

RAILWAY (FORRESTFIELD–AIRPORT LINK) BILL 2015

Consideration in Detail

Clause 1: Short title —

Ms L.L. BAKER: Clause 1 is the short title of the Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill 2015. I would like to start the debate by saying that a link implies something that drives between two points. The logical assumption of a link is that it connects point A and point B. It links places. The short title of this legislation is the Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Rail Link) Bill 2015. It will indeed link Forrestfield and the airport, but it will not link just Forrestfield and the airport. As I covered in quite some detail the other night, this line will link Bayswater and the Midland line with the airport. The minister might laugh but quite a few of my local members are very clear that this rail link will have a very big impact on the community where I come from. I guess that community is pretty dismayed that we are talking about something that will go from Forrestfield to the airport when, in fact, it will go from Bayswater to the airport. Part of the problem I am finding in discussions about the rail link is that we like it and we want it, but I come back to the basic fact that if it is to be a linkage, it means to link the Midland line with Bayswater, Forrestfield and the airport. Logically, it seems to me that a better description for this bill is the “Railway (Bayswater—if we must—Forrestfield) Airport Link”. That is a bit clearer but it is completely logical. I do not think it will massively affect the line’s operations, how it is built, where it is built or the future it holds for anyone. But it would be a far better representation of a starting point for the minister to recognise that this railway will not run in the blue, suddenly erupting out of Forrestfield, as if by magic, with no connection to anywhere except to link Forrestfield and the airport. It would be a gesture of understanding from the Public Transport Authority and from the minister’s government that this railway legislation will link my electorate, Bayswater, to the airport. That is a very good thing but, at the moment, it is certainly not clear and it looks as though it links Forrestfield with the airport, so the title should go further.

Mr D.C. NALDER: If I look at every railway line in Western Australia, it is clear that none of them is named according to the starting point.

Ms L.L. Baker: It’s a good time to start really, minister, isn’t it?

Mr D.C. NALDER: They are all named according to the end point. There is the Joondalup line, although Joondalup is now not the end point. There is the Mandurah line, the Armadale line and the Midland line. They are not named according to where they emanate. For the people of Forrestfield and those who have come in at the airport, this line will link Forrestfield to the central business district. Could we call it the Redcliffe–Forrestfield–Airport link; could we add Bayswater? We could add all sorts of places to this, but the title is only a name. In being consistent with how we have named all the other lines, the end point is important so it will be the Forrestfield line. However, given the strategic importance of the airport and to make sure that people are aware that the airport is on this line, “airport” is included in the title. I think it is a commonsense approach so we have named it accordingly.

Ms L.L. BAKER: I respect the minister’s position and I understand this might be a bridge too far—pardon the pun—or a tunnel too far, but in all honesty, we have the Midland line, the Armadale line, the Fremantle line, the Perth–Mandurah line and the Joondalup line, so “Airport Link” would indeed be a very good title. I suppose my scepticism—I hate to bring it back to this—is that three people have electorates along this line. Two of them are mentioned in the title of this bill.

Mrs M.H. Roberts: Yay for Midland.

Ms L.L. BAKER: Excuse me, the member for Midland’s electorate does not cross this line; her electorate is the same name as the name of the line. For the people of Bayswater, the recognition that this is a piece of heavy rail that will have, hopefully, a good impact on their lives and significantly more impact than the disabled ramp and toilet that I believe are being planned, it seems to me that to change the name would be a very small change. I would be happy even to see “Forrestfield” dropped and for it to be called the “Railway Airport Link”. That would be more truly in line. I understand three new stations will be built—one at Redcliffe, one at Forrestfield and one at the airport. If the member for Belmont had similar concerns to what I have, and was not on the government side of the house, she would probably be here arguing a similar case. To have some consistency, which the minister himself pointed to, it would be logical for this bill to be called the “Railway Airport Link” if he does not want to admit that it is the Bayswater–airport link.

Mr D.C. NALDER: Thank you again. We do not call the Midland line the Midland–Bayswater line because it links Bayswater to Midland.

Ms L.L. Baker: Of course not.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Thursday, 17 September 2015]

p6601b-6623a

Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr John Day; Mr Ben Wyatt

Mr D.C. NALDER: It does not make sense to have the name of the bill include the suburbs in the middle of the line. The current trend has always been to name the end point. Mandurah is the last point on the Mandurah line; when the Joondalup line was created, Joondalup was the last point, Armadale is the last point and Forrestfield is the last point, so Forrestfield is in the title because that is where the line will go. We are adding “airport” because we believe it is of strategic importance.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Can the minister confirm why he has changed the usual practice with these things? I note that there is the Railway (Jandakot to Perth) Act 2002 and the Railway (Northern and Southern Urban Extensions) Act 1999, and the Perth–Joondalup line was created by the Perth–Joondalup Railway Act. Why is the minister not following that practice this time?

Mr D.C. NALDER: It is interesting because we are building the Forrestfield station, which is the same name as the Labor Party put on its transport —

Mr W.J. Johnston: No, it’s not.

Mr D.C. NALDER: I have seen the plans that have Forrestfield written on them. The end point of this line is Forrestfield. We believe in the strategic importance of including the airport, so we have included the airport. I seriously do not see that this is earth-shattering, world-breaking news about the title of a bill. It has always been called the Forrestfield–Airport Link, so I think the bill is named appropriately and accordingly.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: That was not the question I asked. I am not asking about the name of the train line; I am asking about the name of the bill. We are not debating the name of the train line; we are debating the name of the bill. I point out to the minister the Railway (Butler to Brighton) Act 2010, the Railway (Jandakot to Perth) Act 2002 and the Railway (Northern and Southern Urban Extensions) Act 1999. They have always included the origin or some other title. There has never been any railway bill for the urban rail corridors that has been named in the way that the minister has chosen to do in this case. I am just trying to understand why the minister has changed the process for naming this bill. It is not a particularly complex question. Obviously, the Midland line is called the Midland line. The Joondalup line runs to Clarkson, but it is still called the Joondalup line. The Fremantle line runs to Fremantle. However, that has nothing to do with what we are asking the minister. We are asking him why he has chosen to change the way that these names are created. If he had followed the practice used when a bill of this type was last before the house, this bill would be called the “Railway (Bayswater–Forrestfield) Bill 2015”. The minister has not used the ordinary nomenclature that has been used on every other occasion that these things have been debated in this house. We are not trying to work out where the line goes, because we know that; nor are we asking what the Labor Party committed to at the last election, because we know that. We are asking why the minister has chosen not to use the standard practice that has been used on every other occasion that one of these bills has come to this house, including in the first term of this government when it did the northern extension.

Mr D.C. NALDER: We are arguing over what I believe to be nonsense. It is the government’s prerogative to name the bill whatever it wants to. I think members will find that this is a good descriptor of the line that will be built. When members talk about what has been done in the past, they talk about the northern suburbs and the southern suburbs. That involved extensions and changes to existing lines. The original Mandurah line act was called, I believe, the Mandurah act when it was the Mandurah–Thornlie line before Labor changed the route.

Mr W.J. Johnston: No, it wasn’t; it was called the Railway (Jandakot to Perth) Act.

Mr D.C. NALDER: We are saying that this is the Forrestfield–Airport Link. I do not see any change in standard practice. I cannot see the issue with the name of this bill. I believe it is a good descriptor of where we are looking to construct a railway line. I really struggle; members opposite are trying to push for this to be changed for a political purpose.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: As the minister said—this is correct and I do not argue with him when he says this—the government can choose any name that it wants, but that is not what we are asking. We know the name it has chosen; it is the Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill 2015. We are asking why the government chose to abandon the practice that has been used on every occasion that any legislation of this type has come to the chamber, including the only time that this Liberal government in the last two lifetimes has built any part of the rail system—that is, the northern rail line extension. On every other occasion, the bill has described what the government is doing. This is the first occasion that the bill has come here with a political name rather than a description.

We have not even got to where the points are on the train line. It will be interesting to know whether Forrestfield will be serviced by the train line, because my understanding is that that is not where the train station will be. It is strange, is it not, that on every other occasion that a bill has come before the house, it has described where the rail line has gone from and to. On this occasion, because the government wants to—we know that is why it is,

Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr John Day; Mr Ben Wyatt

because the minister has explained that—it is using political terms instead of geographic descriptors. Instead of saying where the line starts and ends, it is called the Forrestfield–Airport Link. That is throwing out the practice that has been used for every other bill that has been brought to this house on these matters. The minister says on behalf of the government that it did it because it wanted to. Yes, minister we understand that. That is not the question we are asking. The question we are asking is: Why does the government not want to continue with the ordinary practice of governments in Western Australia? Why for the first time ever does this government want to play politics with the naming of this bill? That is what we want to know. Why is the government playing politics with the Parliament of Western Australia?

Mr D.C. NALDER: We are not playing politics. I actually like the name, but let us talk about it. When we did the Clarkson line extension to the northern suburbs, it was not to Clarkson; it was to Nowergup. We never called it Nowergup.

Mr W.J. Johnston: What did you call it?

Mr D.C. NALDER: It was not called Nowergup. It was the Labor government’s extension and it was not called that.

Ms R. Saffioti: It went through Clarkson.

Mr D.C. NALDER: Yes, but that was not the end point.

Ms R. Saffioti: Because that is where the train depot was.

Mr W.J. Johnston: So what was the bill’s name?

Mr D.C. NALDER: We cannot recall. It was not called Nowergup.

Ms R. Saffioti: That is where the train depot was.

Mr D.C. NALDER: The Forrestfield station is being built around the Forrestfield railway yards.

Mr W.J. Johnston: What suburb will it be in?

Mr D.C. NALDER: We know it will be in High Wycombe. In the material that the Labor Party put out at the election, it also called it the Forrestfield station.

Mr W.J. Johnston: Who knows what we would have called the bill.

Mr D.C. NALDER: It was Forrestfield station. We are getting to a point at which it is an argument over whether the Labor Party was going to call it Forrestfield station. We are calling it the Forrestfield station. It is the end point of the line.

Point of Order

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Under standing orders, the minister needs to make his remarks relevant to the bill. He is talking about matters that are not relevant to the bill. We are asking why he chose a name and why he has moved away from the ordinary practices of the house. Discussing the name of a station is not related to how the minister has named a particular bill, and that is what we are trying to get at.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms J.M. Freeman): Minister, can you address yourself to the short title of the Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill 2015. Just give your attention to the bill.

Debate Resumed

Mr D.C. NALDER: Paying attention to the bill, I like the name. That is the reason for its name. It is a descriptor of where we are constructing the railway line. I like it. The opposition may consider that I have moved away from standard processes but I do not believe that we have. It is a good descriptor of where we are constructing the railway line, and therefore we believe it is an appropriate name.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: This is an interesting debate. The minister stood earlier and said that he called the line the Forrestfield rail line because it ends in Forrestfield, which is where the station will be. But it does not end in Forrestfield; it ends in High Wycombe. Whose decision was it to call the bill the Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill and also to call that station Forrestfield station, even though it is not in Forrestfield?

Mr D.C. NALDER: I believe it is a good descriptor. We named the end point Forrestfield station. It has been called Forrestfield station since it was in the planning stage. As I explained, we put forward, as did the opposition, a Forrestfield station and a Forrestfield link. I believe that the bill’s name is an appropriate descriptor of this section of the railway. There was a request for the name “Bayswater” to be included. To include the names of all the stations along the line does not make sense. We have utilised the end destination of Forrestfield station to call it the Forrestfield link but we believe that “airport” has a strategic connection and that is why we have called it the Forrestfield–Airport Link, and I believe that is an appropriate name for it.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Can the minister confirm that the station is in High Wycombe?

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Thursday, 17 September 2015]

p6601b-6623a

Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr John Day; Mr Ben Wyatt

Mr D.C. NALDER: I can confirm that the station is in High Wycombe. It is in exactly the same position that the Labor Party took to the election, as did the government. It is in High Wycombe and we have called it Forrestfield station.

Ms L.L. BAKER: I am not sure whether we are going to get off this point soon but I would like to get the minister's comments on the record so that my electorate understands. Since the minister has been telling us why he made this decision, he has canvassed three possible reasons this decision was made. When he first stood, he said that these railways "are always called this". They are always called something, whether it be Fremantle or whatever. That was the first thing the minister said. Then he blamed it on the government. He can check *Hansard*. He said it is government practice to call the railways —

Mr D.C. Nalder: The bill.

Ms L.L. BAKER: Yes—it is government practice to call bills certain names. That was the second reason he gave. The third reason he gave was that he likes it. I like Reginald, Crystal, Mildred and a lot of other names but they are not necessarily descriptive of where something starts and finishes. If the minister is arguing that the railway starts and finishes in Forrestfield and the airport link and that is why this bill is called the Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill, that is blatantly not true because as I said half an hour ago, people would not be able to get anywhere on it because it is actually the Bayswater to airport link. Depending on where people get on that train, they are either at the beginning of the link or at the end of the link. If the minister is saying it is the end point, if someone got on the train at the airport, the end point of the link is Bayswater because it joins the Midland train line at Bayswater. If the minister is talking logically about the title of the bill—the three reasons he gave is that the government has always called these bills by these names, the government named the bill as such and the minister likes it—I just need to be clear for my electorate why Bayswater is completely omitted from the title of this bill.

Mr D.C. NALDER: When the member for Maylands is the Minister for Transport, she can call it the Reginald link or whatever she would like; I really do not care. I believe that the Forrestfield–Airport Link is a good descriptor. I understand that the Labor Party will commit to building a line out to Ellenbrook, which will commence in Bayswater. She can call that the Bayswater link.

Ms L.L. Baker: I will probably call it the Bayswater–Ellenbrook link, minister.

Mr D.C. NALDER: It is the member's prerogative. I believe this to be a good descriptor of the bill. It describes very well the rail construction that will be undertaken. We can go through this all day. I believe this is a good name, and so be it.

Ms L.L. BAKER: We were just having a quiet discussion about what we might call something if we build Metronet out to Ellenbrook. At the moment the language around that spur is Morley–Ellenbrook. This proves the point that I am trying to make. When I am talking in my community about the possible Morley–Ellenbrook line, the first question people ask me is: where does it come from? Unless it is called the Bayswater–Morley–Ellenbrook line or the Bayswater–airport link, people do not understand that it comes in through that particular point. It is only good practice and a logical strategy to make it clear to people who are catching that train where it starts and where it finishes. It seems to me that in other countries in the world, we catch train lines that are named according to where they start and where they finish. The Bayswater–airport link is completely logical to me in the same way that Bayswater–Morley–Ellenbrook would be logical to me and my constituents.

Mr D.C. NALDER: An operating name, which is what the member is now referring to, and the name of this bill are two separate things. The member can call it whatever she likes. People will adopt whatever name they want to. We believe that this bill is appropriately named because it accurately describes the airport construction area that we are talking about. I am very comfortable with the name of the bill.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: We have the Bunbury Harbour (East Perth–Bunbury) Railway Act 1970, the Collie–Cardiff Railway Act 1951, the Coogee–Kwinana (Deviation) Railway Act 1961, the Coogee–Kwinana Railway Act 1952, the Dongara–Eneabba Railway Act 1974, the Industrial Lands (Kwinana) Railway Act 1966, the Kwinana Loop Railway Act 1968, the Kwinana–Mundijong–Jarrahdale Railway Act 1961, the Kwinana–Mundijong–Jarrahdale Railway Extension Act 1967, the Lake Lefroy (Coolgardie–Esperance Wharf) Railway Act 1969, the Morowa–Koolanooka Hills Railway Act 1964, the Muja–Centaur Coal Mine Railway Act 1951, the Perth–Joondalup Railway Act 1989, the Railway (Bunbury to Boyanup) Discontinuance, Revestment and Construction Act 1973, the Railway (Butler to Brighton) Act 2010, the Railway (Jandakot to Perth) Act 2002, the Railway (Narngulu to Geraldton) Act 2001, the Railway (Northern and Southern Urban Extensions) Act 1999, the Railway (Roy Hill Infrastructure Pty Ltd) Agreement Act 2010, the Railway (Tilley to Karara) Act 2010, the Spearwood–Cockburn Cement Pty. Limited Railway Act 1961, the Spencer's Brook–Northam Railway Extension Act 1963, the Trans–Continental Railway Act 1911, the West Kalgoorlie–Lake Lefroy Railway Act

Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr John Day; Mr Ben Wyatt

1970 and the West Kambalda Railway Act 1972. For the first time in the history of the state, we will have a railway act that does not have in its title where it starts and where it finishes. The one thing we used to know about the Liberal Party was that it used to respect convention. It used to like conventions. It used to see conventions as being critical and important, but not this lot—not the modern Liberal Party. It does not care about conventions; it tears up everything. Why? Because it wants to and because it likes it. What a joke! No wonder nobody in Western Australia takes the Minister for Transport seriously! No wonder he is an embarrassment to the government of Western Australia. By his performance here today —

Point of Order

Mr D.C. NALDER: Madam Acting Speaker, every time the member for Cannington starts to lose a political argument or has no actual point to make, he starts to make personal attacks.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms J.M. Freeman): This is not a point of order. You cannot enter into general debate on a point of order. I am sorry about that, but you cannot enter into general debate. However, member, I would draw your attention to the fact that this is the short title, which is the Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill 2015. If you can keep to the bill, that would be great.

Debate Resumed

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Thank you very much for your assistance, Madam Acting Speaker, as always.

The point I am making here is very simple. The government is, for no proper reason and no reason it can explain other than to say that it likes the title, changing the practice of Western Australia. The practice of Western Australia and the conventions that this state has always considered are being thrown away because the minister likes it. That is the problem. It would be helpful if the minister could explain to us what led to the decision to use a political title—that is, to use an act of Parliament not for its ordinary purposes but for a political purpose. For example, was this issue discussed with Mr Morton and anybody in government in the Liberal Party? Was that the sort of thing that happened? Is that the reason for a politicised name for the bill before us? Is that why we are throwing away at least 104 years of convention of having a proper description for a railway act, so that people reading the act in the future will understand from the start what the bill is about, rather than what is happening here today? We do not have a problem with the government spending millions of dollars of taxpayers' money advertising the political agenda of the government on why it is called the Forrestfield–Airport Link. We are just asking for some standards in the chamber that recognise 104 years of tradition in the chamber on naming bills to do with railways for their origin and destination, or some other proper description, rather than bringing into this chamber the politics of the Liberal Party.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We have a further question. We are wondering whether the minister sought any legal advice to name the bill the “Forrestfield–Airport Link” bill, even though the rail line will not go to Forrestfield. We are wondering whether the minister sought any legal advice in relation to that name for the rail line even though the rail line will not go there.

Mr D.C. NALDER: The State Solicitor's Office and parliamentary counsel were involved in drafting the bill and involved in the name.

Mr W.J. Johnston: That's not an answer.

Mr D.C. NALDER: Did we ask specific questions about the name? The name does not require any legal advice. We have named it. We believe it is an appropriate descriptor.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I found the whole discussion enlightening. Basically, as the member for Cannington has outlined, we are hearing the minister justify the name on two fronts: first that he likes it; and second because that it is what Labor had named a particular station during an election campaign. If we had won the election, I doubt that we would have brought a bill into the house with this title. But, as the minister said, the logic and reason for calling it so is that it is what Labor announced during an election campaign; and if that is the case, let us go all the way and give it its real name, which is the “Metronet Stage 1 Bill”. That is the logic that the minister has decided upon today. He said that the government is naming this bill as it is because that is what Labor would name it. Labor's title for the expansion of the rail network is “Metronet”, and I will therefore move that we amend the short title.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I move —

Page 2, line 3 — To insert after the word “Link” —

Metronet Stage 1

I would like to speak to the amendment. What we are doing today with this amendment reflects the minister's belief on the appropriate name for the bill and what Labor had done during the election campaign. That is what

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Thursday, 17 September 2015]

p6601b-6623a

Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr John Day; Mr Ben Wyatt

the minister said. He said today that the reason he has called it the “Forrestfield” bill is that it is the name Labor gave to the station during the election campaign.

Mr D.C. Nalder: No, it isn't.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: That is what the minister said.

Mr D.C. Nalder: No. Check the *Hansard*.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Check the *Hansard*! I heard it. I was sitting here.

Mr D.C. Nalder: You are taking it out of context.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The reason the minister said the government is calling it the “Forrestfield” bill is that it is what Labor announced. Labor announced this rail as stage 1 of Metronet, so let us do it properly and give this bill the name Labor gave it prior to and during the election campaign and in our recent announcement. We believe it should be called the “Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link Metronet Stage 1) Bill”. As we know, and as I outlined during the second reading debate, the only reason the government is committed to this project is that Labor announced it first. That is the only reason. There are two reasons why we would call it that. The first is that we like the name—that is the minister's logic. If the minister of the state can say that he is doing something in this chamber because he likes it, it is a fair enough reason for us to say we can do it because we like it. We think it is a very appropriate name and is the name we announced during the election campaign. Labor sees the Forrestfield rail line as the first stage of a long-term, coordinated, integrated rail system for Western Australia. We see this as part of the—I hate to use the term—“Bigger Picture”. We see it as part of a bigger plan for our metropolitan area. It is a system that allows the full integration of our rail network, which includes and incorporates light rail, bus services and better signage facilities. It is a comprehensive approach to transport in this state.

This government in its first 100 days committed to introducing a coordinated, integrated plan. There is still no coordinated, integrated plan. The only plan that is out there in the community is Labor's Metronet plan. On the basis of what the minister said about the naming of this bill—he liked the title and the government is naming it the “Forrestfield” rail line, as that is what Labor announced—let us go the whole way and call it “Metronet Stage 1” because that is what it was called as part of Labor's plan. Given that the minister has adopted Labor's plan and Labor's naming methodology, let us go the whole way so that we do not confuse people out there and so that they will know it is stage 1 of Labor's Metronet plan. I therefore seek the support of the house for the amendment.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: As the minister said, he is happy to junk convention. He has asked us to do this. He has said he wanted to use politics in the chamber. That was his decision. He has invited us to more accurately name the bill if it is intended to link the airport and Forrestfield but not be referred to as the Bayswater to High Wycombe bill. That is not our decision. We in fact urged the minister in very strong terms to take a sensible approach and follow the traditions of the house, but the minister said that was not what he wanted. Indeed, he said—we had quite a bit of an exchange across the chamber about this—that Labor intended to have a station at that location and call it “Forrestfield”. In fact, I pointed out that what a political party did during an election campaign should not relate to what happens here in the chamber. But the minister said, “No, no, no”, that was justification for what he was doing in calling it the Forrestfield–Airport Link. All we are doing, therefore, is making sure that the minister's bill is given an accurate title. He asked us to do this. We argued with him not to go down this course, but he asked us to make sure that our name be included in the bill, and that is why we are pleased to call it “Metronet Stage 1”. We are very happy to be part of this. As the shadow Minister for Transport explained, Metronet is not just about rail lines; it is about an integrated transport plan. That is why we are pleased to be part of this and we are happy to accept the minister's request for us to do this. I strongly endorse the member for West Swan's amendment.

Ms L.L. BAKER: I also would like to speak to this amendment. I know that the point I am making will seem different from the point my colleagues are making; we are talking about the naming of the bill, not the public understanding of where this track is actually going to run. However, I think the point is relevant to the discussion about what we name the bill. If we were to name it “Metronet”, I should say it would be a very sensible idea for the people of my electorate because, as I pointed out the other day, there has been no consultation with them about how this is going to improve their precinct and how it is going to work on the ground for them. The people of my electorate are not wedded to this title or to a particular image of what it will be; in fact, I would go so far as to say that they are probably far more familiar with the term “Metronet stage 1” than they are with anything the government might come up with that does not even have the word “Bayswater” in the title. From my perspective as the member for Maylands, in actually getting people to the end goal, which is the city, a significant part of all the action is going to happen in my electorate; the line will have to come through my electorate, so it would be very sensible for the title to reflect that. I can only say that I fully endorse the idea that

my constituency would understand and relate more to the title “Metronet stage 1” than it would “Forrestfield–Airport Link”.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I feel compelled to rise in support of this amendment because it is so fundamentally clear that Metronet was embraced by the Western Australian community at the last state election—to such an extent that, out of desperation, the Barnett government chose to lie to the people of Western Australia and claim it had a plan for transport in Western Australia, which subsequently evaporated and was proven to be a complete mirage. It was never funded, never costed, and never even planned, which demonstrates the absolute dishonesty with which the Liberal Party approached the last state election. Metronet has the support of the Western Australian population and continues to resonate greatly throughout Perth. I think members would find people in every suburb overwhelmingly supportive of a comprehensive, strategic approach to providing public transport right throughout the metropolitan area of Perth.

There has never been a strategy proposed in this state that has been so overwhelmingly supported by the electorate. It therefore stands to reason that we acknowledge that Metronet is the only reason the Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill 2015 has come before this Parliament. In fact, it is only a small part of Metronet; it is the first phase. Phase 1 of Metronet was always going to be inclusive of this particular project, or a project of this description. There is no way that this is anything more than part of a solution to public transport challenges and demands in Western Australia, and there is no way that anyone could conclude that this is going to solve the problems of congestion and be a comprehensive response to public transport needs in Perth. The only thing that can do that is the rest of the Metronet plan, of which this is only phase 1. Following on from phase 1 are other components that the people of Perth and the wider Western Australian community are waiting for and are keen to support, including the Ellenbrook rail line, the Yanchep extension, the Byford extension and, of course, the Thornlie line connection into the southern suburbs railway, which will benefit many people in electorates such as mine, which are on the southern suburbs railway and desperately need it. It will actually make this particular part of Metronet worthwhile, because without the ability to divert from around Cockburn over to the airport, why would we go all the way into the city and then back out? It would only add time and it would not be anywhere near as attractive to the people in the southern suburbs, all the way down to Mandurah, thanks to that magnificent line built by WA Labor during its last term in office, with no debt and no contributions from the federal government. What an extraordinary achievement that southern suburbs rail line was! It continues to provide an excellent indication to the people of Western Australia that there is only one side of politics that can provide properly planned, fully costed and fully funded responses to public transport challenges in Western Australia, particularly in the metropolitan area of Perth. Metronet is WA Labor’s plan, and it needs to be enacted. We need to elect a Labor government at the next state election but in the meantime, because the Barnett government has chosen through necessity to pursue phase 1 of Metronet, it should be named appropriately. We should be honest in this place; there should be an honest response to the naming of a bill. If it is phase 1 of Metronet—which was considered by the Barnett government only ever as a response to the real Metronet plan, and that is the only reason that this bill is before us—that should be reflected in the naming of the bill. It makes sense and it is the honest thing to do. I know that is a difficult thing for ministers in the Barnett government to accept—the need for honesty in public debate—but here is an opportunity for the minister to demonstrate that he has turned the corner. He has seen the response, he has seen the need for Metronet; now name the bill appropriately.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Can I first of all say that I think we are very fortunate to have a minister with the capacity and integrity of the current Minister for Transport. I think he does his job extremely well, I think his background in the financial world is second to none in this chamber, and he has actually been a hands-on minister. I will not be crossing the floor on this one, and I am sure my colleagues on the other side of the road will not be too pleased about that! But what I want to say is that the minister has to carry out the instructions of cabinet. We all know who decides what goes into cabinet and what comes out of cabinet, and it is not the Minister for Transport in this instance; I am sure everybody knows exactly who it is. I just want to ask one question, if I can, because there was some doubt at one point: does this railway actually go to the suburb of Forrestfield?

An opposition member: No.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: No, it does not; I did not think it did, and I find that strange. That is why I say it is a political decision made by people from Hale House; it is people from Hale House who have made this decision, without a doubt, and it is the decision that was announced at the last election. Quite frankly, that can backfire. Governments that believe that by building a railway they will gain the support of a couple of marginal seats—a couple of good marginal seats that I would support—are living in cloud-cuckoo-land, because it does not work. Just prior to the 1993 election the Lawrence government decided to build a railway out to Joondalup; at least that went to the suburb of Joondalup. I was Mayor of Wanneroo at the time and was a vocal opponent because I felt it was being done for political purposes, but it was in fact done to save the two marginal seats of

Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr John Day; Mr Ben Wyatt

Whitfords and Wanneroo, but the railway line went to Joondalup. That is what was proposed and that is what actually happened. As it turned out, the Labor Party did not win either of those seats; I won the seat of Whitfords for the Liberal Party, and another Liberal candidate won the seat of Wanneroo. Any government that thinks it is going to win an election simply by building a railway is, I say, living in cloud-cuckoo-land. At the end of the day, the electors do not decide whether they should vote for a political party because of a railway line; they really do not. They say, “Thanks very much, we love it. We’re really pleased to have a railway line coming near or through our suburb, or whatever, with a station”, but they vote on other issues—the standing of the government, the standing of the Premier or the standing of the Leader of the Opposition. They will not vote on the fact that a railway line will go out somewhere near the suburb of Forrestfield; it goes to the electorate of Forrestfield. I think it is a silly decision to call it that and it brings into question the integrity—I agree with the opposition on this—of a government that names a railway line after a suburb that the line does not actually run to. One line went to Mandurah and one went to Joondalup. We have other areas now where this railway line is going to, but it is not actually going to the suburb of Forrestfield. I made some flattering comments about the minister—it may be the kiss of death for him because I was the one saying it—but I do believe that he is a man of integrity. This would not necessarily have been his decision; it would have been you-know-who’s decision. I am sure everyone knows exactly who “who” is.

[Interruption from the gallery.]

Ms L.L. BAKER: Is that the minister spitting his dummy? Sorry; the noise is coming from the gallery! I draw the minister’s attention to the explanatory memorandum and the naming of this bill. It states —

The purpose of this Bill is to authorise the construction of a railway from east of Bayswater Station to Forrestfield.

It does actually say that it starts at the Bayswater station. I know we are debating the Metronet name—I agree with that—but clearly the name of the bill is not correct by the minister’s own explanatory memorandum.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I was happy to have the minister explain the government’s response. This is an amendment that the minister asked us to move and we have moved it, but we do not know what his response is. I want to make another point. There is a difference between making a personal attack on the minister and pointing out his capacities as a minister. The minister gets paid a quarter of a million dollars for his capacities. The minister cannot come into this place and whinge when people point out that he is not doing a good job. This is called life. That is exactly what happens.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, direct your comments to the amendment, please.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Yes, absolutely; I am directing myself to the amendment. As I say, the minister asked us to do this. When the minister does silly things, he gets held to account. That is not a personal remark. I have never once reflected on the minister’s visage—I would hardly be the first one who would be able to throw a stone in that regard!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, I have asked you to speak to the amendment.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Yes, thank you very much. That is exactly what I am doing.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: If you ignore me, I will call you.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I am not ignoring you, Madam Deputy Speaker; I am pointing out why it is important that we carry on with the minister’s suggestion and support this amendment. In doing so, I am making a very important point to the minister about the way this system works. Ministers get paid a large amount of money to be accountable. When we hold them to account, that is not a personal attack. When we say that the minister is not well respected in the community for his capacity to do his job, that is not a personal attack. When the minister comes in here and asks us to move these types of amendments, he becomes thin-skinned when we point out that he is not performing his job very well. As the member for Maylands pointed out, we are dealing with a bill to build a railway line from Bayswater station to, as it says, Forrestfield—I understand that it is not actually in Forrestfield but I will leave that point to one side for the moment—yet, the government chose a political title. The minister told us that one reason the government chose a political title for the bill was that it was copying the Labor Party’s proposal. I make the point that I am not convinced that where the minister is proposing to have the railway station is exactly the same as the proposed position of the railway station sought by Labor. I remind the minister that we had a longer-term plan as part of Metronet, and we still do, that will one day, in the fullness of time, allow Forrestfield station to be connected to the south. I am not convinced that this location is, as the minister says, the location that was chosen by Labor. That was the reason the minister said he wanted to name the bill, for the first time ever, in a way that did not describe where it started and where it finished. I made the

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Thursday, 17 September 2015]

p6601b-6623a

Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr John Day; Mr Ben Wyatt

point that the minister cannot raise a single occasion in the history of our Parliament when bills to do with railway lines have not actually described where they start and finish. That was the minister's decision. According to the member for Hillarys, it was not the minister's decision, but, one way or another, it is the decision that we are confronted with. If we are going to use the word "Forrestfield" because the minister says that that was what Labor was going to do, well, let us go the whole hog and make sure that the member for West Swan gets her way. I have not heard any objection from the other side of the chamber to this amendment except from the member for Hillarys.

Mr R.F. Johnson: I was not actually objecting to your amendment, but I will not be crossing the floor.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Fair enough. I have not heard the government say that it will not support this amendment. The member for West Swan is not in a position —

Mr D.C. Nalder: Put it to the vote.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: No, no, no; the member for West Swan should be given the final word on this as she moved the amendment. The government should put on the record what its position is and then the member for West Swan can respond.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Quite surprisingly, I have not heard the minister's response to this amendment. We understand that there has been a directive that government members are not allowed to say the word "Metronet", so maybe that is the reason. Maybe the minister cannot stand up, because by standing up and talking about our amendment to insert the Metronet name into the short title, he may actually say the word "Metronet". I can understand that he is caught in a bit of a bad position. He is not allowed to say the word "Metronet" even though our amendment seeks to insert the word "Metronet". Maybe that is why he is not standing up. The Minister for Planning came in and in a little interjection said that, yes, this train station is in Forrestfield. It is not, minister.

Mr J.H.D. Day: It is near the boundary between Forrestfield and High Wycombe.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It is not even that close to the boundary. I have gone through it again, because I always like to triple-check. Minister for Planning, please; he has disappointed me twice in two days. Last night he referred to me as Pauline Hanson, which was quite a —

Mr J.H.D. Day: I said that you sounded like her with the phrase you were using at the time. It was very bad for you.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The minister cannot get out of it now!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members! Member for West Swan.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I am very disappointed in the minister. Last night he launched a personal attack on —

Ms L.L. Baker: On Pauline Hanson? Sorry, sorry!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Member for Maylands! Last night the minister launched a personal attack on me. The Minister for Planning, who has a key role in developing the Forrestfield precinct, came in and said —

Mr W.J. Johnston: His agency is objecting to it.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Maybe his agency is objecting to the Forrestfield precinct because they thought it was in Forrestfield! Maybe that is why, minister. The minister came in and said that it is in Forrestfield. No, it is not. I triple-checked it, because, as I said, I like triple-checking things. I compared it with the draft structure plan to see where the railway station is and to see whether even the bit of rail line left after the station is in Forrestfield, but it is not; it is in High Wycombe. I feel sorry for those poor people of High Wycombe. Why are you guys so embarrassed about High Wycombe that you do not want to call it High Wycombe? Why not call it the Bayswater–High Wycombe line? I do not know. It does not actually go through Forrestfield. At least ours went through Forrestfield! I do not know why the minister cannot stand and respond. Like I said, maybe it is because if he stands and responds to our Metronet amendment, he might have to say the word "Metronet". As I understand it, that would mean a bit of detention in the Premier's office.

Ms M.M. Quirk: He is so absorbed in your speech that he is on his phone texting.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: That is okay. He is just checking the odds.

Mr D.C. Nalder: That's it!

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Thursday, 17 September 2015]

p6601b-6623a

Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr John Day; Mr Ben Wyatt

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Do members know what? The Minister for Emergency Services' justification for selling the Totalisator Agency Board is that when one searches for the TAB on Google, it is not the first site that comes up—Sportsbet comes on top! That is the best justification I have ever heard in my life for selling an agency.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, member. Can you address yourself to the amendment, thank you.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The minister stood up. I want to go through this again, because my colleagues the member for Victoria Park, the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Girrawheen were not in the chamber when I said it earlier. We asked the minister why he is calling it Forrestfield. The member for Maylands made some very good points about Bayswater. The minister gave two reasons: because he likes the name and because that is what Labor called it during the election campaign. I stood and said, "Okay, if that is the logic, let's go the full way and call it 'Metronet Stage 1', because that's what we called it during the election campaign. Let's give it the full title. Let's use 'Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link Metronet Stage 1)' as the title of the bill, because that's what we called it during the election campaign and 'cos we like it." That is the same logic that the minister used. I commend this amendment to the house. By the silence on the other side, I suspect it will go through with full support! I look forward to the vote.

Mr D.C. NALDER: We do not support the amendment.

Question to be Put

MR J.H.D. DAY (Kalamunda — Leader of the House) [11.09 am]: I move —

That the question be now put.

Division

Question put and a division taken, the Deputy Speaker casting her vote with the ayes, with the following result —

Ayes (32)

Mr P. Abetz	Mr J.H.D. Day	Mr A.P. Jacob	Mr N.W. Morton
Mr F.A. Alban	Ms W.M. Duncan	Dr G.G. Jacobs	Dr M.D. Nahan
Mr C.J. Barnett	Ms E. Evangel	Mr R.F. Johnson	Mr D.C. Nalder
Mr I.M. Britza	Mr J.M. Francis	Mr S.K. L'Estrange	Mr J. Norberger
Mr G.M. Castrilli	Mr B.J. Grylls	Mr W.R. Marmion	Mr A.J. Simpson
Mr V.A. Catania	Dr K.D. Hames	Ms L. Mettam	Mr M.H. Taylor
Mr M.J. Cowper	Mrs L.M. Harvey	Mr P.T. Miles	Mr T.K. Waldron
Ms M.J. Davies	Mr C.D. Hatton	Ms A.R. Mitchell	Mr A. Krsticevic (<i>Teller</i>)

Noes (17)

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

Pairs

Mr I.C. Blayney	Dr A.D. Buti
Mr R.S. Love	Mr P.B. Watson
Mrs G.J. Godfrey	Ms J. Farrer
Mr J.E. McGrath	Mr D.A. Templeman

Question thus passed.

Division

Amendment (insertion of words) put and a division taken, the Deputy Speaker casting her vote with the noes, with the following result —

Extract from *Hansard*
[ASSEMBLY — Thursday, 17 September 2015]
p6601b-6623a

Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr John Day; Mr Ben Wyatt

Ayes (17)

Ms L.L. Baker
Mr R.H. Cook
Ms J.M. Freeman
Mr W.J. Johnston
Mr D.J. Kelly

Mr F.M. Logan
Mr M. McGowan
Mr M.P. Murray
Mr P. Papalia
Mr J.R. Quigley

Ms M.M. Quirk
Mrs M.H. Roberts
Ms R. Saffioti
Mr C.J. Tallentire
Mr P.C. Tinley

Mr B.S. Wyatt
Ms S.F. McGurk (*Teller*)

Noes (33)

Mr P. Abetz
Mr F.A. Alban
Mr C.J. Barnett
Mr I.M. Britza
Mr G.M. Castrilli
Mr V.A. Catania
Mr M.J. Cowper
Ms M.J. Davies
Mr J.H.D. Day

Ms W.M. Duncan
Ms E. Evangel
Mr J.M. Francis
Mr B.J. Grylls
Dr K.D. Hames
Mrs L.M. Harvey
Mr C.D. Hatton
Mr A.P. Jacob
Dr G.G. Jacobs

Mr R.F. Johnson
Mr S.K. L'Estrange
Mr W.R. Marmion
Ms L. Mettam
Mr P.T. Miles
Ms A.R. Mitchell
Mr N.W. Morton
Dr M.D. Nahan
Mr D.C. Nalder

Mr J. Norberger
Mr D.T. Redman
Mr A.J. Simpson
Mr M.H. Taylor
Mr T.K. Waldron
Mr A. Krsticevic (*Teller*)

Pairs

Ms J. Farrer
Mr D.A. Templeman
Dr A.D. Buti
Mr P.B. Watson

Mrs G.J. Godfrey
Mr J.E. McGrath
Mr I.C. Blayney
Mr R.S. Love

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 2: Commencement —

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: One of the issues put to me relates to the land acquisition process that this bill triggers. This is quite a complicated process but I will go through it from memory. As I understand it, the valuation put on land that can be compulsorily acquired under this legislation is taken from the date of the commencement of the parliamentary session. For example, once this legislation receives royal assent, and when land is compulsorily acquired, the valuation date is April 2013. Can I confirm whether that is correct?

Mr D.C. NALDER: That is correct when there is a compulsory acquisition. It is not correct when it is a negotiated settlement. Under a negotiated settlement, the value can be determined, but if the land is compulsorily acquired, that is correct.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I want to confirm whether this valuation process refers to land acquired for the station and car parks, and are there other parts to which this valuation process will apply?

Mr D.C. NALDER: It applies to the land that we require for the construction of the railway, which includes the car park and the station itself, but only when it is required under compulsory acquisition. When the land acquisition can be negotiated and settled outside of that process, compulsory acquisition is not necessary and the valuations can be different.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I will keep going with my hypothetical example. Let us say that the land has been designated for a car park in 10 to 15 years' time. Does that mean that when the Public Transport Authority or the state government determines that the next stage of the car park is to be developed and the landowner does not want to sell, the valuation given to that land in 10 years' time will be the valuation made in April 2013?

Mr D.C. NALDER: We are referring to only the land that we require to construct this station and the car park associated with it. Any further development beyond that, unless it is to do with the rail line, will fall inside the Department of Planning and the appropriate structure plan, but that has nothing to do with this bill and our plans and what we will be doing.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: This is where things are slightly complex because of what is being proposed. I understand that there are different stages in the development of the car park. Ultimately, the car park that I am talking about is a car park that will be controlled by the PTA, but that may not be determined for another 10 years. So is that valuation process applicable to land currently designated as a car park but to be developed in the long term? My hypothetical relates to someone who owns land that forms part of the current structure plan and is shown to be a car park in 10 to 15 years' time. Will that land be valued under compulsory acquisition as of April 2013?

Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr John Day; Mr Ben Wyatt

Mr D.C. NALDER: If in 10 years' time the PTA requires more land, it will be based on the same valuation process but the valuation will be based on the start of the commencement of the term of Parliament at that time. Does that answer the member's question?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Not really. I am trying to get to the scope of this legislation on the trigger of compulsory acquisition and the valuation process that comes with it. Does it apply to just the land described in the schedule, which does not include, for example, any car parks in Forrestfield or High Wycombe, or does it simply apply to the land required for the rail line and the station?

Mr D.C. NALDER: I know that the Shire of Kalamunda has been looking at another structure plan that shifts car parks. That is not in our plan at this point. Everything around the acquisition applies to only what is within our plan to construct the railway, which pertains to the car park out the front and not to the two other areas the shire is looking at. Technically, we could acquire and put those things under the current railway act, but we have no intention of doing so because it is not in our plan at this point. That is not to say that in the future a decision might be taken for one reason or another that does come under that act, and a decision will be made at that point. However, we intend to acquire the land in our plan that the member should have in front of her, not those side corners that the member is talking about that go into Forrestfield.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: This is where I get confused because the attached plan schedule shows the rail line and the station but it does not show the car park. Can the minister explain how that works? I have the structure plan from the Shire of Kalamunda. Can the minister explain legislatively what triggers the purchase of those car parks?

Mr D.C. NALDER: Yes, the member is right. The parking is not in there because the standard practice is just to include the railway line and to the end of that railway line, but the PTA can acquire any land around there that is required to operate the station and the car park is covered by the legislation. We have also talked about land that we intend to acquire that is immediately out the front, which involves 15 landholders. We are in negotiation and discussion with those 15 landholders about the land that we are looking to acquire.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: What provision allows the government to purchase those car parks, even though it is not shown in the schedule attached?

Mr D.C. Nalder: We are getting off clause 2.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It is all about the authorities, the date of compulsory acquisition and the valuation. What provision allows the government to purchase that car park?

Mr D.C. NALDER: Section 99(1)(a) of the Public Works Act 1902 allows it, and states that we can —

Enter upon and make the railway upon, over, or under any land necessary for the construction thereof, lying along the middle line defined in the map referred to in the Act, or within the authorised limits of deviation, and for this purpose may construct works of every kind and of every material necessary to the making thereof;

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: So the terminology used is “authorised limits of deviation”. I understand from that that this bill gives the authorisation to not only use those compulsory acquisition powers for the rail line —

Mr D.C. Nalder: But also the station.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: But also the station and other land as deemed necessary as part of this development. What is the extent of this authority? How far out can we go under this authority?

Mr D.C. NALDER: The deviation is 1.6 kilometres.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: In relation to what the Minister for Transport understands the car park to be, is he able to table that information? Frankly, a key area of concern for many of the landowners in the area is what the PTA believes is the required land for stage 1 of the car parking requirements, and how many car bays are part of that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for West Swan, we are now starting to stray from what is relevant to clause 2. The minister can answer.

Mr D.C. NALDER: I do have a drawing to hand. It is not the entire drawing but it shows the car park space. There are 2 500 bays for this station. I am happy to table that.

[See paper 3294.]

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: As I understand, construction is expected to commence in the middle of next year. What is the expected time frame for this legislation? When is it required to be passed and receive royal assent?

Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr John Day; Mr Ben Wyatt

Mr D.C. NALDER: We are looking to have this finalised by mid-October so that we can acquire land and sign the appropriate contracts.

Mr B.S. WYATT: Once the line is constructed and operating, will the bill need to operate for ongoing maintenance, or will it expire?

Mr D.C. NALDER: It keeps going until the railway line discontinues.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: In relation to that 1.6-kilometre deviation, which is quite interesting, let us assume hypothetically that Labor wins the next election and it wants to start work on the other part, the Bayswater–Ellenbrook line. Would this clause give authority to start the preparation of Public Transport Authority works around Bayswater?

Mr D.C. NALDER: An element could be done already under the existing act for the Midland line.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3: Terms used —

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I will go through some of the definitions. Of the total eight kilometres, how much falls under the definition of the “airport section of the railway”?

Mr D.C. NALDER: I have only an approximate figure. It is approximately 2.5 to three kilometres.

Mr B.S. WYATT: Can the minister explain to me the difference between the “airport section of the railway” and “Perth Airport land”? Is the Perth Airport land simply all the land on which Perth Airport sits, and the airport section of the railway just a subset of the Perth Airport land? Could the minister confirm that for me?

Mr D.C. NALDER: Yes, I can confirm that.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: What rules and regulations would apply to that section of the airport land? For example, would transit guards have the same authority as they would outside the airport section of the railway?

Mr D.C. NALDER: Any land that is under PTA control would apply to them.

Mr B.S. WYATT: I refer to the Perth Airport land definition and I note the minister’s answer about the airport section of the railway being a subsection of that land. The bill states —

Perth Airport land means the land described in the *Airports Regulations 1997* (Commonwealth) Schedule 1 Part 1.18;

What if that changes? For example, the minister may recall the brickworks that were built on Perth Airport land. Is there a capacity for Perth Airport to say that it wants to develop a section of land, currently described as Perth Airport land, around the rail line? Is there a capacity for Perth Airport, assuming with agreement from the commonwealth government, to change the definitions in schedule 1, part 1.18 of the commonwealth Airports Regulations 1997, and then do its own development, by itself or in partnership with the private sector, along that rail line?

Mr D.C. NALDER: If I understand the member correctly, he is saying that if the government puts down a rail line and the airport all of a sudden decides to do developments that impact on that, it could shut down the railway line.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: Maybe not shut it down, but impact on it in a way that may be inconsistent with what the state government wants to do.

Mr D.C. NALDER: An agreement is being developed with Perth Airport as to how the interaction may occur around the railway line, and that is separate to this.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: Is there a requirement, therefore, because it is commonwealth regulations, to have the commonwealth government as a party to that agreement?

Mr D.C. NALDER: It already has the ability through Perth Airport Pty Ltd to develop its land to a certain agreement. As long as it conforms to that, it can move ahead with things without the commonwealth. The state therefore needs to have a separate agreement directly with Perth Airport to ensure that the interests of the railway are protected.

Mr B.S. WYATT: As part of that agreement that is being developed separately, presumably there will have to be a right for the state government to veto development by Perth Airport or by any other organisation on the land that is currently described as Perth Airport land that may be inconsistent with what the government sees as the operation of that rail line, or the best way on which that land can be utilised to maximise the value of that rail line.

Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr John Day; Mr Ben Wyatt

Mr D.C. NALDER: The approach is consistent with what we have done elsewhere; for example, in the Perth CBD with the underground railway. The agreement includes loads that can be above it and those sorts of things. Yes, there will be an agreement to protect the asset, and some of that will include developments that can occur above, but the load bearing and so forth will be part of those agreements, so it will go into another level of detail.

Ms L.L. BAKER: The definition of the term “underground section of the railway” states —

... so much of the railway as is constructed, or proposed to be constructed, underground, but does not include any part of a railway station, or any part of a related car park, public transport interchange facility or associated means of pedestrian or vehicular access, that is constructed, or proposed to be constructed, underground.

Sorry it took a while; it is a big definition. My question is quite simple. Where the underground section of this railway to be built comes up in Bayswater, it will meet a cycleway that runs all the way along the railway line. I wonder whether that definition should have included “pedestrian, vehicular access or cycleways”.

Mr D.C. NALDER: We consider that a cyclepath is vehicular access, so it will be covered under that.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I go back to the question about transit guards. I am slightly confused about the answer given earlier; for example, the underground station under the consolidated terminal. I can understand that transit guards will be operating on the platform underneath, but will they have any jurisdiction if, for example, they go to deal with someone on the surface of the land? If someone gets off the platform and goes up the escalators onto airport land, will the transit guards have any jurisdiction?

Mr D.C. NALDER: We will work with Perth Airport Pty Ltd and the Australian Federal Police to define a boundary, so it will be able to operate above the station to where the concourses meet. But the boundaries on the airport station itself still need to be defined between the Federal Police and PAPL. The area immediately above the station is under our control. We can go immediately above the station and to where the concourses start. Further definitions of that will be finalised with the Federal Police and PAPL.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: In relation to Perth Airport land, can I clarify where the Airport West, Redcliffe or whatever the name of the station will be, because it is not in Belmont—a Belmont station that is not in Belmont. Let us call it the Redcliffe station, for example. Those poor people in Redcliffe will not have a station named after their suburb. Will that station be on Perth Airport land?

Mr D.C. NALDER: No; it will be on state land on Brearley Avenue.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: How far is it from that site to T3 and T4?

Mr D.C. NALDER: The approximate distance I have been given is around 300 to 400 metres.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We had a briefing, but the actual station location is not highlighted in the schedule. Can I have the exact location of the Redcliffe station? I understand it is on Brearley Avenue just near the boundary of the airport land?

Mr D.C. NALDER: There are two points: the stations are not defined in the bill because their location can change, so they will retain that flexibility. It is not in the bill, but the intent is for the location that the member is talking about.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The location I am talking about I would say is—this is just from my —

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We are talking about definitions, member for West Swan, so can you make that relevant.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes; I am talking about the definition of Perth Airport land and exactly where one of the key stations will be in relation to that land. I understand it will be at the end of Brearley Avenue, closer to Great Eastern Highway.

Mr D.C. Nalder: No. It is right on the edge of the airport land.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Can you give me the exact location, as in its proximity to other intersections?

Mr D.C. Nalder: You said right on the boundary, and I said, “Yes, pretty much there.”

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, would you like to stand?

Mr D.C. NALDER: As part of this bill, we have not defined exact locations because we want to retain flexibility so that we can move station locations. The intent of what we are trying to do—I am trying to be helpful—which is not part of this bill, is to be in the middle, essentially, of the whole location, which is right near the boundary of the airport land and where the City of Belmont starts on Brearley Avenue in Redcliffe.

Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr John Day; Mr Ben Wyatt

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Only one of the two airport stations will be on airport land. The only one that will be on airport land is the one at the integrated terminal precinct; is that right?

Mr D.C. NALDER: That is correct. I do not think the station will be named Airport West. The intent is that the location of the domestic terminals will shift and congregate with the international terminals at that one location. It is the intent that that will be the only station on airport land.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: The minister just mentioned the intention of Perth Airport to amalgamate the terminals over to what it calls the consolidated terminal. Does the minister have advice from Perth Airport about when that might happen?

Mr D.C. NALDER: The advice I have is that Virgin Australia Airlines is expected to move before the end of the year. Its terminal was supposed to be completed about April, so it has been delayed. I understand that construction of the third runway is underway and should finish around 2019. We anticipate that the Forrestfield–Airport Link will be completed in 2020. Negotiations still have to happen between Qantas and the airport and we are not involved in that directly. The advice I have from the airport is that after the third runway is completed, there is a massive incentive to get Qantas over there for efficiency purposes. I anticipate it will happen in the vicinity of that time.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: The minister has not been advised yet of any date, time line et cetera for Qantas moving out of the T3 and T4 precinct. In fact, he mentioned Virgin moving to the new finger at the consolidated terminal. When Virgin moves out of T3, Qantas will take over the balance of T3, which it already uses for Jetstar Airways and an occasional flight. It will extend into the whole of T3, so T3 and T4 will be combined Qantas–Jetstar. I understand that the minister said that at this stage Perth Airport said it is keen to get Qantas to move, but the minister has not yet been advised when Qantas will move to the new site.

Mr D.C. NALDER: That is correct. We have not been advised of the exact time. We have been advised that it is expected within the early 20s. We do not have an exact date. I believe they still need to go through that. I repeat that the station on the west side, whatever we call it—Redcliffe, Airport West or whatever—is about 300 to 400 metres from that current domestic airport. The international one will be around 300 metres because it will sit equidistant from the international to what is currently used—forget all the Ts—for the FIFOs. It will be equidistant and the airport is anticipating a Qantas terminal equidistant on the other side. Airport West or Redcliffe will be about 300 to 400 metres from the terminal.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: In respect of the definitions of “Perth Airport land” and “underground section of the railway”, during the election campaign there was quite a lot of discussion about the location of the consolidated airport terminal and, indeed, there was discussion at that time about the location of the T3 and T4 precinct. The Liberal Party material stated that the two airport stations would be underneath the terminals. I wonder why the government decided not to do what it said it would do at the time of the election—that is, build the two train stations underneath the terminals.

Mr D.C. NALDER: A few things have happened. Firstly, our original plan was to take it down Tonkin Highway, cut into the domestic airport, drop it in underneath and go through. By taking it the way we currently have, we have shortened the length of the line. We found that once we were tunnelling, we could keep tunnelling and, with the bridge over the river and all those things, going underneath was going to be a better outcome. It was very similar cost-wise, although a little cheaper, to do the tunnel all the way, and it did not have the disruption of Tonkin Highway being shut down to one lane each way.

There was early discussion about keeping the stations close to the terminal. Perth Airport Pty Ltd was not keen on that aspect, but as we started to look at the opportunities for an urbanised town centre in Redcliffe, it made a lot more sense to try to centralise it to the whole area rather than necessarily to the domestic airport, as the domestic airport looked to be relocating to the international airport. There has been a lot of discussion and thinking about the best route on the way through. When we explored what we took to the election, we found better options to consider that had broader ramifications that we believed were a lot better for the community.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I appreciate what the minister says about the airport west or Redcliffe station. When we get to it, we will probably have a discussion about making sure that that station is accessible to people on the other side of Tonkin Highway. However, I want to go to the consolidated airport site. I am seeking clarification about why the government is not proceeding to put that station underneath the terminal as it said it would during the election campaign.

Mr D.C. NALDER: I am sorry; I misunderstood the member’s question.

Mr W.J. Johnston: I was asking about both.

Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr John Day; Mr Ben Wyatt

Mr D.C. NALDER: On whether to put it underneath the terminal, it was a matter of which one. It had the T1 and T2 precinct, where the fly in, fly out workers fly from, where the Virgin terminal is, where the international terminal is and where the new Qantas terminal is, so we looked at that. We could not do multiples just within that space, so the decision was taken and supported by PAPL. Its preferred location was to centralise it so that we could access it. Part of the discussion beyond that will be about the concourse that connects that, which is the critical component that we have been discussing with the airport, so that people do not walk out and find themselves in the elements; it will be connected to the terminals as appropriate.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: On that issue, the minister is saying that there is more than just the international terminal in the precinct and, in fact, as he explained, a lot of infrastructure is being built by the airport and, in the long term, as the member for Belmont talked about, it will have some sort of transport system to move people between terminals and there will be car parks and a hotel. The location of the proposed airport station has been moved to the south east of the control tower, so that gives the picture that it is further away from the terminal than the control tower.

Mr D.C. Nalder: It's right next to the control tower.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Yes, but it is on the southern side rather than the northern side. I think that is quite an important issue to get clarified.

Mr D.C. NALDER: Yes, the member is right; it is on the southern side of the control tower. However, because of the circular nature of the way the airport is setting up the terminals, it is positioned so that it is equidistant from those terminals. From a convenience perspective, we want FIFO workers and international travellers to connect over relatively the same distance.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I want to get clarity on the definition of "Perth Airport land". I understand that the majority of the land around the airport west station, or whatever it will be called, is controlled by Perth Airport and the concept of building an industrial park or whatever the case might be will be driven by the airport. Will the concept of creating a precinct there be entirely driven by the Perth Airport group, not the government?

Mr D.C. NALDER: To clarify, we are focused on the west side of the airport. Within that land, there is quite a major piece of state land infrastructure, with Brearley Avenue, the parks and everything else there. Obviously, there is private land. About 30 per cent is PAPL land.

Mr W.J. Johnston: What percentage is government land?

Mr D.C. NALDER: We would have to get back to the member on that.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: The amount of government land would be a smaller percentage than PAPL land.

Mr D.C. NALDER: Yes, I suspect it would be a smaller percentage than PAPL land. I am straying off the topic a little. It is not necessarily part of our responsibility under this bill, but we would like the planning around that area to be for urban renewal. There are discussions within my portfolio about closing Brearley Avenue and making sure that there is access on the other side of Tonkin Highway and opening up that whole area by creating a boulevard with a town centre and so forth. But that is outside the scope of this bill. I think it is quite an exciting opportunity for the residents in that area for an urban renewal process.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: In respect of the issues around the airport section of the railway and the underground stations et cetera, when this proposal was first discussed by the then Minister for Transport, Troy Buswell, there was some discussion about perhaps doing a public-private partnership and ameliorating the taxpayers' contribution to the project on the basis of getting some private sector investment. Is the airport making a contribution in light of the fact that the government is building a train station next to its new airport precinct that will deliver passengers to its airport through a \$2 billion piece of government infrastructure?

Mr D.C. NALDER: Yes, discussions are ongoing with the airport, particularly about the central one and the connections to the terminal, including the concourse and those sorts of things, as well as access to some of its land for car parks and so forth. There is discussion about that contribution and what the airport will contribute towards it.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I am sure that the minister has used the Sydney Airport rail line and perhaps he has used the Brisbane one, both of which were built by the private sector and which then went broke because the passenger numbers were not met. One of the issues is that people pay a higher fee to get on the train at the airport station in Sydney. They pay a higher fee at the two airport terminals than they pay at the next station down, which I think is Green Square; I cannot remember, but it goes through Redfern into the city. If people catch the train from the ordinary public station, they pay the ordinary public transport fee, but if they catch it at the airport, they get a different ticket and it costs \$10 extra. Is that the minister's proposal for here?

Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr John Day; Mr Ben Wyatt

Mr D.C. NALDER: We have committed that the fares will be identical, and will be treated exactly the same as across the rest of the network.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: The government has not received any money from the airport for the \$2 billion worth of infrastructure it is building.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Can you relate this to the clause, please, member for Cannington?

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Yes I can. I am referring to the term “airport section of the railway”. We are spending over \$2 billion on a piece of infrastructure to deliver passengers to the door of the airport. We are allowing the airport to use its freehold land as part of the precinct for that end of the airport, and I assume that it will be able to get other benefits out of delivering passengers to its doorstep at both ends of the airport section of the rail line. We have no contribution from the airport. It has the most expensive parking in Perth, and obviously that will encourage people to use the train, and we are not getting any benefit out of that. What was intended with the public–private partnership? Is that why the PPP did not work, because the minister was not prepared to take any benefits out of the airport rail line delivering passengers to the airport’s door?

Mr D.C. NALDER: Just on the PPP first, because we are going to operate the line, there was no benefit from the PPP for construction only. Just so that people understand, this is different from what applies in Sydney and Brisbane. It does not terminate at the airport. This is actually a connection through.

Mr W.J. Johnston: The Sydney line does not terminate at the airport.

Mr D.C. NALDER: I know the member knows that, but this is a connection through to the eastern suburbs. It is a \$2 billion rail line that connects out to the eastern suburbs, and it provides a world-class facility at the airport. We want to encourage people to catch the train to the airport, and we want to encourage people hopping off planes to catch the train. That is why we are making it consistent with the same pricing of public transport right across the metropolitan area.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: The Sydney rail line does not terminate at the airport. It goes right underneath and continues out on the other side. In fact, the reason the government agreed to the licence arrangement with the original proponents was that it got the extra link to the southern suburbs underneath the airport that it could not afford to build itself. That was the whole reason, so when the operator went broke, the New South Wales government cheered, because it had had a couple of billion dollars’ worth of infrastructure built for free by a private investor. Interestingly, Macquarie Bank never invested in either of the airport rail lines, but it bought part of Cabcharge. Guess who made more money? I do not understand why we are not asking the airport to contribute to the airport section of the railway. We have built the roads around the airport with not a single cent of contribution from the airport. The airport told me that it could not do its airport extension without the Gateway project going ahead. Now, we are building a rail line, so that will be about \$3 billion worth of public sector investment to facilitate expansion of the airport, and it appears to me that the government has never asked for even one cent from the airport for all this public investment.

Mr B.S. WYATT: I will ask one quick question in response to an answer the minister gave to the member for Cannington. I think a figure of around 30 per cent was given by the minister as the proportion of Perth Airport land involved in this project. If Perth Airport, as the minister suggests, builds residences or carries out a residential development on its land, is the airport then also liable to pay the usual stamp duty and state taxes for building on Perth Airport land that ordinary developers are required to pay on other land, because this is effectively commonwealth land?

Mr D.C. NALDER: I am not aware of that.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: Sorry, you’re not aware of what?

Mr D.C. NALDER: The ability to do what the member just said as far as —

Mr B.S. Wyatt: No, are they liable to pay stamp duty?

Mr D.C. NALDER: No, I do not believe so.

Mr B.S. WYATT: For example, in Victoria Park, my own electorate, if somebody builds an apartment tower, and I buy one of those apartments, I am liable to pay stamp duty to the state government. If Perth Airport constructs, on its own land, an apartment tower —

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, this really is straying from the definitions.

Mr B.S. WYATT: It is a direct response to an answer given by the minister. I am just trying to work it out. It looks like the minister might have an answer.

Mr D.C. NALDER: Perth Airport is not allowed to build residential on its land, but it can build commercial.

Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr John Day; Mr Ben Wyatt

Mr B.S. Wyatt: It is the same question, really.

Mr D.C. NALDER: As Minister for Transport, I cannot give the member an answer on that. I would say no, but I cannot give a definite answer.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: Do you say no, they're not liable?

Mr D.C. NALDER: I cannot give a definite answer as Minister for Transport. I just do not know.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: In relation to the Airport West station in the vicinity of airport land as described in clause 3, who is responsible for developing a structure plan for the precinct, and where is that structure plan at?

Mr D.C. NALDER: I am struggling to see how this relates to the terms used in the bill, but, to entertain it, the City of Belmont is working up its structure plan for development area 6 in conjunction with the Department of Planning.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: As I understand through these definitions, the metropolitan region scheme does not apply, although the airport land is not part of the MRS.

Mr J.H.D. Day: Yes, there is a later clause to that effect, for the area underground.

Mr W.J. Johnston: Why doesn't John just jump up and tell us!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: He can do that.

Mr J.H.D. Day: Are you talking about the underground section? Have a look at clause 8.

Ms L.L. BAKER: Just quickly, before we move off this, I want to again get on the record—I know the minister clarified this for my colleague the member for West Swan—how much of the land where the tunnel comes up, at the other end, at Bayswater is already in Public Transport Authority or state government hands, and how much is privately owned. Can the minister give me a bit of a breakdown of that?

Mr D.C. NALDER: It is currently all owned by the state government. However, there is one small piece of land that the PTA will acquire from Western Power.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 4: Authority to construct railway —

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: This is the meaty stuff; it gives the government the authority to go and do it. Of course, it relates to schedule 1. This is the key clause. I want to go through some particular aspects of this. I want to go through the three stations and land acquisitions. I know that the consolidated station is not an issue, but the other two stations will not be on airport land, so what is the amount allocated for land acquisitions for this railway?

Mr D.C. NALDER: We are now getting into budget processes that do not really have any relevance to the bill. This clause is about authority to construct a railway line.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It is not a trick question. I did not expect that sort of response. The clause is about authority to build the rail line. Part of any budget to build a rail line is land acquisition. I want to know how much has been allocated for land acquisition and which budget it is coming from.

Mr D.C. NALDER: I do not have that information on hand at the moment. I would have to check and come back to the member.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: There was a discussion at the commencement clause when we were talking about how the government needed to get car parks at the High Wycombe station. Is this the authority for that? The clause refers to "necessary, proper and usual works and facilities", so is this the clause used to create those car parks that the minister was discussing with the member for West Swan in respect of clause 6(2)?

Mr D.C. NALDER: Yes, that is correct, and that probably helps answer it. There are 15 properties being negotiated at this time. A budget has been set to acquire properties. It is within that budget of \$2 billion, but I do not have the breakdown of all the costs in my head and I do not have them on hand to give the member. Yes, it includes the car park, the train station and construction and maintenance of the proposed railway with all the proper and usual works and facilities. Also, a piece of land will be acquired to handle the works that go with the construction of the railway line; that is a temporary construction —

Mr W.J. Johnston: A temporary facility; a yard.

Mr D.C. NALDER: Yes.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: None of those answers is particularly surprising. Again, it does open the question that the member for West Swan was driving at. The minister has the plans to finish the construction over whatever period it takes, but then he has the big plan to finish the works over an extended period. I think the minister was

Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr John Day; Mr Ben Wyatt

talking about—I do not remember the exact figures and I am not trying to put words into anybody’s mouth—4 500 car bays.

Mr D.C. Nalder: It is 2 500.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: It is 2 500. Is that in the long term or not at High Wycombe?

Mr D.C. Nalder: No, it is 2 500 at Forrestfield.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Is that when construction is finished?

Mr D.C. Nalder: Yes.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: But there will be more car parks in the future.

Mr D.C. NALDER: No. We have a plan for car parking that will take us through for the foreseeable future. The Shire of Kalamunda is trying to bring to us a plan about how it would like to evolve things in its structure plan. That has nothing to do with the bill and what we are trying to put through the house at this point. We have our plan for what we want to do. Kalamunda wants to shift the car park north and south and do it in stages where it would be relocated as the town centre develops around it. We have not agreed to that. My understanding is that approval for that was knocked back the other night at the Shire of Kalamunda council. We have a plan that I have tabled for what we are planning to do as part of the construction.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I understand the minister has a plan, but we are also granting the minister the necessary authority. That is not a criticism; it is just that that is what we are doing. The problem is that the minister could say, “We’ve got the plan to do X, Y and Z today”, and in 10 years, “We’re going to do A, B and C”, because the plan will evolve over time. The point I am trying to get in my mind is: are we authorising the minister to do just this little bit here, or are we authorising him to do everything? The minister said that the car parks are incidental. I am not surprised at that; that is not a criticism. The clause refers to “proper and usual works and facilities in connection with the railway”, so a car park clearly fits in that definition. The minister is saying, “We’re going to do 2 500 car parks and we’re going to have them on these 15 blocks of land, but actually there are these 10 other blocks of land”—I do not know, I am just inventing a number—“that in the future will be used for car parks and that is still within the authority granted under this bill.” That is the point the member was getting at.

Mr D.C. NALDER: I understand the member’s point. The authority enables, for as long as this line is in operation, the Public Transport Authority to do what is necessary, so that future governments and people can act as things evolve without having to bring the legislation back to Parliament. That is what this bill does.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I do not know how we got to this point where the minister has tasked the Shire of Kalamunda to develop a plan.

Mr D.C. Nalder: No, we haven’t tasked it.

Mr W.J. Johnston: You have.

Mr D.C. Nalder: Not the Department of Transport.

Mr W.J. Johnston: No; the government of Western Australia.

Mr D.C. Nalder: Yes.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Let us face it: it is a \$2 billion bit of infrastructure. It is the most expensive project the government is doing. I do not understand how we got to the point that the Shire of Kalamunda has an interpretation of what it is doing, which is an evolving car park situation. The PTA has come out and said that it believes the car park should be in a particular location. I think tabled documents show that the northern part will have 2 500 car bays, which is the ultimate number the government wants to build up-front. Why is the Shire of Kalamunda entertaining an evolving car park and why have we got to the point now that landowners are completely distraught about this process? Can the minister today rule out the evolving car park?

Mr D.C. NALDER: It is the responsibility of the council with the Department of Planning to work out how the town centre develops over time. I would think that as it develops, the shire would want to try to get closer and closer to the station. I imagine that in time we will have multistorey car parks as the town centre continues to concentrate, but we cannot foresee these things at this time. Because of the space that is available, it is far more cost effective at this point to have on-surface flat car parking. However, as the city develops, the Shire of Kalamunda needs to think forward on how it wants to progress it. It wants the flexibility to be able to move things around, but that is not our intent with where we are heading with this bill and what we are doing as part of the construction.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I know what the minister is saying, but this bill gives the government extraordinary power to compulsorily acquire land for car parks valued in 2013 dollars. Can the minister understand the uncertainty and

Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr John Day; Mr Ben Wyatt

anger felt by people who have invested in land and who are now being told—the minister is saying only by the Shire of Kalamunda—and have seen maps that show in 10 or 15 years the government may potentially take their land to build a car park because it makes better planning sense? They have also been told that their land will be valued in 2013 dollars. Can the minister end that uncertainty? It is absolutely ridiculous that we are doing that to landowners in Western Australia, particularly when I do not think we will have an evolving car park. I think it is a silly thing. If we are talking about multistorey car parks, given the minister's obsession with them in Edgewater and given this is a \$2 billion project, I do not understand why he would jeopardise the success of a \$2 billion project, and create massive uncertainty and anger about this project by allowing this situation to occur. I also note that I have seen emails from people to the PTA who are angry that they are being put into a situation in which the community is distrusting the PTA because it is being used as a vehicle for land assembly; and that is what the people are very, very unhappy about.

Mr D.C. NALDER: I will state up-front that it is not being used for land assembly. I will say that last night in Parliament I met with the concerned landholders from that area. They all have varying concerns. Some want a land swap and some want to make sure they get a fair deal. There are all sorts of different things. I have therefore agreed that my office will meet with every individual landowner, and if they are not comfortable with the information they receive from the PTA, we will investigate each case on a case-by-case basis and see what we can do to appease the current situation. There are 15 landholders who are affected here —

Ms R. Saffioti: Directly, by this car park?

Mr D.C. NALDER: Yes, because the station itself is pretty much in the Forrestfield rail yard, so it is about the surrounding area, the car park; I acknowledge that. We are moving forward with the plan to build the car park; we gave a commitment that we would have 3 000 car bays over the new extension, so we are looking at the mix and trying to make sure that we get that right. We are looking at 2 500 car bays for Forrestfield—or High Wycombe—whatever the station gets called—and we will have feeder buses for car parking and we expect it to be a major entry point for people into the public transport network because it will be a 20-minute ride into the city. We are going through the plans accordingly. The powers that exist for acquisition for this line under this legislation are exactly the same powers that exist around the Mandurah line or the Joondalup line; it is no different from what the Public Transport Authority can do anywhere else. Our advice to the council is that if it wants to modify it, it should acquire the land adjacent, because it is not our intent to use it. If the council then wants to work out how it moves, we would be happy to support that and work with it on that basis. But we would say that if it is going to progress down the path of wanting to shift the car parking bays, it should take responsibility for acquiring the additional land. It is not our intent to acquire it.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: This is a very key point, and I want to go through a couple of points. The minister said there were 15 landowners directly involved. Can the minister confirm whether those 15 relate to the car park shown by the PTA in the information tabled today?

Mr D.C. Nalder: Station, railway and car park. Some of the station comes out.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: So there are 15 landowners directly involved in that car park. I am saying that, because of what seems to be a complete lack of coordination, there are a number of other landowners—not just the ones the minister met yesterday—who are also affected, because the draft structure plan shows an evolving car park plan.

Mr D.C. Nalder: I also met with them; they were at the meeting.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Can the minister clarify today that it is not the PTA's intention to purchase other land, which is not for car parking, over the next 20 years?

Mr D.C. NALDER: That is correct.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: In the development of this plan, I do not quite understand the interaction between the PTA and the Shire of Kalamunda. I have seen emails in which people from the PTA are quite disgruntled that they are being used as a vehicle for land assembly for other purposes. Frankly, it should not be the PTA that is used as that vehicle, because it builds railway lines, car parks and stations—that is about it. It should not be a precinct planner. As I said in my contribution to the second reading debate, the PTA builds great railway lines, great railway stations and great car parks, but it does not develop precincts. Can I have some clarity over whose job it is in government to develop a precinct to make a station work?

Mr D.C. NALDER: I agree wholeheartedly with the member's comments, and it is not the PTA; it is the Department of Planning, which is working with the Shire of Kalamunda. Obviously there is an interface into the station, and that is where the PTA gets involved, but that is solely it. The member is right: it is the car park, the railway station and the railway line.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Thursday, 17 September 2015]

p6601b-6623a

Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr John Day; Mr Ben Wyatt

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: As part of this, I go back to the issue of land acquisition. Let us talk about the car park that we know is going to happen, the one that was tabled today. I saw two things: I saw confirmation from Eric Lumsden, I think, about two years ago, saying that there was no direct allocation for the purchase of land for this rail line; and since then, I have also seen in the Western Australian Planning Commission's budget commentary that there has been an allocation under the WAPC. Can I have this confirmed: is there a budget allocation in this \$2 billion rail line budget for land acquisition?

Mr D.C. NALDER: No properties have been acquired through the WAPC, and yes there is, in our budget, an allocation for those 15 properties, but I cannot give the member specifics; I do not have them to hand.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I suspect we will be back after lunch. Can the minister provide the allocation, within that \$2 billion budget, for land acquisition?

Mr D.C. Nalder: Yes, I can.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Nobody is saying that this is an unusual provision. This is, as the minister says, a regular provision in any other legislation, and we are not concerned about that. As the minister said, it was used for the Joondalup line et cetera. Given that the minister has an extraordinary power, he is going to an interesting location, because it is effectively on the edge of the airport and there is only one side of the development. If we were to build a South Perth station, one of the arguments about that is that it could serve only one side of the track, and this is a bit like that. There is also controversy about the planning that goes around the station, and that is clearly not a settled matter because it was rejected by the Shire of Kalamunda the other night. We have 2 500 car bays being assembled through these powers, which is appropriate and understandable. But equally, if the minister were to use the same powers in five years' time to assemble some more land and put 1 000 car bays on that new land under the powers that are being granted here, 40 per cent of the current car park could suddenly become a state government office building sold off to a developer with a guarantee; the minister can see the issue that is being raised. It is an unusual situation because train lines elsewhere—the ones built in contemporary times, rather than Depression-era ones—have been built through areas where development has already happened and effectively the planning has happened first, and then the train arrives, rather than the train arriving and the planning then being done. Again, if I might be so bold as to repeat what we keep saying about Metronet, it is not just about a train line, it is about an integrated plan, and that is what we are drawing the minister's attention to. That is what seems to us to be lacking here. It seems strange to be doing these things to build a train line when we have not worked out how it fits in to the end of the train line. I would have thought it would have been better to work that out first and then put the train line in. That is not a question of delay; it is a question of why the planning was not done. The first time I ever spoke in any detail to anybody about a rail line to the airport, in terms of the PTA, was in 2007, and that is more than eight years ago; that is how long this has been kicking around inside the public service for both sides of Parliament. It is unusual that the plan for the precinct was not done before the train station arrives, because everywhere else, it happened the other way round.

Mr D.C. NALDER: As I have said before in this house, we are actually making a strategic positioning, and the numbers involved in supporting this rail line do not actually incorporate any of the development around it, but there will be additional things to it. I think it is one of the first times that we have not tried to retrofit a public transport solution to an already existing spread. But the ongoing development is not unusual; we have seen the Joondalup Development Corporation and how that was developed by LandCorp over time. It is one of the discussions we got onto last night. This is where it gets difficult for people because they feel like they are missing out, so we are trying to say, "Hang on, how can we help with that?" They are sitting there saying, "Well, you've got this car park, but in time you may do a high-rise car park and consolidate and develop commercial offices around that, and therefore the state benefits from it." That is a fact. Those people have been affected by that, but we cannot forecast what future governments or future shires are going to do as things continue to evolve; that occurs everywhere. What we can do is make sure that we facilitate a fair and equitable arrangement on acquiring that land, and that is why we attempt to negotiate. When people are looking to stay in the area—if they want to stay in the area—are we providing fair value for the land that we are acquiring that allows them to then move in? Is there a mechanism by which they do not then pay other government charges to acquire similar land surrounding that area? We are trying to negotiate all those things with people. Some people want land swaps, some people want to get out and just want a fair value for their land, and some people who still want to be able to profit from the development of that area want to use that to buy somewhere else nearby. Those sorts of things are part of the negotiations that are going on with the 15 people who are affected.

I cannot try to predict what the government will develop in 30, 40 or 50 years and how it will benefit from something. Given that this location is 20 minutes from the CBD, I suspect that the land will become more valuable as the area gets a town centre and becomes urbanised. Does it mean that these people will therefore miss out on participating directly on that land? Yes, it does. That is one of the unfortunate circumstances that the state has to face; when it wants to put in infrastructure, no matter where, it has to have the land to do that. We are

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Thursday, 17 September 2015]

p6601b-6623a

Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr John Day; Mr Ben Wyatt

not trying to force these people to miss out; we are trying to facilitate an opportunity for them to still participate by paying them a fair price—10 per cent above the valuation—and removing charges to get them into land nearby. I think that is the only fair thing that we can do to ensure that we still progress and allow the city to grow and transform.

On the previous question about land acquisition, \$45 million has been set aside.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: Within the \$2 billion?

Mr D.C. NALDER: Yes.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I do not expect the minister to know what is going to happen in 30 years' time; that is not a reasonable thing to ask him to know about. The problem, and I think this is the sensitivity being shown by people up there from what I have seen, is that they are worried about what is going to happen in five years' time, which I think is something that should be foreseen. Their position is that if the government is using the necessary powers, these are not unnecessary, to assemble this so that it can build a car park, which is clearly a facility in connection with the railway—there is no question about that at all; absolutely—but then actually builds an office building on that site, that would then not be a facility in connection with the railway. Can the minister see the difference? That is the problem that needs to be dealt with. I do not expect the minister to know what we are going to do in 30 years' time—I do not know that and the minister does not know that—but five years' time is reasonable. That, I suppose, is the assurance that these owners are looking for. How do they know that this land will be used for the purpose of a facility in connection with the railway line, rather than the government using that power to get the land and then, in five years' time, using that land, which will then be crown land, for this other purpose and then put the facilities in connection with the railway on another piece of land? That is the problem.

Mr D.C. NALDER: Having spent time with those 15 landholders and other owners in the surrounding area, I know that they all have different requirements, different issues and different challenges, and we are trying to work through them. At times the government can be a little bit of a bulldozer. If anything, what I got out of last night is that I do not think we have potentially shown enough empathy towards the individual circumstances. That is what I am apologising for to those 15 landholders who are involved. I want to ensure that we have a better communication process and that we show more empathy. We are not intending to build commercial buildings or anything else but a car park; that is not the intent of the Public Transport Authority at all. I can only state that. What happens and how soon? Again, I cannot see within five years that sort of thing going on with a commercial residence being built. What I can say is that if we ensure that we negotiate a fair value for them and provide a mechanism whereby they can acquire other land that is for sale, obviously, at a similar price or even a little cheaper—we know that over the last couple of years land values have not gone up but have gone down—then we have allowed them the opportunity to participate in that environment. That is why I am trying to get the PTA to work through the individual circumstances. Some of them have businesses to run. Some of them are just land banking. There are different circumstances. We have to work with and show empathy to those people who are affected. That is what I am instructing the PTA to do and is part of what came out of last night's conversation with those landholders.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I have a question in relation to the car park. It has been put to me that the car park will be as big as the car park on the Esplanade—2 500 car bays. That is a massive physical size. That runs contrary to good planning principles in that we will be creating a massive car park in proximity to a station. An amount of \$45 million has been set aside for land acquisition. Would the minister, and could the minister, consider building a multistorey car park? The net financial impact between acquiring all this land compared with building a multistorey car park will not be that significant, given that this is a \$2 billion project. I think the success of this precinct will be fundamental to the success of the line. We will go through the catchment in a second. The success of the precinct will underpin the line. Would it not be smarter to consider a multistorey car park in this case? I ask this because this land has existing landowners, it has fragmented ownership, a lot of people have been there for a long time and it has different purposes—it is basically an industrial-commercial area. Would it not be wiser to consider that? The government is spending \$2 billion. A net impact of \$30 million or \$40 million to build a multistorey car park, because the government would have to acquire less land, would probably make some financial and planning sense in the longer term.

Mr D.C. NALDER: I refer to a couple of things. One, we are straying right off the bill. How we build a car park and whether it is multistorey does not have any relevance to the bill. However, I will try to answer the question, because I am trying to be as collegial as possible in this process. What we are trying to do is to work through the most efficient and effective utilisation of the space available. At this stage, it does not make economic sense to construct a multistorey car park. That is not to say that it will not make sense in 20 or 30 years' time. I cannot see that being so in the next five to 10 years. It is a fair question around the utilisation of 2 500 bays. It is a commitment that we have made to put 3 000 bays on the line. The modelling shows that people will come in to catch trains at this station. Is 2 500 bays adequate, is it too few or is it too many? We can debate around those

Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr John Day; Mr Ben Wyatt

issues but, given the space available and the cost of acquiring that land at current prices, the most efficient and effective method economically is to just do an at-grade car park at this point.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It is a unique site; let us face it. It is basically next to a freight line. It enters into areas where people have been running successful businesses for decades. There are a number of different constraints compared with any other rail line, apart from the complexities of the city where, because it was going straight underground for the whole thing, of course there were engineering difficulties and claims that the buildings would fall in, but this line brings with it a level of complexity and challenges that are quite unique. One thing, in looking at the plan, is the station location. I will go through some of the comments made by some of the private companies. I will not worry about Perth Airport for a second, but I will talk about some of the freight companies in relation to the proximity of potential housing to the freight line. Was consideration given to having a station a bit further east and then creating a buffer between that station and the freight line through car parking? To me, that would have created a more sensible planning outcome as the car parks would have created a buffer—of course, they would need to be accessed, and they would possibly need to be grade separated—and the station could have been brought a little more to the east, so that the government could have developed higher density residential right around the station.

Mr D.C. NALDER: A couple of options were considered for where the station should be. It was felt that this was the best location to allow continuation south when the line is eventually extended and reconnects back down south. It is the best location for that.

Mr W.J. Johnston: Metronet stage 2.

Mr D.C. NALDER: It is fascinating that members opposite keep talking about their transport plan, but I have looked at documents that date back decades that outline the extension to Byford, the Cockburn–Thornlie line and the extension to Yanchep. I find it fascinating that members have missed one priority extension—it surprises me, but I am sure they will add it in—which is the extension of the Midland line to Bellevue. Members opposite have not raised that one yet. I have been waiting for it because I am sure it will come.

The location of the station will facilitate the continuation of the line south; that is the priority. As far as the car parking goes, from a Public Transport Authority perspective, one of the reasons that we looked at that car park is that it provides a natural barrier from a sound perspective. We are concerned that that may be impeded if it is changed, but it is not a PTA decision; it is a planning decision. From a PTA perspective, we have put a plan forward. This is what we intend to do and this bill is about getting on with the construction of that railway; that is what we want to get going with and that is what this bill is about.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I am not talking about a deviation of a significant amount for the station's location. If the minister moved the station, he could basically bring it out to create an easement for it to connect later to the Armadale line. Like I said, I think, from a planning perspective we could—we might—do better.

In relation to catchment figures that are driving the 2 500 car parks, which is part of the authority to construct, does the minister stand by the catchment figures that were released at the time the master plan was released in August 2014, particularly the idea that people in Pickering Brook would catch this railway? Does the minister stand by some of the bizarre catchments in relation to the plan? How did the minister determine the catchments, particularly for the Forrestfield station?

Mr D.C. NALDER: I rely on the expertise of the department and the advice that they provide. In my 18 months as Minister for Transport, I have found the advice from the agencies to be excellent. I really respect the work that they do and the thinking that they put into ensuring that we have one of the best public transport systems in Australia. For the fourth year running, the CANSTAR award—an independent award—says our rail system is the best in Australia. I am very confident of the information that they capture. To clarify, Forrestfield station's large and growing residential catchment of around 60 000 includes the suburbs of High Wycombe, Forrestfield, Maida Vale, Gooseberry Hill and extends into Kalamunda. An estimated 9 800 daily trips on the network will be generated by Forrestfield station by 2021. Yes, I am confident in the information that it is providing that support the reasons that we are making the strategic decision to invest in the Forrestfield–Airport Link and allow Perth to continue to grow east as opposed to solely north–south. As a responsible government—irrespective of our politics—we should be committed to opening up the eastern suburbs. A break in the suburbs prevents easy transport into the CBD or other places for work. This is a fantastic opportunity to open up and allow these communities to flourish and develop, and become modern, urban centres.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I have no doubt that our rail system is one of the best in the world because Labor built most of it. But in relation to the catchment, I have the page the minister referred to. Can he explain why areas within 200 metres of Guildford or East Guildford train stations are included in the catchment numbers?

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Thursday, 17 September 2015]

p6601b-6623a

Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr John Day; Mr Ben Wyatt

Mr D.C. NALDER: It depends on how the buses operate. The numbers that come from that area are facilitated by how the feeder buses feed into Forrestfield station.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Is the minister saying that the passenger numbers using the station, which he is basing his figures on, are also partly based on the alignments of the buses that run to those stations? To give an example on the northern suburbs line, I used to live up in the northern suburbs in Marangaroo, which is east of Wanneroo Road. People could not get to the train line because none of the buses ran across the line. Is the minister saying that buses, instead of running to Guildford station, will run to the Forrestfield station as a preference?

Mr D.C. NALDER: I will confirm that the buses are running between the stations, but it depends on their alignments and how they feed as to which way they go. An element will be that it is more practical if some feed one way and some feed the other way. Modelling shows that it will go both ways.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: What is the expected reduction in passengers on the Midland line for the part prior to Bayswater by the construction of this line?

Mr D.C. NALDER: We are getting way off the bill again.

Mr W.J. Johnston: No, we're not.

Mr D.C. NALDER: We are. This is not about the construction of the Forrestfield line. I do not have the numbers at hand about what is happening around Midland station. Again, modelling suggests with the new hospital and university that are being developed, traffic will continue to increase in both areas. There is an argument that if we extend out to the Bellevue line at some point, it will take some pressure off the Midland line, but it will be more driven than the impact of the Forrestfield line.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Is the minister saying that there is no modelling about the numbers? Is that what he is saying? Is there no modelling of passenger numbers?

Mr D.C. NALDER: There is modelling but I do not have the figures at hand on Midland station because we are talking about construction of the Forrestfield station. There is modelling, but as I said, we do not anticipate that there will be a huge impact. We anticipate a greater impact if we extend the Bellevue line out—take the pressure off the Midland line through that—more so than the Forrestfield line.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I am indebted to the minister for letting us know that there is modelling. I wonder whether he could—I understand that he does not have the modelling with him—provide that modelling to the house?

Mr D.C. NALDER: We will have a look at the level of detail in it. I will determine whether we can provide the whole modelling and when it is appropriate to provide it.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Why is the minister trying to hide information? This is a great news story; the sort of great news story that every government wants to be able to announce. A \$2 billion rail line—what a headline! When we were building a \$1.3 billion rail line, which we delivered without any debt, we celebrated it. We provided a huge amount of detailed information and modelling. It was all in there because we were proud of what we were doing; we were not trying to hide anything. We were trying to be open and honest with everybody. Instead, we get a glossy brochure from the minister with nothing in it. Some ads are on the TV and there are some billboards around the place—all this stuff. It is \$2 billion and the minister is not telling anybody about it! I do not understand it.

Why is it that the Labor Party can be open and honest and the Liberal Party cannot? I do not understand it. What is it that the government is trying to hide from us? Why can the minister not just tell us? He should be proud, this is an unbelievable achievement: a \$2 billion rail line! The minister could retire tomorrow and if this is the only thing he achieves, he could still be proud to have been a minister. Why can he not just provide this information? He says he has the modelling but all he is prepared to say is that he will have a look.

Debate interrupted, pursuant to standing orders.

[Continued on page 6636.]