

Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Speaker; Mr Pendal; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker;
Mr Mark McGowan; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Arthur
Marshall

SOUTHERN METROPOLITAN RAIL LINK ROUTE

Motion

MRS HODSON-THOMAS (Carine) [5.01 pm]: I move -

That this House condemn the Government for its failure to consult with professional bodies and the general public on the preferred route for the southern rail link and for limiting the terms of reference of the Perth City Railway Advisory Committee to the proposed section of the rail link between the Narrows Bridge and the Perth central business district.

In speaking to the motion, I raise a number of issues and matters that are extremely important to all residents affected by the Government's proposal to re-route the southern rail line. As members know, the change of route will bring the rail line down the middle of the Kwinana Freeway, over Mt Henry Bridge, under Canning Bridge, along the Kwinana Freeway over the Narrows Bridge and into the central business district via William Street. The new route along this stretch has raised concern and a great deal of criticism from many people in the wider community. To date, the community thought that it would have an opportunity to raise its misgivings through the consultative process that the minister had previously advocated.

The Minister for Planning and Infrastructure's media statement of 31 October entitled "City rail options to be examined" would have given readers some hope - a false hope, I might add - that she is interested in consulting with the wider community and professional bodies. However, upon close examination and scrutiny, it is clear that the minister has no interest in the views of those in the wider community. I will illustrate this by quoting from the minister's media statement. It states -

... the committee will ensure that a wide range of opinions were examined and that the State Government made the best decision.

The minister goes on to say -

"However, I acknowledge that there are some alternative views which need to be explored.

"To do this I've brought together an independent group with a broad range of expertise to look again at all the options, before we finalise the master plan."

Ms MacTiernan said the committee's tasks were to:

- seek the views of interested parties;
- evaluate options and recommend a preferred rail alignment and station locations through the city; and
- advise on strategies for minimising disruption during the construction phase.

Those options deal only with the way in which the rail line will enter the central business district, and not with whether it will come along the Kwinana Freeway and along our foreshores. The minister said, as I have already articulated, that the views of interested parties will be sought. I am not convinced that the minister is committed to this. I will elaborate on that further during this debate.

The committee's terms of reference require it to consider budgetary restraints and the necessity to complete the south west railway by 2006. A further examination of the advertisement that appeared in *The West Australian* of Monday, 5 November reveals that public submissions have been invited. I was particularly alarmed by the total lack of regard for and consultation with the wider community and professional bodies, and that the option was limited to dealing with only the entry into the CBD. The terms of reference are narrow. They are as follows -

1. develop criteria, evaluate options for and provide recommendations on:
 - a) the alignment of the line through the Central City area; and
 - b) station locations in the Central City.
2. recommend management requirements to ameliorate the impact of the rail in construction and in operation.

In evaluating options, the Committee is to consider social, economic, environmental, planning and financial implications, as well as relevant land use and transport planning issues.

I believe that the minister has clearly been reacting to the adverse publicity she has received from many of those interested parties in the central business district, who will obviously be impacted by this ill thought-out route. I,

Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Speaker; Mr Pendal; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker;
Mr Mark McGowan; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Arthur
Marshall

too, have the same concerns that those retailers, property owners, the City of Perth and others have about the rail line's entry into the city. It alarms me that the minister is ignoring the concerns of the wider community and of professional bodies. As I said before, I am not convinced that the minister is committed to seeking the views of interested parties, especially as the minister is adamant that the rail line will come down the middle of the freeway - so much so that she is quoted in *The West Australian* of 1 November as saying -

"What is absolutely locked in stone is that the rail line will come up through the centre of the freeway into the centre of the city," . . .

How can the minister claim that a wide range of opinions will be examined when the outcome has already been determined. On a reading of a number of press clippings on the rail line, it is evident that there are grave concerns and criticisms about its entry into the central business district. Clearly, the minister has reacted to those concerns and vocal criticisms. I believe that is why there has suddenly been this belated setting up of the Perth City Railway Advisory Committee.

Dr Peter Nattrass, the Lord Mayor, has certainly been vocal, and I have a number of quotes from Dr Nattrass. An article in *The West Australian* of Saturday, 14 July states -

Dr Nattrass said the council opposed strongly the William Street option and wanted the Government to retain the original Kenwick link plan, which had been fully planned and costed.

"The William Street route will create a disastrous visual impact on the city foreshore. It will create another physical barrier . . . and cause severe disruption to the city centre, particularly in terms of traffic and access to adjoining properties," . . .

In *The West Australian* of Monday, 16 July, an article headed "Rail Tunnel" states -

Perth Lord Mayor Peter Nattrass was scathing of the proposals.

He said they would make plans for purpose-built bus lanes running from Murdoch to the freeway and into the city busport redundant. . . .

He said the William Street tunnel would create another physical barrier which would impede any attempt to improve access to the foreshore.

An article in *The West Australian* of Tuesday, 17 July states -

PERTH Lord Mayor Peter Nattrass has vowed to fight the State Government's decision to re-route the Perth to Mandurah rail link.

He said yesterday he would not be alone in his campaign.

Dr Nattrass promised united opposition to the plan. He said the City of Perth would be joined by Rockingham, Kwinana, Melville and South Perth councils.

He blasted the State Government for a lack of consultation and accused it of creating a blight on the beauty of the city by running the rail line over the Narrows Bridge and along a section of the river foreshore.

An article in the *Sunday Times* of 19 August 2001 states -

Mayor Peter Nattrass has called it an eyesore, a blight on the city and a barrier that will keep people away from the Swan River foreshore.

An article in *The West Australian* of Friday, 14 September headed, "Threat seen in city rail links" states -

The State Government should rethink the city leg of the Mandurah to Perth rail link because the proposed route would damage the city's retail heart, Perth's biggest retailers claim.

Another article headed "Rail process attacked" with the subheading, "We weren't consulted, say experts" in *The West Australian* on 28 October states -

Eight professional bodies have condemned the process used to determine the route of the new southern rail link.

Organisations such as the Institute of Engineers, Royal Australian Institute of Architects, City Vision and Institute of Urban Studies say they did not have any involvement in the billion-dollar development.

In a communique, they voiced some concerns as:

Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Speaker; Mr Pendal; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker;
Mr Mark McGowan; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Arthur
Marshall

- The new line will not enter Perth central station and therefore not be integrated with the Midland, Fremantle and Armadale lines.
- The southern rail link on the Perth foreshore will be an eyesore.
- The line will not add to the economic value of the city.

It goes on. They are highly critical of this decision.

Yesterday, I received an e-mail from Ms Dianne McLeod from Convention Link. Ms McLeod's e-mail demonstrates her concerns about the minister's decision to re-route the rail link. I thought it appropriate to read her e-mail, which she sent the minister, particularly because the minister still has not replied to that e-mail, nor to any other correspondence that she has sent the minister. Her e-mail reads -

Minister MacTiernan,

Further to my many requests for information on your proposed Freeway Rail Plans, again, I am still awaiting replies.

Perhaps when you finally decide to answer, you could include your responses to the following:

- a) if your Government is spending \$88M+??? to removing the Railway from the Geraldton foreshore, why are you hell-bent on adding one to the Perth foreshore?
- b) can we please have an ACCURATE cost to your plan to tear up the busway and re-build a railway line.
- c) can we please have an ACCURATE cost of building another bridge alongside the Mt Henry bridge? All of the costs we are seeking need to also include the loss to industry and business due to delays and disruptions during the building phases. Could we also have an ACCURATE cost of altering the Narrows Bridge yet again?
- d) Assuming you are able to railroad (no pun intended!) legislation through Parliament AGAINST the wishes of the people, what are the costs involved in ALL of the Government Departments currently working on your projects, which may/may not go ahead due to public protest? After all, we - the taxpayers - are funding Mr Peter Martinovich and his Department with his expensive expansive? plans. Whilst it is recognised Government Departments need to keep people in work, surely the work on the previous plan and infrastructure already implement, must come at a huge cost to us all?
- e) Why are we continuing to build a busway, when it will be replaced in another couple of years with a railway line?
- f) Does Dr Gallop seriously believe creating a public railway eyesore along our foreshores will bring him or you any votes? Public Transport systems are surely supposed to improve with the Freeway Busway project? or have I missed something?
- g) Peter Martinovich talks about passengers from the Roethorpe Retirement Village. Why would they use a Railway line, which is miles away from them, when they have buses collecting them almost at their front doors? Surely this is bureaucracy gone mad?
- h) Can you tell me how long it has been since you and Dr Gallop travelled along the Freeway as far as the Mt Henry Bridge?

As always Minister, I look forward to receiving your long awaited comments.

Dianne McLeod.

The Government's proposed rail advisory committee is too little, too late. The minister's proposed establishment of this committee is certainly nothing more than a charade - an absolute sham! Consultation should have occurred before the re-routing of the southern rail link, especially given the significant change to the route and particularly given the significant amount of public consultation that took place when we were in government.

Ms MacTiernan: Can you elaborate on when your consultation took place, because that is a key critical point? Can you describe the sequence that your Government went through?

Mrs HODSON-THOMAS: I will do that for the minister shortly.

Mr McGowan: That is all it would take.

Mrs HODSON-THOMAS: That is all it would take, but I will go through that shortly.

Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Speaker; Mr Pental; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker;
Mr Mark McGowan; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Arthur
Marshall

If the minister had been listening to some of the other comments I have made in this place previously, she would have heard about that consultation, so she should not feign ignorance suddenly.

If the minister were truly committed to consultation, she should have put her plan to run the rail line down the middle of the freeway and into the city centre to the community before making the decision. I think that is why people are highly vocal and highly critical of the minister's decision. The minister can shake her head. There are enough people shaking their heads at the Minister for Health about his appalling behaviour; however, I will stay on this motion at this point.

Mr Kucera: I do not see many people in Mandurah and Rockingham shaking their heads. The people who desperately need transport are not shaking their heads. The people who are worried about pollution in this State are not shaking their heads.

Mr Pental interjected.

Mrs HODSON-THOMAS: He has indeed; he certainly has enough problems there.

This decision has the potential to be a major disaster and an atrocious legacy to the State. Frankly, if the minister wants to get it right, proper consultation is imperative. She talks in one breath about having a six-month consultation process; yet she has set up a committee that will meet for maybe only three or, at best, four months to hear the concerns of the people in the community. Is that not true? The editorial in *The West Australian* on Wednesday, 18 July states -

Planning and Infrastructure Minister Alannah MacTiernan says that the Government will start a six-month consultative period and that changes in detail are possible. It is odd, then, that it has already made the final decision on the rail's route.

This rail line will cut off the river foreshore from the city. All the work that the previous coalition did when it was in government - regardless of whether the Government now thinks that was good, bad or indifferent - was done very well. The rail line down the middle of the Kwinana Freeway into the central business district -

Mr McGowan interjected.

Mrs HODSON-THOMAS: The member for Rockingham should go to the library and do some research and then make his own speech.

The minister has only now decided to seek people's opinions, but, as I said, she has limited it to the rail line entry into the central business district. That is only because she has been highly criticised by many people. She should wait until the people in the southern suburbs start to understand the impact this will have on them; then she can watch the backlash. The minister has put in place impossible constraints that will impede the committee's ability to perform its task properly. I am most concerned that this is not a genuine endeavour to provide the members of the wider community with a consultation process that allows for all of their concerns to be aired, considered and properly dealt with.

There are many reasons that the general public should be consulted about this very important infrastructure project. There are many unanswered questions that need serious consideration and further examination. By excluding the wider community and other professional bodies that can contribute to that consultation, the minister will not win over those she hopes will ultimately support her. It is typical of her posturing and riding roughshod over those in the community whom she appears to have deemed irrelevant and should not be given the opportunity to be represented or consulted.

Ms MacTiernan: Which southern suburbs are concerned?

Mrs HODSON-THOMAS: I am getting to that. The minister is quite clearly out of step with the wider community and she is backing away from the commitment that she made on many occasions to consult widely. I have already made mention of the article in *The West Australian*. There are many unanswered questions, which must be answered to give the community some comfort that those matters are being dealt with in a genuine and open way. For example, the community has concerns in relation to safety issues. Over the weekend a motorist rolled her vehicle on the rail track at Glendalough. I will quote from an article in *The West Australian* of Monday, 12 November 2001 headed "Freeway crash brings train to a halt", which reads -

A motorist escaped with only minor injuries yesterday after her vehicle crashed through a safety barrier on the Mitchell Freeway at Glendalough and rolled on to the railway line.

Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Speaker; Mr Pendal; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker;
Mr Mark McGowan; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Arthur
Marshall

The woman, aged about 60, was travelling south about 2pm when she lost control of her Toyota LandCruiser near the Powis Street off ramp. The safety barrier - designed to keep cars away from trains - collapsed on impact and her vehicle rolled several times before coming to a halt on its roof.

...

Passengers on a train which was forced to stop at the crash site had to wait for about 50 minutes for a bus to arrive.

Transport Minister Alannah MacTiernan said the accident would be investigated to determine if safety improvements were needed.

Mr Bradshaw: It is obvious they are needed.

Mrs HODSON-THOMAS: They are.

The driver was extremely fortunate not to have been seriously injured in that accident, and I am pleased she is safe. The accident highlights the real concern that I and others in the community have about the southern rail line, that it will be housed in this 10.2 metre median with the proposed bi-directional bus lane along the eastern side of the Kwinana Freeway between Canning Bridge and the city. As the article stated, it is not the first time an accident has occurred at Glendalough. I have real concerns about the southern rail line, given its close proximity to both the bi-directional bus lane and motorists travelling along the Kwinana Freeway. This project will exacerbate the congestion and add to the community's real concern about safety, and certainly motorists will be concerned about their safety as well.

The coalition Government recognised and worked towards alleviating the congestion along the Kwinana Freeway. We set about major public investment in our freeways to get it right. This investment will be compromised and impeded by this poorly thought out planning disaster that will both aggravate congestion and bring with it further lengthy delays and disruptions for many years to come. It compromises the sound investment made by the coalition to alleviate traffic congestion.

Ms MacTiernan: Can you explain how congestion will be increased?

Mrs HODSON-THOMAS: The minister will have an opportunity; she will have her day.

Several government members interjected.

Mrs HODSON-THOMAS: There will be plenty of answers. However, I would like to make some points first. Commuters who do not have access to the railway will still have -

Several government members interjected.

Mrs HODSON-THOMAS: Members want me to answer the minister. We will lose one lane when we apply a bi-directional bus lane on the eastern side of the Kwinana Freeway - if that is what the minister determines - so of course there will be congestion. How easily do members think motorists will drive along the freeway after they lose an extra lane? Do they think motorists will suddenly disappear and the Tardis will appear and suck up all the cars?

Several government members interjected.

Mrs HODSON-THOMAS: I am sure people will take the train. We all want to see more commuters use public transport, but this is about getting it right. This minister is not prepared to listen to the concerns of those in the community who want to be heard on this occasion. This State needs major infrastructure, but the minister has to get it right. This is the minister who talks about public consultation, but only when the result is what she wants.

Mr McRae: You did not turn up for the ratepayers meeting?

Mrs HODSON-THOMAS: I was very ill that weekend; that is the only reason I did not attend.

Several government members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs HODSON-THOMAS: Mr Speaker, I can hold my own. Government members can make as many interjections as they like. I thank you for your protection, but I will hold my own in this debate.

It is a matter of concern that the minister is backing away from the need to consult widely with the general community and professional bodies that she appeared committed to initially. People residing in South Perth, Como, Mt Pleasant and other areas are exasperated and annoyed that they are being excluded from the process. The many people who have contacted me over the minister's rail link are concerned that they are not being given

Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Speaker; Mr Pendal; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker;
Mr Mark McGowan; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Arthur
Marshall

a genuine opportunity to be part of that consultative process. They have concerns about noise and the visual impact on their local environment. They feel aggrieved, and rightly so, by the process.

This is typical of the minister's arrogance and her total disregard for the community, and is clearly another low for her. There is absolutely no standard of integrity in this process. It appears consultation is fine as long as the minister gets an outcome that is to her liking. As I have said before, it flies in the face of the Government's commitment to accountability. I am certain that the minister will face a major backlash from the general community if she continues to railroad her project upon the people of Western Australia who are not being given an opportunity to be heard.

The SPEAKER: Before I give the call to the member for South Perth, for the benefit of new members I draw to their attention that during debates one of the rules we apply is that reading from documents should be limited to a few lines, and the document should be paraphrased. I hope that members bear that in mind.

MR PENDAL (South Perth) [5.26 pm]: I support the motion moved by the member for Carine. I congratulate her, in the time that has been available, for her exposition. I particularly want to touch on two elements: first, the second part of her motion in which she seeks to condemn the Government for "limiting the terms of reference of the Perth City Railway Advisory Committee to the proposed section of the rail link between the Narrows Bridge and the Perth central business district." Secondly, I will touch on a fear that I have - I will adduce some evidence for this - that we are seeing today the repetition of all that was bad about the WA Inc years.

The first part of the motion that I will address seeks to condemn the Government for limiting this review to the impacts of the railway on the Perth side of the equation. The Minister for Planning and Infrastructure appeared on television the night the Government announced this review. To her credit she said something along these lines - if these were not the words it is their spirit: "I do not think we have got it wrong, but if we have, this is an opportunity in relation to the Perth side to get it right." If the Government has the capacity - even a one per cent capacity - to get it wrong in relation to the Perth side, equally the Government has the capacity to get it wrong about the South Perth and Como side of the equation. The first thing I ask of the minister - as she has had the courage to bring about a review of the way this will impact on the central business district - is that she widen the scope of that review to take into account its impact on South Perth, Como and Salter Point. There are other options, and I will touch briefly on some of those before I resume my seat.

I fear that the Government is running the risk of returning to the worst excesses of WA Inc. I ask members who were here during that time, and even those who were not, to cast their minds back and consider why WA Inc occurred. WA Inc occurred, essentially, because people set out to cut corners and to eliminate those trusted and tried protocols that are used in government to assess the spending of government funds. WA Inc was not necessarily about corruption; it was about cutting all the corners, using people outside the public sector, and arriving at conclusions where one trod on those time-honoured processes and procedures. We are heading down the same path with this issue, and I will provide evidence to support this claim. Incidentally, getting information about this matter from the Government is like pulling teeth. From a Government that came to office on a serious commitment of accountability we have seen nothing but a lack of accountability and information, and a refusal to answer questions. I have questions on the Notice Paper from as far back as August which have not been answered.

Ms MacTiernan: They will be answered within three months.

Mr PENDAL: The implication of the member for Armadale's interjection is that I have to wait virtually until the end of this session - when we leave Parliament and the year has drawn to a close - before I get answers to questions I have asked. I will not weary the House by going through them.

Ms MacTiernan: How many questions have we answered?

Mr PENDAL: The Government has answered about one-third of the questions that I have asked. I do not want the member for Armadale to provoke me today. I made a resolution to ensure that she focuses on this issue before she makes a complete muck of it. If the Government is satisfied with answering a third of the questions that I have asked over the past three months, then it has a very low benchmark for accountability in this Parliament, even though it was elected to office on its great commitment to accountability. Mr Speaker, take it as read; I have a bundle of questions going back to 27 August 2001 that remain unanswered. Other questions were submitted on 5 and 11 September.

Mr Kucera: They are all the same.

Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Speaker; Mr Pendal; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker;
Mr Mark McGowan; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Arthur
Marshall

Mr PENDAL: I wish the member for Yokine, the Minister for Health, would stick to the job that he has been given and try to do that job properly. Not many people in the community feel that he is on top of his job. Therefore, for the member to sit there and make interjections about another portfolio -

Mr McGowan: You said that you were not going to be provoked!

Mr PENDAL: That is right; I will not be provoked.

Take it as read that the level of accountability in the answering of questions is abysmal and hypocritical, and this will revisit the Government in the future.

The Government has answered question on notice 828, which I asked on 8 August 2001. It has taken the Government from 9 August to 5 November - three months - to provide an answer to my simple question. I asked this question so that I could get a handle - I want to ask the minister to address this when she responds - on the extent to which Treasury has been involved in this process. I said earlier that WA Inc happened because the Government of the day decided to abandon all our time-honoured procedures. This proposal has not been assessed by Treasury. The only assessment made before the minister took the matter to Cabinet on the second Monday in July was by the expenditure review committee. The proposal was submitted one day prior to Cabinet's meeting on the second Monday in July. On that fateful Monday, the Government spent an additional \$300 million. I will provide members with the sequence of events. On 9 August, I asked the Treasurer when the proposal had been received by Treasury. I wanted to get an idea whether, the week after the Government was elected in February, the proposal was submitted, and, four or five months later, finally given the tick. That was not the case. After reading the Treasurer's answer, I can understand why he took three months to respond to my question. Part two of the answer stated -

The proposal to re-direct the route was not submitted to Treasury.

It was not submitted to Treasury!

Mr Barnett: You would think that the Government would have had an interest in it.

Mr PENDAL: One would think so - it is only \$300 million. When I received this answer on 5 November, I was bedazzled by the fact that the proposal was not submitted to Treasury. It was only this morning when I was preparing for this debate that I paid greater attention to the second part of the answer which states -

It was submitted to the Expenditure Review Committee by the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure on 12 July 2001.

Members may ask what is the significance of this, and I will tell them. The following Monday, the Premier and the minister made the announcement. The twelfth of July was a Thursday. If we take out the Saturday and Sunday - I presume that Treasury and others do not work on those days - there was only one day in which this proposal could have been assessed by the three members who comprise the expenditure review committee. In the first place, we have established that the proposal was not submitted to Treasury. This is an extraordinary reversion to the days of WA Inc. I have checked and learnt about what is colloquially known as the 10-day cabinet rule. In the ordinary course of events, a cabinet submission is circulated and put on an agenda 10 days out from when Cabinet hopes to make a decision, so that it has all the data in front of it. That is not what happened. By the Government's own admission - this sank in only this morning - the proposal to redirect the route was not submitted to Treasury. Members cannot tell me that that is not a reversion to the days of WA Inc. Secondly, the proposal was submitted to the expenditure review committee by the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure on 12 July. It seems then that the Treasurer has told an untruth, because the answer to part four of my question states -

The Expenditure Review Committee made a recommendation to Cabinet, which was approved on 23 July 2001.

That is wrong. According to the Premier's press release of 16 July - three days after its sole reference to the expenditure review committee -

Premier Geoff Gallop today unveiled a bold new vision to build a direct rail link between Mandurah and Perth.

Dr Gallop said the Cabinet today approved a redirection of the rail line

What I have been told by Treasury is contrary to the facts. The Treasurer is referring to something that took place a week later. I have no doubt that the proposal went back to Cabinet a week later as people started to wake up to the fact that they had to cross a few t's and dot a few i's. However, by then the horse had already bolted.

Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Speaker; Mr Pendal; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker;
Mr Mark McGowan; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Arthur
Marshall

The \$300 million commitment had already been made. I repeat to members that it was not made as a result of the careful scrutiny on the part of the people in this State. I am interested to know what John Langoulant's role has been in all this. How can the Under Treasurer be the head of a Treasury in which he apparently has no say about expenditure of that magnitude?

Mr Barnett: He will be one of the public servants who will end up wearing this.

Mr PENDAL: He will. This morning I read reports in the newspaper about possible cabinet reshuffles and about the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee being put into Cabinet. If there are to be any changes, he should get his teeth into this process and answer the question before he leaves that job. He should represent Parliament and ask the Auditor General how we can commit this State to the expenditure of another \$300 million to put a railway through my electorate, which will have all sorts of other implications that I do not have time to go into today. We know there will be \$300 million worth of implications because the Court Government committed \$900 million to this project and this Government has committed \$1.2 billion. I have never had a problem with the extension of the rail link to Mandurah; I agree with it. Nobody in Western Australia would disagree with it.

Mr McRae: You said that you did not want it in your backyard.

Mr PENDAL: I challenge the member for Riverton and the Government to be as outrageous and radical as London was 100 years ago. There is a thought! One hundred years ago they sank the damn thing!

Mr McRae: What was the population of London 100 years ago?

Mr PENDAL: The population of Perth will not get any smaller in the next 100 years. The member who interjects has some cabinet aspirations, and he should remain silent. The government members who get involved in this look very ordinary. If members opposite cannot see the warning signs in politics, some of them will be out of here quicker than they think.

Several members interjected.

Mr PENDAL: No, I am not. I thank the member for Eyre. He is a very restraining influence around this place. He has been duded by his own Government. The Government has committed \$300 million of taxpayers' money -

Ms MacTiernan: Can you explain that figure? I am somewhat puzzled by it.

Mr PENDAL: I am not surprised that the minister is puzzled.

Ms MacTiernan: Where did the member get the figure of \$300 million from?

Mr PENDAL: I got it from the Government's announcement.

Ms MacTiernan: Where did you get the Court Government's figures from?

Mr PENDAL: I got those figures from the Internet, which is the same source from which I obtained Premier Geoff Gallop's announcements this morning. Is that a reasonably good source?

Ms MacTiernan interjected.

Mr PENDAL: I have only a limited time to debate the matter; therefore, the member can listen for a change. If government members are not alarmed by the fact that this proposal was not submitted to Treasury, they have a limited life span. The expenditure review committee possibly learnt of the expenditure of \$300 million on the Friday, only one working day prior to the cabinet decision that was made on the 16th. This is a repeat of WA Inc. The Government will rue the day it made that decision. All I ask is that it stops the process and widens the scope of the review into the impact on the Perth central business district so that South Perth and Como are included, and that the matter be sent to Treasury. If the Government wants to protect the interests of this State and avoid another WA Inc catastrophe, it should refer these matters to Treasury.

MS MacTIERNAN (Armadale - Minister for Planning and Infrastructure) [5.44 pm]: I presume that the member for South Perth is using the same web site that saw Natasha Stott Despoja stumble so graphically when she cited Afghanistan as a country that offers more generous working conditions for women than Australia. However, when queried about that issue - given that women in Afghanistan are not allowed to work - she had to confess that her information was from a 1997 web site. I am being generous to the member for South Perth. I presume that he is being honest when he tells us that he got his information from a web site. However, I also presume that he must have got it from a 1997 web site because this Government will not spend an extra

Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Speaker; Mr Pandal; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker;
Mr Mark McGowan; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Arthur
Marshall

\$300 million on the rail project. Frankly, this project will cost slightly less than the amount that had been set aside by the previous Government.

Mr Pandal: Are you seriously saying that burrowing under Perth will not add to the cost?

Ms MacTIERNAN: Our project has been costed at \$1.2 billion, and the member acknowledges that. If we are wrong, that will be demonstrated when the master plan is released in February 2002. However, we are confident that we have got it right. Time will tell whether or not we have. The previous Government had set aside \$1.147 billion for the rail link and \$70 million for the second stage of the busway project. We are putting the funds for stage 2 into our rail project. Therefore, there is no \$300 million differential. Effectively, the same amount of money is being spent on our project as would have been spent on the previous Government's project.

If that is the level of analysis we can expect from the member for South Perth, I am not surprised at some of the advice he is getting from his constituents. A letter from the *Community Comment* in November states -

It is time Phillip Pandal stopped playing at dinosaurs or he too will become extinct.

I am tired of reading that a rail line down the centre of the Kwinana freeway will be disastrous for South Perth and will isolate us further from the river.

South Perth is already isolated from the river by an eight lane freeway and a two lane bus route, and is suffering ever increasing air pollution and noise as the volume of traffic on the freeway increases.

That is very good advice for the member for South Perth. The letter continues -

Far from his totally negative attitude to the rail link, Phillip Pandal should be seeking to ensure that it will give maximum benefit to the people of South Perth by offering us rail access to Perth City Railway station and by ensuring that the building of the rail link goes hand in hand with a swinging increase in all day car parking costs in Perth City centre to discourage all day business commuters from driving to the city.

In the long run we will benefit by -

Point of Order

Mr BARNETT: Mr Speaker, I refer to your earlier ruling about lengthy quotations.

The SPEAKER: I was just about to stand. I refer the minister to my previous statement that when documents are referred to, they should be limited to a few lines and should be paraphrased.

Debate Resumed

Ms MacTIERNAN: I am sorry, Mr Speaker, I thought you were concerned about members reading their speeches rather than quoting from documents.

In any event, that was some salutary advice for the member for South Perth from one of his constituents, Suzanne Shield. She is not alone. Another letter expresses the view that -

On another matter, the very few people who "may" be affected by the proposed South Perth railway line really should think about the greater good, including Phillip Pandal.

Suppose a train went through every ten or fifteen minutes.

During that time at present hundreds of vehicles including many large, noisy trucks traverse the freeway.

Even the good burghers of South Perth, whose interests the member for South Perth claims he is advancing, do not unanimously support his position. People can see that it is nonsense to complain about the impact of a train travelling down the middle of a freeway. Many in South Perth can clearly see the advantages of dealing with the causes and not simply the symptoms of congestion. If only the member for South Perth had been as vocal in his opposition to the duplication of the Narrows Bridge, he might have attracted more support.

Mr Pandal: I was.

Ms MacTIERNAN: He was terribly effective in his representation of his constituents!

Mr Pandal: I was as vocal then as I am now. I was equally outspoken when the Court Government tried this stunt back late in 1996. It tried this.

Ms MacTIERNAN: That is nonsense. I have completely scotched the argument that the Government has allocated an extra \$300 million. The facts are clear: this is exactly the same amount of money. It is a

Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Speaker; Mr Pandal; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker;
Mr Mark McGowan; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Arthur
Marshall

combination of the \$1.1 million that the previous Government allocated - that amount is in its projected figures - and the \$70 million allocated for stage 2 of the busway project. There is absolutely no credence to that argument.

The second argument was that a grave impropriety had occurred because this matter had never been considered by Treasury. This issue was examined on three separate occasions by the expenditure review committee.

Several members interjected.

Ms MacTIERNAN: I understand that the member for South Perth has never been in Cabinet. That has caused him a certain amount of distress and anxiety, and some uncharitable people might say that it has resulted in a degree of bitterness. He can be forgiven for not understanding the process. Ministers are required to lodge submissions with the expenditure review committee a week in advance. The documents are then examined by Treasury, which then produces its report. Treasury officials attend the expenditure review committee meetings and make comments about proposals. This project has been through the committee process three times.

Mr Pandal: It has never been to Treasury.

Ms MacTIERNAN: These documents are submitted to the expenditure review committee.

Mr Pandal: That is correct.

Ms MacTIERNAN: They are then provided to Treasury, which has an opportunity to make submissions at a committee hearing. In addition, Treasury is represented on the Perth urban rail development steering committee, which produces the submissions that are lodged with the expenditure review committee. At every stage, Treasury has been intimately involved in this process. It also has representatives on the steering committee that produces the documents that are submitted to the expenditure review committee. This project has been to the committee three times; it has been analysed to within an inch of its life.

Although the public transport benefits of the direct route were self-evident from the start, people questioned whether the project could be completed within budget. Therefore, it was subjected to the most rigorous analysis before it was signed off. That is why it took until July for it to be finalised. It did not go to Cabinet only once - we provided Cabinet with a number of briefings and submissions to ensure that it was fully informed. We had to get the Treasury approval and the analysis. We also had to ensure that the expenditure review committee and the Cabinet were confident that this could be done within the budget framework before we would be given approval to go ahead. There is absolutely no basis to the charge that this proposal has not been financially analysed.

Mr Pandal: That is not Treasury. That is untruthful. Your own Treasurer contradicts you!

Ms MacTIERNAN: That is not true.

Mr Pandal: He said that. Look at the answer. He has sprung you!

Ms MacTIERNAN: This went to the expenditure review committee repeatedly. The Treasurer is a member of that committee and he has access to the documents and makes comments -

Mr Pandal: It is not Treasury.

Ms MacTIERNAN: - to ensure the value of that expenditure. I have dealt with that issue.

Mr Pandal: This will haunt you all your days in Cabinet.

Ms MacTIERNAN: The Government has no difficulty being completely open about these processes. Getting that approval was a lengthy process. People were concerned that we would be able to do this within that cost framework. Of course, there are always limits to what one can do in that environment. At the end of the day, it will require the completion of the master plan process that we are now undertaking to determine whether those projections are correct. As I said, we will know in February whether the cost projections that we made on the basis of the best available advice have held up to the more rigorous scrutiny of the master plan process.

I was waiting for the member for Carine to present her analysis of the consultation process undertaken by her Government that she promised to provide.

Mrs Hodson-Thomas: You should have listened to another debate in which -

Ms MacTIERNAN: I must refer to another debate!

Mrs Hodson-Thomas: - I went right through the master plan.

Ms MacTIERNAN: I thought I heard the member say that she would get to it. I was waiting for her to do so, but unfortunately she did not. I will fill the breach and let members know what happened.

Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Speaker; Mr Pendal; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker;
Mr Mark McGowan; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Arthur
Marshall

Some time in July 1995, the Cabinet announced the extension of the existing rail system from Kenwick to Mandurah and confirmed its in-principle intention to extend the urban rail system to Jandakot by 2005. It then said that it would engage in a master plan process to examine the detail. It took the coalition Government two years to get the funding together to commence the master plan process. The strategic decision was made in 1995 and preparation of the master plan commenced in 1997. We saw the previous Government -

Mr Barnett: Are you saying that the master plan process commenced in 1997?

Ms MacTIERNAN: Yes.

Mr Barnett: When was the decision made by the coalition Government?

Ms MacTIERNAN: In July 1995.

Mr Barnett: Would that not indicate that the planning was done prior to that?

Ms MacTIERNAN: No; it indicates an unacceptable delay in progressing this process.

Mr Barnett: No.

Ms MacTIERNAN: The key point is that no consultative mechanism was put in place prior to the strategic decision made in July 1995 that the rail link would be taken out via Kenwick, adding that critical 12 minutes to the journey time south of Glen Iris. Having made that decision, the previous Government hung about for two years doing nothing. It then decided to commence the master plan phase. During that phase, it talked to all the local councils about the detail. That is exactly what this Government has done.

Mrs Hodson-Thomas: When did you talk to the local councils? It was after you made your announcement. You wrote to the Mayor of Rockingham telling him that you would not make a decision until the council had been consulted. Then you made a decision without consultation.

Ms MacTIERNAN: We have had many discussions and extensive consultation with representatives of the City of Rockingham.

Mrs Hodson-Thomas: I do not forget these things.

Ms MacTIERNAN: I will leave the discussion of Rockingham to the member for Rockingham, because he is the chair of the committee -

Mrs Hodson-Thomas: Is the minister too embarrassed?

The SPEAKER: Order, members! The minister has the floor.

Ms MacTIERNAN: I am not the least bit embarrassed about this project. In fact, I find it extraordinary that the members opposite can keep flogging a dead horse in the way they are doing. There is no support for their proposal out there, except from a few vested interests. It may well be that the owners of Westfield Carousel shopping centre in Cannington might support their proposal, but not many others. The members for Riverton, Rockingham and Mandurah know what their communities are thinking. The member for Carine represents the northern suburbs. Her constituency is serviced by a direct rail link that she does not want the people of the southern suburbs to have. The Opposition's proposal is like saying that, when the rail line reaches Carine, it must do a detour via Bassendean before coming into the city. That is exactly how sensible it is. Members can imagine what the constituents of the northern suburbs would think of that idea, but that is the kind of thing the Opposition would be delivering.

I was listening very closely to the contribution of the member for Carine, because, as I seriously wanted to address the comments of the member for South Perth, so I wanted to address those of the member for Carine. She said she would outline her consultation strategy, but that did not happen. She also said that she would outline what the other options were. I am puzzled about what these other options might be.

Mrs Hodson-Thomas: I did not actually say anything about other options.

Ms MacTIERNAN: Yes, the member did. We will have a look at the *Hansard* tomorrow. My recollection is that the member for Carine said that there were other options. Her basic question, as I understood it, was why the Government had allowed the advisory group process to take place on the city of Perth and not on the points south. Presumably she is talking about taking the rail line down the freeway and over the Narrows Bridge. It is quite clear that there have always been a number of alternate routes available through the city. The report that the Government released identified five possible routes. Work had been done on the costs and advantages of each proposal. The Government did not say that there was only one alternative. The assessment was made that, of those alternatives, the one down William Street provided the best set of benefits for the whole community. The Government still believes, and all the advice it has had from the land use and transport planners agrees, that

Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Speaker; Mr Pandal; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker;
Mr Mark McGowan; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Arthur
Marshall

that is still the case. A group of other people took the opposite view. Seeing they were not particularly happy with the consultation process currently under way - they obviously wanted something that gave them more scope for revisiting the other alternatives - the Government put in place a committee of independent people of considerable standing, expertise and understanding in a range of areas, and asked them to look at these options. As the member for Carine pointed out, the Government thinks it has got it right, and if that is the case, it will be vindicated by this committee. If it turns out that the Government got it wrong, it is no big issue. This is not a question of ego. If the Government got it wrong, another route will be chosen. It is quite open about that. However, there is absolutely no prospect that the Government has got it wrong in taking the railway down the freeway. It would be absolutely ludicrous to set up a panel to look at these mythical options. The only alternate option, other than going via the North Pole, that has been proposed during this debate has been the proposal to sink the rail line on the Narrows Bridge. That option comes at the small cost of about \$800 million - certainly no less than \$500 million. The member for South Perth tells us that that is not a problem. I am not surprised that the Liberal Party decided not to make him a cabinet minister, if he believes that spending \$500 million to save the views of a couple of hundred people is an acceptable strategy.

Mr Pandal: If the cost is spread over 24 years, it will add only \$36 million each year.

Ms MacTIERNAN: It will add \$500 million to the cost of the project. The member for South Perth is asking the Government to spend \$500 million to enhance the views of a small proportion of his electorate. There are many other worthwhile transport projects around this State that the Government would be funding before that one. If the Government had the luxury of another \$500 million - over whatever period - there are many other public transport initiatives it would be undertaking. The member for South Perth is behaving with absolute selfishness.

Mr Pandal: If the Government had thought like you 100 years ago, we would not have a trans-Australian railway line, and we would never have had a pipeline to Kalgoorlie.

Ms MacTIERNAN: The member for South Perth cannot distinguish between vision and fantasy. What he is talking here is fantasy, not vision. To come up with a proposal that is so ludicrously outside the resources of the State really does not bear thinking about. I have explained to the member for Carine - who is so interested in the debate and learning about the issue that she is once again not present in the Chamber - that the reason a rail advisory group is looking at the options in the centre of Perth, is that a number of alternatives can realistically be considered. There is not just one way to do that, but there is no realistic alternative to taking the rail line down the centre of the freeway. I can tell the members for South Perth and Carine that the Government will not compromise the quality of this public transport system for the communities in the south west suburbs. For the communities of Thomson Lake, Rockingham, Mandurah and others, the Government will deliver a first-class, not a second-class, system.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Edwards): Order!

Ms MacTIERNAN: The Government has clearly demonstrated the reasons it has implemented the rail advisory group. There were long quotes from the Lord Mayor, dating back to July. Interestingly, there are no quotes from the Lord Mayor more recently, because he has accepted the process, and supported the Government in the appointment of this rail advisory group.

Mr Omodei: What about the eight groups that objected to the Government's lack of consultation?

Ms MacTIERNAN: In response to the concerns raised by those groups - the member for Warren-Blackwood might have been down in Manjimup and not listening to what has gone on in the last couple of months - the Government has appointed a rail advisory group.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order, members! The minister has the floor.

Ms MacTIERNAN: The rail advisory group has been appointed; it includes engineers, it has on it a representative from one of the senior engineering firms in Perth, representatives from the planning profession, from the Property Council of Australia and from city business. That group has been well received and it will get on with the job of looking at the options that are available throughout the city area. We think we have got that right, but we are happy to subject ourselves to the scrutiny of such a group. We are not compromising on the quality of transport that we will deliver to the people of the south-western suburbs.

MR MCGOWAN (Rockingham - Parliamentary Secretary) [6.10 pm]: I am pleased that the Opposition has brought on this motion on the southern suburbs rail link. It is just terrific. I ask members to bring it on every

Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Speaker; Mr Pental; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker;
Mr Mark McGowan; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Arthur
Marshall

week. The more they bring it on and the more time we spend in private members' business debating this issue, the happier I and the members for Peel, Cockburn, Mandurah and Riverton will be.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr McRae): Thank you, members! Order!

Mr McGOWAN: Mr Acting Speaker, I am ecstatic that this motion has been brought on now. I have spoken on this issue about four times, either as a matter of public interest, private members' business or in general debate. It has provided me with more and more opportunities to say what a terrific decision it was to take the railway up the freeway into Perth.

Mr Pental interjected.

Mr McGOWAN: I will get to the arguments put by the member for South Perth. I always thought he was an old-style Tory, a man who believes in the principles of Edmund Burke, but he is actually a nimby - a lightish-green, slightly pink nimby.

Mr Pental: A green, pink nimby? Mr Acting Speaker, can I take a point of order on that?

Mr McGOWAN: I always had a sort of romantic view of the member for South Perth.

Several members interjected.

Mr Pental: What? I take a point of order on that. You just keep over there!

Mr McGOWAN: He wanders around the place in his suits and he strikes me as the sort of bloke who should wear a bow tie. I met him once wandering around the streets of Melbourne - he was looking at the architecture - and we discussed heritage together and all that sort of thing. He is an old-style Tory, but if one scratches that thick Tory skin, he will find that underneath he is a greenish, pinkish nimby, who is concerned -

Several members interjected.

Mr McGOWAN: He is obviously more concerned about the views of a select group of people in his electorate than he is about a decent, comprehensive public transport system for the people of Western Australia. But that is all right. I know what it is like to be fighting for an electorate, and I expect that the member for South Perth will probably be -

Mr Pental: You did not fight for yours. They took the Rockingham loop away from you and you rolled over. They took your \$100 million loop and they stuck it in central Perth.

Several members interjected.

Mr McGOWAN: I will address that point, if I can have a bit of silence. The loop that came into Rockingham was only about a kilometre long. The extension of the rail line on the surface through the city of Rockingham was about five kilometres long. The member is constantly complaining -

Mr Pental: I am not complaining; you should be.

Mr McGOWAN: Just hear me out. The member is complaining all the time about the rail link going on the surface through South Perth and Como.

Mr Pental: Correct.

Mr McGOWAN: The member says that I should support it going on the surface through Rockingham. Somehow I have been duded, in that it will not go on the surface through Rockingham. On balance, I am very happy with the decision made by the Government, and I am willing to go anywhere and argue it.

Mrs Hodson-Thomas: The next Minister for Planning and Infrastructure!

Mr McGOWAN: Now that the member for Carine has interjected, I will ask her: if she were elected to government, would she change this decision to take it up the freeway into Perth?

Mrs Hodson-Thomas: No, I would stick to the Kenwick route. I would continue with the Kenwick route.

Mr McGOWAN: What is the point of view of the Leader of the Opposition?

Mr Barnett: I will speak in this debate, but on all the information that has been compiled, the Kenwick route is superior. However, if this Government wishes to revisit that, which it is entitled to do, we are saying it should be done properly.

Several members interjected.

Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Speaker; Mr Pental; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker;
Mr Mark McGowan; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Arthur
Marshall

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Rockingham has the floor.

Mr McGOWAN: The member's answer is that he would like to see it go through Kenwick. Is that correct?

Mr Barnett: That was the decision we made. We believe it was the proper decision.

Mr McGOWAN: And the member still does?

Mr Barnett: On the information provided to this stage, I still do. If you wish to revisit it, you must do it properly. I suspect when you revisit it, you will end up back at Kenwick.

Mr McGOWAN: If the member were elected, on the information available, he would change the decision that we have made.

Mr Barnett: On the information to this point, yes.

Mr McGOWAN: Terrific. I wanted to go over a couple of things. The motion refers to consultation, and the consultation the Government went through to change the decision made by the previous Government. When the decision was announced in the southern suburbs of Perth for the route to go through Kenwick, it was opposed, it was disapproved of and it was hated by the people who live in my electorate and the electorates of members to my right - the members for Peel, Mandurah and so forth. It was absolutely hated. The previous Government announced that decision without doing any consultation. The former Labor Government decided that it should go through via Fremantle. However, the Court Government was elected and said it would go through Kenwick. A two-year period followed after which the previous Government launched a master plan document with the line going through Kenwick. There was never any consultation on taking the rail line through Kenwick and there was never any consultation with the people who live in my community and the other communities in the southern suburbs. They felt that somehow they were being treated as second-class citizens, because the rail line to the communities in the northern suburbs, the eastern suburbs, the south-eastern suburbs and Fremantle follow a direct line to the city. They felt that a direct route should link the people of those communities with the city. The rail line connecting the electorates of the members for Hillarys, Carine and Kingsley with the city does not take a massive detour before it reaches its destination, and that was because of the visionary decision made in the 1980s by the Labor Government.

Mrs Hodson-Thomas: Is the member for Rockingham not concerned that this railway will be running 10.2 kilometres down the median strip in the middle of the freeway? That is what I have been saying all along to the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure.

Mr McGOWAN: Australia produces the best engineers in the world. That was demonstrated with the construction of the northern suburbs railway. In modern times, despite modern techniques, building a railway is a complex process; nonetheless, it is possible. The old suburban line through Victoria Park to Armadale has level crossings and runs alongside suburban streets. The methods of today were not available then. Although those railways were built much more quickly in those days, they could not provide a fast, high speed, efficient transport service for the burgeoning outer suburbs.

Members opposite have a decent rail line that links their communities with the city. My community does not have that rail link and we want to have the same facilities as members opposite.

Mr Pental: Everybody agrees that you should have it.

Mr McGOWAN: I suspect there are a group of people in the member for South Perth's electorate who are concerned about the rail line. However, when it is built they will use it in the same way as people in the northern suburbs use their railway.

Mrs Hodson-Thomas: At this time, consultation has been only with people in the CBD. Where is the consultation with people in the South Perth-Como areas?

Mr Whitely interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Edwards): Order!

Mr McGOWAN: As part of the process, consultation is being undertaken. If I were to discuss the Minister for Transport's faults, I would not suggest that lack of consultation was one of them.

Mr Hyde interjected.

Mr McGOWAN: As the member for Perth said, and as we all know, the minister has no faults! Of all the things we could accuse her of, being non-consultative is not one of them. She organises seminars about road trains,

Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Speaker; Mr Pendal; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker;
Mr Mark McGowan; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Arthur
Marshall

consults on planning decisions and addresses meetings about the future of Hope Valley and Wattleup. She is the most consultative minister we have ever had.

Several government members: Hear, hear!

Mr McGOWAN: I do not understand how members opposite can accuse her of not consulting people.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr McGOWAN: That consultation process will be undertaken. When the southern rail link is finished it will be seen as visionary because it will provide a decent, high-speed rail link for 400 000 people living in the southern suburbs of Perth. It will remove a potential problem created by the previous Government by its plan to build a rail link along a route that was not supported by the people of that area.

I suspect the people in the electorate of the member for South Perth will grow to like and use the railway. As we know, there will be a station on the border, which they will grow to like. The people of South Perth and Como have expressed fair concern about the railway affecting their property values. However, as can be borne out around the world, having a property in close proximity to a rail line improves property values. Although those residents may be upset now, for which I do not blame them - people get upset about all sorts of things - they will appreciate this decision in time. One of the legacies of this Government will be the decision to provide a decent rail link for the people of this area.

I was interested to learn that if the Opposition were elected to government it would reverse that decision. I am sure the people of my electorate will be very interested to know that. I will ensure they are informed. I will even pick up the Leader of the Opposition and drive him to my electorate so that he can put his view on this matter to a public meeting. As a result, no doubt he will no longer allow any more motions of this type to be brought forward in this Parliament.

MRS EDWARDES (Kingsley) [6.24 pm]: I support the motion, which refers to the minister's failure to undertake necessary community consultation. During the estimates debate I recalled that when the Narrows Bridge was being built, Bessie Rischbieth took her trademark brolly with her and enlisted the support of a large number of people and became well known for her fight to conserve the Swan River foreshore. The minister's proposal to put the rail along the foreshore will effectively stop pedestrian access between the Perth city area and the foreshore. The proposal to suspend the rail line will create visual pollution, which people will have to look over, under or around to see the foreshore. It will be nothing less than an act of vandalism. I can see Bessies and their brollies out in the thousands to once again fight for the Perth foreshore.

The Local Government Planners Association believes that government transport planners should take local government planners more seriously. They believe that they best understand local issues and how vehicles and pedestrians move around, particularly in the central business district. They have the technical knowledge for assessing the options. When the association knew that the Government was looking at changing the railway route, it thought it would be consulted. However, much to its dismay, the announcement was made public long before then. The concern at the time was about other options that had been considered. An announcement was made in July and only in October a report was written on the options in the CBD area; the minister referred to five of them.

Another option favoured by many professional planning bodies and associations, not just local government planners, is to build the rail to run west to Parliament House and past Parliament House, linking in with the Perth central station. That would have a number of advantages compared with the William Street approach. I will show the differences between the two. Planning cannot be for the short term; it must be on a long-term basis.

In response to the member for South Perth's comments about sinking the railway and the roads along the South Perth foreshore, the minister said it would cost \$500 million or \$800 million. During the estimates debate I suggested that rather than planning to build the rail along the Perth foreshore the minister should consider sinking Riverside Drive, as the coalition Government had proposed and on which it had consulted the community. People wanted to drive along the river foreshore because they liked looking at it; therefore the amount of road proposed to be sunk was shortened. However, it would have created a wonderful pedestrian link down Barrack Street, to Barrack Square and the foreshore. It is a shame that people do not have better access to the Perth foreshore than they now have, although the Bell Tower has encouraged more people to visit the area. The patronage of restaurants and shops has improved markedly. The Bell Tower is a success story on its own. It is a shame that stage 2 has been not only put on the backburner but also halted because the extension of Barrack

Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Speaker; Mr Pendal; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker;
Mr Mark McGowan; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Arthur
Marshall

Square to the little beach, which was also supported by the City of Perth, would have provided better access for people to the Perth foreshore.

I return to the point about long-term planning as against short-term planning. The minister is stuck in a short-term planning mode, as she has not considered any of the wider options that may require a 15 to 25-year time frame for sinking the railway, the freeway and Riverside Drive. She is proceeding to put the railway in her proposal without considering that the community of Western Australia may want to consider the options.

Also, one advantage of the convention centre that Western Australia would have over the other States to attract people here is the visual connection with the Perth foreshore, the Swan River and the lights in South Perth. The people attending the convention centre would not want a railway travelling directly past their windows. Members may recall the design of the convention centre. It had a wonderful reception area outside the main hall which had a fabulous 180-degree view of the Perth city, the belltower, Barrack Street jetty, the Swan River and Kings Park. If the Government is going to destroy that view with a railway up in the air and a train going past every now and then, it will take away some of the attractiveness of the convention centre. There are a number of reasons for not putting the railway down a route in front of the Perth foreshore. It is short-term planning and does not take into account longer-term planning.

I turn from the visual pollution and aesthetic side of the railway to the opinions of some of the professional bodies in town. A conference was held a couple of weeks ago of all professional groups who decided to submit a plan in opposition to the railway. They have grave concerns about the railway travelling up William Street. In fact, they employed an engineer to undertake a comparison of the Government's proposal with a railway station at Parliament House linked to some of the new business districts in West Perth and Perth central railway station. People are moving out of the centre of the city between Barrack and William Streets because rents are lower in some of the new developments in the west end of town. One advantage of their proposal is that it would link Midland, Armadale, Joondalup and Fremantle. However the option of taking a railway up William Street would mean that there would be a brand new station ten minutes walk from Perth central railway station. The train will therefore travel up and down the south west railway route with no link to any other station. I do not know what the patronage figures will be.

There are two problems with the Government's proposal. First, it will change the way in which pedestrians use the central business district. Planners tell me that is against 30 years' practice of planning in this city. In fact, a Danish town planner, Jan Gehl, recommended that Perth's central area be stretched to break out of the narrow confines of the core between Barrack and William Street. Therefore, contrary to city planning principles, all of a sudden we will have a new railway station in the City of Perth, not linked with any other railway. I do not know of another city in the world that does that; it does not make too much sense. Not only will the route of the railway change the pedestrian pattern of behaviour but also the railway network will not be used efficiently. There may be no increased patronage if the rail goes up and down the south west route. Railway carriages would be used if the railway were linked to the Perth central station because it would have patronage to Joondalup, Armadale, Midland and Fremantle. However, the Government's proposal has the potential for empty carriages travelling up and down some routes at times. That also is not an efficient use of the railways in the south west area of Perth.

The planners raised another issue in their comparison of the William Street and Parliament House routes. The paper issued by the minister in October comparing the options stated that taking a railway past Parliament House would be unsuitable because part of Mounts Bay Road would need to be sunk. That is not necessarily true. It is one option. However, the engineering consultant employed by the professional bodies that I referred to said that it was not the only option if the Government wished to take the railway past Parliament House. The minister has often quipped, "Who really wants to come to Parliament House?" That is not the point. It would be a new railway station for the people who work in the western side of the city and who would provide valuable patronage to the railway.

In the alternative routes considered there would be no need for overhead poles and wires. If the Government is concerned purely about aesthetics, it does not need to use overhead poles and wires. That option, again, has not been considered. The engineering consultant said that the option of a link going past Parliament House would reduce the cost by about \$50 million. That is maybe not a big deal when one considers the amount of money we are talking about; however, it must be taken into account.

While we are talking about costs, members should not forget that with the William Street option there would be disruption to vehicular traffic and pedestrians. Planners have told me that once a disruption occurs to a particular area, people do not return to use it. Again, they believe the city cannot afford that loss. There will be therefore a

Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Speaker; Mr Pendal; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker;
Mr Mark McGowan; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Arthur
Marshall

level of disruption and the potential of losing some traffic. Members might say that they do not want traffic in the city centre. If that is the basis of the Government's proposal, let us debate that as a reason for getting vehicular traffic out of the city centre. There will also be a greater level of disruption with the preferred route that the professional planners referred to as a cut and paste style of railway. I had not heard of that before; however, obviously the development of the railway and tunnel will involve a greater level of disruption to people and take longer to build than taking it past Parliament House.

Mr Hyde: Member for Kingsley -

Mrs EDWARDES: Can I keep going, please? The member for Perth can have his say in a minute.

Mr Hyde: No, you have raised the matter. Would you then say the Northbridge tunnel was a mistake?

Mrs EDWARDES: Not at all. I am talking about William Street, which is a different area. The member has raised a good point. Another point that the planning and engineering consultants made was that one should not build the railway in an area where there is no opportunity to value add. There will be no value adding by using the William Street proposal but taking the railway past Parliament House would provide a chance for value adding with the buildings, businesses and the like there. Similarly there has been value adding in Northbridge, and there will continue to be value adding in the less-developed areas, with the use of the Northbridge tunnel and lower values creating opportunities for civic improvements and a greater scope to capitalise on that work.

Mr Kucera: Where is the issue in this debate? The minister has already said that she is examining those options.

Mrs EDWARDES: Can I continue, please?

The issue is that the options were not considered before the Government's announcement. The William Street option was considered to be the preferred route. The minister has not given any indication that she is prepared to move on that option. She has established a committee with all the professional bodies as members of that committee. Given the work that has already been started, I believe that valuable options will come from that - ones that will not be to the minister's liking. Therefore, that will be the real test of what the minister will do in a consultative -

Mr Kucera: It just goes to show that -

Mrs EDWARDES: No, I do not have time for interjections, Minister for Health. I will conclude by reading a couple of paragraphs. I am keeping in mind a previous speaker's comments tonight. However, I have not quoted or read anything else during my address. It is important to have the consultation before making an announcement, because to change the proposals afterwards costs money and causes embarrassment. I quote from a speech to a forum of professional bodies by the President of the Local Government Planners' Association (WA Division). He said -

It is obvious that the William Street option was selected on the flimsiest of information. Masterplanning studies that are now being carried out are running concurrently with detailed engineering design of the William Street route -

Therefore, nothing has stopped. The planning and the design of the William Street route is still going ahead. It continues -

and will only justify the detailed design of the chosen option after the event. The only public consultation will be to determine such things as access for the disabled and the design of stations to address safety and security. Options to the William Street route are not being examined, simply because there is no time to do that . . .

In my lifetime, there have been two examples in the past -

Points of Order

Mr McRAE: The Leader of the Opposition raised a point of order about a government speaker who quoted far less than the member for Kingsley has already done. If we are to establish those rules for debate and impose them in the course of this motion, they should apply to both sides. I request that the member either comply with the standing orders, which state that a member should selectively quote and paraphrase, or desist from quoting a page-long document.

Mr DAY: The Leader of the Opposition took a point of order earlier. However, I think he was primarily seeking to draw attention to the fact that the same point of order had been taken against the member for Carine. Without wanting to perpetuate this issue excessively, he was really asking for a degree of consistency. A fair degree of

Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Speaker; Mr Pental; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker;
Mr Mark McGowan; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Arthur
Marshall

latitude was shown to the minister regarding the documents from which she quoted and the length of those quotes. It does not strike me that the member for Kingsley has exceeded the degree of latitude that was shown to the minister.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Edwards): I take due note of the member for Riverton's point of order. Sadly, I was not in the House when the earlier point of order was raised by the Leader of the Opposition. However, I will give some latitude in this case. I ask, though, that the member for Kingsley keep the quote reasonably brief.

Debate Resumed

Mrs EDWARDES: I do not want to offend any members opposite. However, I hope that other debates and answers to questions, particularly dorothy dixers, also adhere to the same rules.

There were two examples. One was a proposal in the 1960s when the inner-ring freeway was planned for the city's foreshore. It was supposed to go through Langley Park and the Supreme Court Gardens. It led to Australia's first freeway revolt. After professional institutes had banded together and demanded that the Government reassess what it was doing, the plans were changed. The second example is the Burswood bridge and the freeway that was proposed to be constructed through East Perth. City planners again had a major role in demonstrating the advantages of relocating the freeway to its current location, to provide for the rejuvenation of East Perth. In both those instances, the Government took a lot of convincing. After it had made the original decision, the plans were changed following professional advice. Professional groups banded together and got the people behind them. I say to this Government that to put that railway in front of the foreshore and along William Street has a lot of downsides. There are many pluses in going the other way past Parliament House. The planners say that 20 years later, they are facing exactly the same debate.

Their other concerns have been about the cost of the William Street option. Although the master plan is still to be done, the costs to date have not taken into account any of the indirect costs associated with the William Street option, such as constructing the tunnel and taking the railway through it. Those indirect costs relate to reprogramming traffic lights, provision of closed circuit television security cameras, pedestrian segregation from major vehicular traffic routes, reorientation of street furniture and signs, and myriad other city infrastructure associated with railway stations. Inevitably, those costs will vary widely according to the route location and the design of the railway. The engineer who was employed did not take long to do a preliminary assessment. It took only one week to come up with a valuable comparison between the two options, and to point out that the William Street option is not the only option but that other options could be considered. The option with greater value and value adding and greater scales of economies and efficiencies is the one that would take the railway past Parliament House.

MR TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah) [6.45 pm]: Like the member for Rockingham, I am always pleased to talk about the preferred rail route, which is the one that was announced by the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure a number of months ago. I am pleased to comment on this matter as it affects the electorate of Mandurah and the electorates along the southern corridor. The decision made a few months ago was very well received by the people of Mandurah. It was overwhelmingly received because of its importance to the fastest-growing region in Western Australia, and to the fastest-growing city in Australia over the past decade.

Unlike some other members, I will not quote from any documents. However, one of the key groups that commented immediately after the decision was made was the Mandurah Peel Region Chamber of Commerce. It acknowledged that the Gallop Labor Government had made a decision of crucial importance to the economic betterment of the Mandurah and Peel region communities. It acknowledged that the government decision, unlike the previous Government's decision on the rail route, is important and crucial to the future economic and social growth in the city of Mandurah and, indeed, in the wider Peel region.

The front page of the *Mandurah Mail* had three key comments from the Mandurah Peel Region Chamber of Commerce, the City of Mandurah and me. The voices were in unison. This was a welcome decision. It was welcomed overwhelmingly because it was a sensible decision and the preferred decision of communities in that area. When I walked in the streets and talked to people in the city of Mandurah and in the wider community, they all said the same thing: finally the Government had made the sensible decision. They said that it would be important for them in accessing employment opportunities outside the region. I have mentioned in this House previously that 40 per cent of the work force travels outside the region to access its employment. This is a cleaner, greener and more environmentally friendly option for those people, and for future generations who will seek employment outside the region. For that reason, it is an important decision.

The rail link issue has been around for a long time in Mandurah. In the past, both parties have kicked it around. Had the Lawrence Government been re-elected in 1993, I would now be able to travel by train from Mandurah to

Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Speaker; Mr Pendal; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker;
Mr Mark McGowan; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Arthur
Marshall

Parliament House. The Labor Government made a promise in 1993 that, if re-elected, that railway line would be constructed. I am sure it would have been. I will tell the House why. The members on the other side of the House have no credibility on rail transport and they know it. Let us look at history. Let us look at what they did. Who closed the Perth to Fremantle rail link? The Liberals did! Which Government reopened it? The Labor Government. Which Government electrified the rail system? The Labor Government, not the Liberals. Which Government made sure that the northern suburbs - many of which are represented by members opposite - got an extended and electrified rail system? Not a Liberal Government; it was a Labor Government. Members opposite have no credibility on matters of public transport and they have no credibility on rail transport and passenger transport. The Labor Government is the one that delivers passenger rail links to people in need of them. People in Rockingham, Cockburn and Mandurah deserved to be treated the same as people in the northern suburbs. Why should they not demand and receive a rail link? They live in the fastest-growing corridor in the State. Under the Gallop Labor Government they will be treated the same. They will receive a rail link that goes directly up the freeway; not one that is diverted where it is not wanted. It will go straight up the freeway; that is what people want. It will mean that people in the area, who are suffering high unemployment, will have better opportunities. They will be able to access opportunities in further education and recreation.

Mrs Hodson-Thomas: When?

Mr TEMPLEMAN: Come down and see. Come and talk to the people. They would love to see the member there. The member would be shouted down in Mandurah. People down there know that this decision is sensible. Whenever they get a Liberal member talking about public transport or what the Liberal Party can deliver with rail transport, they do not believe him. The Liberal Party does not have a history on rail; it has no credibility on this issue. If Liberal members want to go to Mandurah and talk about rail transport they can, but they will be laughed out of town as they have no credibility. This is a clean, green decision. It will ensure that Mandurah gets a very important transport link. The Labor Government will deliver it.

I am looking forward to the day when the rail link comes to Mandurah. People will flock to welcome it. The Labor Government will deliver it; not a Liberal Government because the Liberals do not believe in it. The people of Mandurah know that the Labor Government believes in it. That is why the Government will deliver it to them in 2006.

MR MARSHALL (Dawesville) [6.52 pm]: The address by the member for Mandurah would have to be the greatest piece of hogwash that I have heard. He talks about what people did not get with the rail track. Before we gave Mandurah its performing arts centre the member was unheard of. He did a few courses in acting. The House has just seen an act. It would not have won an Academy Award. I think that, as a little boy, the member played by himself too much and did not reach adolescence. That was a lightweight performance. The member should look at the people around him. He is surrounded by people who are successful. The member spoke on nothing at all; he threw his arms around as though he were on a stage of the performing arts centre. For the people the member represents, it was a disgrace. The member represents about 14 000 in his electorate of Mandurah. I represent people in the Mandurah area that keep it alive. I represent 18 000 people. All the people that count are in the peripheral areas; the member has only the hub. He has been talking on behalf of all the people down there and he is wrong. After many years of broken promises and fidgeting by Labor Governments, the coalition Government said there would be a rail track to Perth. Everyone, including people in the member's electorate, were ecstatic.

The member was part of a Labor-oriented council. Three members of that council had a shot at entering this House as a member. The member has beaten them all. The mayor could not do it and the other bloke, John Hughes, could not do it. The member did it. I congratulate him for at least getting his nose in front. It will be a short term occupancy if he keeps talking about the people of Mandurah in a collective way without consulting them. The people of Mandurah are disappointed at the delay. They were content to have a rail track to Perth and travel to Perth in 50 minutes. I want the rail track to be in place by 2005. The Government's rail track is now a dream. We have all heard the member for South Perth: none of the councils agrees that the Government is doing it the right way. I have a small wager with the - for the moment - Minister for Planning and Infrastructure that the track will not be finished by 2006. When it is not, we will then see what is the member for Mandurah's so-called collective opinion of the people of Mandurah.

I was taught years ago that one does not have to shout to be heard. I remember that well. When one speaks the truth about accusations that are incorrect, one speaks at a lower ebb. The truth does hurt.

The proposal to put the rail link through Kenwick was accepted by everybody in the Mandurah area. They were thrilled. The proposal was first-rate. The proposal to go through Rockingham was debatable because of

Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Speaker; Mr Pendal; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker;
Mr Mark McGowan; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Tony McRae; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Arthur
Marshall

objections by the City of Mandurah. We accommodated both: a track through Rockingham and a direct line. It would have given the same type of resourcing to the metropolitan area and all the things that go with it such as scholastic advantages and employment opportunities.

Members who have visited the United States may have travelled on Amtrak. Passengers are able to sit back, read newspapers and have a coffee or a meal on the journey. The difference between travelling times of 50 minutes and 59 minutes is infinitesimal to the considerations of the people of Mandurah. The member for Mandurah should think about all the people of Mandurah and not just his very small electorate. He represents 14 000 people as opposed to my 18 000.

MR BARNETT (Cottesloe - Leader of the Opposition) [6.57 pm]: A lot of attention was paid to the planning of the southern rail link during the time of the previous Government. It made a sound decision on the information provided. I recognise and respect the right of an incoming Government to review a decision of a previous Government. The point of the debate is that the minister responsible should have announced that the Government was going to review the decision; it should then have taken six months or a year to do that, so that it was done properly. That has been the failure of this debate. The minister said that the Government may have got it wrong. I believe the Government has got it wrong. The one point I want to record in this debate is, how wrong does the Government have to get it? Is a \$100 million mistake getting it wrong? Is it \$200 million, \$300 million or \$400 million? I will be generous: if the minister is more than \$100 million out, we will demand her resignation.

MR McRAE (Riverton) [6.58 pm]: I was just packing up, as I thought the Leader of the Opposition would have more to say. I thank him for allowing another minute of debate.

Mr Barnett: Sit down then.

Mr McRAE: The member does not get any better the longer the day goes on. The problem with the Opposition - and the member is the leader - is that it has form on this issue. In more than 50 years not one metre of rail line in this State has been built by a Liberal Government - not one metre! The Liberal Party is in deficit, because it took away the Fremantle railway line. It has form this evening and it still cannot deal with the truth about efficient public transport systems.

Mr Barnett: Your constituents will be very upset over your stand on this.

Mr McRAE: I have one minute left and I will make one point about the line that the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure has taken. It confirms absolutely that the master plan being developed now, which will prove or disprove the viability of this line, rests on some key fundamentals of public transport. There must be directness, efficiency and frequent services to make public transport viable in urban systems. We know that the via-Kenwick link would take 28 minutes from Jandakot to Perth, 45 minutes from Rockingham to Perth and 60 minutes from Mandurah to Perth. The direct route that this Government has proposed will save 43, 26 and 20 per cent respectively.

Debate interrupted, pursuant to standing orders.

House adjourned at 7.00 pm
