-blood, absolute commitment before the last state election and he dropped it, so I do not believe the Premier. The government has not done the engineering work necessary to try to work out how to get a light rail route into the city. I think the reason the government dropped its light rail plan and proceeded with the Forrestfield–Airport Link is that there were technical issues with MAX light rail, which was the government's first priority, and it proceeded with the airport link, which is significant from an engineering perspective but technically less difficult than introducing a new technology into Perth. That is what I think has happened with MAX light rail. The opposition will continue to pursue the government over MAX light rail. The government has lost enormous credibility with that particular broken promise.

Members should bear in mind that although MAX light rail has been delayed—who knows when it will conclude—the opposition will support this bill because I will not be a wrecker like the Liberal Leader of the Opposition back in 2002. I will support legislation that will enable a rail line to be built, although, admittedly, it is only eight kilometres versus 70 kilometres for the Mandurah line. I will not stand in the way of that project and come up with every argument against it. As I said, the opposition supports the bill, but I want to make sure that in Forrestfield the government maximises the value of the land and the activity that feeds into that train station so that the community and taxpayers of Western Australia receive full benefit from what is a significant amount of public money.

MRS G.J. GODFREY (Belmont) [4.59 pm]: I represent the residents and business people of Belmont and I support this Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill. It shows courage and vision and provides a legislative framework for the Forrestfield–Airport rail link. For the first time, the airport will be connected from Belmont to the city by a new world-class rail network. This is proof that this government is addressing traffic congestion by providing road, rail and shared-path networks in Perth. In Belmont, we will have two train stations; one will be at Airport West, currently in the vicinity of terminals 3 and 4. The second train stop will be at the Consolidated Airport Station, currently at terminals 1 and 2. Every Perth Airport user will be given a faster, more environmentally friendly travel option. Before providing more details about this exciting project, I wish to recall some previous success stories around Belmont.

The Graham Farmer Freeway was delivered by the Court Liberal government. It is six kilometres long and links Burswood with West Perth. I use it regularly and I always enjoy the ride to work. It includes the 1.6 kilometre Northbridge tunnel, which is colloquially known as the Polly pipe. The six-lane freeway then crosses the

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

Swan River over the Windan Bridge. The bridge includes pedestrian and cycling access. In 2000, the Graham Farmer Freeway was completed. It is hard today to imagine the Perth road system without the time-saving east–west route that bypasses Perth’s central business district. The Graham Farmer Freeway was completed three months ahead of schedule and within its budget of \$313 million. It was designed for a 150-year lifespan. In 2013, an extra lane was added to the tunnel in each direction to improve the traffic flow of more than 100 000 cars a day. This whole project was opposed by the Labor Party.

Western Australia is having continued economic prosperity. Over the next 35 years, it is anticipated that Perth’s population will reach 3.5 million people. This will equal 75 per cent of Western Australia’s total population living in Perth. How we will manage this influx of people is documented in “Directions 2031”. The plan lays out the foundations for a consolidated city through an urban expansion management program. In the Western Australian Planning Commission document called “Perth and Peel@3.5 million”, the vision contains four draft subregional planning frameworks. It highlights the need to reduce car dependency. Perth has one of the highest car-use rates in the world. In 2009, the cost of congestion was estimated to be \$1 billion and by 2020 it could double.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members, you need to keep the conversation down a little bit.

Mrs G.J. GODFREY: In 2014, the population of Perth and Peel exceeded two million people. Within 12 months, it had increased by 2.5 per cent. This is the fastest growth rate in the nation. It is estimated that 55 per cent of all workers commuted from one subregion where they live to another where they work, with the vast majority of all workers travelling daily to the central business district to work. Belmont is located in the central subregion, and Perth Airport is designated an activity centre. In 2014, 17 800 employees were working on-site at Perth Airport. Perth Airport is a private company that receives no state or commonwealth government funding. The airport is an employment node, which has no curfew. Perth Airport operates 24 hours a day, seven days a week, adding approximately \$2.6 billion to the state’s gross regional product. Sydney Airport has a curfew, and the cost to the New South Wales economy is \$1 billion a year. In 2009, Perth Airport had 10 million passengers. Within five years, until 2014, the number had grown to 14 million passengers travelling through Perth Airport. It is anticipated that over the next 20 years, this figure will rise to 28 million. Airlines operating at Perth Airport have been understanding and supportive of the need to expand capacity and improve customer service. Perth Airport welcomes the state government’s commitment to the Forrestfield–Airport Link, which will service their passengers and their employees. As a former Mayor of the City of Belmont, it was a pleasure to work with Perth Airport, and I am pleased that it always considered the community when issues were raised. The illegal kerbside parking in Brearley Avenue was resolved with better signage and more short-term parking.

The airport viewing platform is 120 feet long—the same length as the first flight undertaken by the Wright brothers. It was opened in December 2011 and has proved to be very popular. Aviation association members are regularly at the airport viewing platform to photograph unusual planes visiting Perth. Aircraft movement demand exceeds capacity in some peak periods. The unprecedented growth rate has triggered the need for the third runway to be built by 2019. The cost of this parallel runway will be \$480 million. It will provide effective and efficient air services, which are crucial to WA and to eliminating bottlenecks affecting our economic development. I am hopeful that the extra runway will help to reduce the noise impact of the airport on the electorate. The third runway is not supported by Labor. It is exciting that Perth will become the hub for the nonstop flights from Australia to Europe for the ultra-long-range Boeing 787. This aircraft is the quietest, most advanced commercial passenger plane. The Perth Airport master plan outlines how the airport will develop over the next 30 years to meet the demand. All the commercial domestic flights are to be moved to the international terminal precinct. There will be multistorey car parks around the air traffic control tower, a hotel at the centre of the airport next to the tower and a new loop automated passenger shuttle, similar to those at major international airports such as Singapore and Heathrow. We know that tourism is an important economic and employment growth opportunity for WA. There were 768 000 international visitors to Western Australia in 2013–14, and they contributed \$2.2 billion to our local economy. The number of visitors from China has risen by 50 per cent. At the same time, 1.2 million visitors from interstate spent a total of \$1.5 billion.

Great Eastern Highway is one of Perth’s principal transport routes and is one of my favourite roads. The initial draft of the policy plan to upgrade Great Eastern Highway commenced in 1998. However, it was not implemented during the Labor government. Its upgrade was delivered by the Barnett government in 2013. Prior to its upgrade, it was operating beyond capacity. It had serious crash rates that were twice the rate of the state average. Since 2001, when the Polly pipe was completed, and during my time as the Mayor of the City of Belmont, my calls to upgrade Great Eastern Highway on behalf of the community of Belmont fell on deaf ears. We endured rat runs and motorists trying to avoid congestion. We endured run-down properties that had waited 20 years for the highway to be upgraded. No wonder Belmont carried the stigma of an untidy and

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

rundown community. It was in 2010 when the Barnett government, through the City East Alliance, commenced the premier entryway connecting Perth Airport to our city centre. Major funding was obtained through the hard work of our federal member, Mr Steve Irons, MP. Great Eastern Highway is now a six-lane carriageway. It includes better lighting, bus shelters, sound walls, footpaths, connection to the river, landscaping and a Wagyl artwork theme. I am hopeful that the Forrestfield–Airport Link will bring the upgrade of the final section of Great Eastern Highway from Tonkin Highway to the bypass, which would greatly complement the wonderful work being done on the Gateway.

The Gateway WA project is nothing short of amazing. What an appropriate name. Belmont is the Gateway to WA; I am so proud. With a price tag of over \$1 billion, it is the biggest and most expensive transport project currently undertaken by the Western Australian Barnett government. Every person in WA who uses aviation to travel will appreciate the improvements of the upgrading of the existing road network that surrounds Perth Airport. This project is designed to ease the daily gridlock that chokes the transport precincts of Kewdale, Welshpool and the airport. Its centrepiece is a three-level interchange at Tonkin and Leach Highways. This will be the main gateway from the airport into the city. Some interesting facts are as follows. There will be seven kilometres of noise walls; there will be 950 00 plants for landscaping; 11 new bridges are to be built; and there are 800 workers on the project on any one day—and one is my brother-in-law, Rick Newton.

The stakeholder engagement on this project has been exemplary. The comments and suggestions raised by the community have helped to shape the scope of the project and influence a number of key decisions. I would like to put on record some of the ways that the community influenced the Gateway WA Perth Airport and Freight Access Project. In the Kewdale precinct, a number of workshops resulted in changes to the concept designs to allow better access arrangements for property owners and business operators. The interchange at Leach Highway required additional land from the Gerry Archer reserve. This is a community sports reserve and the users groups and the City of Belmont negotiated a positive outcome of a new turf oval, a modern grandstand with tiered seating, a new equipment storage area and new sports lighting. This is the regional centre for Little Athletics. The noise wall design had several refinements in response to concerns raised by residents. This included installing acrylic panels at the top of the wall to reduce the visual scale of the structure and removing from the design the proposed opening in the noise wall at Epsom Park. The urban design and public art was developed collaboratively with various stakeholders through public forums and the concept of “ribbons of landscape” has been ingrained into the final design. The Abernethy Loop includes a road train assembly area, which provides a safe and dedicated area for industry to inspect vehicles and for drivers to take refuge to avoid fatigue. There is an increase of 21 kilometres of shared path network that will create improved facilities for cyclists and pedestrians. More than 100 local subcontractors and suppliers have been engaged to deliver the project.

I now move on to the rail airport link. It will connect the existing Midland line near Bayswater and run to Forrestfield through underground tunnels. This will ensure minimal impact on the existing land and road network, and the community. The \$2 billion state government–funded Forrestfield–Airport Link is the transport solution to improve connections to and from Perth Airport and the eastern regions. It will relieve pressure on existing roads. Construction will begin in 2016 and the first trains will run on the line in 2020. The improved transport options include providing a reliable alternative for airport workers and passengers. The project is currently in the formal procurement phase, with detailed design work being undertaken before the state government appoints a main contractor in mid-2016. This phase focuses on achieving the best outcomes for stakeholders and the community as the design evolves for the tunnels and the three stations. The airport line will integrate with Perth’s existing rail network and deliver 8.5 kilometres of rail extension from the Midland line east of Bayswater to Forrestfield via Perth Airport. There will be three new stations—Airport West, Consolidated Airport Station and Forrestfield. Airport West and Forrestfield stations will have associated Park ‘n’ Ride and bus transfer facilities. There will be an expanded and new bus feeder services.

The new rail line will benefit the community by providing a viable alternative to car travel between the eastern suburbs and Perth. It will alleviate road traffic, easing congestion and reducing travel times for people living and working in the region. Although there are many benefits, there are concerns in the community regarding the road layout in the area, particularly the closure of Brearley Avenue. It is important that sufficient consultation is carried out to best accommodate those local concerns whilst ensuring Perth gets the high-quality infrastructure we need. Environmental and heritage considerations are a key priority for the Forrestfield–Airport Link. As the line will be located almost entirely underground, the impact on surrounding communities will be minimal, both during construction and once the line becomes operational.

The Forrestfield–Airport Link will provide a quick and efficient connection between Perth’s CBD and Perth Airport, whilst making it easier for visitors to get to other tourist centres such as Fremantle. Taking cars off

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

the roads along this route will relieve traffic congestion, which in turn boosts productivity and improves the capacity of the road network. The new rail line will also boost employment and create residential and economic growth by promoting new and existing centres, including Airport West and Forrestfield. Much more than a train to the airport, the new rail line will also deliver enormous benefits to the state's economy and communities along the route. It will ensure Perth has a more balanced and sustainable suburban public transport system, in the same way that the Mandurah and Joondalup lines have underpinned urban development in Perth's southern and northern corridors. Another benefit to be derived from the train to the airport is the train station in Redcliffe, a suburb of the City of Belmont. This development will trigger the regeneration of Redcliffe by the development area 6 master plan. The City of Belmont started this project in 2012, and it will highlight the immense development potential when the train station in Belmont opens. Short-stay accommodation, mixed business, affordable housing and retail and public open space are some of the exciting proposals waiting to start.

I am pleased the Leader of the Opposition has publicly supported the rail line to the airport; however, I note that his comrades in Belmont do not agree. Perhaps he should have a word to them so that they are all on the same page!

MS L.L. BAKER (Maylands) [5.17 pm]: I am particularly interested in rising to support this Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill 2015, because I have been sitting here for many hours now listening to various people speaking about all the good things that will be offered by the airport rail link—and, indeed, I think it is absolutely fantastic. I am here to say for the record that this is a great project. Last week I went to the information session presented at the Bayswater Bowling and Recreation Club. For members who have forgotten, with all their talk about three beautiful new stations, a massive impost will come into my electorate at the Bayswater train line. The new airport rail link will come straight into my electorate at Bayswater. I went to this information session along with 50 or 60 residents to look at the impact, and I got all these fabulous brochures I am holding. It is a big project, with lots of money being spent on information for people, and information is a great idea.

I went through these brochures so that if members of my community could not make it that night, I could adequately inform them about the wonderful redevelopment they would see in Bayswater. At the start of my half hour, I should say to members that in the seven years since I was elected to this house, I have had a number of conversations and written correspondence with the City of Bayswater and others, including delegations to the Department of Planning that I went on earlier this year that I will mention in a minute, and there has been no mention of what redevelopment Bayswater can look forward to until the airport rail link comes to fruition. I was told, “Lisa, you can't keep pushing for redeveloping Bayswater until the link comes in because that is the key.” It made complete sense to me that when the airport rail link was developed, whether the Liberals built it or we built it, it would be a shot in the arm for Bayswater.

When I went to the community information briefing, I collected these brochures and started looking for information on what would happen to Bayswater train station and the area around it. I found the word “Bayswater” three times in the brochure titled “Project overview”, which is particularly positive compared with the rest of the information that is presented, in which it is mentioned significantly fewer than three times. We would think there would be some information for my community in the “Project overview” about what would come to our wonderful precinct of Bayswater. It states —

Forrestfield–Airport Link will connect with the existing Midland line just east of Bayswater ...

I have another brochure titled “Delivering solutions with new stations”. I can see the member for Swan Hills nodding in agreement because surely if this came into his electorate, there would be a huge description in this brochure about what Bayswater can expect. It states —

It is anticipated that by 2021, there will be around 20,000 boardings added to the rail network by the Forrestfield Line each day.

I think about 12 extra trains an hour are expected on the section of line from Bayswater to Midland. It continues —

Analysis indicates that up to 2,100 people per hour will use the services from the three stations during peak times.

Clearly, people will just get off the train before they get to the Midland line because the brochure does not include any comments about what will happen with the Bayswater train station. So, 2 100 people will simply disappear before they get to the Bayswater link. That is interesting. This brochure titled “Delivering solutions with new stations” does not mention Bayswater anywhere.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

Let us try another brochure. We would not expect the brochure titled “Environment and heritage” would have much to do with Bayswater because no tunnelling will impact on the environmental heritage. I can cop the fact that it does not mention Bayswater. I have another brochure titled “Tunnels”. I am looking for the Bayswater end and what the impact will be when the tunnel pops out in Bayswater. Indeed, the front page of the “Tunnels” brochure states —

Trains will enter the tunnels from a dive structure at Bayswater ...

That is it for Bayswater. I am looking at the minister because I am absolutely appalled at how he could let this kind of lack of consultation—this complete apparent negation of the Bayswater end of this wonderful new line—happen. When we went to the briefing at the Bedford Bowling Club, along with 50 or 60 of my residents, they were very keen to find out what would happen. In fact, interestingly, I think one of them was talking on social media about this big event that was coming, saying that all residents of Bayswater should get along to the Bedford Bowling Club to look at the plans and have a chat. He was contacted by someone. I am not sure who it was or from whose office. I do not know whether it was someone from the minister’s office, the Department of Planning or the Public Transport Authority. Somebody contacted him to dispel the fact that this briefing was a consultation and said, “Don’t expect to make any comment at this session. If you are expecting to be listened to, it ain’t going to happen at this session.” That pretty much fits with the comment at the bottom of the “Tunnels” brochure. Honestly, we have to scratch our head. There are two dot points under “Community involvement”. It is the only time the community is mentioned in any of the documents that I have referred to since I have been on my feet. Let me read them. Let me commit them to *Hansard*. The first dot point states —

According to tradition the TBMs —

I think it is a tunnel —

are given female names as a sign of good luck in the spirit of Saint Barbara, the patron saint of miners and tunnellers.

That is the first dot point under “Community involvement”. Do members know what the second dot point is? I could just dissolve into hysterical laughter if this next dot point was not true. It states —

If plans at the time allow, we could be holding a community naming competition for the TBMs.

Ms M.M. Quirk: Bear in mind, they have to be female names.

Ms L.L. BAKER: Yes. My community is expecting a conversation about this. Let me just define the area of Bayswater for the benefit of members. It is an inner-city hub of Perth. Clearly, the minister does not know that or does not understand where Bayswater is or what it is or why its residents might be concerned about this. They would welcome it because it is the harbouring of many good things, according to the hype from the other side. Bayswater is eight kilometres from Perth, along the Midland train line. The Bayswater village is one kilometre off Guildford Road and three kilometres from Beaufort Street. The eastern border of Bayswater is two kilometres from the Morley strategic metropolitan centre, which I believe is expecting 10 000 more families in the next two years. The Acting Speaker (Mr I.M. Britza) is nodding his head. It is also, as the crow flies, six kilometres from Perth Airport, if we follow the Tonkin Highway. Both Guildford Road and Beaufort Street are major arterial roads for Perth. We have heard from members on both sides of the chamber how important that is. These roads provide access to the city for people from the eastern suburbs, the Perth hills and the Swan Valley.

I will just describe to members how this railway line runs through my electorate and runs through Bayswater. The Midland rail line runs straight through the middle of Bayswater. I mean that; it runs straight through—it divides the town of Bayswater into two halves. It is an infrastructure divider that splits the town into two. The heart of the village is along the intersection of King William Street and Whatley Crescent. It is the eastern side of that divide of the railway line. It is mostly retail precinct. On either side of the rail line, there is a bit of retail but the biggest set of shops is on the eastern side and they are mostly privately owned. If the minister has driven down there and had a look, he would know that it is pretty old and tired. On the western side of the Midland rail line, along Railway Parade, there is a small retail precinct with a hotel, a row of shops, some public housing and some private housing and behind these, the great big reserve, Halliday Park, which is home to many recreation and sporting activities and clubs, including the Bayswater Lacrosse Club. The area east of the railway line, where the larger commercial precinct is located, is zoned urban under the metropolitan redevelopment scheme. There is a range of businesses, including a general store, a grocer, a delicatessen, a bakery, a pharmacy, a post office, a newsagent, a liquor store, a real estate agent, an Oxfam shop, an antique shop, a bike shop and a beautician, and the Bayswater branch of Bendigo Bank is also in that area. Two new specialist shops recently

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

opened—Drip Espresso and Little Cheese Shop. The community waited a long time for those shops. They are great additions to the town centre and are well frequented by locals. The two halves of Bayswater are connected by an old subway on King William Street, which runs under the railway line. It is a major and heavily used road with traffic coming from the hills and the Swan Valley across my electorate. A lot of the traffic travels along King William Street. I can see the Minister for Planning shaking his head.

Mr J.H.D. Day: It was in response to the member for Victoria Park.

Ms L.L. BAKER: Good, because I was about to bite it off, minister!

A lot of traffic travels across to access Perth by going down Walter Road, Broun Avenue or Beaufort Street. It is a heavily used road. Many people use it to travel to and from work, to the coast, or to the north-west suburbs and home in the evening. There is increasing traffic along King William Street and under the subway. The subway fails in capacity every month because, as has been reported to me by locals, in the last 12 months, six trucks have become stuck under the subway because it is simply too low for them to pass under it, which adds to the problem of congestion and road rage, I might say.

Bayswater is a growing community and despite some of its sad bits, it has huge potential. The Central Metropolitan Perth Sub-regional Strategy—that is a mouthful—section of “Directions 2031 and beyond: metropolitan planning and beyond the horizon” indicates that the City of Bayswater will need 9 230 new dwellings by 2031. “Directions 2031” indicates that Bayswater is a neighbourhood centre that provides for the daily needs of its residents and has likely scope to upgrade its classification to what is called a district centre, which would put it in the same category as Maylands and would be a big change. In April last year, the City of Bayswater voted to amend zoning in the Bayswater town centre to allow for mixed-use residential dwellings, including multistorey apartments and offices. The buildings had previously been used for only commercial use. I will read what was said, because it is pertinent to this debate about the airport rail link. The council minutes from 15 April 2014 proposed the following for the Bayswater town centre —

It is intended that a structure plan will be developed which encompasses a greater number of properties and provides a more comprehensive rezoning of the centre.

...

The timing of this structure plan/scheme amendment may be dependent on —

Guess what? —

the airport rail link.

...

The future structure plan would address matters such as landmark development sites and the impact on traffic and parking in the centre.

...

The Bayswater town centre also contains a second commercial strip along Beechboro Road South. This area is considered suitable to accommodate mixed use development. However, the Beechboro Road South commercial area is not well connected with the King William Street/Whatley Crescent commercial precinct due to the barrier formed by the train line.

The City will need to investigate opportunities to increase permeability, legibility and connectedness between the two (2) commercial precincts.

That was stated publicly last year in the council’s minutes. Since then my community and I have been waiting for news of the airport rail link. The government had the audacity to tell people to come along to an information session at which they had no opportunity to comment and put forward their opinions. The government said it was going to start this project in 2016. This is unconscionable and it is not good consultation. I cannot understand how any government could completely fail to talk to my electorate when it is a major part of this plan. What is the government doing? This is not good urban planning; it is not even good transport planning. We want this; we want the airport rail link. We want consultation and we want to see things change. The Minister for Transport is indicating that he wants to make a comment. I would love to hear his comment, but just not yet. I suspect that my community will ask him whether he would like to make those comments directly to them at some point.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

Mr D.C. Nalder: You were just holding up one of the brochures. I refer you to paragraph 3, which talks about Bayswater station and the upgrades that will apply to bring it into line with disability et cetera.

Ms L.L. BAKER: I am getting to that. Does the minister know what the upgrades at Bayswater station consist of? They consist of a disabled ramp.

Mr D.C. Nalder: There will be three new stations as part of the new rail link and an upgrade to Bayswater station on the Midland line.

Ms L.L. BAKER: Yes. Can you tell me what the upgrade is, minister?

Mr D.C. Nalder: This will bring the station into line with the current Disability Discrimination Act. There will be increased services at Bayswater station as both the Midland and Forrestfield lines will use the station.

Ms L.L. BAKER: That is quite correct.

[Member's time extended.]

Ms L.L. BAKER: There will be increased use, but a disabled ramp is the extent of the upgrades as described in the document. Believe me, minister, I have looked for it.

Mr D.C. Nalder: I thought you said there was nothing in there.

Ms L.L. BAKER: I have looked for it.

Mr D.C. Nalder: Okay.

Ms L.L. BAKER: I am about to get to what the government promised. With 12 extra trains and 21 000 extra passengers, the government will put in a disabled ramp—and call it quits. Yes, we need a disabled ramp—there is no problem with that. But I am sorry, that is not a development upgrade for Bayswater station. When we look at urban design and best practice, we do not build a public transport system in isolation. I hope the government heard the Labor Party's plans about linking urban development with public transport. At the beginning of the year, Alannah MacTiernan and I went to see the director general of the Western Australian Planning Commission. I am sure the Minister for Planning knows about that.

Mr D.C. Nalder: Have you seen the Forrestfield development concept plan?

Ms L.L. BAKER: Minister, I am not talking about Forrestfield! Let me just point out to him that the only Labor electorate involved in this grand plan is mine. One might think that it is surprising then that practically no redevelopment has been planned around Bayswater station. I am seriously questioning the minister's claim that he is consulting when all he does is send my electorate members away when they front up for an information session. Do not just listen to me. The minister should not screw up his face. I will read the comments of just one group. There are several highly active and agitated community groups in Bayswater. I will read directly from one email. These are not stupid people; these people are involved in urban design. They are professionals living in Bayswater who are deeply committed to the development of my electorate, particularly the Bayswater area. One email reads —

Good to catch up with you again last night. As you know there is enormous community interest in achieving optimal community benefit from key public infrastructure investments such as the Forrestfield Airport Link.

See, I told you, minister—we all like it. The email continues —

Everyone I spoke to who went to the “info session” last night at the Bayswater Bowling Club to find out what is proposed for the Airport Link (in relation to Bayswater and surrounding suburbs) was underwhelmed and disappointed with the lack of consideration of any impacts/opportunities from the project on our local area. There appears to be no thought on how this project could benefit the Town Centre or the communities that it connects with along the line.

It goes on to say that one public servant who was there —

pretty much indicated there hadn't been and wouldn't be any integrated planning for this project, and that anything to do with the Bayswater Train station (which sits at the heart of the Bayswater Town Centre) was the province of “others” in the PTA or other agencies. Funny - you would assume if you

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton;
Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter
Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms
Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

are turning up to an event in Bayswater that they would be able to indicate some of the planning that has been done and the implications for Bayswater??

But let me go on. The email continues —

It seems that the project team on the Airport Link view this work simply as laying some rail line to the airport —

I can tell members that I was there when that comment was passed —

and don't really consider any other factors or potential project partners who could add value to this project (silo mentality). As they stated —

“They” being the public servants there; I am not bashing the public servants, I might add—I am clearly not going to do that, because this is a government decision —

the scope has been set and they are rolling it out, hoping to move to procurement quickly. Their list of consultations prior in their brochure make interesting reading. Basically it listed no community engagement and mostly government agency engagement. They didn't even list engaging with the City of Bayswater—but did identify engaging with the City of Belmont (re; Airport one would assume).

Well, imagine that. They did not run a consultation in Bayswater.

Mrs G.J. Godfrey interjected.

Ms L.L. BAKER: Member for Belmont, they did not run a consultation in Bayswater. I am the member for Maylands, this is in my electorate, and the member for Belmont can trust me: they did not do it. The email continues —

So in a nutshell there are no essential amenity upgrades or consideration for the key strategic role of this project as being a catalyst for urban developments around transport hubs. Such a missed opportunity—with the whole cumulative benefit concept seeming to be lost on them.

I will read the final paragraph. It states —

Basically this means there will be no additional shelter for commuters at a station with virtually no shelter; no additional parking at station where there isn't enough already; no additional seating; no streetscape improvements; no provision for enhanced pedestrian/cycling access; no consideration for travellers with luggage going to the airport and above all no consideration of the crucial role of the train station in relation the town centre (nor any sinking of the rail at the subway to reconnect all areas of the Town Centre).

I continue with my quote —

It was like we were speaking a foreign language when suggesting that they may want to consider the broader impact of increased commuter numbers and that this project should seek to generate greater benefits than just a new railway link to the airport. We were fobbed off to speak with others in the PTA.

We all agree that it is short sighted to treat transport planning as an isolated area of development. There is a great chance ... to integrated town/community structure planning that includes transport infrastructure planning—so as to be a catalyst for the revitalisation of urban areas.

I read that email in some detail because it hits the nail on the head. What are we getting from this? We are getting a disabled ramp, which we need. Does the Minister for Planning know that the Bayswater train station does not have a toilet?

Mr D.C. Nalder interjected.

Ms L.L. BAKER: Well, it is not in any of the planning. I will let them know; at least the disabled people who can now make it there can actually go to a bathroom. That will be good.

Mr J.R. Quigley: It's one of those temporary ones that they bring in on a truck, member.

Ms L.L. BAKER: That is what we have at the moment.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

Mr D.C. Nalder: You're making some comments about the consultation; there are two aspects to deal with. One is the Forrestfield–Airport Link, which is what we're on about today, and there is limited impact on Bayswater as result of that, but there is —

Ms L.L. BAKER: Is the minister in la-la land? I am sorry; I am not going to take an interjection that is based on complete nonsense.

Mr D.C. Nalder interjected.

Ms L.L. BAKER: No, not now. I am sorry, but I am just beside myself about the level of ignorance that the minister continues to show to my community. Yes, ignorance. He has just said that the Forrestfield–Airport Link project will have minimal impact on Bayswater. The minister is not living in this century; he needs to come and visit my community and have a conversation with the hundreds or thousands of people who live around Bayswater, and tell them why he does not want to listen to their views. He needs to tell them why he does not want to engage in any discussion with them and why he does not want to do any building. I have read every page of what he has put out, as have members of the community. The minister might have noticed that their concerns have been getting quite a bit of attention and they will get more attention. I hope they go ahead and invite the minister to come out and address them. It would certainly be better for my job if they were listened to for once. It would certainly make an amazing change for this Liberal government to listen to anything that people in a Labor electorate might have to say about a major infrastructure project worth billions of dollars. Where are the possibilities; where are the options for looking at the redevelopment of the Bayswater precinct? It is a major opportunity, but the minister has not even discussed it with my constituents, let alone anyone of note outside a government agency or two. The minister tells me it will not impact on my residents; I would like him to go and live next to the Bayswater train station when there are 12 more trains per hour running on that line and 21 000 extra passengers at the station. Those statistics are in the minister's document; I am just —

Mr D.C. Nalder: Are you aware that Labor plans to run the Ellenbrook line through Bayswater as well?

Ms L.L. BAKER: I know exactly what Metronet is going to do, but I have only three minutes to talk to the minister about this. I am going to talk to my community about what they want Metronet to deliver for them, and I suspect they will want to talk to us about how the Forrestfield–Airport Link should actually revitalise this vital part of the electorate. Labor will go and ask, and we will listen to what we are being told, as distinct from the minister going and asking a few government agencies how it should work. My community will be brought along with Metronet; they will have a chance to contribute. They might not have every single dream, aspiration or vision realised; it might not look like the Jetsons built it at the end of the day, but it will be a product that will add to the activity centre in a meaningful way and will not simply waste this opportunity. It will bring increased activity, a commercial presence and attention to the crossovers. We have two major crossovers, of which many members will be aware, one of which is on Caledonian Avenue. Where are the plans for dealing with that? There are no plans for dealing with that. Traffic is banked up there every day. Look at Garratt Road, member for Belmont. People coming from her side of the river are backed up to Ascot Racecourse because of people trying to get across a railway line in Bayswater. That is the reality for them, but where are the government's plans for looking at that? The whole concept of redevelopment has been absolutely ignored, yet it would improve the flow of traffic and the lives of the residents in my area. This is an absolute failure for my residents, and I encourage the minister to start taking notice of what the City of Bayswater is saying and what the people of my electorate want to tell him about opportunities for redeveloping Bayswater into the future.

MR C.J. TALLENTIRE (Gosnells) [5.47 pm]: I am very pleased to rise to speak to the Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill 2015, and to offer it my full support.

There is an urgent need for investment in rail as public transport infrastructure. We know from documents presented to us by organisations like the RAC that traffic congestion is costing us an estimated \$2.1 billion a year; hence the urgency for us to construct a public transport network that enables people to have a choice between their personal motor vehicles or public transport. We need to give them that choice so they can make sensible decisions about how they get around.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.M. Britza): Members, you just need to lower your voices a little, please. It is getting a bit loud.

Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE: The need for investment in public transport is becoming greater and greater; we know that. Quality of life is being impacted on here. It is not just the economic cost of \$2.1 billion a year, but the quality of life of our citizens that is at stake. The Forrestfield–Airport Link is one of the components of the grand plan that was presented at the 2013 election campaign and has now been re-presented to the people of Western Australia by

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

the Leader of the Opposition as the Metronet plan. This is what we need; we need to have a clear indication of what the eventual scope of Metronet will look like. Then, slowly but surely, there will be an unveiling of various projects as they become more detailed and the costings become available; as we determine—I think this is a job for the whole community to be involved in—as a society what the priorities are. We have to work that out because it will always be nice to imagine that the whole Metronet concept can magically be delivered in a matter of years. That will just not be feasible in budgetary terms or in terms of the relatively minor, but nevertheless real, upheaval that goes with some of the construction works that are around. We need to be sensible about this and get on with tackling it bit by bit. That is what I think the Western Australian people are ready for—that unveiling of a sequential delivery of Metronet. People are very excited by the possibility of it. Obviously, we would start by meeting the needs of those people who are suffering the most from the congestion crisis that is around. We would aim to deliver first and foremost on those projects. Also, though, in looking to develop that list of priorities, we would probably also need to think about ease of deliverability, which is where things such as existing rail line easements would make some projects come to the fore.

That is why I am particularly keen to observe the extension of the Thornlie line through to the Mandurah line; that Thornlie–Cockburn connection is very fortunate because the rail line easement already exists. It is simply a matter of having a parallel set of Public Transport Authority passenger line tracks run alongside the tracks that are currently there for the freight line—the Forrestfield–Kwinana freight line. That easement is already there; there is no land acquisition. It is a big cost saving when a rail project can be delivered without having to get into expensive land acquisition; that makes things much, much easier. It also means that the community around that rail easement is ready for an increase in train traffic. I think it is something that we have to be mindful of, though; we have to work with the community on this. People will, of course, experience a fairly dramatic rise in the number of trains. People with properties that back onto the train line have endured a dramatic rise in the number of freight trains that go along the bottom of their gardens. People have complained about that, and there is good reason for those complaints, I must say. There is a technological solution to the problem, which I am pleased to put on the record. It is a problem when some users of the freight line use old rolling stock and old locomotives. It is really noticeable how much quieter things are when other users have invested in the latest rolling stock and the latest locomotives.

This is where we have to look, for the future, to especially make sure that when we roll out the passenger line network, we have that quality of rolling stock as well, which goes quietly and efficiently. It is relatively close to people's homes. I note the member for Southern River's acknowledgement and I think he would agree with me that the Co-operative Bulk Handling trains seem to be particularly good. That is an example of the quality of locomotive and rolling stock that we want. They have large silver wagons that hold the grain that are relatively quiet as they go by, whereas—I have to say—the iron ore locomotives that Mineral Resources use are very noisy. I know there are people in the iron ore sector who are struggling, but it is still operating and I am sure it is still making a profit from its various activities. I think some wagons are worse than others, but it is disappointing that a company like that is imposing this vibration and noise pollution on the people in my community, in the electorate of Cannington, the people who live in the Southern River electorate, and I would imagine the people in the Riverton electorate as well, as those trains make their way to the coast. That is an issue that we have to address. The funding has become available for the grade separation works at Nicholson Road where the freight lines are currently going over a level crossing. That is good to see. It will make a big difference as well to eliminate boom gates from a very busy crossing, especially with the eventual delivery of the Thornlie line extension. It is very important that we have grade separation there.

That brings me to the issue of where the federal government invests money. I really hope that with the change in Prime Minister, we see a change in federal government policy on this matter. We have had a crazy situation with this unfathomable silliness about the idea that the federal government funds only road projects—crazy. We surely have to have a federal government that is prepared to fund big public transport projects—urban rail projects. It is absolutely essential because the alternative is that the funding of these projects is just left to state governments, and that is not realistic at all. These are major pieces of infrastructure. The eastern Gateway is a major piece of infrastructure that has received, the minister said today, two-thirds of its funding from the federal government—he acknowledged that it was two-thirds from the federal Labor government—and that has to continue, but in the future there also has to be a stream of funding directed towards urban rail and other major public transport initiatives. That needs to happen urgently and I hope that it is a major discussion point when the Minister for Transport is next at the Council of Australian Governments meeting with his federal and state counterparts. I hope it is put to whoever is the next federal Minister for Infrastructure and Regional Development that funding of urban rail is a top priority. It should be a top priority for the Turnbull government and any future government. A future federal Labor government, of course, will be committed to funding urban rail. That has to

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

happen because otherwise Western Australians and people right across the nation, in fact, will be waiting a very long time for the delivery of some of these projects, simply because the dollars might not be there for the delivery of some of these expensive projects.

Returning to the issue of costs around the extension of the Thornlie line to the Mandurah line, the estimates are that this can be delivered for around \$360 million. That compares very favourably with the Forrestfield–Airport Link, the cost of which is in the billions of dollars. I think that makes the Thornlie line a particularly attractive option for government because it is so much more affordable. Looking at the return on investment—the number of passenger movements that we will have as the result of that extension—we can see that the benefit is relatively low cost. Of course, the issue with the new stadium is that the movement of people in and out of that stadium will be done, in the main, by the use of public transport. That sounds like a worthy initiative, but the public transport has to be there. The Thornlie line extension—with that connection to the Mandurah line—would enable people to come up from the southern coastal suburbs to the stadium via Thornlie, so that they could get to the Burswood stadium without having to go through the centre of Perth and then out to Burswood. It makes great sense on those grounds as well. The people in my electorate of Gosnells and the people of Thornlie are very keen to see this investment in the Thornlie line extension. They are keen to be involved in the whole discussion around how the train stations will look. There is a large area of land that is ideally situated for a fairly substantial car parking area near the Nicholson Road train station. The area could also be used for some retail, or perhaps some more residential, or commercial buildings so that we can use the theory of transit-oriented development to the maximum.

Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.00 pm

Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE: I will resume my oration, which is perhaps not filling the chamber; nevertheless, I think I have some important points to make about the Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill 2015. I was previously talking about my support for this bill and, indeed, for the many components of Metronet. We need to see that this is one of those components. I was presenting the case that there are some components that are perhaps more deliverable, less expensive and likely to give a bigger return in passenger usage rates than others, and that perhaps that is where we can look for guidance when it comes to assessing the priorities about which stages or components of the Metronet plan should be rolled out and in which order. I also expressed the view that there is great enthusiasm for all the components. The overwhelming message from the Western Australian public is that they want action and delivery on public transport. I also outlined why I believe it is essential that the federal government be involved in the funding of these major pieces of public infrastructure. I explained that there is such a task ahead of us that it would be unreasonable to expect all of the funding to come from state government reserves. This needs to be something that the federal government is fully supportive of. I expressed a degree of optimism that the new Turnbull federal government may actually be inclined to fund —

[Quorum formed.]

Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE: I hope members can perhaps tell me that the new Prime Minister has announced a commitment to the funding of public transport, because it is such an important thing. The funding of the expansion of our rail networks is absolutely vital —

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr N.W. Morton): Members, if we can just keep the noise down, please. It does make it difficult for Hansard.

Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE: —so that people can free themselves from that congestion crisis. To use the RAC's figures, we are talking about a congestion crisis that is costing the Western Australian community about \$2.1 billion a year. It is an enormous sum of money; it is a huge, huge cost.

I want to touch on a few issues around this proposal. I am sure the Minister for Transport will talk about this on coming occasions, but we have got to a situation when it comes to the construction of freeways that we automatically construct cyclepaths alongside those freeways. We need to be specific and clear in this legislation about whether there is an intention to have a cycleway running parallel to the Forrestfield–Airport Link. One would imagine that it would not be too difficult to design that into the tender documents and to have the engineers come up with a way of having a cyclepath running parallel. It sounds like a relatively minor thing but it is tremendous that it is a given that when a new major road or freeway extension is constructed, there is a cyclepath built. If more people take this railway easement through to the Forrestfield area or to the airport at certain times, that will be a good thing. We want as many people as possible on those trains—that is for sure—but there is no doubt that when there is peak transport to deal with, there is a point when we are actually relieved when some people opt not to be in the train carriages, because otherwise there needs to be more train carriages.

[Member's time extended.]

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE: That option needs to be there. It is important and we need to do the sums on this. I have seen various Public Transport Authority estimates on the benefit to society and the reduction of overall costs when 100 people ride bikes rather than get in a rail carriage, as that actually takes pressure off the rail system. It is a worthy thing to have.

Like all of the transport solutions that we discuss in this place, there is not one single silver-bullet solution; there needs to be a range of solutions that give people options so that they can choose what is best for them on a particular day. That is what has been so successful in Europe. The wealthier countries in the European Union—that is an important point to note—have a typical passenger usage rate that is around at least 100 journeys per year by the average citizen; that is, people are taking public transport at least 100 times a year. There is another category of people who use public transport on 130 occasions per year, and that is where we should be aiming. I do not have the figures to hand—I am sure the minister does—on the current usage rate for Western Australians, but I am sure it is nowhere near that rate of 100 journeys per citizen per year. That is what we should be aspiring to. That is what the wealthy countries in Europe are doing. Why should we be any different? However, we need a transport system that provides the quality of service that will lead to that usage rate; that is very important.

I also want to say how important it is to get the idea of active transport firmly in people's minds. I acknowledge that the WA government puts out material on active transport. I have a document from the Department of Transport headed "be active wa", which talks about this point. So many people have got into the habit of imagining that they should be able to get in their car at home and drive almost to the door of their office and walk barely 20 metres at either end. It is very sad when people are in that habit, because the experience elsewhere in the world is that if people accept that they might have a kilometre to walk to the station from their home and perhaps a kilometre when they get to the end of their journey to get to their office, that is two kilometres that someone has walked just in their journey to work, and they can repeat that on the way home. That is a part of active transport. It means that people use public transport but they also get health benefits.

I must say that I find it a very pleasant experience to catch the train into Perth from Thornlie train station. I get off the train in central Perth and walk to Parliament House. I have the option of catching a CAT bus, but I generally prefer to walk up the hill. It is quite pleasant. My only gripe, if I can share this with you, Mr Acting Speaker (Mr N.W. Morton), is when I walk through central Perth and find myself following people who are smoking. It is surprising how often that happens. It is very irritating. I have heard that the City of Perth said it has brought in laws to ban smoking in shopping malls and what have you, but I have not seen evidence of that ban being enforced. It is a problem particularly when I come in on the days when we start a bit later, such as tomorrow morning, and smokers who have already gone into work and clocked on, come down to the bottom of their building and congregate, and I have to walk through Perth dodging congregations of smokers. That is unfair, and it is not good for those smokers. I would like their employers to recognise that they have a problem with those people and encourage them to do something different.

Active transport is an important issue and it is something that we have to recognise, because, in some ways, it is a solution to the idea we have that there has to be a car parking bay for every person catching the train at a station. Of course we need good parking facilities at train stations, but I think we could be going too far. I notice that the government has put out some documents on this point. On the cost of providing parking bays, it states —

Excluding the cost of the land, a multi-level car park costs between \$30,000 and \$50,000 per bay to construct and an open-air public car bay costs at least \$2,500.

They are big costs. If we can find ways to enable people to get to a train station by a feeder bus service or by encouraging them to walk or by making it even easier to take a commuter bike on board with them on the train to use at either end of the journey, we will be doing something about reducing these sorts of costs. Somewhere between \$30 000 and \$50 000 to provide a parking bay in a multistorey car park is a horrendous cost. It seems to be a problem that will snowball eventually. I think there will be no end in sight to that problem if we go too far with the provision of a parking bay for every single person who wants to use public transport.

I am pleased to see that the government provides documentation on active transport; the health benefits that come from it are absolutely enormous. I could not help but notice on the television tonight a segment about Perth's healthiest suburbs, in which various correlations were made between the lifestyle habits of people in some suburbs versus others to come up with various lists. Unfortunately, the report did not really get into this issue, but I think that if we look at the suburbs in which people did the most active commuting, we would find they are some of the healthiest suburbs.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

I hope as areas such as Forrestfield become well connected to our public transport network that people in those suburbs are able to lead a healthier life and that we see better health rates. There are all kinds of indicators that can determine health rates, including visits to the GP, blood test results and measuring cholesterol levels. All sorts of things can be used to monitor how effective public transport is to not only deliver an efficient way for people to go about their business, but also give them an opportunity to be engaged in a very healthy form of travel, which is much, much healthier than this idea we currently have in our heads that we should be able to get out of the front door and into the car to arrive within 20 metres of the office front door. That is old thinking and it is unhealthy thinking; we have to change that. I have friends in this place who tell me how they rush to get home in time to drive to the local gym or they do that trip in the morning in peak-hour traffic. They drive from their homes to the local gym, where they do a 40-minute workout and then they get back into the traffic. That is really crazy thinking and we have to encourage people to be active in their transport choices.

I refer now to the RAC's submissions to state and federal governments. A very important aspect of this issue is the land use planning that needs to occur around our transport hubs. On land use planning, the RAC document states —

In future-proofing the mobility of Western Australians, transport and land use planning are inextricably linked. In order to curb continued urban sprawl, more effective integration of land use and transport modes is required to reduce the need for people to travel so far and so often. This is also critical to facilitating travel by more sustainable modes.

The issue is to ensure that land around a train station is zoned not just for car parking, but for the development of shopping facilities, and commercial and even residential premises. That is a winning combination, because it means that people feel so much safer. I feel sad when people tell me that they are scared to use the train at night. I point out to them that if they catch the train now, as I might get home later this evening, there is usually a guard on the train. I feel perfectly safe when I am on the train. The problem for people is when they get off the train and they have to make the journey from the train station to either their car parked at the station or their home, if they are walking. We need that space to be—this might be a bit of planning jargon—as active as possible, so it is well frequented and there are people around so there is the passive surveillance that means there is not the current threat that exists in so many places where there is a barren landscape. If there is nothing there and somebody with malicious intent is around, a poor commuter making their way home can feel quite vulnerable, and understandably so.

This bill is the first stage; it is just a component of the whole Metronet plan. It is a very expensive component, and I think in future we need to make decisions about prioritising our Metronet projects based on their affordability. I come back to the project that I am passionate about—the extension of the Thornlie line through to the Mandurah line. That is currently estimated to cost somewhere between \$350 million and \$360 million. I have heard even lower estimates than that, but let us be conservative or somewhat pessimistic, and assume that it is the higher figure of \$360 million. I think it would deliver greater value because it would go a long way to alleviate the congestion we are seeing on the feeder roads in the southern suburbs. People who travel on those roads do not have any other choice; they are shackled to their cars because there is no alternative. We know that is costing us an absolute fortune in the congestion costs that the RAC estimated and developed; \$2.1 billion annually is a horrendous figure for us to put up with, and worst of all it is damaging people's quality of life. It means that people are in the relatively unhealthy passive activity of being stuck in a vehicle while they negotiate traffic jams and endure all kinds of frustration as they make their way to and from their place of work, where they study or where they catch up with family and friends. Ensuring our citizens are as mobile as possible is essential.

MR P. ABETZ (Southern River) [7.19 pm]: I would like to make a brief contribution to the Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill 2015 second reading debate. I believe this is a very exciting development and I look forward to the Forrestfield–Airport Link proceeding. The plans to have a significant part of the link underground is a really positive move because it avoids interference with activity on top of the ground for people in that area, and also eliminates the whole issue of noise, vibration and so on for people in that corridor. Also, it will allow the Forrestfield area, or the eastern part of the Perth area, to develop by being linked by a very fast route into the central business district. I understand it will take about 20 minutes to get into the city, which at the moment takes most people 45 minutes or longer. It will be a great boost for people who live in that area. For those in my electorate of Southern River, which takes in Canning Vale, Southern River and Huntingdale, it takes on average 45 minutes to get into the city at peak hour. Even if a person catches the bus to the Murdoch station, and then catches the train into the CBD, it still takes around the same time—it is pretty similar to the time taken driving in. Having a fast service will certainly be a boon to that area.

The other exciting thing is that once the Forrestfield line is completed, the Premier has indicated that the Thornlie line extension through to the Mandurah line will be the next railway project.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

Ms R. Saffioti: Really? Is that what he said?

Mr P. ABETZ: He is on public record as saying that, so I am certainly hoping that that will be the case. The government's commitment to that project will become very evident before the end of this year because the railway overpass at Nicholson Road is due to commence construction before the end of this year. I successfully advocated for funding with the federal infrastructure opposition spokesman at the time, Warren Truss, when he was in Western Australia. I took him out there together with the federal members, showed him the situation and asked that consideration be given to providing at least some federal funding for that grade separation or that rail overpass. It is a fairly costly process to build such an overpass. Back in the early 1990s, there were about seven or nine goods trains a day on that line; now it is closer to 30 trains a day. The rail overpass will obviously make provision for not only the two goods train tracks, but also the two passenger lines coming through. That sort of construction costs a ballpark figure of \$30 million. Once completed—part funded by the federal government and part funded by the state—that much less will have to be spent when the main project gets underway in about five years, when the Forrestfield line hopefully will be completed. That will certainly be a very welcome addition to the infrastructure in my electorate.

In terms of the costs the member for Gosnells floated, I have been told it is around the \$300 million mark, but we will not know until the exact detailed costing is done. I believe there is a real possibility for a public–private partnership with the railway station at Nicholson Road roundabout. The big area next to the police station would lend itself well to high-rise apartments that would not cause any hindrance or block out sunlight to any neighbours because the location has an industrial area on one side of the railway line and the Barbagallo Ballpark on the other. There is nothing to hinder a high-rise development. If we did something similar to the development at Cockburn railway station with high-rise apartments at Nicholson Road, and it was a public–private partnership, the developer, for having access to the land, could perhaps also build the railway station or something along that line. That would significantly reduce the cost to the taxpayer. The other issue is the significant shortage of commercial space in the Canning Vale and Southern River area. Some commercial space in the railway complex could also be quite attractive. Given that it is right next to a freight line, some people say that they would not want to live next to a freight line because of the vibrations et cetera, but these days all of these things can be dealt with through engineering, house design, double glazing facing towards the railway line and so on, and the noise issue would not be significant.

The other thing of course is that rail is not the only answer to the issue of getting people into the city and trying to reduce congestion. We need to ensure that the feeder bus services can get through to the station promptly, and I am very thankful to the Minister for Transport and the City of Canning for making funds available for a bus lane on Ranford Road from Bannister Road through to Nicholson Road. This gets fairly congested in the morning, which delays the buses. If buses can run on time, that will improve the situation to such a point that more people will want to catch public transport because they will get to work more quickly than driving the car; whereas at the moment, it is still pretty much equal time whether a person drives or uses public transport. When the weather is bad, people still jump in their cars rather than use public transport. That is a significant issue that we need to keep in mind.

Those small projects such as a bus lane on Ranford Road going both ways costs roughly \$6 million. In comparison with a \$300 million rail project, it is almost like petty cash, yet it makes a very significant difference. Incidentally, the traffic on Ranford Road has improved since the freeway widening towards Roe Highway has been completed, because now instead of taking Ranford Road, people in Southern River and Harrisdale merrily continue down the freeway, take the Berrigan Drive exit, go up Jandakot Road and go into Southern River. In terms of distance, it is about four kilometres longer than taking South Street and Ranford Road, but there are no traffic lights on the route—so it is quicker. I am enjoying that the freeway has been widened and there is no bottleneck there anymore with peak-hour traffic. That is certainly of benefit.

I conclude my remarks and say that I look forward to the Forrestfield–Airport Link being constructed. I am sure that once it is completed, people will be very grateful for that project.

MR B.S. WYATT (Victoria Park) [7.28 pm]: I, too, rise to make some comments on the Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill 2015. As pointed out by the member for West Swan and the Leader of the Opposition, the WA Labor opposition is delighted to be supporting the passage of this bill, that otherwise could be known as the “Metronet Stage 1 Bill 2015”.

Mr P. Papalia: Phase 1.

Mr B.S. WYATT: Phase 1—“Metronet Phase 1 Bill 2015”.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

We support this bill because we support that rail line that, as the member for West Swan pointed out, the Liberal Party was terrified about and panicked into committing to. We support it because we need this bill to keep the Liberals committed to it, because we know that the Liberal Party goes wobbly on public transport. We know it makes commitments that are then rapidly abandoned, changed or delayed after an election. We need this bill to keep the Liberal Party honest, and the people of Forreestfield need this bill to keep the Liberal Party honest. We know that it might just get through another election, and it will all change again. That is the reason the people of Forreestfield, Belmont and broader Western Australia need this bill—to keep the Liberal Party honest and to lock it into a commitment that it has weaselled out of since the 2013 fully funded, fully costed election campaign. I know, Mr Acting Speaker (Mr N.W. Morton), in your contribution tonight you made that point when you yelled out to the Leader of the Opposition, “Give us a time frame? Give us a costing?”

Mr P. Papalia: Interesting questions.

Mr B.S. WYATT: They were very interesting questions—they were very astute questions, we would think, but they are also very new questions for the Barnett government to be asking. We know that when Metro Area Express and the airport line were committed to, the government did not know two things: first, it did not know the time frame; and, second, it did not know the costs. When the Premier was saying to the people of Mirrabooka, “I give you the tip: buy property around here”, he had not the slightest idea of the route of that line, nor the cost. When he said that, his draft transport policy was stating that Perth did not need an airport line until 2030. When Metronet terrified the Liberal Party during the 2013 election campaign, bang, it suddenly found itself committed to the airport line. I remind the member for Forreestfield that the Liberal Party was committed to the airport line because he asked the opposition to give him a time frame. I remind all members what the commitment was in 2013 in that fully funded, fully costed election campaign. I will quote from the Liberal WA media statement during the election campaign, which states —

Transport Minister Troy Buswell said the fully costed \$1.895billion rail line ... would have three stations, 3000 parking bays and be built by 2018.

Time and again during that election campaign, Troy Buswell and the Premier said that the rail line would be operating by 2018 and so would MAX; both would be built and both would be operating. We need the Metronet phase 1 Forreestfield line legislation passed through the Parliament to lock in the Liberal Party to its commitment, because it goes wobbly on public transport—it always has done.

The member for West Swan, in an outstanding contribution, went through the 10 reasons the Liberal Party cannot be trusted on public rail—I think there could have been a few more; the member for West Swan was being generous—and they were astute reasons. Interestingly, some of the interjections from the Premier along the way suggested that he did not make some of those commitments, but as is always the way, the member for West Swan had done her work. When the Premier said that the Liberal Party did not commit to the Ellenbrook bus rapid transit, we had to again read in the media statement of the Liberal Party that committed it to the Ellenbrook BRT. If we do not lock the Premier down to his own quotes, he never said it; that is why we have to lock the Liberal Party into this project, because it will go wobbly. The government will abandon it, change it. It has already treated the people of Forreestfield and Belmont with contempt by deferring it—fully funded, fully costed and operating by 2018 at the same time as building MAX.

The Leader of the Opposition made this point when he said, “We’ve got a new Prime Minister now.” My congratulations go to Malcolm Turnbull on his election as Leader of the Liberal Party and his swearing-in as our new Prime Minister. I hope that the new Prime Minister, Malcolm Turnbull, will change the archaic and outdated position of the former Prime Minister that rail is not in the federal government’s knitting. I recall that not that long ago—in fact, on 31 August—Malcolm Turnbull was in town campaigning in the Canning by-election with the Liberal candidate, Andrew Hastie. Malcolm Turnbull tweeted on 31 August, standing in front of a train, with Mr Hastie —

With #AndrewHastie about to board the train to Mandurah at Esplanade station in Perth.

To which he received a reply from a gentleman by the name of Peter Waterhouse —

... I’ve been on that train. It is an excellent service. #Trains

To which Malcolm Turnbull responded —

... sure is catching it back to Perth now.

Under that comment was a picture of Malcolm Turnbull on the train chatting to someone, with the hashtag #Iwillfundurbanrail. He did not really have that hashtag—I thought I would put that in there by way of dramatic addition. But at least we know that the new Prime Minister appreciates that wonderful line, delivered to

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

Mandurah by the former Labor government, one of the 10 reasons that the member for West Swan went through why we cannot trust the Liberal Party when it comes to public rail. We simply cannot.

That was indeed transformational, to use the government's word on the projects that it has since abandoned. Transformational projects such as the Yanchep line—abandoned. Projects like MAX—abandoned. I know it is transformational because the Urban Development Institute of Australia told me so. I hope the Minister for Planning will come back into the chamber, because the “UDIA Submission: Perth and Peel @3.5 million” is a cracker. We would all agree that the UDIA knows a bit about planning. I assume all members got a copy of its submission in response to the government's Perth and Peel@3.5million and subregional frameworks. It arrived in my electorate office and I read it on the bus while coming into Parliament last week. I recommend all members read it because, to be frank, it is not terribly complimentary of the government's key planning document. But the reason I know and the reason Malcolm Turnbull knows that the Labor Party delivered a transformational line to Mandurah is the UDIA tells me so. It states at page 47 of its submission —

The new Mandurah rail line has been transformational with significant modal shift occurring in Kwinana, Rockingham, and Atwell/Success/Hammond Park/Aubin Grove (South of Cockburn Central). Clarkson, on the northern railway line has also been strongly responsive to public transport with 29% of commuters now using public transport.

The submission goes on to state —

This transport network will need to be enhanced with stronger East–West linkages. The Institute was concerned about the lack of depth in the information provided in the documentation —

That is referring to the government's key planning document —

on the future of mass transit. Even some of the most basic information was flawed, such as the aspirational “peak frequency of 5 minute intervals” ... for rail in peak hour, times that are already being exceeded by the Public Transport Authority on some lines.

The UDIA is saying in its submission that we need Metronet. The UDIA is endorsing—it does not use the word Metronet—east–west travel. It is endorsing Metronet. That is what it is doing. The Minister for Planning is not here; it is a rare occurrence that he is not in the chamber. However, the UDIA makes some less than flattering remarks. I refer members to a few words in its executive summary —

... it will create catastrophic land supply shortages, ...

... it has been more secretive than any other planning process that UDIA has observed since the institute's establishment in 1972.

In reviewing the document it was clear that assumptions have been made, based on opaque data ...

The general tone of the document paints Perth as ... unacceptably sprawled ... This assumption is not validated by the evidence.

It goes on —

Within the documentations, density appears to be seen as a panacea for many problems, however some of the fundamental data is flawed.

It continues —

Assumption about car dependency are now also very dated.

It continues —

Assumptions about the use of basic raw materials are also deeply flawed ...

This is not a complimentary document of the Barnett government's key planning document “Perth and Peel@3.5million”. The UDIA is saying that it is completely undercooked. Its second recommendation is that a steering group needs to be appointed to review it all because all the government's data is wrong—it is old; it is opaque; it is secretive. What a scathing assessment of the government's chief document! I am looking forward to a response. I hope the government responds in a way that is vaguely transparent so that we can see the decisions the government has made, because echoing in all of this, as the member for West Swan I think referred to, is the draft transport plan. Do members remember that? We never saw a final plan. We saw a draft transport plan that I assume was part of that initial commitment in 2008 within the first 100 days to set up an integrated public transport plan. Here we are, seven years later, still waiting for it.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

Later on the UDIA's submission goes through some detail around the issues of public transport, as we would expect from a credible organisation that is looking at planning. Page 16 reads —

The opportunity to reframe Perth as a transport responsive city (rather than a narrower concept of Transport Orientated Development—TOD) has not been explored in the frameworks. Nor do the plans have due regard for the technological changes that are likely to revolutionise transport throughout the world.

It goes on in bold print, so they are making the point —

Whilst it could be argued that the intent of the document is to increase density and public transport patronage, the restrictive process that has been identified will not deliver this outcome. These outcomes requires courage not constraint.

There is nothing in the Urban Development Institute of Australia's submission—it tries to be polite despite all those words—that casts a positive light on “Perth and Peel@3.5 million”; not one thing, but it certainly endorses Metronet—absolutely. I know members opposite are spooked on Metronet. I knew they were spooked when a member of the opposition was on their feet talking about Metronet and referred to a time frame. Straight away the Premier and the Minister for Transport: “By when?” Silence. “By when?” We saw the white of the member for Forrestfield's eyes. He too knows that his government needs to be locked into this Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill because it goes wobbly on public transport, as it has always done. I think the Minister for Transport's critique of Metronet is basically, “Oh, you know, these are just preliminary concept-design phases; it doesn't mean anything.” I assume that is the basic line the Minister for Transport is running. Their lines in the media have been a bit inconsistent—the Premier finally drew a bead—about this. I say “inconsistent” because members opposite are now trying to take a stand that they have never once applied to themselves. They are just in government, mind you, so why apply a standard? I know the Minister for Transport's other line is, “Oh, that was a previous Minister for Transport; it's got nothing to do with me.” I understand that. Do members know what? I like the minister and I feel sorry for the minister because he is just the Mr Topsy-Turvy in this. He has been handed this portfolio after Mr Buswell, Mr Barnett, Mr O'Brien and everyone else have had their fingerprints on it along the way—chaos, incoherence, broken promises, real estate advice from the Premier—and the member for Alfred Cove has just got it. I know why he is Mr Topsy-Turvy. Jonathan Barrett wrote a very astute piece in *The Australian Financial Review* on the government about putting Mr Topsy-Turvy in charge. He is just Mr Topsy-Turvy. I know also because I have the book *Mr. Topsy-Turvy*. Members may know that I have young daughters and I like Mr. Men books. I will read one page of the Mr Topsy-Turvy story for the benefit of *Hansard*. It reads —

Now, this story is all about the time Mr Topsy-Turvy came to the town where you and I live.

Nobody is quite sure how Mr Topsy-Turvy got there, or where he came from, but he did arrive, because somebody saw him getting off the train.

The trouble was, he did it in a Topsy-Turvy way, and got out on the wrong side and fell on the railway line.

Which really isn't that surprising, is it?

The minister is just Mr Topsy-Turvy. He arrived on the train line. The member for Forrestfield is desperate to have it built. It will not be operating by 2018, as the member for Forrestfield committed to the people of Forrestfield. It is not the minister. We listen intently and we kind of get it. The minister does not understand it either. It is tough. I know that because, by way of documents on government planning, this is one of the best. The member for West Swan outlined this briefing note from the Department of Transport to, I can only assume, the Minister for Transport. It has that wonderful table headed “Nation Building Program 2—Candidate Proposal Summary Table”. As the member for West Swan pointed out, it goes through Ellenbrook bus rapid transit, which the Premier tried to say, “We are not committed to that; no, we never committed to that”, until we pointed out his media statements that, of course, he was. The best bit for me is scrawled down the bottom in some sort of desperate attempt to take control of the debate during the election campaign, no doubt, in Troy Buswell's very familiar handwriting, “Airport rail link. Rail extension to Canning Vale.” “Quick, fax it off. We've done the work on this and we're ready to go.” We know that the work had not been done because the Economic Regulation Authority told us so.

[Member's time extended.]

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

Mr B.S. WYATT: I keep saying to members, go and read the ERA's microeconomic reform report. It is a cracker of a report. The ERA looked at MAX and the airport line and made the following point. I will quote from the ERA's report —

A business case for the MAX Light Rail project has been completed by the Department of Transport including detailed CBA —

That means cost-benefit analysis. To continue —

which was subjected to rigorous independent scrutiny from Infrastructure Australia. The CBA outlines a range of patronage and demographic assumptions, showing an aggregate (and independently verified) net benefit. The business case has not been made public.

A business case is yet to be finalised for the Airport Rail Link project.

It is therefore not clear on what basis Government has given the Airport Link priority over the MAX Light Rail Project.

That was written by the independent ERA. All it has been able to find no doubt is Troy Buswell's handwriting scrawled at the bottom of the "Nation Building Program 2—Candidate Proposal Summary Table". Is there any wonder the opposition is supporting this bill? We will lock the Liberal Party into it before it goes wobbly again and finds another project that catches the Premier's attention as he is driving through Perth and commits to that, because that is about the effort of the work the government has gone into on public transport. That is about it. There is no coherent plan at all. Unfortunately, the Minister for Planning is not here, and the UDIA bells the cat on this. It makes the point that "Perth and Peel@3.5 million" ain't going to deliver the density in transit numbers the government is hoping for.

I have to refer to this because the member for Forrestfield and the minister talk about it and ask, "What's your costings?" I think it is only the seventeenth time I have referred to it, but I will do it again for the benefit of us all. The member for Cockburn likes it when I go through this. I want to remind everyone what happened on 2 September 2012 when the Premier went to Mirrabooka, announced MAX and advised on Channel Seven news that the people of Western Australia should invest around that site because that was where the MAX terminal would be built. On that very day the government leaked the story to *The Sunday Times* and got a big glossy *The Sunday Times* front page, headed "A billion to put us on track". This was when the government of the day, with all the resources of government committed to around—it did not really know—let us say a \$1 billion-plus project. This is what Troy Buswell, who was Treasurer and transport minister was reported as saying —

He said the State Government was aiming to have the project finished within six years.

"Under the current timeline, contracts will be awarded in late 2015 with construction starting in 2016 and completion towards the end of 2018," he said.

Remember, this was announced by the Premier standing next to the Treasurer and transport minister. When the question was asked, "How much will this cost?" he answered for *The Sunday Times* —

I suspect without knowing in detail and when you have a look at what's happening on the Gold Coast, the cost for this type of infrastructure will be a billion dollars plus,"

"We have not worked through a procurement analysis yet.

The minister stands there and tries to undermine Metronet. I think the minister's line—I have it here—was that the absence of clear deadlines meant there was a lack of commitment surrounding the Metronet policy—absence of clear deadlines. Hang on a minute: "Contracts will be awarded in late 2015 with construction starting in 2016 and completion towards the end of 2018." An absence of clear deadlines? I just do not understand. This is why the Liberal Party has zero credibility on public transport. It needs only one reason, but the member for West Swan outlined the top 10, because there are more than 10. When I am buried, I will take the *Hansard* with me, pinned to my shirt, because, for me, it was Troy Buswell's finest moment. I like Troy and I miss Troy.

Dr K.D. Hames: So do we.

Mr B.S. WYATT: I know the Deputy Premier misses Troy. I know he wishes Troy was here, because he might have been able to explain the Liberal Party's public transport policy, because no-one else can. I sensed from Troy at the time that he was not happy that the Premier had rushed out the Metro Area Express light rail. Of course, members may remember that the reason it was rushed out was that the Bigger Picture television advertisements, which had big glossy pictures of a light rail project, were starting on that Sunday night. The Liberal Party's own advertising campaign came at it and it was not ready, so it rushed out and committed to it. Troy Buswell knew that. We all knew that. This is how the Liberal Party goes about managing its public

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

transport policy in Western Australia. The next day, unsurprisingly, Mr Buswell was asked to go on radio. When he went on 720 ABC on 3 September, the question that was put to him was, “How are you going to pay for it?” Troy Buswell responded, “It’ll be paid for by, I’m assuming or I imagine” but then the DJ interrupted. Troy also said, “We’ll sit down with the commonwealth, I’d imagine.” It is like some sort of bad song. The best line from Troy—I have quoted this time and again but I will keep doing it—in response to the question about how much it is going to cost was —

I think it will be over a billion dollars or at least a billion dollars or more than a billion dollars ...

That is how much it is going to cost. I do not know what that means. Ultimately, just before election day, Treasury told us that it would cost, from memory, \$1.8 billion, so Troy was right; it was “over a billion dollars or at least a billion dollars or more than a billion dollars”. That was the work that the Treasurer and transport minister had done when all members opposite committed to it. When Treasury put out its documentation outlining how much the airport line and MAX would cost, it specifically made the point that both MAX and the airport line were at a preliminary concept design stage. It went on to make this point about MAX —

- detailed scope elements (for example: length of light rail track, related roadworks and stations etc), where not explicitly specified in the Liberal Party scope advice, ...

Does the government think for a minute that it has some sort of credibility? These are not opposition documents. This is not the opposition saying, “I think it will be over a billion dollars or at least a billion dollars or more than a billion dollars”; this is the government, with all the resources of government. That is the detail to which it takes a commitment, with both projects to be operating by 2018, yet it has the audacity to critique Metronet. It is just extraordinary. I say again, Mr Acting Speaker (Mr N.W. Morton), that we are backing you in; we will support this bill because I know, just like you know, that the Liberal Party has form. It goes wobbly on public transport; it has never really committed to it. It was dragged kicking and screaming to commit to the airport line. That is why we support this bill, because the people of Forrestfield and Belmont know in their DNA that the Liberal Party is not committed to rail. It is not its knitting, as Tony Abbott said. Tony Abbott nailed it. There are lots of things he said that I thought were utterly ridiculous.

Mr F.M. Logan: Most actually.

Mr B.S. WYATT: Most! I thought it was ridiculous at the time when he said that it was not the Liberal Party’s knitting, but, upon reflection, all he was doing was being honest. The Liberal Party does not do rail. That is what he was saying when he made those comments all that time ago. I have said that the new Prime Minister has tweeted pictures of the Labor transformational line to Mandurah. He made the point that it is a wonderful project and he loved riding on it and so he tweeted a picture of himself on it.

The member for West Swan outlined the 10 reasons why we cannot trust the Liberal Party. I know you are holding on to the airport line for grim death, Mr Acting Speaker, and of course you should, but the Liberal Party had already deceived the people of Forrestfield when it said that it would be operating by 2018. The Liberal Party went to the election saying that everything was fully funded and fully costed, yet it assumed that \$3 billion would be provided by the commonwealth government and a Prime Minister who said that urban rail is not his knitting. It is treating the people of Western Australia with contempt with its election promises, too. It has abandoned its timetables of 2018, which is a time frame that the member for Forrestfield and the Minister for Transport carry on about, but they have not been able to meet any of them. I read on the front page of *The Sunday Times* that the MAX contract would be out this year, construction would begin next year and it would be finished in 2018. The Liberal Party should think about its own position before it has the audacity to think it has the moral high ground on public transport, because it does not. Those 10 points about why the Liberal Party cannot be trusted on public transport will be airdropped from Bronwyn’s chopper during the election campaign. Every Western Australian will have a copy of the 10 reasons that the Liberal Party cannot be trusted, and I will stamp it with “fully funded, fully costed” just to really make the point.

We are delighted, Mr Acting Speaker, to support this bill—the Metronet phase 1 bill 2015. As I said, I do not trust the Liberal Party. It goes wobbly on public transport; it always does, and it will go wobbly on it again unless we have some legislation in this place. We look forward. We will complete that and we will continue, as the Urban Development Institute of Australia says, east–west, to Ellenbrook and to Yanchep—remember the commitment by the member for Butler, which was one of the 10. We will make sure that the people of Western Australia understand what they know in their heart of hearts; that is, if they want rail, if they want a coordinated plan and if they want a government that is committed to rail, they should elect the Labor Party. That is the reality. The Liberal Party has only itself to blame for the deceit that it put upon the people of

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

Western Australia, because it went to an election making promises that it could not meet on assumptions that were unrealistic, arrogant, spurious and ridiculous.

MR P. PAPALIA (Warnbro) [7.58 pm]: I rise in the footsteps of the member for Victoria Park to wholeheartedly embrace the Metronet phase 1 bill, otherwise known at the moment as the Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill 2015. What a wonderful project. What a wonderful part of Metronet. What a wonderful concession by the government that only Labor has ideas that are worth pursuing and only Labor can deliver on rail, because that is what everyone in Western Australia knows now and will be very aware of as we get closer to the next election. The depression imprinted across the foreheads of the people opposite confirms exactly what the member for Victoria Park just said. They know that the people of Western Australia have their measure. The government lacks any credibility. Any tenuous link it may have had to any credibility evaporated after the last election. The people of Western Australia were burnt in the 2008 election, particularly those poor souls living in Ellenbrook and the suburbs to the south towards the city who were promised a rail line by the member for Swan Hills and the Premier. They were absolutely mortified after the last election, when they again gave their trust to the Liberal Party of Western Australia, conceding that they might have got it wrong once, but the party certainly would not lie to them or deceive them twice in such an audacious fashion, but the truth has been well and truly revealed. The fact is that the government is never going to recover that credibility; it has gone. It is a wonderful thing that the government is introducing this bill because, after the opposition's announcement of Metronet at the state conference, it is the second step towards a constant stream of repetition of the government's failures, reminding the people of Western Australia of the lies, deception and falsehoods that were peddled right across the metropolitan area, particularly prior to the last election. Every time the Barnett government refers to a rail project, it will give the opposition the opportunity to remind everybody how the Liberals cannot be trusted when it comes to rail, and that the only party that will deliver public transport to the people of Western Australia in a strategic, comprehensive fashion is the Labor Party. We embrace this opportunity; we embrace this bill.

We are well served in Western Australia by some fine journalists dedicated to recording political life in Western Australia. I will not name them all, but I will name a couple of them. Particularly in this term of government, two experienced, well-qualified journalists with a sharp eye for detail and a very fine memory on both counts have nailed it on this particular subject. The first one I will refer to is Liam Bartlett. He wrote an outstanding article, published in *The Sunday Times* on 15 March this year, titled "Public railroad again." Who would that be about, Minister for Transport? I am sure the minister read it. I know that members opposite read it, and then recoiled in shame at having been called out in such an accurate fashion by someone who is doing a fine job as a journalist. He is not partisan—not Liam Bartlett. He is certainly not partisan towards the Labor Party. Having been elected in a by-election in February 2007, I recall many talkback radio shows when Liam Bartlett was working at ABC 720. He shifted over to 6PR later that year, I think. My first recollection as an excited and enthused new member of state Parliament—a backbencher in the then government—was being horrified at the attacks on the wonderful transport minister Alannah MacTiernan by Liam. He got people on his program on almost a daily basis who would predict that the trains would run off the rails and smash into cars. I recall that at one point he had a federal Liberal transport spokesman over from the east coast who said that the whole job could be done with six buses. There was no need for a southern suburbs railway; there was no need for a railway to Mandurah. It could be done with six buses. He gave that clown 15 minutes, I think. There is no suggestion at all that Liam was on the side of Labor in any political way, but this article nails it. Having gone away and had a fine career with *60 Minutes*, travelling the world and performing very ably in that role, he has come back to Perth and no doubt looked stupefied at the behaviour of the Barnett government. This article pretty much sums it up. It was so wonderfully accurate that I will read several parts of it into *Hansard* to remind those members opposite who may have read it, almost holding it at arm's length and hoping that no-one else bought the paper that day and noticed it. I am going to remind them just how accurate that article was. It reads —

IT'S commonly said the term "railroaded" sprang from around the 1870s, at a time when rail was being forced on and through communities and private land holdings by the railway "robber" barons.

"Being railroaded" meant that you were doing something that was "against one's will".

Today, in Western Australia, it has taken on a new meaning. In this state it refers to the act of voting for a Liberal member of parliament under the assumption they will build you a railroad if they get in. And further, when they do win the public vote, they will abandon the promise of rail and drop you like a hot dog-spike.

The Barnett Government calls it a "transport policy", but its more easily digestible if we call it what it really is; "railroading".

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

Is that not an accurate assessment of what has been done to the people of Western Australia by this government with respect to rail? It is extraordinary behaviour, by which consistently, before elections, the Barnett government's key spokespersons, including the Premier, say one thing and then drop it and effectively confirm the lie after the election. With regard to the rail promises at both the 2008 and 2013 elections, it is undeniable that that is the case. I like the line that Liam Bartlett used when he wrote —

... the Liberals appear to have neurological resistance when it comes to rail.

The member for Victoria Park was saying that they go wobbly. Liam Bartlett says they have neurological resistance. Is that not a nice and appropriate phrase? That is the problem; it is far deeper than going wobbly. It is much more fundamental. The government is incapable of actually committing and delivering. It is a good thing, as the member for Victoria Park said, that we put this in law and compel the government, although we know that the only way to compel this to happen is to vote Labor at the next election. At least the Liberals will have signed up in legislation to do it.

I would like to quote one other fine point from this wonderful article by Liam Bartlett that, I think, sums it all up. I can promise the government side that we will repeat this. This will be the consistent message. Every time the government talks about public transport or makes an announcement between now and the election, we will be saying this —

Politics aside, it is a fact that without Labor's love of trains we would not enjoy our current network.

An independent observer condemns the Liberal Party in Western Australia. It closed the Fremantle line, and it took a Labor government to reopen it. Labor built the northern line; Labor electrified the network; Labor built the southern line and extended the northern line, and the only party that will deliver a strategic, comprehensive plan for public transport in Western Australia is the Labor Party. That has been embedded in the psyche of Western Australian voters. The government can do nothing about it. People do not trust the Premier. As was pointed out by the member for West Swan during question time, the Premier is yet again the most unpopular leader in the country, bar none. The new Prime Minister is way more popular than his predecessor, and the Premier has a net disapproval of minus 21. That is unheralded.

Mr D.C. Nalder: Can I make an interjection?

Mr P. PAPALIA: I do not think the Minister for Transport has anything to contribute. If he has something to contribute, he should do that when he stands up to make his speech. I am tired of Liberal Ministers for Transport standing in the public eye and saying one thing about public transport and then abandoning it completely the moment they have been elected. It is not going to happen this time. Every single opportunity we get, every moment, every time the Liberal Party or the Barnett government or one of their representatives stands in front of a camera or in this place and says something about public transport, we will remind the people of Western Australia that they cannot be trusted. If the government promises something, it will be haphazard, off the cuff and unplanned, and it will be only a poor imitation of Metronet. Nothing the government can do will reach people to the extent that Metronet already has. That is the beauty of it; that is the wonderful thing about this strategy. It has completely revealed and exposed the government's deception and its lack of credibility. The Minister for Transport knows that.

Mr D.C. Nalder interjected.

Ms R. Saffioti: Remind him about his 10 per cent.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Okay, I have to go there. The minister has interjected. I must go there. The Minister for Transport is so rattled at his poor performance and the abysmal performance of his own government that he has publicly announced he will confront and challenge his colleague, who holds a 20-plus per cent margin seat, because the minister holds only a 10.5 per cent margin seat. The minister is so afraid of defending a 10-plus per cent margin that he has taken on publicly his good friend and colleague the member for Bateman.

Mr D.C. Nalder interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Take a seat, member for Warnbro. I am just going to get you back on to the bill so that we can stop the interjections. If you just get back on to the bill, we will be fine; thank you.

Mr P. PAPALIA: It is extraordinary! I understand there is further confirmation of just how rattled the Liberal Party is. I understand that another minister has been so rattled that he does not want to defend a 10-plus per cent margin seat.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Warnbro, come back to the bill.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

Mr P. PAPALIA: The minister begged the colleague to submit to the Electoral Commission that he should have his margin changed just so that the minister could defend a much higher margin. It is a bit of a worry when two key ministers in a government are too afraid to defend a 10-plus per cent margin seat.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Warnbro, come back to the bill.

Mr P. PAPALIA: This is all about the Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill 2015. Members of the government should understand that they will have to defend their record. If there is one field of endeavour in which they have demonstrated their abject failure and have actually deceived the public on more than one occasion—a massive deception, a fraud conducted on the public Western Australia—it is in the field of public transport and rail development in the city of Perth. There is nothing they can do about it to recover. They know that. It is written all over the face of every single member on the other side. The moment the Labor Party announced unprecedented confirmation 18 months out from the next election that we intend to go with Metronet, written all over the face of each member opposite was the knowledge that they knew that was it. The member for Forrestfield knew then that he now has nothing to offer. The only thing the member for Forrestfield has to offer is a poor imitation of Labor’s plan.

Dr K.D. Hames interjected.

Mr D.C. Nalder interjected.

Point of Order

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: The Minister for Health and the Minister for Transport are incessantly interjecting. As you understand, Madam Acting Speaker, all interjections are disorderly and I ask that they be brought to account.

Dr K.D. HAMES: Further to that point of order, Madam Acting Speaker, I am sure you heard me interject on only one occasion, which leaves me miles in arrears of the member who just brought the point of order.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms J.M. Freeman): Member for Warnbro.

Debate Resumed

Mr P. PAPALIA: I will push on because it is just too much fun! Another thing is that we are going to announce it many times between now and March 2017. There is no concern about people being fully aware—they are already. That is the beauty of the whole strategy. Metronet is a wonderful strategy. It will develop a comprehensive plan for public transport in Perth. The thing about that is that it exposes the fact that the government does not have a plan. The government’s plan consists of ad hoc, unplanned, inconsistent, unrelated announcements in response to the Labor Party. Every time we talk about Metronet, it exposes what the government is, what it has done and what it will do. It reveals and confirms the government’s inconsistency and lack of credibility. The beautiful thing about all of that, even beyond that fact, is that the person who currently has to defend it is the Minister for Transport. The person who has to confront the challenge of trying to cut through an already concluded argument is the Minister for Transport, who has demonstrated a complete incapacity to sell anything, or probably even to understand any message before selling. It is extraordinary that the government is left with this minister to sell it. I like the Minister for Transport. Like the member for Victoria Park, I like the minister.

Mr D.C. Nalder: Don’t play the man!

Mr P. PAPALIA: What; by saying that I like the minister? He has not exactly covered himself in glory with respect to being able to sell a message. That is the truth. It is wonderful that he is the one who the government will rely on to convey the message. That aside, the other journalist I want to pay tribute to this evening —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members! The member for Warnbro has the floor.

Mr S.K. L’Estrange interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Churchlands!

Mr P. PAPALIA: May I have an extension, please, Madam Acting Speaker?

The ACTING SPEAKER: Absolutely!

[Member’s time extended.]

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

Mr P. PAPALIA: Another fine journalist I want to pay tribute to this evening wrote one of the two single pieces in this term of government that have absolutely nailed the issue. The first is from Liam Bartlett titled “Public railroaded again”. The other journalist I want to pay tribute to and praise is Paul Murray, a vastly experienced journalist, former editor of *The West Australian* and part-time retiree, but also still very sharp with his analysis. The article I refer to is more recent, published on 5 September this year post the Labor state conference. It not only is about the Metronet announcement, but also analyses the overall picture with regard to public transport. It is titled “Labor strategy on right lines”, and we have to endorse that. I will quote a couple of parts of his article as well. He started with —

It’s more than just a bad pun to say that the Barnett Government’s track record on rail transport is poor.

Even less funny would be to describe it as deceitful, grudging and electorally poisonous.

This is from an astute journalist. This is from someone who has watched decades of politics in Western Australia and across the nation—and he gets it, minister! I know that the minister has to keep his chin up, that he has to try to convince the backbenchers it is not that big a deal and that it will all be okay. We all know to whom the Premier was speaking at the state conference of the Liberal Party. He was not speaking to the other side when he was telling us that he was going out there to win marginal seats. He was not talking to us. We all know to whom he was talking. I do not know whether they were listening, but he was talking to the backbench. Yes, he was talking to you, member for Belmont. I am not sure that he was actually talking to the member for Belmont; I think he might have let her go already. However, he was certainly talking to some people. Perhaps he was talking to the member for Forrestfield; perhaps he was trying to convince that guy.

Mrs L.M. Harvey interjected.

Mr P. PAPALIA: The member for Belmont is wonderful. Were she to change sides, I would give her a hand. At least she opposes the sale of the TAB.

Mr D.C. Nalder: You’re playing the man. Play the ball.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I am commending her. I am not playing the man.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Albany!

Mr P. PAPALIA: That the minister reverts to accusing me of playing the man is quite tragic. That is not really a criticism because he knows I am not playing the man.

I will read out another couple of quotes from Paul Murray’s excellent article. He refers to the unprecedented announcement by the Leader of the Opposition 18 months out from the election that embraces the policy of Metronet and conveys the clear message to Western Australians that they can trust Labor, and that we are the only side people can trust with public transport and rail in Western Australia because we are telling people well in advance that this is a key issue for us. It is not the only one, but it is a key issue. Paul Murray said —

Metronet was blunted at the last State election by hurried Liberal plans for the MAX light rail project and the airport link—but they were shown to be spurious within the first half of this term of government.

That is the problem the Barnett government is confronted with. In less than two years, the Premier had demonstrated that he deceived the people of Western Australia, as had the entire Liberal and National Parties, because every member of the government owns the decision. The Minister for Transport cannot step back and say, “It wasn’t me; it was the big guy from Vasse before. It wasn’t my fault.” He is the Minister for Transport in the Barnett Liberal–National government. It is his responsibility. The minister owns every single decision of the Liberal–National government to date, and there have been a lot of really bad ones. The minister owns the deception that was played out on the people of Western Australia, particularly in the space of public transport. What the minister inherited is appalling, and I feel sorry for him in that respect. I feel sorry because it was not of his personal doing, but he is now the responsible person. He now has to sell this sandwich, and it will not taste very nice.

Paul Murray’s article quotes Daniel Emerson’s excellent piece on the freedom of information issue. If ever there was a realisation as to just how worried the Liberal Party was about how much it lied prior to the last state election, it was the bitter, long, drawn-out battle it had with *The West Australian* over an FOI request for some pretty basic facts that confirmed it was all a deception, all done on the back of a cigarette packet and there was never the funding. In his article, Paul quotes Daniel Emerson’s article, which states —

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

“Touted as fully funded, fully costed, the dirty little secret of the campaign was that they were anything but,” Emerson wrote. “The airport line was predicated on 80 per cent of its funding coming from the Federal Government, while MAX assumed 50 per cent.”

We all know how much the state government actually got from the federal government—from that bloke who used to be Prime Minister until last night and who said rail was not in his knitting; the state government got nothing, and it knew it had nothing. It had not asked because it did not want to be told it had nothing. That is the truth of the matter. Everyone in Western Australia knows that, and if they do not—if they were not paying attention to Paul Murray or Liam Bartlett’s excellent articles—what does the government think we will be telling them for the next 18 months? What clear message does the minister think is going to be passed on every time he talks about anything in the domain of congestion, public transport or even roads? Whenever the minister announces anything to do with moving people and traffic around Perth, we will be reminding people of how much this government lied to them.

Mr D.C. Nalder: How’s the Gateway project going?

Mr P. PAPALIA: The Gateway project is a wonderful federal Labor-funded project!

Several members interjected.

Mr P. PAPALIA: This railway is a wonderful idea from the Labor Party; this is part of Metronet!

Several members interjected.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Good luck, minister! Go there! Go out to the public and tell them that the latest iteration of the Barnett government’s haphazard, ad hoc, off-the-cuff proposal for dealing with congestion or public transport is whatever the latest pale imitation of Metronet is. Because that is what it is—everything the minister does will be nothing other than a pale imitation of Metronet. It will only be a component of it.

The poor old member for Forrestfield is tearing his hair out! It was all lined up—he probably had the advertisements already paid for! No doubt there were some big blue and white signs—even bigger than the millions of them that are propagating all over the metropolitan area and state at the moment with “Bigger Picture” written on them. No doubt there was something like that. They probably had pictures and read “Vote Liberal, and you’ll get a pale imitation of Metronet for Forrestfield”. That is what it is. From now on, everyone knows that if they want the real Metronet, they will have to vote Labor. If they do that, they will get the whole thing! They will not get bits and pieces when the Premier deigns they will receive them. People will not have to wait with bated breath for the Premier to drive his car across the Causeway or look out of the window of his limousine and make some observation about one side of the road, find out the government does not own that bit and then go to the other side of road! It will not be anything like that; it will be a structured, consistent, logical plan, and people know that Labor will deliver it because when we are in government, we deliver rail. History shows that Labor in Western Australia delivers rail. That is what both these journalists observed. These astute —

Mr S.K. L’Estrange interjected.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I know the member for Churchlands is rattled. I know it is sad.

Several members interjected.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Look at it this way: the member for Churchlands can be a really good Leader of the Opposition; he has my vote.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister for Health!

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Cockburn and Minister for Health, thank you very much. The member for Warnbro has the call.

Mr P. PAPALIA: When it comes down to it, the beautiful thing about this debate on the Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill 2015 is that it enables the Western Australian Labor Party to remind people of the Premier’s response when he was caught out after the election and after it had become clear he was not going to build Metro Area Express. What was his statement? It was —

“I don’t think people study the promises, ...

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

“I’m not dismissing them, but people elected us because they saw it as a good, reliable, stable government that made decisions and was getting on with the job.”

I tell the government that people actually elected it because they thought it was telling the truth. They thought the member for Cottesloe was telling the truth, not lying to them, but, lo and behold, fewer than two years after the election it has been confirmed that all of it was an absolute lie. “Fully funded, fully costed”—rubbish! There was no funding or costing. The member for Victoria Park looked across the chamber at the Minister for Transport and laughed when the minister was describing his and the Premier’s anticipation, and the urgency with which he demanded of the member for West Swan or Leader of the Opposition some detail of time frames—“Time frame! Time frame, please! Give us a time frame!” That was because the minister was completely rattled.

Mr D.C. Nalder: I look like I am rattled!

Mr P. PAPALIA: Mate —

Mr R.H. Cook: You look like a rabbit in the spotlight, mate!

Mr P. PAPALIA: I am going to go to one specific area I am particularly interested in. Metronet is a wonderful plan that will deliver right across Perth. There will be a proper consultation, and then a strategic response to people’s transport needs. The rail line between the airport and Forrestfield will be completed. Ellenbrook, Morley, Yanchep, Byford and the Thornlie–Cockburn line are all part of Metronet, as is removing unnecessary and dangerous rail crossings that also contribute to congestion. I want to point one out for the people of my electorate of Warnbro, everyone in the northern suburbs of Mandurah and the southern and eastern suburbs of Rockingham. I reiterate that the minister, on 15 October last year, confirmed his government will not be looking at the Karnup station on the southern line until 2025. The question posed was —

- (1) Does the Government still support a new bus–rail interchange at Karnup?
- (2) If yes to (1):
 - (a) when does the Government expect it will be needed;

The answer provided by Hon Jim Chown in the other place on behalf of the minister was —

- (1) Yes, at the appropriate time.
- (2) (a) Timing will be influenced by land use and land take-up; currently it is estimated the interchange may be required around 2025.

That is 10 years from today, member for Mandurah! Ten years from today is not good enough for the Labor Party and not good enough for the people of Rockingham and Mandurah, and the minister will not be good enough for them at the next election! The minister has been exposed! The Barnett government lied on public transport. The Barnett government does not care about trains or public transport, and the only way for the people of Western Australia to get a proper public transport system—Metronet—will be to vote Labor. Labor will include a station at Karnup, and we have committed to it. There—the minister has been exposed! The emperor over there does not have any clothes or rail plan. He does not have a strategic plan or approach that is anything other than haphazard, ad hoc and in response to Labor. At all times he is in response to Labor because we have set the standard on rail in WA. Whatever the Liberal Party does will be a pale imitation of Metronet. If people want the real Metronet, they should vote Labor!

MR R.H. COOK (Kwinana — Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [8.29 pm]: I rise to speak on the Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill 2015. Member for Warnbro, is it seriously 2025?

Mr P. Papalia: Yes, 2025; there you go, member for Kwinana!

Mr R.H. COOK: If my memory serves me correctly, in the member for Warnbro’s electorate did the Liberal Party candidate not —

Mr P. Papalia: It was on the front page —

Mr R.H. COOK: It was on the front page of the local paper!

Mr P. Papalia: It was on the front page of the *Sound Telegraph* that “Liberals promise a station in Karnup at the last election”.

Mr R.H. COOK: This, I guess, is the best illustration yet, just in a local area, of the extent to which members opposite will lie their way into office. Government members might have noticed this unusual display tonight of

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton;
Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter
Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms
Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

members on this side getting up to speak one after the other—we will go into the wee hours—on a bill that we are supporting. They might want to ask, “Why aren’t you just letting it go through on the nod?” It is because we want to get up and start rehearsing our lines on what we are going to be saying every day, day in, day out, until the next election—that the Liberal Party cannot be trusted. It was elected on the back of lies at the last election. We will remind the electorate day after day that it was that mob that lied to the people of Western Australia. It was the Liberal Party that deliberately went out and lied its way back into office. It was on the back of its promises around public transport that the Liberal Party’s biggest lies were on greatest display. So it is not surprising when the government comes up with legislation to enable it to implement this poor imitation of Metronet—a policy that was conjured up on the spur of the moment in the blind panic of an election campaign to try to mimic one of the features of Metronet.

Members opposite have demonstrated most fully their lack of character and demonstrated most perfectly why they are not fit to hold office. There is a reason, of course, that they have opted for the Forrestfield–Belmont line rather than going ahead with their own idea, which was Metro Area Express. There is a reason they have abandoned MAX altogether and continued with this poor copy of the airport aspects of Metronet; that is, they have one member in particular but two electorates that they are trying to pork-barrel. Essentially, they have forgotten about all those seats that they wanted to buttress up and down the inner northern suburbs and have abandoned MAX altogether. Instead, they are holding onto this other policy that was thought up in the last minute of the election campaign because we had them on the run with our Metronet policy. They are now starting to implement this aspect of the Metronet vision. We support the Forrestfield line—of course we support it. We are the party of public transport. We are the party that has always championed public transport and has always built railway lines. We know the only reason members opposite have come here with this legislation, with this poor imitation of this aspect of Metronet. To the extent that members opposite have come, in their incompetent way, to this place seeking permission to do this aspect of Metronet, of course we are very happy to support it. In some respects, we have much to thank the Liberal Party for in its railway policies over the years, because it was the work —

Mr F.M. Logan: Name one!

Mr R.H. COOK: Member, bear with me. It was the work of the then Minister for Transport, Cyril Rushton, under the premiership of Sir Charles Court, that shut down the Perth–Fremantle line—they shut down an urban rail line. It must have been the only government in the world at that stage that was shutting down railway lines. But we owe it to the Liberal Party in government at that time for providing a whole generation of state Labor activists with that catalyst, that call to arms, that ignited their political motivation and will to become involved in these sorts of issues, to become members of the Labor Party and to commit their lives to the cause of Labor. We have the Liberal Party to thank for that, and Cyril Rushton and the misguided, hopeless policies of the Liberal government of the day. At the time—it would have been about 1975, I suppose, so I was about 10—I remember penning a stinging letter to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning, who I think was June Craig, saying that if they were so foolish as to shut down the railway line, they should dedicate the reserve —

Mr D.A. Templeman: Was it pen and ink that you were using? The quill!

Mr R.H. COOK: The quill! I am not that old, member for Mandurah. I think I did rule the lines with a pencil first so that I could make sure that my running writing was neat! I said to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning at the time that they should set aside the rail reserve as a bike path if they were not going to use it as a rail line. I would like to think that the bike path members see there today along the railway line is solely down to my intervention in the policy process at the time. Although we have Labor to thank for reinstating that rail line, the Liberal Party at the time knew that it could not stand in the way of my visionary policy to have a bike path along the rail line! Of course, we saw the electrification of the Perth–Fremantle line after that time. Members who grew up in Perth will perhaps remember the old diesel trains that ploughed up and down the railway line. I think those rail carriages were ultimately exported to Bulgaria.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: No, Auckland.

Mr R.H. COOK: Auckland? Good Lord!

Mrs L.M. Harvey: There are some still there in Auckland.

Mr R.H. COOK: Still?

Mrs L.M. Harvey: Yes. They thank us for them.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

Mr R.H. COOK: I am sure they do some things, but perhaps “thank” is not the word, minister. They had those old diesel carriages that used to plough up and down the old Fremantle line, and then, of course, the Labor government electrified the Perth–Fremantle line, which seemed revolutionary at the time. It seemed a— I think this word has been used about 20 times today—transformative project at the time. I remember seeing the first trains going up and down the Perth–Fremantle line and feeling immensely proud that a Labor government had passenger rail transport to the western and southern suburbs of Perth once again. But Labor’s legacy in metropolitan rail transport did not stop there. Of course, we then saw the construction of the Perth–Joondalup line, which was an electrified line as well. Labor has a very proud history of developing rail. There is the Thornlie spur and, in addition to that, the Mandurah line. That is an extraordinary piece of public transport infrastructure. I remember at the time that Hon Alannah MacTiernan was talking it down, saying that we should not be patting ourselves on the back too much for developing the Mandurah line because, in effect, it was a retrofit to suburbs that already existed. From that point of view she was saying, and quite rightly of course, that the sign of a properly growing city is one that is developing its rail transport at the same time as it is developing its outer suburbs, and not this situation of developing its outer suburbs and relying heavily upon car transport and trying to service them through some sort of bus public transport, which is not the desired solution and really is not a public transport solution in itself. Labor has a great history of developing rail transport. It is the public transport party of this state. We are the ones who have always pioneered these big projects. We are always the ones who are pushing forward to develop our public transport further.

I want to talk about values for a moment and the role that they play. It is the reason that public transport is not of the Liberal Party’s knitting and the reason that it is built into our DNA. The Labor Party stands for sustainability, equity and access. People should be able to get around the city without being shackled to the tyranny of car transport. That is the cornerstone to equality of opportunity. Access is important to make sure that people can find their way to work and can get to school, and that we produce a sustainable society that is not reliant solely upon vehicle transport. That is the reason we were so appalled when the Liberal Party in government closed the Perth–Fremantle rail line and why we could not believe that the Barnett government was expecting such a large contribution from the federal Liberal government, because federal Liberal governments have never supported large passenger rail transport.

I want to talk about the values associated with the Liberal Party’s policies at the last election. We know that the Liberal Party went out deliberately to deceive the people of Western Australia around public transport issues. It put out policies around MAX light rail, which has been relegated to the dustbin of history, and its poor copy of the Labor Party’s Metronet policy stated it would develop an airport rail line. I will set aside all the other Liberal lies—the twice-promised railway line to Ellenbrook and the extension of the Joondalup line to Butler, which fell short. I will ignore those Liberal Party election promises at this stage.

Mr P.B. Watson: Can you put in the gas pipeline to Albany?

Mr R.H. COOK: I think even the member for Albany might be retired by the time the Liberals in government ever get around to a gas pipeline.

Mr D.C. Nalder: How does the Butler line fall short?

Mr R.H. COOK: My understanding is that it does not get to the transport-oriented development; it actually falls short of it. I noticed that in the public debate, because I live in a TOD and I think it is incredibly important that we develop our communities in this way. As the member for Cannington pointed out, the government said that it would extend the rail line to Yanchep, and it has not.

Let us go back to the biggest Liberal lie, which is about the development of the airport rail line and MAX light rail.

Mr D.C. Nalder interjected.

Mr R.H. COOK: The one the government is talking about now.

Mr D.C. Nalder: The one we are doing the bill for?

Mr R.H. COOK: Correct; yes.

At the last election, the Liberal Party said that these promises were fully costed and fully funded. That is what the Liberal Party said, but we know that that was a complete lie. We know through the contribution of Dan Emerson that at the time the Liberal Party knew it was a lie. Like the member for Warnbro, I am drawn to the piece by Paul Murray published in *The West Australian* of 5 September. The article quotes Dan Emerson and states —

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

“Touted as fully funded, fully costed, the dirty little secret of the campaign was that they were anything but,” Emerson wrote. “The airport line was predicated on 80 per cent of its funding coming from the Federal Government, while MAX assumed 50 per cent.”

The Liberal Party had not asked the federal government about this, and it went to the people of Western Australia saying the rail line was fully funded and fully costed when representatives of the Liberal Party knew the whole time that it was not true. Is that not the case?

Mr D.C. Nalder: You’re telling the story.

Mr R.H. COOK: The minister is taking great pride in interjecting as much as he can, so I invite him to interject on that particular point.

Mr D.C. Nalder: We committed to the Forrestfield–Airport link. We committed to commence the Forrestfield–Airport Link.

Mr R.H. COOK: Is it true that at the time the Liberal Party knew that the project was not fully funded and fully costed?

Mr D.C. Nalder: To be honest, I cannot comment on what was known and not known. I wasn’t actually here. What we’ve said—and we’ve taken it on the chin—is that we’d have to defer one of the projects. We acknowledge that. We deferred it for three years. We have acknowledged it; we take it on the chin.

Mr R.H. COOK: That is because it was not fully funded and fully costed.

Mr D.C. Nalder: We went to the election saying that we were seeking federal support.

Mr R.H. COOK: No, the government said that it was fully funded, fully costed, which meant the money was in the bank and the government was ready to go and the finances were sorted, and it was anything but. As Paul Murray observed in his piece —

... Barnett’s senior adviser Narelle Cant on the eve of the MAX announcement showing something was being hidden: “I don’t think we need to say in the statement the funding sources, just the total cost,” she wrote to a media advisor.

Mr Murray went on to observe —

On the eve of the election, another advisor showed the Liberal Party’s concern about coming unstuck on the funding sham: “Treasury when they release our costings next week will likely highlight risks associated with the projects should the Federal Government not commit funding.”

The Liberal Party had not asked the question, yet it assured the people of Western Australia that the question had been asked and that the federal government had committed to the funding.

Mr D.C. Nalder: What did you assure the people on your public transport plans?

Mr R.H. COOK: With the resources of opposition, we costed it. On the basis of that costing, we said we would not proceed with some very popular projects, such as the Museum. Liberal Party members sat around going, “Yes, we will do that. Yes, we will do that, and we will do Labor’s policies as well. And by the way it is all fully funded, fully costed.” It was the Liberal Party lie that put your seat in the government bench. It is a Liberal Party lie upon which you are drawing a salary as a minister at the moment. That is why you are not fit to hold office, because you lack the character, you lack the values that —

Dr K.D. Hames: Let the personal attacks come forward; you guys just cannot stop.

Mr R.H. COOK: I am not attacking the Minister for Health.

Dr K.D. Hames: You are attacking my good friend.

Mr R.H. COOK: How have I attacked him? The minister must have been paying too much attention to his papers for the first time in his career.

[Member’s time extended.]

Dr K.D. Hames: I have a message from my staff. It says “boring”; they are listening to you.

Mr R.H. COOK: The minister can give Ms Hayes my love and strong affection.

Mrs M.H. Roberts interjected.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

Mr R.H. COOK: The Minister for Health decided to be personal.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Okay, members, back on track!

Mr R.H. COOK: The only time the Minister for Health has shown any interest in this debate is to pop up his head and make a personal remark. The minister should go back to his papers and not worry about it.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Back on track!

Mr R.H. COOK: I am drawing the house's attention to the values that are writ large across the other benches: they were elected off the back of a lie.

Dr K.D. Hames: Let me see, Albany Hospital—know who promised that?

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister, we do not need any more interjections. The member for Kwinana has the floor. We are not talking about anything else. Thank you very much. If I stand up again, I will call you.

Mr R.H. COOK: Members, does that not just say it all? The minister said, "Hang on, we built Albany Hospital." The minister promised Albany Hospital, and he built it. What does he want? An elephant stamp for actually keeping one promise! Keeping promises is not exceptional. What should be exceptional is the rampant dishonesty we saw from the Liberal Party at that last election.

Dr K.D. Hames interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister, I call you.

Point of Order

Dr K.D. HAMES: Madam Acting Speaker, I am not at all questioning your ruling, but I would simply like to point out that when personal comment is being directed to me, it is very difficult not to respond.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I want to point out that the Speaker in question time every day reminds the opposition that just because a government minister in answering a question mentions somebody on this side of the chamber, it does not give anybody on this side of the chamber licence to interject. All I am doing is drawing the Minister for Health's attention to the manner in which this chamber is managed on these matters. The fact that a member on the government side is mentioned in debate is no excuse for government members to interject.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Further to that point of order, the Deputy Premier prefaced his remarks on his point of order, which was not a point of order, with, "I am not canvassing your ruling." It is clearly exactly what he did and he should be called to order again for that.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms J.M. Freeman): Thank you very much. Do not canvass my ruling. Member for Kwinana, you have the floor.

Debate Resumed

Mr R.H. COOK: Thank you, Acting Speaker, for your decisive and sensible rulings.

Several members interjected.

Mr R.H. COOK: Is that canvassing?

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Kwinana, you have the floor; can we just move through this, please?

Dr K.D. Hames interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Deputy Premier!

Mr P.C. Tinley interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Willagee! I call you to order for the second time. Member for Kwinana, you have the call.

Mr R.H. COOK: Thank you, Acting Speaker. I want to now talk about Metronet and how it differs from what the government is proposing.

Mr M.J. Cowper interjected.

Mr R.H. COOK: It has a much better chance of getting to Pinjarra under us than it has under any Liberal government, my friend. By the way, it is fantastic to see the member for Murray–Wellington on his feet

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

congratulating the government for getting onto redeveloping Harvey Hospital, which I think was only in the 2008–09 budget, before this minister cancelled that redevelopment, was it not? Bully for the member if he thinks the Minister for Health is looking after him. That is great. I feel sorry for the rest of the constituents in his electorate.

Mr M.J. Cowper interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Kwinana, you have the floor. You do not, member for Murray–Wellington. Please move on, member.

Mr R.H. COOK: In his best efforts to try to bolster his backbench, the Premier on 3 September said that Metronet was just a list of rail projects. That is the fundamental difference between what this government is about when it comes to public transport, and what Metronet is about. Metronet is about the city coming of age. It is about not only the spider slowly working its way out into the outer suburbs, but also linking those intermediate suburbs that make such an important contribution to our city’s future. From the point of view of members of my constituency, it means that they can at last catch a train more or less direct to Fremantle from Kwinana, without having to go into the city and back out again. It ultimately means that they will be able to go to many of the factories and worksites in the Thornlie and Canning Vale area, without having to go into the city and back out again. Metronet links the city in a way that has never been done before. That is why people love it so much. I can imagine government members in the strategy room saying, “Ooh, this Metronet thing is good; we have got to go out that way too”, without actually understanding exactly what the values are that hang off Metronet. Metronet is not a list of projects. It is a vision for a connected city, and that is what members opposite do not get. They are pushing a rail line out to Forrestfield and patting themselves on the back, and it is just a portion of what Metronet represents but it does not connect the communities in the same way —

Mr D.A. Templeman interjected.

Mr R.H. COOK: Acting Speaker, I am going to need protection from the member for Mandurah!

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Mandurah! The member for Kwinana has the floor.

Mr R.H. COOK: It is ultimately connecting Thornlie through to Cockburn. It is about ultimately connecting Cockburn through to Fremantle, and it is about those northern inner suburbs in the areas that you represent, Acting Speaker, connecting those suburbs so that they, too, can be part of a great connected and integrated public rail system.

This is the reason that Metro Area Express does not work. MAX is just another limb on the spider; it does not connect the community. If the government ever gets around to developing MAX—it will not—it will be an interesting addition to the rail network, but it will not connect the city because it does not have those ring routes. The member for Jandakot knows what I am talking about because he has one of those communities in his electorate that will benefit most from that overall development. We have not spelt out the time line that these things will ever be developed, but I tell members what: the community does not care. What they want to know is that it is part of the vision and that it is part of the values that hang off the side of this. That is the reason that Metronet is so important, because it is dripping in Labor values of public transport, sustainable communities and people being able to move around their city without the tyranny of the car. That is the reason Metronet is such a powerful vision.

As I said in my opening remarks, we will be talking about public transport right up to the next election. We will be using public transport to show the people of Western Australia just how dishonest the Liberal Party was at the last election, and that the Liberal Party and its representatives cannot be trusted. It will be about a matter of trust and about what Liberal members said to the public at the last election in order to get their votes, and how quickly they ran away from those promises. We will be reminding the electorate about the lies that were told in the last election, and we will continue to remind the electorate about those lies, because fool us once, and shame on you; fool us twice, shame on us.

MR F.M. LOGAN (Cockburn) [8.57 pm]: Whilst I have been listening to my colleagues address the Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill 2015 tonight, I have been going back over some history of the house, including the history of railway legislation in this house and the positions taken—especially in the lead-up to elections. What I find absolutely incredible is the similarities in debate over this legislation tonight when compared with the debate in the house in the lead-up to the 2001 election. We could go all the way back to the debate in the house in 1991, and the lead-up to the 1993 election. The debates are all very similar. What is the debate we are having here tonight about? It is about the railway line to the airport. But why is that legislation coming on now, so many years after it was promised? It is coming on because the Liberal government is desperate to shore up the

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

seats of Belmont and Forrestdale. That is what it is. The only time that the Liberal Party members ever want to talk about railways is when they are desperately trying to save their necks. What are they doing here? Who will be the major beneficiaries out of this legislation tonight? It will be another couple of marginal seats—the seats of Belmont and Forrestdale.

A government member: Forrestfield.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Forrestfield. Thank you, member.

If we go back to the debate in this house in the lead-up to the 2001 election, we can see that it was exactly the same. A piece of legislation was before the house on the Perth–Mandurah rail line proposed by the then Liberal government. Where was the original Perth–Mandurah rail link to go? It was to go via Kenwick. Why was it to go via Kenwick even though the advice of the public service was not to go via Kenwick because of the traffic on the Armadale rail line? It was to go via Kenwick because the government of the day wanted to shore up the marginal seats of Southern River and Roleystone. There is no difference. We are having exactly the same argument. In 2000, a desperate, politically bankrupt government was trying to hold onto power by using the magic of a rail line and saying, “We will deliver a rail line to you”, to hold onto the marginal seats of Roleystone and Southern River as it was then. That is why the rail link was proposed go through Thornlie. There was no good reason, economically or technically, that rail should be —

Dr K.D. Hames: A National Party minister was responsible.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: It makes no difference whatsoever, minister, who sat in the chair.

Dr K.D. Hames interjected.

The SPEAKER: Minister, I have just walked in. I do not know what you have been up to, but stop it.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Mr Speaker, you have caught him out straightaway. He has been like this all night!

It does not matter who was Minister for Transport at the time, the reasons behind it were identical in 2000 to what they are today. The only time a Liberal government walks a rail bill into this house is when it is desperate to hang onto power and is trying to win marginal seats. It was the same in 2000 with Southern River and Roleystone as it is today with the government trying to hold on to Forrestdale —

Mr N.W. Morton: Forrestfield —

Mr F.M. LOGAN: — Forrestfield and Belmont. It is exactly the same; there is no difference.

If we look at the bill to build the rail line between Perth and Mandurah, we can see that, as I said, it was proposed to go via the Kenwick Link, as they called it. Just think what it would be like now for people getting on the train in Cockburn, Kwinana, Rockingham or Mandurah to get to the city. They would get as far as the freeway, just past Berrigan Drive, and then they would turn right and head off towards Kenwick and Armadale and then they would have to turn left and come back into the city on a very, very busy rail route. Even by then it was fully electrified, thanks once again to the Labor government. It would have added at least another 45 minutes to the train journey to get from Cockburn through to Perth. Today, people would not use it in the numbers they use it; they would have stayed in their cars and by now the traffic on the southern freeway would probably be at gridlock.

I recall the arrogance of the Court government of the day in 2000, once the legislation was passed. By the way, the legislation was passed with the Labor opposition’s support. At no time has Labor ever opposed a bill on railways that has been brought into this house, whether by the Nationals, the Liberals or their predecessors. Labor has never opposed legislation relating to railways that has been brought into this house. In November 1999, the shadow transport minister, Alannah MacTiernan said —

In supporting this legislation, the Labor Party is not to be understood to be necessarily endorsing the Kenwick option. However, we are keen to see the Government do something to extend the rail network. Members opposite have been in government for seven years and not a kilometre of rail track has been added to the entire network.

Does that not sound exactly the same as what we are hearing today? The point I am making is that the Labor opposition supported the legislation but made it very clear that it did not necessarily support the Kenwick option.

Mr D.A. Templeman interjected.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: That is true.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton;
Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter
Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms
Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

When Labor was elected to power in 2001 and Alannah MacTiernan became the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure, of course, the first decision she took was to amend the legislation to ensure we had a direct rail route between Perth and Mandurah down the middle of the freeway. It was a fantastic proposal and was opposed bitterly in this house by the Liberal–National opposition. The member for Rockingham referred to some of the crazy arguments against that amending legislation. One was that if the tunnel was built to link the Mandurah rail line with the Wellington Street railway station, and people were not careful, buildings in the city block would fall over. That is what they said in this house. I could not believe my ears one day in here when the then member for Alfred Cove said that the rail line should not be built next to the river because at certain points in time during the year a lot of froth and bubble floated around on top of the river and that could be blown onto the electric lines and short-circuit the rail line and all the trains would stop. That was the level of debate in this house from the opposition of the day opposing the Perth–Mandurah rail line.

If we go back to 1904–05 during the Labor government of the day, Henry Daglish was the first Premier to come up with the idea of constructing rail lines to link the inner and outer suburbs of Perth; for example, as I indicated earlier, the Fremantle–Armadale rail line. That line still exists. If we go along North Lake Road, we can see the line. If we drive down Armadale Road, we can see that the railway easement is still there. It is a pity it is not used because it would be a remarkable piece of rail connection through the southern suburbs. Liberal governments closed that line in 1964 and 1966. As we have heard in this house, they went on in the 1980s to close the Perth–Fremantle line. Why? It was because the government of the day believed public transport was unnecessary; it was far better that we create Perth as a new Los Angeles, hence Roe Highway stages 7, 8 and 9 and the Stephenson link—all those proposals from Professor Stephenson are because the government of the day was locked into the Stephenson plan that would turn Perth into another version of Los Angeles. It was Labor that reopened the Perth to Fremantle rail line in 1983. Did the Perth to Fremantle line benefit Labor voters? Some, probably.

Mrs L.M. Harvey interjected.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Some Labor people. Who did it benefit most? It benefited the people in the western suburbs.

Dr K.D. Hames interjected.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: What is the minister talking about? I am talking about the Perth to Fremantle rail line—the one the Liberal government shut. Who benefited from it? It benefited the people in the western suburbs but we still built it.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Yes, unbelievable.

There is no comparison with the arrogance of Liberal governments when it comes to public transport. Members who drive down the Kwinana Freeway, where the freeway crosses over a bridge—and where, by the way, it has just been extended, just before Berrigan Drive—will see that underneath that bridge is a tunnel. That tunnel was built in 2000 because the government of the day was so sure it was going to win the 2001 election and that the Kenwick link would be built. That is the reason the tunnel is there. That tunnel is an example of the arrogance of the Liberal government thinking it would win the next election and that it would build the Perth–Kenwick–Mandurah rail link. The tunnel is still there and eventually it will be used because of Metronet. When it comes to arrogance, I just cannot believe the arguments we have been hearing tonight through interjections from the minister about Metronet, saying that somehow the Perth to airport to Forrestdale—sorry, Forrestfield; I will get it right: Forrestfield, Forrestdale, “Parisdale” —

Mr P.C. Tinley interjected.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: I know it will go to Cockburn.

The minister said that the Forrestfield–Airport Link has no relationship to Metronet. Of course it does! Have a look at the map, for crying out loud. Was this airport link on the policy agenda between 2008 and 2013? No, it was not.

Mr D.C. Nalder: Yes, it was. The alignment plan was put in place in 2012.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: No, it was not. It was not on the agenda. It was never raised in 2008 and it was never raised in this house between 2008 and 2013. It came about because the Liberal government panicked when it saw the Metronet policy—it panicked. Metronet was unbelievably popular and, as the minister knows today, it still is popular—have a look at the polling. The minister knows that Metronet is still unbelievably popular and his

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

government, not the minister as a person, panicked and its first point of action and its response to the Metronet policy in 2013 was to propose the Metro Area Express light rail. That was the first response, and when that did not go down well across the whole of Perth, it then came up with the idea of the Perth–airport rail link.

[Member’s time extended.]

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Even today it is not exactly the same proposal that was first put on the table in 2013 in the lead-up to the election. What we have on the table today is one of the arms of the Metronet policy. Why is Metronet so popular and necessary? It is because we cannot afford not to build Metronet. Perth will have a population of 3.5 million people by 2050. Do members honestly think we can operate a city of that size without an extensive, integrated public transport system? Of course we cannot. The best way of getting large numbers of people around a city, as is seen in every city around the world, is a heavier rail line. Every major city in the world has a heavier rail line, whether it is overground or underground. Of course they are linked with light rail, bus freeways and bus lanes, but the large proportion of people in a large city travel by train. Perth is a large city now. People underestimate how big Perth is. Perth has a population of two million. That is bigger than most cities in the United Kingdom—much bigger than places like Leeds, Manchester, Newcastle or Bristol. Perth is a big city now, but with an extra 1.5 million people in the city it will be impossible to get around unless there is an integrated public transport system based on heavy rail. That is the reason we put Metronet up and that is the reason the minister knows that Metronet is popular—people understand it. People in Perth are not stupid; they have been to other cities around the world and they know how those public transport systems work. They know that a proposal such as Metronet is long overdue here in Perth. Although we support this legislation, as we have always done for rail legislation in this house, we do so on the basis that it will be only one part of an integrated heavy rail public transport system, one that will link Perth to the airport, Forrestfield and Cockburn central using the tunnel I just referred to that is still underneath the freeway. That tunnel will be used and hopefully, shadow transport minister, another tunnel will be built alongside it that will link that railway line right the way around to Fremantle so that there will be a full, integrated circle line for Western Australia and Perth, particularly linking the Armadale line to the circle line.

I want to raise one other issue and put a question to the minister. Minister, when the extra railway line is built, particularly the extension of this line, because it is much larger than the extension to Clarkson, for example, it will require new rail carriages, and obviously there will be a demand for more rail carriages for the network. I want the minister to tell this house very clearly about his trade delegation to the Punjab that was going through those rail workshops and having their toes kissed—we do not get that do we, Mr Speaker? Even you, Mr Speaker, do not get your toes kissed!

The SPEAKER: I am very disappointed!

Mr F.M. LOGAN: I want some reassurance from the minister that the recent trade delegation to the Punjab has not signed up for more railcars for the Forrestfield–Airport rail link. We need that assurance, minister, because the travel report by the member for Morley stated very clearly that those two—I did say “carpetbaggers” in the media, but I probably should tone it down in the house—members of Western Australia’s very important trade delegation to the Punjab indicated that their links were going to transform the Punjab economy! They backed up those links with a direct line straight into government. That could be the Minister for Transport. I hope they were not there speaking on the minister’s behalf. I am more worried about the Minister for Transport. They were there representing him, ordering tens of railcars to be shipped into Fremantle. Then the minister got a phone call from Fremantle saying, “Mr Transport Minister, your railcars are ready, come and pick them up.”

Several members interjected.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Remember it was India, so it would probably have a similar gauge to Australia; I am not too sure.

There was a serious note to the report by the member for Morley. The serious nub of the report was that the two members of the delegation gave an indication to the Punjabi government, and the industrialists who actually make the railcars, that they were seriously looking at their proposals and their manufacturing for the possibility of links with Western Australia. I do not know about you, Mr Speaker, but I do not think that any MP from Western Australia should be going to the Punjab and looking at building jobs in the Punjabi economy when we have such a serious situation with unemployment in Western Australia. That is just not on. That is the serious side of that travel report. The very fact that the member for Morley could even consider the possibility that railcars could be imported from the Punjab into Western Australia beggars belief. That he went down that line of inquiry shows that he is not serious about job creation here in Western Australia. He is not serious about the people who actually build and maintain railcars in Western Australia. Some of those people are not very far from

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

the member's own electorate. I would lay London to a brick that some of the people who work in the workshops of United Goninan at Bassendean, or at Aurizon, live in the electorate of the member for Morley. Meanwhile, he is off looking at railcars to be imported from India. That is why there is a very serious side to my criticism of his travel to India.

This brings me back to the commitments by the minister. The minister has indicated, by a simple nod of his head in the house, that any extension of a rail line would require the building of more railcars. I would like to hear from the minister that he will give a commitment that those extra railcars will be built here in Western Australia. We have the capacity to build railcars here in Western Australia, and that should be undertaken. The new generation of trams now running around Melbourne have signs all the way down the side saying, "Made in Melbourne". They are proud of what they are doing and they are proud of their skills and manufacturing, and they want everyone in Melbourne to know about it. These new generation trams are made by Victorians in Melbourne. We should be doing the same thing. Why would we not want to do the same thing? Why would we not want to manufacture those railcars here? We used to manufacture the cars here. We manufactured them at United Goninan. They are still out there, doing work on railcars. They still have the capacity to build railcars. Aurizon has the capacity to maintain and build railcars. Why are they not built here in WA? I asked the minister to place on record, as part of his response to this second reading debate, whether he will commit to having the extra railcars for the extension of the rail line to the airport and Forrestfield built here in Western Australia.

The fabrication and engineering sector in Western Australia, as I said before in this house, is being devastated at the moment because of the downturn in the resources sector, and the end of many of the major engineering and construction projects in the north. Those people live in all the electorates of members in this house. The jump in unemployment in Western Australia is directly related to the ending of those construction projects and the downturn in the engineering and fabrication sector here in Western Australia. Henderson was full of fabrication shops. Half of them are up for lease and the other half are up for sale. Further south in Kwinana it is the same, except that the workshops are bigger. They are either up for lease, up for sale or operating on skeleton staff. One of the ways to counter that is by government expenditure. The government has talked about this at length, and one of the expenditures it should be looking at as part of this piece of legislation and as a commitment to this house is to build here in Western Australia the extra railcars needed for this proposed line. That will go a long way towards helping the engineering and fabrication sector, and would do a great deal for apprenticeships and employment in Western Australia. I want to hear the minister say either that he will or that he will not build those railcars in Western Australia.

MR W.J. JOHNSTON (Cannington) [9.27 pm]: I rise to support the Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill 2015—the next phase in the Metronet project for Western Australia. I always find it a surprise that the Liberal Party criticises the Metronet idea. We cannot spend a day in this chamber without hearing some member of the Liberal Party yelling across the chamber about the Stephenson–Hepburn plan, which was a plan, 30-odd years ago, for constructing roads. Government members continually yell and scream across the chamber, "Why are you complaining about this? This is part of a road project planned 40 years ago." Somehow, that is supposed to imply that, regardless of changes in technology, we are supposed to continue to support that. Metronet is a long-term vision for rail infrastructure. I do not understand why the government does not like to have a long-term plan for rail infrastructure. Which bit of Metronet is the government saying is not needed for the future of Western Australia?

We have always accepted that there needed to be a rail line to Forrestfield. I remember, as state secretary of the Labor Party, being told by public servants when we were in government that there needed to be a rail line to Forrestfield because it is blocked by the airport, and traditional transport means are not available to people living in that wedge of land behind the airport. Since the rail line is being built to Forrestfield, there may as well be some train terminals around the airport to service the airport. Which bit of Metronet is the Minister for Transport saying is not needed? I will be interested to hear the minister explain that in his second reading reply. Is the line to Ellenbrook not needed? Is the Thornlie line extension not needed? Is a train line to Morley not needed? In the longer term, are east–west linkages not needed? That is what the Liberal Party is saying. Which bits of Metronet are not required for the future of Western Australia's capital city?

As the member for Willagee pointed out, the surface area of the metropolitan Perth region is larger than the city of Los Angeles, so we are not talking about a small surface area; we are talking about a large surface area. Which parts of Metronet does the Liberal government say are not needed? In 30 years' time, when people look back over who made a contribution to transport infrastructure in Western Australia, which parts of Metronet does the current government say it will not need? I love hearing members on the other side of the chamber calling out "Spaghettinet" when we talk about Metronet. Those members need to tell us which bits of Metronet are not required for the future of Western Australia's capital city and region.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

It is interesting that there has been some discussion about the fact that the Liberal Party has, in the past, enjoyed closing train lines. The Fremantle line was reopened by the incoming Labor government in the early 1980s; the Subiaco by-election at that time was won by Carmen Lawrence, who replaced the retiring Liberal member, Tom Dadour. I was not here at the time, but I understand that Mr Dadour drove the first engine on the reopening of that line. He—the retiring Liberal member for Subiaco—endorsed Carmen Lawrence as the Labor candidate for the seat of Subiaco in that by-election, which of course she won. It was the first time the Labor Party had held that seat at least since the Second World War, if not earlier, and it was partly because the Labor Party had promised to reopen that line.

It is also interesting to remember the shrill behaviour of the then Liberal opposition with regard to Leighton Contractors' work on the construction of the tunnel underneath the city. I know other members have spoken about this, and I am not going to go over it for a long time, but Leighton was actually indignant that the Liberal Party would think that it could not build a piece of infrastructure like that here in Australia, given that it had built similar pieces of infrastructure around the world. It was aghast at the Liberal Party saying that it was not capable of building what was, no doubt, a complex project—the double tunnel through the city. I point out that the typical behaviour of the Liberal Party in not taking into account the future public transport needs of the city is reflected in Elizabeth Quay, where there is no provision for a future east–west city link from Esplanade train station, because Esplanade train station is not part of the tunnel underneath the city; it is part of a separate cut and cover that runs from the end of the Narrows Bridge to the start of the underground tunnel, and even though it was built by the same contractor, it was not part of the same project; it was part of a separate package of work. Because it is a cut and cover, it is not very deep, which means that we cannot have another train from that station turn left.

It will not happen anytime soon but if, at some time in the future, the people of Perth want to build an east–west link from Esplanade station, we will have to go down further and build a second subterranean train station underneath the existing Esplanade train station, and then take the rail line underneath Elizabeth Quay, all the buildings and the water. As I have said in this chamber many, many times, if a proper plan had been done on the foreshore project, the government would have integrated the road infrastructure into the project and taken a long-term view about the future needs of the inner city. We will end up with a lot more residents in the inner city in 20 or 30 years' time. We heard earlier today the Minister for Planning telling us about the Riverside east project near Trinity College —

Mr J.H.D. Day: Waterbank.

Mr W. J. JOHNSTON: Waterbank, or whatever it is called now. That is just one example of the projects that are bringing more and more high-rise buildings and residents into the city, and in 30 years' time we are going to have these extra problems.

I want to refer now to one of the comments made by the Liberal Party during the election campaign, and I draw attention to a media release headed, "Liberals' airport rail delivers to front door". I quote from the release —

"Our airport line will take Western Australians and tourists straight to the door step of the airport terminal, delivering maximum convenience and cost savings for travellers," Mr Barnett said.

Further along there is another quote, this time from Mr Buswell —

"Unlike the Labor Party's 'airport' rail line, the Liberal Party will not leave you sweating or shivering waiting for a shuttle bus more than 1km down the road; we will take you directly to both the international and domestic terminals," Mr Buswell said.

The media statement reads, further along —

The planned rail alignment branches off the Midland line at Bayswater station, to the future consolidated Perth Airport terminal, with stations west and east of the airport as well as beneath the main terminal.

I asked on 15 October 2014 how far the terminal will be from Perth Airport T3 and T4, which is the current domestic terminal. Mr Buswell said that the government would "take you directly to both the international and domestic terminals". My question, in part, was —

- (a) what is the exact distance from the Airport West station to;
 - (i) Perth Airport terminal T3; and
 - (ii) Perth Airport terminal T4;

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

The minister replied —

- (a) (i)–(ii) Under the Consolidated Airport arrangement Terminals 3 and 4 will eventually be redundant.

That was a very interesting answer but, of course, it did not relate to the question I asked because the promise that was made by the Liberal Party during the election campaign was that it would take passengers directly to both the international and domestic terminals. It is quite likely that in 10 years' time Qantas will still be using T3 and T4 for a whole range of economic reasons, including the fact that it is currently investing money in the terminal and that the airport owners will actually make more money by having Qantas stay at T3 and T4 rather than having it move to the other side of the airport. Of course, in the long term, it will move, but that will not be within the next 10 years. The government promised to deliver passengers directly to the domestic terminal, but it is not even prepared to tell us how far the train station will be from the airport.

I also asked —

- (b) what is the exact distance from the Consolidated Airport station to:
- (i) Perth Airport T1; and
- (ii) Perth Airport T2?

The answer was —

- (b) (i) Approximately 300 metres.
- (ii) Approximately 250 metres.

That is very interesting, because in the media release during the election campaign the Liberal Party said that the T1 and T2 train station would be beneath the main terminal. Somehow it moved 300 metres. It is now closer to where the 2013 version of the Metronet station was going to be than where during the election campaign it was promised it would be. That is an extraordinary achievement. The government cannot get anything right when it comes to planning. We saw that today during question time, when the member for West Swan asked why the minister's own departments have objected to the planning proposal for the Forrestfield link train stations. What the heck? The minister's own agencies have lodged objections to the planning proposal for the Forrestfield link train stations. How does that happen? He gets a briefing note from one agency, but because that is from one agency he does not read it with his Public Transport Authority hat on! How does that possibly work?

I also want to point out that I asked the minister how many passengers are expected to use each of the terminals between midnight and 6.00 am each weekday at the Airport West and Consolidated Airport Station terminals. He said it would be approximately 300 for Airport West, and approximately 80 for the Consolidated terminal. That is quite extraordinary, because, remember, the minister will not tell us how far Airport West station is from the airport, but it will apparently get 300 boardings between midnight and 6.00 am. I want to know where those trains will go. As people know, there are trains operating until about 1.00 am at the weekends, but on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday where are they going? The Consolidated Airport Station will have approximately 80 boardings: where are those passengers going?

I then asked the same question but about weekend days. The minister then said —

The level of detail requested by the Member has not been identified.

This is extraordinary planning because the government knows how many passengers will get on at these times during the week, but not on the weekends. That just does not make any sense. That is just crazy, and I do not understand how that could possibly be true. It will be interesting to hear the minister's second reading reply, because I am sure he will clarify what he was talking about in that answer.

I want to turn to everybody's favourite topic—the Metro Area Express project. As we know, the MAX project will not proceed. On 10 March 2015, the Premier said something during a matter of public interest debate that struck me. He listed four reasons for MAX not proceeding. He said —

Then there is a fourth reason: at the last Council of Australian Governments meeting in the informal discussions between Premiers, Prime Ministers and chief ministers one of the discussion points that came up was a warning from other states to beware of light rail—be careful on light rail. Indeed, the states that had light rail were issuing that warning, due to the high costs of construction, high costs of operation and sometimes very poor patronage results. That was the warning around the table from states, both Liberal and Labor, and what started me thinking.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

That is quite interesting. The Premier says he was warned by the other states and territories about proceeding with light rail. I draw Mr Speaker's attention to the blog of Andrew Barr, who of course is Chief Minister of the Australian Capital Territory. He has a post on his blog called "Transport Reform" that I will quote in part —

The City to Gungahlin line is the first component of the light rail network we are planning for the ACT. Over the coming decades, we envision that Capital Metro will service the airport, Belconnen, Woden and Tuggeranong—linking our major urban hubs together through sustainable public transport.

[Member's time extended.]

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Clearly, it was not Andrew Barr, Chief Minister of the ACT, who was criticising light rail.

Then I thought maybe it could have been the former Liberal-National Party Premier of Queensland, so I looked at the *Gold Coast Bulletin* of 28 January 2015. It states —

Campbell Newman has announced a commitment to connect Gold Coast's light rail system to the heavy rail trains at Helensvale.

...

The Premier speaking at a campaign media conference in Brisbane during an LNP Queensland fundraising luncheon said "We are committed to building the Gold Coast light rail Stage 2 project. We will provide 20 new and upgraded Park n Rides across Brisbane, the Sunshine Coast and Gold Coast".

Apparently, the Premier was not talking to the former Premier of Queensland, Campbell Newman, because Campbell Newman was planning on extending the Gold Coast light rail. I am sure people will have seen articles in the media about the great success of the light rail service on the Gold Coast, and that property developers have actually followed the light rail project and are now investing more along that rail line.

Then I thought that maybe it was his good friend Mike Baird, Premier of New South Wales, so I did a bit of googling. It was not very hard, and I found an article from during the election campaign that reads —

NSW Premier and Minister for Western Sydney Mike Baird and Minister for Transport Gladys Berejiklian today said the NSW Government will begin a study into the feasibility of light rail in the Parramatta region.

Work will begin immediately with the NSW Government identifying the highest priority corridors for the introduction of light rail. This will be followed by a detailed feasibility study and high-level business case for those corridors.

"This is potentially another great project for Sydney's West, which will provide the missing transport link from north to south," said Mr Baird.

"Building light rail has been a priority for the NSW Government across the state, and we are determined to get on with the job of fast-tracking major infrastructure.

I could not believe that, because it was contradictory to what the Premier told Parliament. But I was also interested that Mike Baird said "across the state". On 11 August 2015, just a month ago, the Transport for New South Wales website carried a media release that announced the tender for a plan to put a light rail service in Newcastle. The quote from the relevant minister is —

"Make no mistake, we are getting on with the job of delivering these key revitalisation projects for the people of Newcastle," Mr Constance said.

...

"The delivery of a well-planned light rail network in Newcastle will help reignite confidence in the region, ...

It was clearly not New South Wales that the Premier was talking about, because it is actually expanding its successful light rail service.

I then thought maybe it was the Labor state of South Australia. Again, it takes only a couple of seconds to google and look at Adelaide's *The Advertiser* of 22 October 2013, which was during the election campaign over there. The article states —

Premier Jay Weatherill has announced a 30-year transport and infrastructure plan for the state that also details plans for major upgrades of road and rail services.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

The cornerstone of the plan is returning Adelaide's tram network to its former glory by installing six new networks sprawling out from a CBD loop, including an airport line.

South Australia is expanding its light rail service.

Tasmania does not have a light rail service, and I am not aware of one in the Northern Territory. Therefore, the Premier must have been referring to only one other state—Victoria. Melbourne, the capital city of Victoria, is, effectively, defined by its tram service. People cannot go to the centre of Melbourne and not notice the tram service. It is iconic. It is part of the fabric of Melbourne. The idea that Melbourne is somehow or other upset or concerned about or is not backing its light rail service is just inconceivable. Again, I will quote what the Premier said on 10 March 2015 —

Indeed, the states that had light rail were issuing that warning, due to the high costs of construction, high costs of operation and sometimes very poor patronage results.

Is he saying that it was Victoria that was telling him not to build a light rail service? Each of the states that have light rail—Queensland, South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales—are expanding their light rail services. The ACT does not currently have a light rail service, but the Labor government there, and some people would say quite controversially, is starting to build one. The idea that any state Premier ever told the Premier that light rail was not a positive contributor to public transport is simply unbelievable. How could anyone think that any of those states, all of which are continuing to invest larger and larger amounts in light rail, told the Premier, at any time, that light rail is not an option for public transport? It is just not possible that that is true. It will be interesting to see where that goes. What was the basis for the Premier's statement in this Parliament that he was told by state Premiers in New South Wales, Queensland, Victoria or South Australia not to build light rail? Which Premier said that? Members cannot come into the chamber and say things that are not true. That is a breach of the longstanding practices of Parliament. If they do inadvertently tell the Parliament something that is not true, they have an obligation to correct the record. The Premier said that he had been told by both Liberal and Labor Premiers that light rail was not an effective option for public transport in those states. The Premier must fess up and make it clear that that was simply a debating point because he was under pressure because of his broken promise on MAX light rail.

I make the point that having a long-term vision for public transport in Western Australia such as Metronet is not saying that only heavy rail can be used to deliver public transport in the Perth metropolitan area. It is a comprehensive plan and there will be many elements, such as buses and light rail. Who knows what other options are going to be available? I point out that in South Australia people also have the option of the O-bahn system, which is those guided busways. There is even a proposal for an underground guided busway. All those options are available to transport planning. The idea that a long-term vision for public transport is somehow to be criticised is just extraordinary. No wonder we are in the transport chaos that this government has delivered. No wonder we have the problems that we have encountered. How can it be that none of the planning documents of the government line up? Why is it that its land-planning processes do not match its public transport planning? Why is it that every time the government announces a public transport plan, it gets junked? It was not the Labor Party but the Liberal Party that said that the airport rail line was not required. The Liberal Party said that. It said that maybe some time in the distant future an airport rail line would be required. I do not think it was right when it said that. It was not the Labor Party that said that; it was the Liberal Party.

It is interesting that today one cannot catch a public bus to terminals 1 or 2 at the airport. There are thousands of workers who work in the airport precinct in warehouses and other commercial activities that are unrelated to the Perth airport operations. Perth Airport sees itself as a property manager, appropriately, because the airport is just one of the activities there. It is obviously the most important activity for the state, but it is not the only one for that business. There are thousands of workers who go to the airport every day for their job and they have no public transport option. They have to drive. There is no public transport to the airport. Why is that the case? Surely it cannot be that hard. They can do it in Melbourne, Canberra, Brisbane and even Sydney. Even when there is an airport line, they can still catch a bus to the airport. I do not understand why it is beyond the capacity of this government to put a bus into T1 and T2. Another thing that I would quickly like to draw attention to is that many people using Perth Airport do not leave from any of the terminals—they are fly in, fly out workers who leave with the smaller airlines at the northern end of the airport. Because the government's transport plan is not integrated, even within the airport precinct, they also have no public transport option. The government will spend \$2.2 billion or whatever it is on this line, but it still needs to come up with a transport plan to integrate the options for those other airport users so that they do not simply have to rely on cars to get out to the airport, which is the current situation. There needs to be a proper plan, which we have not yet seen from the government. That

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

proper plan, of course, is Metronet. That is what the government is most scared of. It is not that the government can call it spaghetti-net land; it is that it knows that it is an integrated plan, that it is about the long term and that it will work. The worst thing the government has in its mind is that Metronet makes sense. It is so upset about the plan because Metronet makes sense.

Mr S.K. L'Estrange interjected.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: What is the government's costing for MAX, member? Sorry, the minister is in the government; what is the costing?

The SPEAKER: Members, that is enough, thank you.

MR P.C. TINLEY (Willagee) [9.57 pm]: I would like to pick up from where the member for Cannington left off. He was moving on to planning and the shambles that it is in, with this Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill 2015 seeming to be part of a patchwork effect of trying to paper over some of the problems which seem to be occurring and which the shadow minister has been more than adept at highlighting in both this place and the media. I will be particularly keen to hear from the minister in his response to the second reading debate; I am sure the list is mounting of the commentary that he will need to respond to from the contributions of members who are particularly concerned about this issue. My first concern that I will bring to the attention of the minister is the principal business case under which the Forrestfield–Airport Link was first identified. I will quote from Gareth Parker's article of 23 August last year, when he said —

The Perth–Forrestfield airport rail link is the most expensive public transport project that will carry the fewest number of passengers per taxpayer dollar expended on infrastructure, ...

That was the analysis of *The Weekend West*. He goes on to say —

The Barnett Government's centrepiece public transport project, an 8.5km twin-tunnelled rail line from Bayswater to High Wycombe, featuring three stations, will cost \$2.2 billion and generate 14,500 passenger boardings per day by 2031.

That was the underlying case for doing this. We can compare this with the other Liberal lie, which was the MAX. The article continues —

This compares to its other major public transport project—the MAX light rail, shelved due to Budget constraints —

In other words, fully funded, fully costed—not! It continues —

which for \$1.88 billion would generate 100,000 passenger boardings per day by 2031.

We have one rail line with 14 500 passenger boardings per day by 2031 that we are paying \$2.2 billion for versus a rail line mooted to carry over 100 000 passengers per day by 2031 that was promised for delivery at the last election for \$1.88 billion but has been shelved. I do not understand this government's logic. I do not understand the benefit–cost ratio the minister highlighted. I again quote the article —

Mr Nalder last week heralded a benefit–cost ratio of 1.5 for the airport link, meaning that there was \$1.50 of benefit for every \$1 spent on the project, as evidence it was a good project.

That was the minister's evidence. The Cockburn–Thornlie link project that was submitted to Infrastructure Australia last year had a preliminary BCR of 1.6. Some of these numbers are loose at best. Clearly, if we stack it up against the failed Metro Area Express light rail, the benefit–cost ratio would have been substantially improved on that. I really want to hear why the minister proceeded with the airport rail link and not MAX light rail. What does that decision tell us about the identified future planning opportunities that this rail link will bring? There must be more to it; there must be a bigger plan. There must be something else to this project, because we cannot have a project with a BCR of 1.5, when, had the government done the MAX light rail, that project would have had a significantly improved BCR number. If the government is serious about urban infill, there must be a further plan, a bigger plan or a wider plan to integrate this rail line. There must be something other than a simple piece of dumb infrastructure. It should be integrated with a comprehensive urban plan for the benefit of Western Australians, particularly in the east metropolitan area, well into the future.

I can only assume that the decision to shelve MAX and push on with the airport rail link was a political decision as opposed to a prudent financial decision. This government has form on making political decisions over well-thought-out, proper decisions on infrastructure. The best and most current example of this—one I have to deal with in my own seat, along with the members for Cockburn and Fremantle—is Perth Freight Link. Perth Freight Link as it relates to the airport rail link is another political decision. For nearly 20 years there has

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

been bipartisan support for the Kwinana outer harbour as the second port for Western Australia to take overflow traffic and eventually quite probably take over as the primary container freight input port. Then \$900 million fell out of the sky on a visit to Canberra by the minister. That funding is tied to the simple purpose of directly funding Perth Freight Link, starting with Roe 8 and then the business and community-destroying, home-wrecking, six-lane freeway through communities to Marmion Street, where it will stop and require a further nearly \$1 billion to go those last couple of miles that will make it an effective piece of infrastructure.

There are great parallels between the airport rail link and Perth Freight Link, but those parallels are not that the projects are based on good, comprehensive planning for an economic multiplier for the state or well-thought-out, prioritised infrastructure plans; the projects are simply based on political kneejerk. There is no more telling an indicator of the shambles that is the airport rail link than plane noise. The rail link will go through to the airport, and my interest has been raised as to how any urban infill, which should follow a rail line, will adjust to the environment and the north district structure plan.

I quote from today's *The West Australian* in which Daniel Emerson states —

Half the area the State Government has earmarked for a residential and commercial hub surrounding the future Forrestfield train station is unsuitable for standard housing because of aircraft noise, Perth Airport has warned.

The revelation is among a host of emerging planning headaches contained in Shire of Kalamunda documents detailing concerns by the State Government's own agencies, including the Department of Planning, Main Roads, Environmental Protection Authority and Public Transport Authority.

This article is quite damning. It is amazing that the government's own departments are highlighting the major flaws of this project. The article continues —

After formally committing to the Forrestfield-airport rail link in June last year, the Government asked the shire to begin planning the residential and commercial development of Forrestfield and High Wycombe.

The resulting Forrestfield North District Structure Plan, which was considered by the shire's development and infrastructure services committee last night, included summaries of 55 submissions which were split evenly for and against the plan.

Perth Airport, a major beneficiary of the rail line, warned that it did not support residential development in areas subject to aircraft noise exceeding 50 flights louder than 65 decibels per day unless suitable building form, design and materials could be demonstrated.

Shire planning officers wrote that the plan complied with State policy relating to airport noise, the only document relevant at the early planning stage, and noise and vibration studies would be conducted later to determine development and building requirements.

Main Roads aired concerns about road access to the area, revealing the Federal-State Roe Highway-Berkshire Road interchange upgrade, which began construction in November "did not factor in" the proposed regional changes.

The member for West Swan succinctly highlighted during question time today the failure of this government to plan anything or do anything with any sort of vision. The government was spooked in the 2013 election by Metronet and it jumped into committing to the Forrestfield-Airport Link on political grounds without wider planning for such things as aircraft noise, infrastructure and the integration of the plan. More importantly, how does the airport fit into the Liberal-National government's wider picture for public transport in the metropolitan area? The government has no plan. It has an ad hoc patchwork of bandaids that fit the political expediency of the member for Riverton either to take trucks off Leach Highway—I suppose he is leading the case for the Perth Freight Link—or to implement a jumping-at-shadows railway link, just because his opponents decided it would have it as phase 1 of its much more wider, much more thought out, integrated transport plan. This goes back to the central theme of this government since 2008 when it first inherited government, without a plan and without a vision: it has a complete lack of understanding about the future of Western Australia and the needs of 79 per cent of the population of Western Australia who reside in Perth, the capital of Western Australia, who see the city as an economic multiplier. Every development will always have unintended consequences. The opposition has highlighted time and again, both inside and outside this house, the victims of this government through its poor planning of the Perth Freight Link and its kneejerk reactions to infrastructure building. The

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

Forrestfield–Airport Link also has its victims, not least of which are the small businesses that the Liberal Party feels are its natural constituents.

Mr P. Papalia: They don't like small business.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: It is clear that the Liberal Party does not like small businesses. I will quote *The Sunday Times* of 6 September. It states —

BUSINESSES say they are being pressured to sell their land to make way for the Barnett Government's underground airport rail link and future redevelopment of Perth's east.

The firms say the \$2 billion project, combined with the Shire of Kalamunda's plans to turn light industrial lots into a high density housing and car parks, had thrown their lives into chaos.

...

Some said they were prepared to take the Government and Shire to court to protect their livelihoods and property.

The Public Transport Authority confirmed it was in negotiation with a number of High Wycombe firms in the vicinity of the planned Forrestfield Station.

Three property owners have settled and it is believed another four are holding out, fearing compulsory acquisition.

Lisa and Hadyn Reynolds, who own Century West Transport and whose land on Dundas Rd —

That is at the High Wycombe end —

would be used for the station, said the financial compensation they had been offered was only a "fraction" of what it would cost to relocate their business.

The minister has form on this. He wanted to turn out, for example, D'Orsogna in my electorate, which employs nearly 750 people, the largest employer in my little seat, and force it to move its business to another location. I would like to know the compensation arrangements for businesses such as D'Orsogna and those on Stock Road, should he use that route for the Perth Freight Link stage 2, and how those businesses can close and reopen in a timely fashion, given the time line the minister has imposed on the Perth Freight Link. If we go back to the rail link, the same applies. It seems to me that businesses are being unfairly dealt with due to a political kneejerk reaction, not from a long-term, forward-thinking identified cost–benefit ratio that would deliver the best economic outcome for Western Australia, which Metronet will do.

I quote again from *The Sunday Times* article about other businesses that feel they will be hard done by. It reads —

David Bucchion, —

I hope I am saying that correctly —

owner of David's Garden Centre, whose nursery is slated to become a car park in 20 years, said property values in the area had effectively been "sterilised".

They are hanging us out to dry," Mr Bucchion said.

I feel like someone is trying to break into my house and I can't do anything about it."

Linda and Mark Bennett of Tilt Trans WA on Eureka Street said that the change in land use would be a blow. Mr Bennett said that the project is just a white elephant and the scale of it is not justified. The rail link, which will run from Bayswater, needs land for a tunnel station and bus interchange at High Wycombe. The Shire of Kalamunda's draft "Forrestfield North District Structure Plan" also proposes developing land near the station, plus parking for 2 500 cars, which would shift sites over a 20-year period. Kalamunda said that it was told to plan for office, commercial and residential development to coincide with the rail line. The blueprint will be considered by the council this month, with the council recommended to request that the state government provide certainty of timing—good luck to the council if it wants any certainty from this government—and commitment to acquisition of land. *The Sunday Times* article continues —

The PTA said discussions began last year and the landowners had known for some time the time frame in which it was seeking to acquire their properties.

It goes on to state that the PTA said that it was very careful in identifying the properties that were required. Again, I do not have a lot of faith in the PTA when it is being led by this government. The same PTA issued letters, out of the blue, to 77 businesses and homes in my seat and the member for Fremantle's seat. They all of a sudden arrived in the letterboxes stating that their properties would be compulsorily acquired for a six-lane

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

freeway they had never ever heard about. I am not so sure that the businesses in High Wycombe or those along the airport rail link can take any sort of confidence from what the PTA said to them, because when we get to the next election, who knows what will be proposed for the people of Western Australia and who knows what the government will jump at. We might throw out a few booby traps and see whether the government will politically jump at them. We on this side are pretty adept at putting out a few booby traps, so members opposite should be wary of what they might find at the next election. They have a great deal of form on jumping at shadows, so it will be very interesting.

[Member's time extended.]

Mr P.C. TINLEY: What concerns me is that there is no long-term planning. From what we can tell from the available information, there is no detailed planning on what is now taken as world's best practice and has been developed here in Western Australia—that is, transport-orientated designs. I would be very keen to hear the minister's response. It seems that the areas around the proposed train stations will be surrounded by car parks for as much as 400 metres. I would have thought that that would be a particularly bad choice, particularly when we are talking about trying to integrate public transport with the live-work-play methodology; that is, where people work will be potentially different and up the line from where they recreate, and where they congregate and live will be further up the line and hopefully around the station. Subiaco is often used as an indicator of a very good retrofitted urban transport-orientated design. It is obviously integrated with the shops and the businesses that have flourished there, such as BDO Australia and other medium-sized businesses that are fortunate enough to employ a significant number of people outside the CBD but are still within relative reach of their clients who happen to be in the CBD and certainly provide an urban service. That is the sort of thing that is possible. Of course, Fremantle was probably the first transport-orientated development. From day one, it was integrated around the railway station, and, of course, Perth is one big one. I am particularly concerned that the government is going to surround a train station with a car park for 400 to 450 metres, which is the accepted walking radius from any public transport. It will create these stations and then it will create around them a bitumen thermal sink, if you like, for the purpose of parking cars so that people can get on a train. It will further perpetuate the requirement to use cars and the urban sprawl required to support the single unit, single-block dwelling that will be a feature of these eastern suburbs. Now is a golden opportunity to redress the issue.

The Butler train station is also a poor example of the integration of public transport infrastructure with the surrounding area. It is right next to a shopping centre, which might sound fine for some, but there will be a significant demand on the shopping centre's parking area by the people who want to use the public rail. Again, I will be corrected on this, but I do not think I am wrong. I think the provision in the density around Butler station is only for single-lot dwellings. There might be some cottage blocks, but there is certainly no density of any kind that would support the cost of putting in that infrastructure. There is a massive cost to put in these very large stations, which are well designed but poorly conceived. We have to look beyond the piece of infrastructure itself and towards how the land use is being integrated as a whole. There will be 3.5 million people in Perth at a point in the future. That needs to be considered very carefully; otherwise, we will have to redefine stations such as Butler and the ones on the airport link and retrofit them with enough capacity to get value out of the infrastructure. One wonders whether it would not have been a lot better, a lot more popular and a lot more useful if the government had just done the Metro Area Express and got the 1 000 passenger boardings a day and got a benefit-cost ratio that would have been significantly more defensible than the one it is currently using for the airport rail link.

I would like to hear any contribution the minister might make about modelling that has been done on noise vibration, as well as any mitigation that might be considered when putting this rail in. I am guided by several documents. One that was interesting was the New South Wales guidelines for rail noise outlining when noise triggers and when it comes in. The reason I am attracted to this document is that table 7 shows a comparison across all Australian states, as well as internationally—North America, Asia and Europe—of the sorts of limits on acceptable decibel ratings for existing lines before noise mitigation needs to be applied. This is a comparison of airborne rail noise criteria, not vibration or ground-transmitted noise, in Victoria, South Australia, Queensland, Tasmania and of course Western Australia in the redevelopment of existing lines. All it states for Western Australia is that major upgrades are dealt with on a case-by-case basis. Every other state has very clearly articulated the decibel range by which it would apply noise mitigation in its planning levels. There are subsequent tables that deal with vibrational or ground transmission disruption by the use of medium to heavy rail. For new rail lines, Western Australia has a decibel range of 65 to 87 before noise mitigation is done. That makes our threshold for noise mitigation on new rail lines second only to Queensland, and I find that a bit sad and concerning. I wonder what might be done about that for this line and, of course, any further lines that the government might be looking to do. The rail noise and vibration levels that the guidelines addressed include

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

airborne noise that is heard within noise-sensitive premises. That is obviously a shaped arrangement in profile. Ground-borne noise can be generated inside a building and there can be ground-borne vibration from the vehicle passing on by rail that causes vibrations in buildings and affects amenity.

There is a significant issue here if a piece of rail infrastructure is going through and the area around the rail line has not been integrated as a plan. There is no precinct plan, there is no density plan and there are no specifics about how each of the three pieces of infrastructure in the stations will be integrated in a mixed-use way or in a way that is appropriate to the environment they are nested in. From what I can tell, and I can be corrected, there is no envelope for densification around the rail line to make sure that we get some sort of value capture in a wider economic sense, even if it is deferred and not direct to the state, to the landowners. It becomes a significant problem for us. A lot can be done to mitigate noise and vibration. Of course, there are sound walls and sound attenuation devices and treatments. I presume the tunnel would be a significant attenuator itself, but any time the train is not below ground, it is very important that we have some sort of track treatment that allows us to integrate as close as possible density and land that is consistent with the opportunity that has been presented. There is a very good example, if the minister ever wants to see one, in the member for Cockburn's electorate where houses have been built within, I think, less than 100 metres from the heavy rail going to the Kwinana port, which carries iron ore and grain out of that district to the Kwinana Bulk Terminal. The residents of those houses are having a devil's own job because they never envisaged iron ore being transported on that rail line and they never envisaged the scale of the volume of traffic that they inherited. Tamping under the tracks and the rubberisation of the sleeper bed or some sort of tamping device inside the ballast of the rail lines certainly needs to be investigated. When houses are built so close to rail lines, there are problems getting the maximum benefits out of infrastructure. I am talking specifically about the restriction of freight movements on that rail line. The time restrictions at night and unsociable hours have not been allowed for. Of course, the use of signal traffic, horns and that sort of stuff is particularly concerning for the residents of the Cockburn area.

I conclude on this final point. This is not a plan; this is a rail line. That is all it is. It is a phantom piece of infrastructure inasmuch as it comes from the airport and stops where it stops. There are no plans for further integration within the Perth metropolitan area to ensure we get the best benefit for the taxpayer dollar.

MRS M.H. ROBERTS (Midland) [10.26 pm]: I rise to contribute to the debate on the Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill 2015. When it comes to rail and lies about rail during state election campaigns, the Liberal Party in this state really does have form. I am not sure why my colleagues or, indeed, some members of the public were particularly surprised at the Liberal Party's latest lot of lies when it talked about Metro Area Express light rail because it has a long history of this. I will not go over the closure of the Fremantle line by Sir Charles Court, a former Liberal Premier of this state, back in the early 1980s and how the Labor Party had to reopen it post its election in 1983. Imagine the impact that would have had on the state had the Fremantle line remained closed. What a narrow-sighted thing. It points to the fact that the Liberal Party in this state has never supported rail. It has never really supported public transport at all.

I will focus on the lies that the Liberal Party told in the latter part of 1992 and the early part of 1993 in the lead-up to the state election. The Liberal Party in this state won government largely on the back of what was called the WA Inc era, having had the equivalent of three terms in office, because in 1983 I think we still had three-year terms but the 1989 to 1993 term was a four-year term. After 10 years in office, by way of the electoral cycle, the likelihood was that there would be a change of government. During that time the Liberal Party again went out and made promises about rail. In fact, the big lie of the 1993 state campaign—this occurred before I entered Parliament but I remember it very, very well—was made at the Midland railway workshops, which at that time was a thriving place employing thousands of people. The then leader of the Liberal Party, Richard Court, went out there and issued a press release that I think I have quoted from in this Parliament before. Essentially, it said that the workers had nothing to fear because the Liberal Party was going to expand the Midland railway workshops; it was going to turn them into a centre of engineering excellence.

That was a great and popular policy put out there for the people of Midland and the broader region. All the workers who worked at the Midland railway workshops at that time thought that not only did they have nothing to fear from an incoming Liberal government, but also their jobs would be secure. Far from closing the Midland railway workshops, the Liberal Party claimed to have a plan to expand the workshops to a centre of engineering excellence in which future workers would be trained in various trades to not just build trains and do the traditional work that had been undertaken there, but they would be appropriately trained to take on jobs in other industries such as mining or in other areas in which their skills would be relevant. Indeed, there was quite a history of that already at the Midland railway workshops because, essentially, the workshops was one of the great training bases for this state for the best part of 100 years. People received training there as carpenters,

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

boilermakers and metalworkers of various kinds. They got trades skills and trades certificates in a working environment, and many of those people took their skills off to an assortment of other industries within this state—indeed, industries that helped build this state. It was really a centre for young people to gain trades skills that would take them all through life. Many people stayed to work their whole lives at the Midland railway workshops, but many others attribute their start to the workshops. Even some engineers got their start by working at the Midland railway workshops and then progressing to other places. We can see the appeal of this promise. It was the big promise that was held out when Richard Court held a press conference and made a press release saying it would be a centre of engineering excellence, and it would be great. Imagine how that appealed to the people of the broader Midland and Swan region—parents thinking that their 15, 16 and 17-year-olds would have a future at the Midland railway workshops, or that they could get trades skills there in a variety of metalworking and other industries and achieve the qualifications to either take up permanent work there or take those skills anywhere within the state, Australia or the world.

The question is: was the government genuine in that promise? The only conclusion that can be drawn is the government was no more genuine in that promise than when it released the plan for the Metro Area Express light rail. Although the Midland railway workshops were not closed until 1994—about a year after the Court government took office—the announcement of the closure came within a matter of weeks of the government being elected. It was not as if the government had looked at the books and the operations over a period of six or 12 months and decided it wanted to go in another direction; although it had made a promise, reluctantly it would move in another direction. A very short time—I think it was about six weeks—after the election of the government, it announced the closure of the Midland railway workshops. There were rallies at the workshops at that time. People were absolutely shocked. They had elected a government that had promised to expand the workshops and provide a greater training base and skills base for this state for everyone from metalworkers through to engineers, but the government did not deliver on that promise—quite the contrary. The very jobs that were there were destined to go, and go they did, within 12 months of the election of that Liberal government. In my view it is worse than not keeping a promise. There was a promise to expand the operation, and if the government had not delivered on that promise it would have been a letdown and it would have been wrong. It would have been a broken promise, but to do the absolute opposite was simply appalling. To go 180 degrees in the other direction and close the workshops was appalling.

The government had no plan at that point, indeed not for a number of years, for any re-use of the site to engage people working there and to provide other jobs there. It also had no plan for the ongoing training of apprentices at an alternative venue and no real plan for what to do with that workforce. Many people working there over the course of the following year or so were sent to redeployment. Some of those people were able to be redeployed elsewhere in the public sector and others got redundancy payments and effectively found themselves out of a job. Of those who found themselves out of a job entirely with no other job in the state public sector, some found jobs quickly in private industry and elsewhere but many others, many of whom ultimately became my constituents, were out of work for years after that. It was a complete betrayal for the government to say that it would expand the workshops and provide more jobs and more opportunities and to do the reverse: to close it down, to remove the training and to remove the jobs and opportunities. It fits into two key themes of the Liberal Party in this state. One is the theme of making promises about rail and then letting people down and betraying them. The other is the reduction of training in this state. We are seeing it happening again now with the current Minister for Training and Workforce Development and the current government in cutting courses and putting up fees for people to get training. It is a very retrograde step. People in my electorate are asking where the training opportunities are for the future. They are saying that they do not have the money—\$2 000, \$3 000, \$4 000, \$5 000 or \$6 000—to commit to TAFE training. I still call it TAFE training. Amusingly enough and quite ironically, the one in my electorate is now called Polytechnic West. It is a stupid name for a training system that has been very poorly managed by this government.

Again we see this pattern of behaviour of Liberals in this state that is bad for rail and railways, and very bad for training in this state and for providing opportunities for the young people of the future. Even if the government has no empathy for the people involved, it just does not make economic sense. It makes no economic sense to not provide adequate public transport and it also makes no economic sense to not train our youth to have opportunities for employment into the future. Why create a system whereby people are left on the scrap heap and they do not get the opportunities for education, training and apprenticeships, and they do not get the opportunities to go into the workforce and do well in their life? The alternative for people who do not get the training and the skills is to find themselves without skills, without a job, collecting unemployment benefits and relying on the state to pay for their medical and other costs. Linked with that lack of education and lack of employment is a range of other psychological and other health problems.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

This is another part of the history. I know that many of my colleagues already in this debate have highlighted the sheer hypocrisy and betrayal on aspects of rail but, as the member for Midland, I could not let the opportunity go by without again highlighting that the Liberal Party has form here. Its history is that of betrayal election after election when it has anything at all to do with rail or railways. I do not know how it can have the gall to go out there and promise things during the election campaign and say that they are fully funded and that it is committed to them, when we all know it is just rubbish. These things are not funded and the government has no commitment to them. It has no more commitment to the Ellenbrook railway than it had to expanding the Midland Workshops. I wonder what those two things, in particular, have in common. They have in common the eastern region of Perth—a region that the Liberal Party has historically treated with contempt and continues to treat with contempt. Many of my colleagues have already highlighted the broken promises in the last two elections with respect to the Ellenbrook railway; if it is not going to do it, it should not promise it. Everyone knows that a busway or something else will be cheaper, but the government knew that at the beginning; it does not even need to go and get any costings done to know that it could run some extra buses and move people more cheaply that way. Would it be as good, and would people see it as being visionary? No, they would not, because it would not be particularly visionary. Again, the government has treated the people of the eastern region with contempt and, quite frankly, got away with it. It got away with it in 1993, when it promised to expand the Midland Workshops and then announced its closure some weeks later; it got away with it in 2008, when it promised the Ellenbrook railway and then did not deliver it; and it then tried to pretend in 2013 that, “Well, we’ve been planning for it; we’re still planning the Ellenbrook railway and it’s going to happen”. The member for Swan Hills went out and told his electorate, “Yes, we’re going to deliver a railway to Ellenbrook”. It even had the little blurb, “fully funded, fully costed”, but the only problem was that it was not fully funded, it was not fully costed, and it was never going to happen.

I think the people of Ellenbrook have probably learnt by now not to trust the Liberal Party, and I doubt that most people, if they are at all interested in public transport, would vote for it again. It behoves us to point out to people that the Liberal Party is not the party of public transport and is never to be believed on public transport. It let people down in the early 1980s when it closed the Fremantle line; it let people down again when it was elected in 1993 and it closed the Midland Workshops; and over its ensuing period in government, it did not deliver even one single metre of actual rail line. Despite talking up the Mandurah rail line, it never delivered on it and never had the money on budget to deliver on it. My colleagues have gone over this point, and I do not intend to dwell on it, but the Liberal Party saw our Metronet plan and could see that people in the community saw it as a visionary plan and were starting to grasp hold of it and think, “This is the kind of infrastructure we need for the future”.

People are worried about congestion; there is limited capacity on our roads. We have a rapidly expanding population in this state and have had for decades, and we cannot meet transport needs without providing good public transport.

[Member’s time extended.]

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: What did the government do? It said, “We’ll just go out and make one of these little promises; we’ve done it before. We did it in the 80s, we did it in the 90s; let’s go out again in the new century and make another promise, because we can just cross our fingers behind our back.” We have been through the actual lie in which the Premier said “Fully funded, fully costed—that’s just a slogan”. My colleagues have quoted the article by Daniel Emerson in which he referred to the “dirty little secret” of the 2013 campaign. I think what I have demonstrated this evening is that there was a dirty little secret in the 80s, another one in 1993 when it went to the election, and further dirty little secrets—I missed out 1997; I can go back to that—in 2008 and 2013. It seems that transport is the dirty little secret of every campaign that the Liberal Party has done in this state in the last three or four decades. We have to give the Liberal Party points for consistency. The Liberal Party has consistently lied at every election when it has come to public transport.

For the people of my electorate, the lie that hurt the most was the closure of the Midland Workshops. The government was not honest with the people of Midland and the surrounding region when it closed the Midland Workshops. I also want to focus on Midland with respect to the promises that were made to the people of the eastern region in the 2013 election campaign. The Premier visited Midland a number of times during the 2013 election campaign. Imagine the hypocrisy of this. The Premier went to Centrepoint Shopping Centre and visited the Yellowbird project, which was a small project that was receiving a small amount of government money to assist older people to connect through technology and the Internet and so forth. The Premier had a few happy snaps taken with people involved in that project and said what a great thing it is to assist older people to become familiar with technology so that they do their own emails and do stuff online. That is not the subject of this debate tonight. However, the fact of the matter is that the Premier’s minister and his government withdrew

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

the funding for that project within about 18 months of the election, and the government no longer funds or supports that project.

On that same day, the Premier was asked to walk across and see the state of Midland train station. I can tell members that it is not in a good state. The Premier made a comment to the effect that, “I can see your point. This station really needs an upgrade”. We got a report in the local paper to say that the Premier acknowledged the need for an upgrade of Midland station. However, the Premier was not honest about the fact that in May 2008, the former Labor government, under the then Treasurer, Hon Eric Ripper, had put money on budget for the upgrade of Midland train station. What did the Barnett government do? The government did not announce it during that 2008 campaign, but it completely withdrew that funding. The Liberal Party actually took the money for the upgrade of Midland station off the state budget in 2008. We know that the Liberal Party does not support light public transport. In the first year that the Liberal Party was in government, it withdrew the funding for the station upgrade. Therefore, members can imagine what I thought of the hypocrisy of the Premier when he said that the station does look a bit shoddy and needs an upgrade. The Premier has been to Midland since that time, and he continues to acknowledge that, yes, the station needs an upgrade and, yes, ideally it should be moved closer to the hospital, and he has given a few little nods. However, we do not have one dollar on budget for that project. Therefore, my advice to people is: do not trust the Premier. Even when the Liberal Party promises that it will do something on public transport, it does not deliver it. Really, it is not a promise. It is just an acknowledgment. The Premier is acknowledging that, yes, Midland train station is not up to standard and needs to be upgraded and, yes, it would be nice to move it in an easterly direction so that it would better align with the new St John of God Midland public hospital. However, the Premier has not put one cent on budget for that project. Therefore, until I see that money, I will not believe that the government will do that. That is just another big gap in transport planning for this state.

I have had a close read of the explanatory memorandum for this bill. I have also looked at the minister’s second reading speech. The minister’s speech says it all about what the Liberal Party’s real commitment is when it comes to public transport. The speech is two-and-a-quarter pages long. Guess what? There is no vision and no passion in that speech. It is the most pedestrian second reading speech I have ever seen. In fact, it does not have even a proper introduction or conclusion. The speech starts with the words —

Before I commence the second reading of the Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill 2015, I am required by section 18A of the Transport Co-ordination Act 1966 to table a report ...

So the minister got on with tabling the report. It is a very simple and boring little speech with no vision, no passion and no commitment, which is what I have come to expect from the Liberal Party on public transport. But the second reading speech is also somewhat misleading, because the third paragraph states —

The purpose of this bill is to implement the legislative authority for the construction of the railway to Forrestfield. The Public Transport Authority began planning for the Forrestfield–Airport Link project in 2008 and was guided by ...

The government has been quite cute there in stating “the Forrestfield–Airport Link project in 2008”. Yes, the government probably did begin planning a project with that label in 2008, but the Public Transport Authority was certainly planning for a potential rail link to the airport well before this lot got into government in 2008. I know for a fact that Hon Alannah MacTiernan, a former transport minister, was looking at the potential for those links, was making plans and had her agency working on potential plans for that rail link to the airport back in 2007 and 2008. As the neighbouring member for Midland, Hon Alannah MacTiernan raised and canvassed these matters with me, and advised me that she was having plans drawn up—plans that she hoped to be able to get assistance to fund from a federal Labor government. Hon Alannah MacTiernan is certainly someone of great vision, and we agreed that part of the essential infrastructure for a great city—a big city—is having a good public transport link, preferably a rail line through to an airport. Planning started way before 2008. Prior to 2008—in fact it might have started as early as 2004 or 2005, but I can certainly remember her raising the issue back in 2007 and 2008—the title would not necessarily have involved the word “Forrestfield”, but an airport link had been planned by the PTA well before 2008.

The explanatory memorandum is very much lacking in detail; it is still very much in the planning stage. I am not sure whether all the money is on budget yet, but I doubt it is. The second reading speech states that \$12 million for the project was provided in the 2014–15 budget—that is really just planning money—and —

... another \$57 million has been allocated for further planning, design and procurement for activities in 2015–16.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

Where is the money in the out years of 2016–17, 2017–18 or 2018–19? If it was in the forward estimates, the minister probably would have detailed that.

One would have significant doubts whether a government with the attitude to money this one has actually intends to fund the project. The government talked up all its supposed planning for its Mandurah rail route for the eight years it was in government between 1993 and 2001, but did it ever put one metre of rail on the ground? No, it did not. I suspect that is the game here, too. Spending money on the planning is pretty cheap in comparison with actually getting on with building it.

I will not have time to go through this in detail, but I have had the opportunity to look through the agenda of a meeting of the Development and Infrastructure Services Committee of the Shire of Kalamunda that was held on Monday, 14 September—so just earlier this week. Items associated with the planning of this Forrestfield–Airport Link were on the agenda. Like the member for West Swan, I note that most of the objections to the Forrestfield north district structure plan came from government agencies, including Perth Airport with respect to residential development. Agenda item 31 of the Shire of Kalamunda’s Development and Infrastructure Services Committee meeting states —

Perth Airport does not support residential development being located within areas of projected aircraft noise exceeding 50 events ...

And so it goes on. There are environmental concerns and there are concerns about the proximity to the freight rail and rail yards, and about noise and vibration. People are opposed to the closure of Dundas Road and they are concerned about the loss of land and investment. However, what surprises me the most are the concerns of agencies such as Planning and other agencies such as Main Roads, within the minister’s portfolio areas. I had a good read through the attachments of the meeting at the Shire of Kalamunda, which has a clear role in this matter, and it would seem that the government is a long way off resolving a lot of issues. This is not as advanced as it appears.

MS J.M. FREEMAN (Mirrabooka) [10.56 pm]: I, too, rise to speak on the Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill 2015. It would be remiss of me, as the member for Mirrabooka, representing the community of Mirrabooka—both the suburb of Mirrabooka and the suburbs that make up the electorate of Mirrabooka—if I did not raise the government’s betrayal of the people of Mirrabooka by not delivering the Metro Area Express light rail as promised. When the government went to the election in 2013 and raised the issue of MAX light rail in 2012, well prior to the election, it did not promise that it would come after the 2017 election; it promised to deliver light rail in that period. The light rail was announced well before the 2013 election, in September 2012, and, as the press release stated, it was going to be a \$1.8 billion project that would start construction in 2016, with the line scheduled to be operational by the end of 2018. It was not a promise that the government would consider it in 2017 after the next election. It was not a promise that the government would do it with a bus rail. It was the cornerstone of a promise that the government led with into an election around its rail and transport policies, of which the Forrestfield–Airport Link railway made up a part, and the choice to betray those people in Mirrabooka was based purely on a political fix, a political delivery, to marginal electorates in Liberal seats. I am not the only one who says that. Paul Murray in *The Weekend West* of 5 September 2015 states —

... the Government’s plans for any other reason than to shore up Liberal prospects in the seats of Belmont and Forrestfield which it took from Labor in 2013.

The difference between this piece of legislation before us and the Metronet promise to the community in 2013 and the announcement to now deliver Metronet to the community after 2017 is that that announcement is honest because it states that it is a long-term vision and a long-term plan to bring together, to link up, the transport system to make a rapid transport system that is integrated. For me, that is the point. If a government says that it will deliver a project and gives a community a time line in the lead up to an election, then that is its promise and what it should deliver to that community. If a government goes into an election saying this is our vision and what we want to achieve and here are the structures for some of those areas that we want to achieve and it cannot deliver, then people can rightly say that they understand it was a vision. But there is no plan or vision about what is before us or what this government is doing around transport.

In my view, the Liberal Party only announced the Forrestfield–Airport link in response to Labor’s Metronet plan. That is certainly the view of a long-term, well-respected Western Australian journalist. The government has basically thrown out the \$25 million it has spent on planning for the Metro Area Express light rail. It threw away the fully funded, fully costed commitment, because the prime minister of the day said that rail was not in his government’s knitting, it was not the thing it was going to do, and the state government was relying on federal funding. I put to the Premier and the minister that they need to have a craft corner with the new

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

Liberal Prime Minister and reconnect with him, because it is a commitment the government made to the people and it fits within the transport blueprint the government put out for discussion—the draft report for consultation “Public Transport for Perth in 2031: Mapping Out the Future for Perth’s Public Transport Network.” This blueprint very clearly states that the north-central corridor of Perth—the Mirrabooka area—is a priority area. I am not standing in this place just to say that the government made a promise and that it should deliver on that promise, I am also saying that the government made that promise based on studies, a consultation paper and an independent panel the government put together to deliver what it said would be the transport plan for the future. That means that that promise was based on data and knowledge that the greatest need is in that area—it is a priority area.

Of course, I am of the view that people in the area’s needs would be better met by Metronet, which is heavy rail along Reid Highway connecting the Ellenbrook and Midland rail lines to the Joondalup rail line. But, given that the government made a promise and it had data and figures behind that promise that showed that this is a priority area in metropolitan Perth, it is vital that the government refocus and not have just these bits of plans that public transport is currently based on. If the government is to deliver on MAX, it really needs to deliver an integrated system, such as Metronet, because that is what the community in the area needs and certainly that is what is in the draft consultation report “Public Transport for Perth in 2031”. It is noteworthy that this draft consultation report was released in 2010. Is that correct, minister? The minister can just nod. I understand that this report was released by the Department of Transport in 2010. An independent committee was formed to look at having an integrated plan in the area, but we are still waiting for a transport plan for Western Australia. That is an interesting aspect of this, because recently I met a local authority planner who expressed the urgent need for a public transport plan. He said that we had road reserves down pat and we know where they are going to go and can plan around those things, but we need a rapid transport plan that is not constantly shifted and changed, otherwise it is very difficult to plan for communities in the area.

The “Draft for consultation: Public Transport for Perth in 2031” was consistent with “Directions 2031 and beyond: metropolitan planning and beyond the horizon” and was based on planning, data and modelling to determine patronage levels; that is, the number of people who would use the service. That report clearly illustrates that buses, even articulated buses that the minister is currently looking at, would reach capacity so that this corridor would need rapid transport. In fact, in an answer to a question without notice in the other place, which states —

Can the Minister for Transport confirm that patronage modelling for the northern leg of the Metro Area Express light rail estimated that there would be 49 000 boardings as a non-school holiday week day in 2031?

Hon Jim Chown replied —

The government has confirmed previously that over 100 000 passenger boardings per day would be expected on the MAX light rail network by 2031.

I understand that would be above the patronage estimated on the Armadale line in the same period. We are talking about a great need. Gareth Parker’s article in *The Weekend West* on 23 August 2014 pointed out that the airport rail link would move fewer people than MAX light rail. We seem to be dominated not by good planning for the community or good data and certainly not on commitment to promises that were made to people that I represent in the electorate of Mirrabooka, but on a political fix for marginal electorates.

It is pretty important that I go through the key findings of this independent report on public transport for Perth just before I wrap-up. The key findings are very much a no-brainer. The report states —

Over the next 21 years, much of the investment in public transport infrastructure and system improvements is needed within 15km of the Perth central area.

Mirrabooka falls within that area. It continues —

...

The current network strongly supports the central city area. However, there are major differences in the quality of services, with limited quality mass transit services for the central northern sector of the Perth metropolitan area and between major centres outside of the central area.

As I was saying earlier, this report absolutely and clearly states the need for a rapid transport system into the Mirrabooka area that was promised to the people and should be delivered. The report goes on to state that that area requires a transformational project.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton;
Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter
Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms
Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

In closing, I want to remind members that I am not the only one who thinks that the Barnett Liberal government and Liberal ministers have betrayed the people they promised MAX light rail to. There have been other media reports, including in *The Sunday Times*, about how the current changes do not reflect the undertaking given to those people. I am most interested in Paul Murray's comment that the Liberal–National government's proposal is not good public policy and that aspects of Metronet, the Labor Party's transport policy that it took to the 2013 election and will take to the 2017, is good policy. Paul Murray states —

... it's good public policy that addresses growing concerns about road congestion.

Good public policy should indeed follow good processes. A process was set up that was not continued. If it had been continued, the impetus for delivering to the people of Mirrabooka would still be there. It is my strong belief that we need Metronet, as the member for Kwinana put it so well, instead of a rapid-transit spider system of trains. We need a linked system. As the member for West Swan said, Ellenbrook is an important link in a rail system that we need in Western Australia. For those two links to come together between the Joondalup and Ellenbrook lines and to have continuing loops both south and north, would make a chain of good, efficient public transport that we should be seeing delivered into our community. We need that; we do not need bit players such as we have before us tonight.

MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah) [11.10 pm]: I think I am the last opposition speaker tonight to comment on the Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill 2015, and what a good bill it is—that is why we are supporting it. As opposition members have highlighted in their contributions, this is part of a broader strategy for how we deal with the projected population growth and continuing sprawl of the Perth metropolitan area, stretching south into the Peel region. I have listened with great interest to contributions by members from this side of the Parliament. I listened intently to the member for Belmont's contribution and to some of the other speakers' contributions. If at the end of the day we are to understand the growth demands of Perth–Peel into the future, we cannot simply allow exponential population growth without a proper sensible, integrated infrastructure plan. That is why the WA Labor Party is, if you like, reinforcing its concept of Metronet. In the lead-up to the 2013 election, Metronet struck a chord, and that was why the Liberal Party in particular made a hastily concocted response, which led to a range of promises we now know can be seen for what they are: simply uncosted, blatant lies to those communities they sought to win over and gain support from. They gained support from communities in the north east in Swan Hills and some of the other areas where seats were required for them to win government. We now know that the kneejerk response to Metronet initiated from that. One can only imagine what the Liberal Party planning bunker was like as its members bunkered down and looked at the polling figures that were coming through on a day-to-day basis as the March 2013 election date got closer. They would have realised, of course, that Metronet was striking a chord with the general public because, as we know, in the lead-up to the 2013 election, and subsequently, congestion has remained a major concern for hundreds of thousands of people living in the Perth metropolitan area and people living further south in the Peel region.

We can conclude that in the Liberal Party election strategy bunker in Menzies House, there was an ongoing concern about how it would deal with Metronet because it was striking a chord. As we know, the Labor Party was not successful at winning government at the 2013 election; however, that does not mean that we should jettison a sensible, constructive, strategic plan for the future provision of public transport in a metropolitan area that will have some three million people living in it in a few short decades. What we saw then and what we see now are two stark plans. The Liberal Party manifesto was punctuated with comments or slogans such as fully costed et cetera. It was a disconnected plan that was a kneejerk response and was focused only on holding and/or winning specific seats. Instead, the Metronet plan is integrated and strategic and also focuses on creating places, spaces and destinations that will be focused on generating their own employment within metro hubs. The plans are very stark.

In the next 18 months, as the election gets closer and the election manifestoes are unravelled, the Barnett government will have a major problem. It has no credibility now. When it seeks to try to convince the public that its plan—if it can be called a plan—is fully costed, well thought out and strategic, the general public will not believe it. Why will the public not believe the government? It is because it broke a number of promises to a number of key communities, including the ones that the member for Mirrabooka just highlighted.

Ms J.M. Freeman: You broke their hearts.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: It did, leaving a boulevard of broken dreams. The same has occurred in Ellenbrook and Two Rocks. With the boulevard of broken promises unfolding before people's eyes, they will not be hoodwinked a second time. Why will they not be hoodwinked a second time? It is because there is no trust now. They know very well that only one party will deliver rail. That is the reality. Only one party has the track record

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

of delivering rail for a modern, twenty-first century city—that is, the City of Perth and the region to the south, the Peel. I am not going to go through all the examples of the track record of the Labor Party on public transport planning; they have been mentioned by a number of speakers. The sad thing for some members opposite is that they think that people do not remember who delivers rail. They do remember who delivers rail and it will be very interesting when we get closer to the election. We will continue to talk of Metronet, explain it and give very clear indications of what elements of the plan we would like to prioritise. That will all come in the coming months leading up to the next election. I think we will find that when Metronet is reinforced and continues to be explained, details given and priorities highlighted, people will see it as the only plan to deal with congestion and the great demand, and make Perth as a metropolitan area a modern, twenty-first century city. Much has been said about the sprawl and the fact that Perth is known internationally as a city that has continued to sprawl, in some respects almost uncontrollably, north and south. When we think that the Perth metropolitan area stretches over 100 kilometres from its southern to its northern boundary, and then when we add in the City of Mandurah, which sits in the Peel region outside the metropolitan area, with a coastline of some 54 kilometres, we have a coastline from the southern boundary of the City of Mandurah through to the northern boundary of the Perth metropolitan area up near Two Rocks of some 170 or 180 kilometres. It is a massive sprawl and any government should have as its priority a focus on connecting communities effectively and efficiently.

I drove here today. When I come to Parliament I try to come by train as regularly as I can, but this morning I had to drop off some things, so I took the car. I remember when Alannah MacTiernan made the call to Premier Gallop about the reality of rerouting the planned Perth to Mandurah railway down the freeway. I always remember Keith Holmes, who was the Mayor of Mandurah at the time, being called by Alannah, the minister, to say, “This is what we want to do, Keith, what do you think?” I remember Keith Holmes saying to me very clearly when I called him about it that it was the best plan not for just Mandurah and the greater Peel region that would rely on the Mandurah line as a connection to the Perth metropolitan area, but of course for the whole southern corridor, which we knew was growing at a rapid rate and has of course continued to grow at a rapid rate. That was a monumental decision. The current Minister for Transport was not in this place, but I can tell him that when we had the debates about the Perth–Mandurah railway line in this place, there were comments coming from the Liberal side of politics about it being way before its time and it being a white elephant. Then there were supporters of the Liberal Party, conservative members of the Perth community, the Willy Packers of the world, saying things like, “Why are you sending it down to that little town where there are only cows? There are only cows between here and Mandurah.” These are the comments he made. They were ridiculous comments made by people who were trying to paint it as a white elephant. We know that even on day one and in the first weeks of the opening of the Perth–Mandurah railway line, it began to exceed, and very quickly exceeded, the patronage expectations that were planned. That is the reality, and now we know that the people effectively voted with their feet, because it is a most successful 72-kilometre addition to the metropolitan public transport corridor.

We now have this situation in which there is an element of the Metronet plan in the bill that we are debating tonight; that is, the bill that introduces this railway line through to Forrestfield, past the airport et cetera. What is the opposition of the day doing? We are supporting it. What happened when we built the Perth–Mandurah railway line? When those opposite were in opposition, they did not support it. I was always quite amazed that some members of the Liberal Party had the gall to turn up to the opening, to which they were invited. They looked a little sheepish. I remember taking the late Dudley Tuckey and his wife to the station when the first train left for Mandurah, when the line was opened on 23 December 2007. I think I saw the member for South Perth standing on the platform looking very forlorn. There were a couple of others there, too, with their little Liberal Party lapels on.

Ms R. Saffioti: We didn’t invite them all.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: We did not invite them all. They might have been invited to ride in the last carriage but they were still there.

Mr J.E. McGrath interjected.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: The member for South Perth was invited. He was there. He drove his Mercedes-Benz to the Murray Street car park.

A member: Did he have the horse float?

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: No, he did not. He dropped the horse float on the South Perth foreshore beforehand. He had driven there in his Merc.

Mr J.E. McGrath: Trevor Sprigg was there.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I always remember that he was very disappointed. That is right; the late Trevor Sprigg was there. The member for South Perth had parked his Merc in the Murray Street car park, and Spriggy was there. The member for South Perth looked very forlorn. It was almost like he had put on the wrong suit. He had on a safari suit. He decided to wear the wrong sort of dress for the occasion. He reminded me of the guy from that famous Peter Sellers movie *The Party*, in which chaos reigned, and the guy was walking on the other side of the pool saying, “Birdy num num” or whatever he did in that movie. It was a great movie.

I digress at this late stage tonight—at this late bewitching hour. I remember that day. It was a great day. I always remember the member for South Perth was always, and he remains, forlorn —

Mr J.E. McGrath: Why would I be celebrating something for the Labor Party?

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: That is the difference between us. We believe that everyone should be celebrating the 72-kilometre extension to the electrified rail system of Perth.

[Member’s time extended.]

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: This galls the member for South Perth. He knows that I like him. I know he is always disappointed that he never got the South Perth train station.

Mr J.E. McGrath: You didn’t give us the station.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I know. The member did not get the station.

Ms R. Saffioti: You’ve been in government for seven years.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: The member’s government has not given him the station either. That is very poor lobbying on his behalf.

Dr K.D. Hames: I was there at the function at the end. What was really amusing is that Alannah made no mention whatsoever of Liberal Party involvement and gave a public servant an award for 10 years of service to developing the line.

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members! Member for West Swan!

Several members interjected.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: The problem is that whenever we talk about the track record of rail in Western Australia, the government does not like it. It hates it because it knows that there is no record. When it looks at the history of the Liberal Party, here it is. It is one page. The history of the Liberal Party contribution to public transport in Western Australia fits on one page. We could have a file full of stuff highlighting the contribution of the Labor Party to Western Australia. As the member for Cockburn said earlier this evening, we do not oppose rail; it is not in our character and it is not in our genes on this side of the house to oppose rail. The problem is that there are too many deviant genes on the other side, and they end up saying, “We can’t do it.” They get frustrated. They remind me a bit of Yosemite Sam from *Looney Toons*. They get all boiled up and angry. Their whiskers stand on end, steam comes from their ears and they are spitting saliva. Members opposite get upset because they know there is no history. They know it is not in their genes to support public transport, and that is the problem whenever we bring it to Parliament. But this is the government’s bill; we are supporting it, and it is the government’s bill. We are embracing this as part of the strategic plan for public transport in the Perth metropolitan area. The government does not even like that; it does not even like the fact that we are embracing this bill, and that is the sad thing.

Members opposite cannot do it; it sticks in their craw as they fire up their Mercedes-Benzes, Volvos and BMWs out in the car park. They fire up their cars and drive home with gritted teeth, the member for South Perth with the blood oozing from his fingers. This is the problem. They hate it, and they cannot even celebrate a victory for themselves, because it is not in their nature. They cannot even accept praise. I am praising the government; I am not actually criticising it, but members opposite cannot even accept that. The contribution of the Liberal Party to public transport in Western Australia is a very thin piece of paper, which I place on my desk right here, and then I will get out the voluminous files of the Labor contribution. I do not want the member for South Perth to get upset, because I like him. I want him to stay around longer, but I do not want him to get upset, because he does get upset. It upsets him, and I know he goes home at night and punches his pillow as if it were me. As he hits the pillow he says, “That Templeman, he got me again.” His Mercedes-Benz gleams out in the carport, with the four rabid dogs guarding it, and the gates closed.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

It is late and I want to get back to my children. I will be home at half past 12 or quarter to one, and I have to get up at five. Let us celebrate this. This is a celebration. I am with the government; I am endorsing this legislation, and I look forward to its rapid passage through Parliament into the other place so that it becomes one of the key elements of the WA Labor Party's Metronet plan.

MR D.C. NALDER (Alfred Cove — Minister for Transport) [11.33 pm] — in reply: I rise to respond to the second reading debate of the Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill 2015. I must admit that I am a little concerned for the member for Mandurah. I doubt that he will get to sleep tonight after that rousing performance. I want to touch on a couple of points, because I have sat and listened to this debate since three o'clock—seven and a half hours of members saying that they fully support the bill, which is about starting the construction of the Forrestfield–Airport Link, but the whole time they talked about everything else but getting on with constructing the railway. A couple of things need a little clarification, because I hate seeing history painted over. A couple of points are really valid. One is the talk about the contribution to public transport from this side of the house. We as a government have every right to be proud of what we have been doing. I will touch on a few things. It is not all about laying down track. The member for Cockburn rightly pointed out that we need to ensure we purchase railcars. This government is in the process of increasing the rail fleet by 28 per cent; that is, a spend of over a quarter of a billion dollars to increase the rail fleet at this time. However, we are also laying down for the future an upgraded C-series railcar that will see another 56 car trains at a cost of \$1.5 billion. Unless Labor's public transport plan is to remove the requirement for these cars into the future, that is \$1.5 billion of its total \$2.5 billion spend. Perhaps the Labor Party has slightly forgotten that a public transport solution needs not only track, but also the vehicles to go on that track.

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, member for West Swan!

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for West Swan, the minister is not accepting your interjection.

Mr D.C. NALDER: I want to point out what the member for West Swan announced in the press in communitynews.com. The announcement referred to the members for Victoria Park, West Swan and Cannington and said that part of the Labor Party's long-term plan is to upgrade all the rail crossings—I assume to a fully grade-separated situation. I have advice that 31 level crossings need upgrading at a cost of between \$50 million and \$70 million each. That would cost between \$1.5 billion and \$2 billion just for the rail crossings. The Labor Party is saying it will be able to complete its public transport plan for \$2.5 billion. The first thing it will complete if it wins government is the Forrestfield–Airport Link project, which we started. However, that is a \$2 billion project, so there is \$2 billion of its \$2.5 billion. And we have not even got to Ellenbrook, we have not even got to Yanchep, we have not even got to Byford and we have not done the Mandurah–Thornlie line. Labor members stand in this house and this is why I said that if they believe they can deliver this project for \$2.5 billion, they are dreaming. I stand by that.

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, member!

Mr D.C. NALDER: The shadow minister for Transport, the member for West Swan, spent most of her speech talking about delivering a line to Ellenbrook, and the Labor Party says it will get on with it. I have been in the press and said that I do not believe that a rail solution to Ellenbrook is needed for 10 to 20 years. The Premier said that he does not believe it is needed for 10 years. Let me get to the point. The point is that Labor members think it should be done sooner than that, yet they will not commit to doing it next term. We are 18 months away from an election and then there will be a four-year term for government, so that is five and a half years. If it takes four years for construction, the construction of it has to start next term. Labor members seem to forget this. This is some of the little bits of detail that they slightly forget. If they want to bring this project on quicker than the next 10 years, it will have to start construction next term. Are Labor members committed to starting construction of the Ellenbrook rail line next term if they win government? They are so far off the planet on what is required to deliver an integrated transport solution.

This whole seven and a half hours of commentary that I have listened to has been about Labor's public transport plan. Labor members seem to forget that public transport is not purely about train lines, yet that is what they believe it is. We believe that train lines are important. That is why we are getting on with constructing the Forrestfield–Airport Link. It is why we extended the Joondalup line to Butler, it is why we are building a train station at Aubin Grove and it is why we are increasing the rail fleet by 28 per cent. This is not doing nothing. One of the faults of this government is that we do not trumpet enough exactly what we do. We do not do enough to tell people

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 September 2015]

p6274b-6341a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr David Templeman; Mr Dean Nalder

exactly what we are doing, because we do not rest on our laurels for one project; we are actually getting on with the next project. That is what we are doing, because we want to do more and we have more to do. We have a city that is transforming and growing and we want to make sure that we take this city into the future. We are not going to just rest on our laurels and talk about what I heard tonight for half the night about the Mandurah rail line, which the Liberal Party actually started. We started that line, and we acknowledge that the Labor Party changed the route and finished it. I acknowledge that the Labor Party changed the route to go down the freeway.

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for West Swan, the minister is not accepting your interjection. Will you please let him speak.

Mr D.C. NALDER: I do not like history being repainted with misinformation and members misleading people. If members opposite are saying that that they are going to finish this public transport plan within the next 10 years, they are absolutely dreaming. If they believe they can do it for \$2.5 billion, they are dreaming. We have told them that the Forrestfield–Airport Link is a \$2 billion project. I have stood in this house and informed them that the route we are now taking is not the route we promised at the election; it is a better route. This tunnel is cheaper than the proposal we took to the election; it is also cheaper than the proposal Labor took to the election. We know that the engineering difficulties of delivering on what the Labor Party took to the election—going down Horrie Miller Drive and stopping a kilometre away from the airport—were too great to be able to do it, and that it would cost a lot more.

The other thing that is really important is that the Labor Party is adopting our route, the Liberal Party plan, which is going to ensure a 20-minute journey from Forrestfield to the city, not the 40-minute journey that the Labor Party took to the last election, yet the Labor Party is wanting to claim the credit as if this were its plan. It has nothing to do with its plan. This started long before the Labor Party came up with its current slogan for a public transport plan.

There is a lot more that this government is doing; we have been delivering on things that were not promised before the last election. I have talked about the 950 bus service, a rapid bus service from Morley that has delivered a 39 per cent increase in customers and a customer satisfaction rating that is higher than that for our rail system. That is not to say that I do not believe in heavy rail, because heavy rail is critical for capacity; buses do not deliver capacity, so we need rail, but it must be organised. When we talk about it being integrated, integration of public transport is not about connecting rail lines; it is about understanding how all modes interconnect. We have to understand exactly how heavy rail connects with the bus network and the light rail network; we need to understand how the roads connect with car parking; and we have to understand what the cycle networks are. That is what members opposite do not understand; for them, integrated transport is connecting all the rail lines, and that is only part of the puzzle. They have failed to understand that, and they are misleading the people of Western Australia when they say that they believe they have a solution for public transport.

I am very proud of the fact that we are going to get on and deliver the Forrestfield–Airport Link. This is a great thing for the eastern suburbs and it has taken this government to ensure that we focus on the eastern suburbs and not just on the north–south corridor. On that basis, I commend the bill to the house.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.