

GRAIN FREIGHT NETWORK — FUNDING

925. Hon KEN TRAVERS to the Minister for Transport:

I refer to the government's announcement yesterday that it has allocated funding for the grain rail network.

- (1) Can the minister table the following —
 - (a) a list of each railway line that will receive funding and the amount it will receive;
 - (b) a list of each road that will receive funding and the amount it will receive;
 - (c) for each road that will receive funding, the standard it will be built to; and
 - (d) for each tier 3 line, the purpose of the funding?
- (2) What value is placed on a human life in assessing road versus rail options for this funding?

Hon Simon O'Brien: What?

Hon KEN TRAVERS: If the minister looks at his externalities, he does! So have a look at that.

The PRESIDENT: Order! That section of the question is out of order.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: On what basis, Mr President?

The PRESIDENT: It is out of order. The member should have a look at standing order 140.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Mr President, the government had a review that included externalities, and the value of a human life was one of the externalities calculated. I would have thought that for me to ask what was the value attached to that—because that is not included in the report but is referred to in the report as part of the calculations—is not —

The PRESIDENT: It contains certain imputations.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: It is not an imputation.

The PRESIDENT: Order! That is my ruling. If you wish to take it further, then it is up to you.

Point of Order

Hon SUE ELLERY: I respect the fact that you have had made an order, Mr President. I wonder if you might provide us with some reasons for determining that that which Hon Ken Travers has described as one of the externalities is indeed an imputation.

The PRESIDENT: The reasons are contained in standing order 140.

Hon SUE ELLERY: Which I have before me, with the greatest of respect, Mr President. And I heard you just refer to “imputations” and I am wondering how you draw the conclusion that what the honourable member as described as “one of the externalities” constitutes an imputation.

The PRESIDENT: Order! “Inferences” and “imputations” are contained in standing order 140, and that is the basis that that section of the question is out of order.

Would the member like to ask the rest of his question?

Hon Norman Moore: You know the process if you want to do anything about it.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: And I am seriously considering it, Hon Norman Moore. It is not something that I would do lightly but —

The PRESIDENT: Order! The member knows the process, if he wants to engage the process. You either go down that path or you ask the rest of your question.

Questions without Notice Resumed

Hon KEN TRAVERS:

- (3) How much new money has been allocated by cabinet for this project and how much is from funding previously allocated to a government agency, and which projects was it allocated to?

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN replied:

I thank the honourable member for some notice of this question.

- (1) (a)–(b) I provided the line information in my ministerial statement this morning.

- (c) Seven metres sealed with the local roads, and eight metres sealed with the state roads; and nominal standard built-to-fit for purpose use.
- (d) No funding was allocated for re-sleepering of tier 3 lines; and funds allocated to tier 3 lines were allocated to the transition assistance package.

Mr President, I will not provide an answer to (2) as you have ruled it out of order.

- (3) \$178.8 million —

Hon Ken Travers: You have one, don't you, because it was in the report?

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: \$178.8 million is new allocation; \$38.3 million was previously allocated in the 2009–10 budget, providing \$30 million for rail works and \$8.3 million for the transitional assistance package.

Mr President, if I can correct that; it would be the 2010–11 budget.