

**TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE — PLANNING AND EXPENDITURE**

*Motion*

**HON KEN TRAVERS (North Metropolitan)** [10.39 am] — without notice: I move —

That this Council condemns the Barnett government for its failure to budget to ensure adequate transport infrastructure for the future due to its —

- (a) insufficient planning and expenditure on public transport; and
- (b) misplaced priorities for statewide infrastructure establishment.

This government clearly has its priorities wrong for infrastructure expenditure and as a result it has completely neglected investment in public transport and roads across Western Australia. It has made its focus a number of projects in the CBD of Perth, such as the Perth Waterfront, Riverside, Perth City Link, the new stadium and the new Museum. Although they may be worthwhile projects, the simple fact is that the state cannot afford to do all of them at the same time and to meet the demands of a growing state that is seeing not only population growth, but an exponential growth in the number of vehicles using our roads and people using our public transport. Across those projects we are talking somewhere in the order of \$2 billion to \$3 billion worth of expenditure that is available for that investment in transport infrastructure. The Perth Waterfront project is a worthy project, but it is also an extravagant project as this government is developing it. We have seen that not only will it spend \$440 million on the waterfront project alone, with no guaranteed land sales to recoup any of that money at this stage, but it has also had to increase expenditure by adding another \$105 million to try to mitigate the traffic congestion that will be caused on the roads right around the CBD of Perth as a result of the bad decision to close Riverside Drive. We still do not know the full effect of that closure on other roads in South Perth, in Burswood or in Victoria Park. We do not know how it will affect people coming into the city from places such as Forrestfield.

**Hon Adele Farina:** Haven't they done a traffic management plan?

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** The government has, but it will not release the results of the modelling, so we do not know what other interventions will be required as people come into the city down Fitzgerald Street from areas such as Ballajura. What congestion will they face at the intersection with James Street as all that extra traffic that comes out of the tunnel tries to manage that very narrow roadway? That is the government's priority. At the expense of that, there are hundreds of roads to address across regional Western Australia, the roads that service very important towns and regional cities of Western Australia, and there is a real lack of public transport in the Perth metropolitan area.

I recently attended the WA Transport and Roads Forum of the Western Australian Local Government Association. At that forum I put up some pictures of the state of Quairading–York Road, a very important road in this state that is having extra traffic on it as a result of a bad decision of this government to close the tier 3 rail lines. As a result of the closure and reopening, we have already seen more traffic occurring by way of trucks over rail. Even though the government belatedly reopened the rail system for another year, that confusion has led to more trucks on the roads. Quairading–York Road is in a very bad state of disrepair. After I showed photos of that road at the WALGA conference, it was a bit like a scene out of *Crocodile Dundee*. Local government CEOs, councillors and everyone else were coming up to me and saying, “If you think that's bad, come and see our roads.” Our roads right across Western Australia are in funding decline. Towns across Western Australia require bypasses. If people go to Kununurra, they will see that a bypass is needed. A study was commenced by the previous Labor government to develop the plans for the Kununurra bypass. Do we see anything in the current budget? Have we seen any proposals put to the commonwealth to assist in the funding of the Kununurra bypass? No. Go to York; go to Toodyay; go to Narrogin—many members on the government side represent these areas—and ask whether the people want bypasses. The work commenced by the previous Labor government has been put on hold since the election of the Liberal–National government. Drive down the Albany Highway and talk to anyone who lives in Albany and they will say it needs upgrading and it needs more passing lanes. Why is that not happening? It is not happening because this government is putting all the money into those CBD projects I talked about earlier.

I will take a bit of time to go through the budget for Main Roads. I have gone back and looked at the budget papers since 2001 to compare the expenditure on roads in Western Australia. For the benefit of members who may not have the same interest in roads that I do, there are two types of road expenditure: there is recurrent road expenditure and there is the capital on new works, or asset investment as it is called today. On top of that there are a number of sources of funding for road expenditure. Firstly, there is the appropriation of the state government budget money. The second source is through the Road Traffic Act. When we all pay our motor

Hon Ken Travers; Hon Simon O'Brien; Deputy President; Hon Adele Farina; Hon Phil Edman; Hon Philip Gardiner; Hon Lynn MacLaren

---

vehicle licence fees, a component of that goes to the funding of roads in Western Australia. Finally, the third source—which is predominantly for the capital, but there is also a contribution towards maintenance—is from the commonwealth government.

What do we find when we start to look at the expenditure on roads under this government? The first thing we notice is that the government promised it would spend money on roads and it failed to deliver it; it is unable to deliver what it budgets in each year. We have only to look at expenditure on the capital appropriation it expected to spend last year. In the 2011–12 budget the government thought it was going to spend \$214 million, but it spent \$160 million. The year before, it thought it was going to spend \$150 million, but it spent \$114 million. I have to give credit to the minister who represents Transport in this place. When Hon Simon O'Brien was Minister for Transport, he budgeted to spend \$277 million and he actually got closer—he got to \$263 million. When he was the minister, he was able to get close to meeting what he estimated. A lot of credit has to be given to Hon Alannah MacTiernan for roadworks, because planning for roadworks often has to be done two to three years ahead. The person responsible has to be in front of the game. Since then, in the last couple of years, we have seen that funding has declined. The next thing to look at is the comparison of expenditure on new roads in Western Australia between the previous government and the current government. In the period of 2009 to 2013, this government expects to appropriate \$770 million for roads. Looking forward in the budget that was brought down last week, the government is predicting to spend only \$533 million on roads. The important thing to remember, though, is how that compares with what the Labor Party spent on new roads when it was in government. That figure is \$818 million. Back then, we were spending, in those —

**Hon Simon O'Brien:** Over what period was that?

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** That was between 2004 and 2008. Members will note that I have left out 2008–09. I could quite rightfully have claimed that period has expenditure effectively committed by Labor. The projects were in train and there was \$340-odd million in that period. I have left that out of the figures; it would have inflated the figure of the Labor Party's road expenditure even higher—this was new capital works.

**Hon Simon O'Brien:** You had the Bunbury highway project.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Minister, it does not matter whether it was the new Bunbury highway, it does not matter whether it was the first —

**Hon Simon O'Brien** interjected.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I have only limited time. It does not matter whether it was the new Perth–Bunbury highway or stage 1 of the Narrogin bypass, roads were getting built when Labor was in power and they are not getting built, other than with commonwealth money, under this government. Let us look at another thing about this in terms of the money, to give an idea of what growth has happened in that time. I have to admit that a lot more money is going into roads as a result of the funding that comes from the Road Traffic Act. In 2004, we collected \$302 million under the Road Traffic Act to spend on roads. By 2010–11 that figure had grown 74 per cent to \$528 million, and in 2015–16 it will have grown to \$704 million. That money is going into the maintenance projects required on our roads—I acknowledge that—but that money is being spent because we pay for it; the families of Western Australia pay for it out of their motor vehicle registration. But has the government matched in recurrent expenditure the amount of money that is being spent on roads? The answer is no, it has not. In 2010–11 the government estimated it would spend \$162 million on recurrent expenditure on roads, but it spent \$145 million. Do members know that in the whole time Labor was in government, our appropriation for road expenditure was less than \$145 million in only one year? With money that we took out of the consolidated account and put into road funding, in only one year did we get that expenditure up, but it was below what the government spent in the 2010–11 financial year. That was in 2006–07. In every other year, going back to 2001, Labor spent more money on Western Australian roads. The important issue is how much this state government is appropriating. I could highlight that we are getting more money for roads than ever before from the commonwealth government. If people drive around Western Australia and see roadworks, they might question why I am saying that the government is not spending money on roads. The commonwealth government is spending money on our roads. However, this state government is walking away from road expenditure.

Several members interjected.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** The figures are there. You know you have hit a button when members opposite get excited. They should look at the budget. I challenge all of them to look at the state appropriation for recurrent expenditure and the state appropriation for capital works. If they do that, they will see that under this government it is declining in real terms and in actual dollar terms. In the last year of the budget, the government will appropriate \$7 million for new roadworks—\$7 million!

**Hon Simon O'Brien:** That's not this year, is it?

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** No. This year the government is spending less than Labor ever spent. If people drive to the Great Eastern Highway and Roe Highway interchange, they will see roadworks funded by the commonwealth government. If they travel along Great Eastern Highway, they will see roadworks, 80 per cent of which have been funded by the commonwealth. This government's expenditure on roads has been declining. There is also a bit of trickiness in this, because it said that it would put red light money into roads for road safety. However, it has cut black spot funding to do so. That is the sort of game played by this government. Regional roads have been neglected. Members can see evidence of that in any regional electorate in Western Australia. I find it extraordinary that the National Party has sat by during all of this. It used to always want the transport portfolio when it was in a coalition government. It has not wanted the transport portfolio in this government. The government has not spent money on roads and it has allowed the Liberal–National government to put a lot of transport infrastructure money into the central business district of Perth at the expense of regional roads across Western Australia.

I turn now to public transport. There has also been a dramatic reduction in the expenditure to expand the capacity of the public transport system. When the Labor Party was in power, it spent, in real dollar terms, about \$3 billion on expanding the capacity of public transport. This government, by its own admission and using its own figures, claims it is spending \$1.5 billion. However, of the \$1.5 billion that is being spent, \$500 million is for bus replacement contracts and \$600 million—which includes a \$236 million commonwealth contribution—is for the Perth City Link project. The Perth City Link project might be a worthy urban renewal project, but it will do nothing to expand the capacity of our public transport system. That yet again symbolises the government's fixation with public transport. How do we know that public transport is not performing at the level at which we would like it to perform? We can look at the government's statistics. We found out earlier that the reliability of buses had declined from 79 per cent in March last year to 74 per cent in March this year; in other words, one in four Perth buses is running late. They are not running late because more roadworks are going on. In fact, the peak time for road congestion in the Perth CBD was about two years ago when buses were being delayed. At the time the government said it was only a blip. However, whereas the reliability of buses in April last year was 83 per cent, this April it dropped to 74 per cent. Again, one in four Perth buses is running late.

The other test is to determine whether the government is expanding capacity to keep up with population growth. The government claims in the public transport budget that the proportion of street addresses within the public transport area that are within 500 metres of a Transperth stop providing an exceptional level of service is 85 per cent. The interesting thing is that the Department of Planning also does measures in terms of the budget outcomes. It says that its target for people in the metropolitan region living within 10 minutes of a major public transport route—within a 10-minute walk to a bus stop—was 91 per cent last financial year. It expects to achieve 81 per cent, which is a decline from the previous year of 89 per cent. Fewer and fewer Western Australians live near public transport. The government is not expending enough money on expanding that capacity. I could talk about railway stations and the fact that the Department of Planning wants to have at least 36 per cent of people living near a railway station. It has achieved only 33 per cent, which is down from 36 per cent the previous year. Again, that highlights the fact that the government is not expanding the system to keep up with population growth.

What is the government doing? The government is looking to see how much more money it can fleece from Western Australian families. Buried in the budget—the government did not make a big announcement about this one—is a fare revenue review. As a result of that fare revenue review, the government now expects to get an additional \$111 million in anticipated fare revenue between 2011–12 and 2015–16.

**Hon Simon O'Brien:** Could that be through a growth in passenger numbers by any chance?

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** That might be part of it, minister.

**Hon Simon O'Brien:** It's the bulk of it.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** It might be a bit of the money coming into the —

**Hon Simon O'Brien:** Whoops—there's an own goal!

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I have limited time.

It might include some of the money that is coming into the budget as a result of the Perth parking tax being re-spent. However, in the next financial year it expects to get an extra \$18 million in revenue from public transport. That might be as a result of population projections. If it is a result of population projections, it is not because it has put on extra capacity. Twelve months ago it decided to add extra buses and trains. The trains have not been delivered. The buses are arriving, but still there is not enough. That does not make up for somewhere in the order of a 10.9 per cent jump, which is what that \$18 million represents. As a percentage of the total fare box, a 10.9 per cent jump is more than passenger growth. What we need to know is how the government expects to get

the additional revenue. In the out years of the budget, the government expects a 19 per cent growth in the fare revenue that the government is collecting. It is not increasing capacity by 19 per cent. Clearly, it is intending to jam more people onto buses and trains and to take their money—or it intends to increase fares above the consumer price index over the forward estimates. That is the untold story of the budget.

I could have talked about a range of other issues today. One of the ways the government thinks it can increase capacity on our trains is to take out all the seats, which is what passengers like, and to reinstall longitudinal seats. The government thinks it can jam more people in. I watched trains leaving Subiaco the other day. People do not want to stand, because there is nothing to hold on to. For me it is not a problem, but not everyone is my height and can put their hand on the roof. This government has neglected the transport budget in favour of the CBD.

Several members interjected.

**HON SIMON O'BRIEN (South Metropolitan — Minister for Finance)** [10.58 am]: You have to hand it to the mover of this motion—he is always full of surprises. This motion is as scattergun as it gets. I had no idea what he wanted to talk about when I prepared for the motion. He has taken a scattergun approach. Apparently, there has been a failure to budget to ensure adequate transport infrastructure. I had to wait until this morning to find out where Hon Ken Travers would direct his accusations. He spoke about insufficient planning in public transport. What Hon Ken Travers did talk about were some allegations, which are just that—allegations. I advise Hon Ken Travers that he needs to do some homework before he gets up in this place and talks about matters on which he is clearly out of touch. One of those matters is bus service capacity, which he spoke about in his closing remarks. He said that we are not increasing the capacity of the bus network. That is an absolute fabrication! It is a blind allegation that is quite unsustainable.

The fact of the matter is that we announced in a former budget a very big increase in the total bus inventory in Western Australia that is designed to meet current gaps in the network and future needs and to build capacity in existing key routes and secondary routes. That is a matter of fact. How do I know? Because I was the minister who put that up through the cabinet and budget processes. In terms of the bus network, there are a number of ways in which service can be measured. One way is service kilometres. The increase in bus service kilometres has been absolutely staggering. Indeed, in the current financial year it will increase by over six per cent and it will increase by over five per cent in the following year. Indeed, it will increase by over 30 per cent over the life of this government, both in terms of our current achievements and over the out years. That is a massive increase. We can compare that with the performance of the ALP in government, when buses were a very distant second in terms of priority. If the member wants to dispute this, fine, let us have a debate about that matter, but I am not going to allow him to stand up in here and make blind accusations that we have been neglecting bus capacities. What we are doing right now certainly compares more than favourably with Labor's record in government. That is a fact.

The member's motion makes a sweeping statement about insufficient planning. Again, it is this government that is actually doing the planning. There is a lot still to be done. Why? Because of the backlog we inherited when we came to government. There was no plan. There was no Department of Transport. I had to create one. We had to take the wreckage of the Department of Planning and Infrastructure and re-create transport planning capacity in this state so that we could get on with the sorts of jobs that are needed and are being called for by industry and others. We have committed to the planning for a light rail network. No other government has done that. We have identified it and we are getting on and doing it. There is funding in this budget, as there was in the previous budget. That planning is proceeding now. The bus priority measures that have been announced in association with the CBD transport plan are further evidence of a government that has been planning and continues to plan, and, more importantly, is actually introducing additional services, whether for the CBD, the suburbs or throughout the state.

The member made a range of fairly imprecise but sweeping and generalised statements about how to read the budget. All that shows is that there are a number of ways in which figures can be interpreted. It reminds me of the early days of this government when I was looking at the first budget we had to construct. I was transport minister at the time. The Main Roads Western Australia area of the budget contains a number of service delivery areas, including road construction. What does that mean? It means putting asphalt and what have you on roads. It means road maintenance. What does that mean? That means rebuilding roads and putting asphalt down. It means road safety. What does that mean? It means, from Main Roads' point of view, rearranging the asphalt or rebuilding roads. Everything is about roads and engineering works on roads. I was bemused to see a project that the former Labor government had hailed in its budget as part of its target for the previous year or year before in the road safety expenditure area. How had it done that? It had taken a whole lot of new road that had been built and called it a road safety initiative, because it would contribute to safety by having a better bit of road in this locality! That is the sort of smoke and mirrors trick that the former government was getting up to. They are still alive to it now in opposition, trying to misrepresent figures —

**Hon Ken Travers:** Do you deny you cut black spot funding?

**Hon SIMON O'BRIEN:** Here we go; a bit of creative accounting to move around —

**Hon Ken Travers:** Do you deny it?

**Hon SIMON O'BRIEN:** Of course I deny it.

**Hon Ken Travers:** He doesn't deny it! Let the *Hansard* record show that.

**Hon SIMON O'BRIEN:** Hang on, I am doing this speech.

**Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich** interjected.

**Hon SIMON O'BRIEN:** Gee, they do not like it when they are caught out! They want to turn around and make other sweeping allegations. If Hon Ken Travers wants to bring forward any allegation, something specific for once, he should bring on a specific debate and we will have that debate.

**Hon Ken Travers:** Have you cut black spot funding in the Main Roads budget? It was \$75 million last year and is \$45 million this year.

**The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm):** Order, members! I have allowed a bit of interjection. I think you are going a bit far now.

**Hon SIMON O'BRIEN:** Any time Hon Ken Travers wants to have a specific debate, he should bring it up during estimates. Whatever Hon Ken Travers likes; we can go through those matters in detail. But he should not use up my time with his particular —

**Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich:** Tell us: have you cut black spot funding?

**Hon SIMON O'BRIEN:** Mr Deputy President.

**Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich:** That is specific. You have invited us.

**The DEPUTY PRESIDENT:** The Minister for Finance has the call.

**Hon SIMON O'BRIEN:** The gall of this opposition is quite breathtaking. All they seem to have is the capacity to put up sweeping statements, nonspecific motions —

**Hon Ken Travers:** I quoted figures from the budget.

**Hon SIMON O'BRIEN:** Where is it? If Hon Ken Travers is going to talk about black spot funding, why not have a debate about it?

**Hon Ken Travers:** Your budget is so bad we had to do the totality of it.

**Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich** interjected.

**Hon SIMON O'BRIEN:** Mr Deputy President, this is just screaming from the opposition.

**The DEPUTY PRESIDENT:** Order, members! It is bad enough listening to a couple of interjections but three or four at the one time is a bit too much for me and it must be for Hansard.

**Hon SIMON O'BRIEN:** The motion that this opposition has brought forward today is very sweeping, general and imprecise. What it talks about —

**Hon Helen Bullock:** You have said that already; move on!

**Hon SIMON O'BRIEN:** Post-preselection, some of them have finally found a voice, Mr Deputy President! They are buoyed. They have got great prospects in the future.

The motion talks about insufficient planning and misplaced priorities. The mover of this motion has got a scattergun approach. Let us talk about some of the things he raised. He spoke in passing about the grain rail network. Apparently, we failed to budget there. I do not think so. We have allocated a nine-figure sum. How much did the former government allocate? Zero; absolutely zero! I will tell members where Labor did not spend any money, and that was on the York–Quairading road.

**Hon Nigel Hallett:** The Collie road.

**Hon SIMON O'BRIEN:** They took money out of the Collie road. That is the other aspect about this quasi-motion. It talks about a failure to budget. It talks about misplaced priorities. Again, the Court government embarked on a process of fixing our roads. That is something we are very proud of. I served in this place with former transport ministers Charlton and Criddle. I still value them as friends. They were doing a great job in setting up the future for road maintenance and enhancement of our road network right across the state, including in the wheatbelt areas.

Hon Ken Travers; Hon Simon O'Brien; Deputy President; Hon Adele Farina; Hon Phil Edman; Hon Philip Gardiner; Hon Lynn MacLaren

---

When Labor took office, what did it do? It slashed the lot. It took funding in the out years away from the Collie highway. Heaven only knows what they spent it on, but they took it out of there. As minister, what did I do? I took money from elsewhere in the Main Roads budget to reallocate it to the Collie highway. Why? Because if we had not done that, in my judgement, people would have died. I did that. What is a misplaced priority in that, and how does that compare with what those opposite have to offer?

I found some money, which I reallocated—I think it might have been from the Greenbushes area—after extensive consultation with those in that area. We reallocated it to the Chester Pass Road—another road that had been denuded of its funding by the former Labor government. I as transport minister took a decision to put it back, because as I discussed with the then Commissioner of Main Roads, if we did not do that—that is, invest that essential money in Chester Pass Road; money that had been denied all through the Labor years—again, it was likely that people were going to die. So much for misplaced priorities.

We have built in capacity for planning and we are budgeting to ensure that we have the transport infrastructure for the future. Opposition members are all at sixes and sevens. They do not know whether to criticise us because nothing is happening, or to criticise us because of roadworks that are temporarily adding to congestion, such as on the Kwinana Freeway south. They will be complaining about it on the Mitchell Freeway north. That is one thing a Labor government will never do: spend a cent on the Mitchell Freeway. We are the ones who are expanding the capacity north along the Mitchell Freeway. That is a priority. That is in the budget.

**Hon Ken Travers** interjected.

**Hon SIMON O'BRIEN:** We are obviously striking a few nerves here.

**Hon Ken Travers:** Only because you are misrepresenting the facts. You go and check who built the Mitchell Freeway—in which government it was built.

**Hon SIMON O'BRIEN:** The honourable member is again trying to use sweeping generalisations as a substitute to facing up to the truth. The truth is that this government is investing in capital works. The claim that we are failing to budget is extraordinarily misplaced. If the honourable member wants to simply rely on his budget papers, let us look at a few figures in them. Let us look at the capital works and asset investment proportions of our budget, and we can talk about our failure to invest once they have digested that. Tell us about our misplaced —

**Hon Ken Travers:** I did. I quoted the figures—\$700 million compared to \$800 million under us and going to \$500 million over a four-year period.

**Hon SIMON O'BRIEN:** The member's creative accounting is not really impressing anyone. This is just the same as when we came into office and discovered the truth about all the moneys that the opposition has said were there that were not there—the inadequate moneys that the opposition claimed were there for projects into the future. When we got into office, there was not enough money to do any of them.

**HON ADELE FARINA (South West) [11.15 am]:** I am pleased to speak in support of the motion and congratulate Hon Ken Travers for bringing this important matter to the attention of the house. The big visionary item in the Barnett government's fourth budget was a future fund—a fund that, contrary to providing for the future as claimed, saddles future generations with massive cost pressures because the critical infrastructure needs of the here and now are not being met by the Barnett government. We are being led to believe that these will be taken care of in the future, but can we wait 20 years to get these critical infrastructure projects underway? The answer is no. We will cripple the economic development of this state by deferring spending on critical infrastructure projects. The budget is nothing but a set of contradictions. The government is creating a future fund—a paltry one at that—while at the same time increasing debt by billions.

The Leader of the Opposition has provided an explanation in the other place that I want to share here. In 2016 the future fund will be creating \$55 million in net interest, while this government's poor economic mismanagement will leave taxpayers paying \$1.15 billion in net interest cost. Any Economics 101 student will say that this makes absolutely no economic sense. Any Economics 101 student will tell you that investment in infrastructure and business today drives the economic success of tomorrow. But these are basic concepts the Barnett government does not understand.

The Chamber of Commerce and Industry understands these basic concepts and have been critical of the timing of the government's future fund and how it has been structured. We are depriving ourselves today of large important infrastructure for the future in order to provide a revenue stream in 20 years, which in today's terms is 0.5 per cent of the total budget. It makes no sense to create a tiny savings account when we are increasing our borrowings by billions each year. To add insult to injury, taxpayers in the regions are incurring double the pain. Money that is royalties money, of which 25 per cent should be being paid in the royalties for regions fund, is being used to create the future fund. This is money that Brendon Grylls promised the regions, but the regions are

fast learning and understanding that Brendon Grylls has kept few of his royalties for regions promises and he is dudding the regions.

The great marketing that surrounded royalties for regions is fast wearing off. To compound this further, not only is future fund money being stolen from the regions, but also when we finally get access to the fund in 20 years, the regions will have to compete with the metropolitan area to access those funds. We all know that in a competition between the metropolitan area and the regions, the regions always—always—miss out. The regions are being robbed and can expect to diddly-squat from the future fund. The regions are crying out for more critical infrastructure spend. We need to invest in our regions today to grow our regions and to provide them with the sound economic footing for the future. WA is facing severe infrastructure demands, as is the south west, on which I intend to focus for the remainder of my remarks.

The south west, particularly along the coast, has for more than 10 years experienced massive population growth pressures. The rate of population growth has been higher than the national and state averages. This has placed enormous pressure on existing services and infrastructures; they are at breaking point. The population growth rate is projected to continue well into the future, making investment in services and infrastructure in the south west is a critical funding priority. Yet the south west has been ignored by the Barnett government. Government investment has failed to keep pace with the population growth and the pressures on existing services and infrastructure. In fact, the only spend by the Barnett government on critical infrastructure in the south west has been to complete projects committed to by the last Labor government. The Barnett government's record for the south west is dismal.

Let me turn to the "Roads for Export" document. It is a document all members know very well, because I have discussed it on numerous occasions in this house. In fact, every occasion I get up, I raise this issue. In 2009 the South West Development Commission, the Bunbury Port Authority, the Chamber of Minerals and Energy, the Bunbury Wellington Economic Alliance and the City of Bunbury examined the relationship between the forecast growth of exports through the Bunbury port and the associated freight tasks. The "Roads for Export" document developed from this formed a sound and compelling business case bid to state and federal governments for infrastructure funding. The infrastructure need comprises completion of the port access road, completion of the Bunbury outer ring-road, the completion and upgrade of the Coalfields highway, completion of the second railway line from Brunswick Junction to the port and the diversion of the Preston River. All these projects are linked and are critical to the continued economic development of the region.

In 2009, 2010 and 2011, and now in 2012, these organisations have been lobbying the Barnett government hard for funding for these critical infrastructure projects and have been making a sound and compelling case for an urgent spend on these projects. That is a cry that Infrastructure Australia and the federal government heard and understood but were unable to commit to, because the projects were not identified as funding priorities by the Barnett government. Perhaps these organisations need to pay \$25 000 into the leaders' campaign for the Liberal Party in order to be heard, because they certainly are not being heard, despite the fact that they have provided a compelling business case. The Barnett government has chosen to ignore the sound and compelling argument that the federal government has understood, and has continued to ignore the south west.

This budget was the last opportunity for the Barnett government to make amends to the south west community during this term of government, and it blew it. With the exception of Treendale Primary School, no new critical infrastructure projects in the south west have been funded in this year's budget. These critical infrastructure projects require an urgent funding commitment to provide for the current and future economic development of the region and the state, and they have been ignored. But the sorry story does not end there. The south west is a major export area. We have product that needs to travel by road to Fremantle port, because Bunbury port is at capacity. Ships are stranded off Bunbury for weeks on end, waiting for a berth, and that is costing industry millions of dollars. Bunbury port has developed an expansion plan and a strong business case in support of that plan; yet in consecutive budgets, the Barnett government has failed to fund the expansion of Bunbury port, refused to allow the port to borrow to complete this critically needed expansion work, and refused to allow the port to use its own savings to progress the proposal and get the environment assessments under way. This is an economic travesty. It is crippling economic development in the region, denying the creation of jobs in the region, costing industry millions, and forcing more freight onto our road—roads that are struggling to cope.

Road spending in regional WA is at an all-time low, as Hon Ken Travers has pointed out. Critical road projects such as the ones I have mentioned, and the upgrading of South Western Highway, a road identified by the RAC as a high priority, the dualling of Bussell Highway between Bunbury and Margaret River, a road that, like South Western Highway, carries a dangerously high mix of heavy traffic vehicles, local traffic and tourist traffic, and the Margaret River perimeter road, are a few of the roads that have been ignored over four consecutive Barnett budgets. There many more roads in the south west, too many to mention, that have failed to secure funding under the Barnett government and for which there is no funding plan in the forward estimates. This is a disgrace.

I now turn briefly to the Perth–Bunbury fast train. If the Barnett government wanted to be visionary and was genuinely committed to the region and to developing Bunbury into the state's second city, as it claims, it would have funded this project, but it did not. The government dragged its feet on completing the feasibility study commissioned by the last Labor government and has now consigned that project to the too-hard basket. That is nothing new for Liberal governments; they have a poor track record in investing in public transport. The Barnett government has no vision for the south west, no infrastructure for the south west and no public transport plan for the south west, and it needs to be condemned for its failure to deliver in respect of all three.

The Barnett government has failed to grow rail transport in the region, both freight and passenger; there is no funding for a fast train; and there is no funding to improve the *Australind* service to better provide for the needs of the south west. There has been no investment in growing our public transport services in the south west in towns such as Bunbury, which is desperately crying out for improved public transport, not only between towns in the south west, but also between the region and Perth. Despite population growth pressures, the need to grow the service has been ignored. At best, the government has shuffled the deck chairs on the *Titanic*, taking or restricting services from some areas in order to provide a very basic and inadequate service in other areas. That is a disgrace. We need a south west infrastructure plan, and we need a south west public transport plan. These are critically needed. This government has failed to plan for the transport needs of the south west and to fund these projects in a timely manner, and it must be condemned for this failure.

**The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon Brian Ellis):** Members, before I give the call to Hon Phil Edman, I will indicate the speakers in order: Hon Phil Gardiner, Hon Lynn MacLaren and Hon Helen Bullock.

**Hon Sue Ellery:** No, you can't do that! It's supposed to be shared.

**The DEPUTY PRESIDENT:** I have been going across the chamber.

**HON PHIL EDMAN (South Metropolitan) [11.24 am]:** I want to talk a bit about what the Barnett government has been doing in the South Metropolitan Region. But, before I start, I would like to correct a few things in relation to what the member for Rockingham and the Australian Labor Party have done in the Rockingham area. I remember quite well in 2006 when the then Howard federal government gave the council of the City of Rockingham some \$6.7 million of AusLink funding—which was basically wired straight into its bank account—so that it could get on with building the extension to Mundijong Road. That was fantastic news. At that time, the member for Rockingham, Mark McGowan, was a minister, but he was also chair of the Rockingham Kwinana Development Office. One of the priorities for that development office was to get on with the extension of that road. However, for the whole time that the member for Rockingham was chair of that development office, nothing was done. It was very disappointing that nothing was done. That commonwealth money was sitting in that council's bank account, doing absolutely nothing, when the member for Rockingham, the then chair of the development office, should have been working hard to get the Western Australian Planning Commission to buy the different sections of land that had to be bought in order to build that road. But he did nothing. When the Barnett government was elected and I became a member of this place, one of the things that had to be done was to find a new chair for that development office, and, lucky me, I got that job. So I guess going into that position and grabbing the chair —

**Hon Simon O'Brien:** You were better than the last one, I think!

**Hon PHIL EDMAN:** I thought, "This is great. I will just carry on from where the member for Rockingham left off. I am sure he has done a lot of work in relation to infrastructure to do with this road, so there could not be much for me to do, surely". However, I found out that nothing had been done whatsoever and that the City of Rockingham and our government came close to losing that money—which is now close to \$7 million, because it has earned interest—by having to give it back to the commonwealth. So, in an absolute panic, we had to very quickly try to find funds to get this road plan through the Western Australian Planning Commission, and people from the City of Rockingham had to desperately fly to Canberra to obtain an extension of that AusLink funding.

I find that appalling. Fair enough, the member for Rockingham is now the leader of the Labor Party. But this is his own electorate. This is the bit I cannot understand. What frustrates me is that I was not even a member of the Liberal Party at the time. I did not even want to get involved in this game. I had a flourishing business, building kitchens for everybody in Western Australia, and I did not even want to get involved. But I sat there as a resident in Rockingham, watching the ALP, the former member for Brand, and Mark McGowan, and just watching the place self-destruct. It must have been because it was such a safe Labor area—well, it was a safe Labor area on the federal level—that it was being bypassed. That is what activated me to get involved. So, before members opposite start chucking stones and rocks at us, they should have a look at the leader of their own party and at what he did in his own electorate in relation to Mundijong Road.

We had a debate in this place not so long ago when we moved a motion to lift the A-class reservation on this land. I thank the members on the other side for supporting us in that motion—the Greens (WA) did not—and for getting that A-class reservation lifted. I think we need to be mindful of some of the things that happened in the past. The former Court government extended the Kwinana Freeway to Safety Bay Road, which was fantastic. People can drive all the way down Safety Bay Road and it will bring them into the City of Rockingham. Do members know what the member for Rockingham did with his friend the member for Warnbro? There is an entrance statement to our beautiful city at the roundabout, which was proposed to be the site of a much-needed school. What did the member for Rockingham do? He supported the construction of a substation, which is an eyesore. People had bought land, built a house and were raising their families in the area on the promise that a school would be built for their children, but Labor built a substation. That is what happened to the beautiful Safety Bay Road, which is the entrance for the city. We got a substation. Very soon we will build the Mundijong Road extension and have the decent entrance statement that we deserve. I hope that whenever members opposite get back into power they do not stuff up that entrance statement by putting in a chimney stack. Keep it beautiful so that people are attracted to come to our city.

The Rockingham train station was supposed to be located in the city centre. That is what the Court government promised and that is what we were going to get. However, it was taken away from us by the Labor Party, which moved it two kilometres away from the city centre. The member for Rockingham would not lobby or do anything about that. Do members know what the City of Rockingham had to do? It had to employ Brian Burke and Julian Grill to lobby their own member. The City of Rockingham had to pay lobbyists to get the train station relocated back into the city centre.

**Hon Simon O'Brien:** Did they email him at all?

**Hon PHIL EDMAN:** It is well publicised. This is well before I became a member of Parliament. I looked at our city and wondered why the member for Rockingham was failing us and why my ratepayer's contribution had to be spent on employing Brian Burke and Julian Grill to lobby the member for Rockingham so that we could get our train station relocated, which the Liberal Court government promised would be in the city centre. Let us not forget the past. Members can see how quiet members opposite are. They are quiet because they know that I am right. Our government is not only getting on with building the Mundijong Road extension, but also widening Kwinana Freeway. Many of my constituents are frustrated with traffic congestion on the freeway. Hopefully those works will be finished very soon, which should ease some of the congestion. That was announced by our government.

In the budget was an announcement that \$10 million would be allocated for the Murdoch Drive intersection and that the Murdoch activity centre would be upgraded. I am not saying that there is not more that needs to be done. A lot more needs to be done. It is never-ending with this city and this state. This place is just growing. When I came here from Newcastle back in 1976, which is where Mark McGowan was born, I could not believe just how fast the place was growing. It is incredible, and it will never stop. A lot more needs to be done. As a member of this government whose office resides in Rockingham I will continue to lobby this government for train stations, more roads and better facilities and amenities. The one thing I love about this government is that it listens. We do not have to employ lobbyists or carry on like a pork chop to try to get the member for Rockingham or the soon-to-be former member for Brand to get off their hands to bring the necessary infrastructure to our town.

**Hon Ken Travers** interjected.

**Hon PHIL EDMAN:** Hon Ken Travers should read the book called *Power Plays* by Laurie Oakes. There is a chapter in that book called "Rorts and All" in which members will find a bit about the Australian Labor Party and me. Get it out from the library and read it; the member might learn something about people who get annoyed when the Labor Party does not deliver and people like me join the Liberal Party to get a better deal for our city and towns because members of the Labor Party sit on their hands and do not want to help out. It is absolute laziness. Why was the Labor Party lazy? It is because Brand was a safe Labor seat. It ain't anymore because our candidate, Donna Gordin, will beat Gary Gray and finally Brand will be a Liberal seat.

**HON PHILIP GARDINER (Agricultural) [11.36 am]:** I do not rise to support the motion to condemn the minister. Nonetheless, we can always improve, no matter where we are. I will talk about something that is of great concern to me as a Western Australian. It may not be well known among members that this state has one of the highest road tolls in the world. A report done by the Office of Road Safety's strategy Towards Zero Western Australia, which was written by the police and RACWA media offices, shows that Western Australia has a death rate on the roads that is higher than Greece, Thailand, Slovenia and western countries such as the UK, Netherlands, Sweden and Norway. The death rate on the roads in the non-metropolitan area of Western Australia is 21 per 100 000. The wheatbelt zone, as they have defined it, is the worst of all with 34 deaths per 100 000. When we have a death rate like that, we must try to work out how to reduce it, because it is too high. Our state is

one of the wealthiest parts of the world and those death rates are simply too high. A report called the “Regional Freight Network Plan” is being done, but it looks only at the main roads in the state and not the local roads. Road deaths are occurring in the Agricultural Region and we must see which roads freight will go on to move the economic activity. Of course, the freight is mainly grain, as we all know.

I am sorry to come back to a pet hobby of mine, which is the tier 3 rail, but the trouble with it is that there is such a logical case for it. Hon Simon O’Brien is concerned about funding being given to work on Chester Pass Road to reduce the road toll, but death is not the only thing we need to reduce. According to the Western Australian Local Government Association, in 2009 deaths on our roads cost Western Australia \$2.6 billion. How do we reduce that amount? We should be recouping that money to go back into the economy, if we look at it from an economic point of view. Where is the problem? Part of the problem is our policy, because we have modes of transport operating in a distorted way. The economic rationality is distorted when we subsidise the roads extensively and we have a rail mode that is run by private enterprise; it is a user-pays system. I respect that the government has put money into tiers 1 and 2, which is essential, because without tier 1 we probably cannot have tier 2, and without tier 2, we will never get tier 3. The whole thing is done on a tiered basis, which means that we must have the foundation stones in place before we can do the rest. That is fine and it is money well spent, including money from the commonwealth government, which provided \$130 million-odd, which it specifies is for rail, not road. I know that that has been extended now to road. But when we have a report on this that says we should carry the freight on either road or rail and each one costs \$100 million, we have to choose. If we have only \$100 million, I am afraid in my view the wrong one was chosen. However, it is not a single case; it is a mixed case, because we must have rail and road.

We have got to understand what the industry is out there. My concern is that we do not fully understand it. For example, Co-operative Bulk Handling is criticised when its trucks use a road. People say, “Oh, here’s CBH using the road when they said they’re going to put all their grain on rail.” We have a complex problem with the logistics of multiple marketers, multiple segregations and sites that get full and have to have grain moved to the next site that is not as full so that the growers can keep carting to the nearest site. If I ever hear anyone again say, “Gosh, CBH has got trucks on the road” and criticising CBH, I will say that it is not CBH that should be criticised but the logic. It is very bad logic—let me leave it at that—but we have to get the distortion out. The problem is not about the government closing tier 3 railway lines; it has nothing to do with closing tier 3 railway lines. All the government has is money to invest in it, and it is either yes or no. So it is Brookfield Rail in that tier 3 area that closes the rail, but of course it is building rail elsewhere too. It has rail going up in the midwest area for iron ore. It is putting that capital in itself and it can charge the iron ore industry because it has the money to cover that cost and cover the charges, which must be there if Brookfield is going to make money from it because it is a private sector company. That is all fine; it is in a mining area that has those huge gross margins at the current time in its operations.

I speak partly with a vested interest because I know farming. There is not the gross margin in farming. Brookfield Rail cannot put money into rail out at tier 3 because it cannot charge to get the return back on the money it invests. Anyway, it is competing with a subsidised road system. It will never make it but it will make it if the money is put in by government in the same way to match the subsidies that are being put into roads. It is not unlike the issue with renewable energy. It is an uneven playing field on renewables also because the solars and the geothermals—not so much the winds now—cannot compete with the south west interconnected system because the SWIS has a cheaper price for coal. Until there is market parity, we will never be able to get rational money flowing into where the investment should be made. So those distortions have to be removed, and if they are not removed, they have to be recognised as a risk and then dealt with. If we do not do that, we will get money invested and channelled in the wrong way for the wrong reasons. That is the reason why it is very important in this transport area that the analysis be done in a way that takes into account these various elements so that we do not have flawed documents giving flawed recommendations on which decisions are made.

**HON LYNN MacLAREN (South Metropolitan)** [11.44 am]: I rise to speak to the motion and I have to say that Hon Ken Travers has a very good point about expenditure on transport infrastructure and the emphasis that this state government is putting on it. I have to agree with him for the most part. I thought that his take on the budget and how much spending has been shifted over the years in comparing the Liberal government with the Labor government was very insightful. I commend past Labor governments for spending \$3 billion on infrastructure for public transport. It is important to give credit where credit is due, and the Labor Party did spend a bit of money on public transport. However, it is also important to note that this Liberal government, the Barnett government, is trying. It does have for the first time ever a forward-looking approach to transport. It is developing policies for moving people and moving freight. That is a good step in the right direction. Certainly the bike plan is a very important step in the right direction. In the two plans released, the public transport plan

and the bike plan, we would definitely have some debate over the emphasis in those plans. We would disagree with the amount of money that has been allocated so far. I think more money —

**Hon Ken Travers:** They are just plans.

**Hon LYNN MacLAREN:** Exactly; they are just plans. That is why I am saying that the government is making an effort and looking in the right direction.

It is fair to say that the Greens (WA) have been disappointed with the amount of money that has been allocated in this budget towards the implementation of those plans, and that is where the Barnett government has let us down. The future fund and the ability to squirrel away a little money for future generations is to be commended. We need to see the details on that, and I know that this house will debate that. But the notion of putting away some savings so that future generations and our kids, even in 20 years, can have a little benefit from the boom is a great notion. I think we should move in that direction, and it really should have happened long ago. When I was a policy officer at the Western Australian Council of Social Service, it was something that we lobbied the Labor government to do at that time. It is the most difficult thing to do. I know in my own personal finances that it is the most difficult thing to put away a little for a rainy day because power bills are going up, rents are going up and mortgages are going up. It is really difficult to do, so I commend the government for its attempt to do it, and we look forward to seeing the detail on it.

However, as I said, the Greens have a different perspective on what the future holds. Although the government has identified that we have future public transport needs, I think the Greens would have a quite different approach to that. I know to some degree that the Labor Party also has a different approach. In particular we agree on the need for light rail infrastructure. Although Hon Ken Travers made the point that this government should be spending more money on roads, I make the point that this government has to spend a great deal more money on infrastructure now that gets people off the roads. That infrastructure is light rail. As Hon Philip Gardiner mentioned, it is heavy rail in the wheatbelt. It is investing in alternatives to the same old business of more roads, as more roads will not solve all of our problems. We therefore need these activity centres that have been identified in the Directions 2031 plan so that people do not have to travel such long distances to get to their workplace, school or whatever. We can as a city do land-use planning that reduces the need for the transport infrastructure that we have. We therefore do not see this government making inroads into moving towards the future that we see—an oil-constrained future where people's mobility is curtailed by the infrastructure that we have—and trying now to invest in those long-term solutions to make sure that people can continue to enjoy the lives that we lead in Western Australia.

**Hon Ken Travers:** To clarify, I was talking about regional roads. Definitely in the metropolitan area it is public transport, but across the rest of the state there still needs to be roads—and rail in the wheatbelt.

**Hon LYNN MacLAREN:** Yes. I felt that the information brought forward from Hon Adele Farina on the lack of infrastructure in the south west, particularly road and rail infrastructure to Bunbury port, is concerning. The government should sit up and take notice that Hon Adele Farina has brought to its attention the dire need for infrastructure outside the city in regional centres, which would also reduce our need for transport.

I have only a few minutes but I want to mention the other key infrastructure projects that, had we the Treasurer's portfolio, we would invest in. I have mentioned light rail. We would also invest immediately in rail to Perth Airport. We should have a fast rail to the airport to deal with all the fly in, fly out workers who right now are competing on the roads. That would do a lot to help reduce congestion. The money is available federally and we should tap into that federal money. All that would take is a plan about where the alignment will go in Belmont. If this government could identify where we are going to put it, we could attract federal funds and we could build that train station at the airport, which should be done now while the airport is under major renovation, so that we can invest in the future. It is short-sighted that we have not now put that money into rail to the airport. In our consultation on the public transport plan, people from all around the city said that we need rail to the airport.

Another issue is light rail to link the activity centres—that is, including universities and hospitals. That will also take people off the road and it will lower costs for people who need it the most, such as students, the elderly and people who need to go to these universities and hospitals. Fiona Stanley Hospital is a debacle. What Hon Phil Edman mentioned as the great new Murdoch activity centre will be the great new congestion nightmare! It has no infrastructure, yet it is one place that we could easily put in light rail to solve the problems that will barrel down upon us when Fiona Stanley Hospital opens. It is an extreme problem.

**Hon Mia Davies:** It's right next to a train station.

**Hon LYNN MacLAREN:** Yes it is, but try to walk there! There are very serious issues for people who are taking patients to the hospital, but it is right next to the train station, which provides a great opportunity for just a

Hon Ken Travers; Hon Simon O'Brien; Deputy President; Hon Adele Farina; Hon Phil Edman; Hon Philip Gardiner; Hon Lynn MacLaren

---

little redevelopment to maximise its pedestrianisation. It can easily be pedestrianised but, again, decisions need to be made now about where that freeway off-ramp goes so that it does not cause problems like the one at Canning Bridge—it is amazing that pedestrians can find that train station.

Another thing I want to mention, because I am a member who has an office in Fremantle, is the need to invest in technologies and management strategies so that freight that goes to the port through the city is moved by rail and not road—that is, double-stacking. I noticed some money in this budget for the double-stacking project to Fremantle port, but it is also —

**Hon Ken Travers:** Nothing for the freight subsidy.

**Hon LYNN MacLAREN:** There is nothing for the freight subsidy and also the management strategy to ensure that we do not have so many empty trucks leaving the port. It is a matter of beefing up the port's infrastructure and management. I noticed there is something in the budget and I hope to drill down to that in the estimates hearing and find out what it is.

Finally, the government has invested some money in congestion alleviators. It has mentioned cameras in the city, synchronised traffic lights and ramp meters on the freeways. These are very interesting technologies, but they take some of our transport dollar and we say that is a bandaid solution; it will solve congestion problems in the very short term but still deals with cars in the city. We have to remove the need for people to drive into the CBD so that we do not have that congestion. Light rail and better city and land-use planning will give us that. Therefore, instead of spending money on the Perth Waterfront on such a huge scale at this point, the Greens would definitely redirect that funding into more future-proof infrastructure projects.

**HON KEN TRAVERS (North Metropolitan)** [11.54 am] — in reply: Thank you, Mr Deputy President.

**Hon Simon O'Brien:** Didn't Hon Helen Bullock want the call?

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** No, she is happy for me to have a right of reply because a number of issues raised by members on the other side need to be responded to.

The minister claimed that I did not put forward any hard facts about the decline in expenditure. I mentioned the fact that we spent \$3 billion in real terms on rail and the expansion of public transport. I used the government's own Minister for Transport's claim that we spent —

**Hon Simon O'Brien:** I don't believe I said any such thing; stop making it up!

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** No, the minister did! He said, "Where's your facts? You're making these broad statements without any facts." I mentioned the amount of money we spent. I even mentioned in rebuttal the figure that the government's Minister for Transport claimed that the government is spending. I then took from that figure the expenditure that should not be included because it does not go to the expansion of the system. I also went through the roads budget and identified how much this government is appropriating for roads. Forget the money that the government gets from the Road Traffic Act; that is paid for by the families and small business people of Western Australia.

**Hon Simon O'Brien:** The money that's appropriated, who pays for that? Is it not the taxpayers of Western Australia as well?

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Yes, so? But the government is getting it through motor vehicle licence fees —

**Hon Simon O'Brien:** You're just talking selectively about things!

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** No. The government has commonwealth money and it has the money that gets paid through motor vehicle licences. We are getting lots more vehicles on the roads, so we need to spend more on roads. But the question is: given that we know that the government has record revenues, how much is it spending out of general government revenue? Let us look at what is in the budget that was recently handed down. It gives us the final actual figures of what this government spent in 2010–11. The combination of its appropriation for the delivery of services and its appropriation for capital totals \$259.779 million, if people want the exact figure. That was in its third year of government. What did Labor spend some 12 years ago in its third year in government? It spent \$292 million on the delivery of services and \$169 million on capital appropriation—a total of \$361 million. Therefore, over \$100 million more was being put into roads and that is on top of what the Labor government spent on public transport. Members opposite cannot say that is the Perth–Bunbury highway, which is still a road—we were still building it. The government was telling us about its widening of the Mitchell Freeway. The only reason the government is widening the Mitchell Freeway is that it will put a whole lot more traffic on it when it closes Riverside Drive. When we look at the history of who did the extensions of the Mitchell Freeway —

**Hon Simon O'Brien:** What?

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** That is why the government is doing it, minister—understand that. When we look at the history of who built the Mitchell Freeway, predominantly Labor governments have built it. That is what the government is talking about.

Although he defended his government in the beginning, I agree with Hon Phil Gardiner's comments that the number of deaths on roads in the wheatbelt is simply unacceptable. We need to upgrade the roads and we need to spend that tier 3 money to keep those tier 3 rail lines open. I notice that another \$5 million is included in this budget for the transition assistance package payment. If we had got on with it three years ago, I think we would have now put over \$20 million into the TAP payments and we could have upgraded those roads. The business case was clear.

The final thing I want to mention in response to this debate is that if the government has such a good record of spending on tier 3 rail and roads in regional Western Australia, why will the Minister for Transport not meet with the Western Australian Farmers Federation? Why not? What an extraordinary situation! A group that would normally be seen as aligned with the conservative side of politics cannot meet with the Minister for Transport. I cannot believe that. I have to tell members that tomorrow morning I will meet with the WA Farmers Federation, as I have in the past. When I am minister, I will continue to meet with the WA Farmers Federation and other people who have a key role and are key stakeholders in this issue.

I understand that we need to spend money in regional WA predominantly on roads, but where we have good rail we should maintain it and keep it up and where we have opportunities to expand it, we should expand it. However, roads will always be the predominant form of transport in regional Western Australia, which is why we need to spend the money and build those bypasses. Public transport is the answer to the congestion crisis in the metropolitan area. Labor has a history of doing that, but this government is not matching it in either area.

Motion lapsed, pursuant to standing orders.