

President; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Jon Ford; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Ljiljana Ravlich; Hon Dr Sally Talbot

PUBLIC TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE

Urgency Motion

THE PRESIDENT (Hon Nick Griffiths): Members, I am in receipt of a letter in these terms —

Dear Mr President

Pursuant to Standing Order 72, I hereby give notice that today's sitting I intend to move;

That the Council consider as a matter of urgency, the current Liberal National Government's lack of ongoing planning for and construction of public transport infrastructure in Western Australia.

The letter is from Hon Ken Travers. In order for Hon Ken Travers to move his motion, at least four members should stand.

[At least four members rose in their places.]

The PRESIDENT: I invite Hon Ken Travers to move his motion.

HON KEN TRAVERS (North Metropolitan) [3.42 pm]: I move the motion.

I move this motion because we have long had debates in this state about public transport. To develop and enhance our public transport system requires constant planning and construction work. Two significant issues currently face this state, and probably the world—one is climate change, and the other is providing job creation stimulus for people in the community. It is generally accepted these days that infrastructure projects are a good way of creating jobs because they have a very high multiplier effect and flow-on impact throughout the community. One way of dealing with those issues in Western Australia is to build public transport infrastructure. It would address the problems of climate change and create jobs for the future. The previous government had three different public transport infrastructure projects on the go in the metropolitan area, and a number of emerging projects in regional Western Australia that would build and enhance our public transport infrastructure. The metropolitan area projects included the extension of the railway line to Butler and Brighton; the development of the Ellenbrook railway line; and the development of the airport railway line. The airport railway line has been often talked about, but it would actually be more than an airport railway line; it would also be a foothills railway line. The plan was for it to run via the airport and also service a large section of the community situated behind the airport whose access to Perth is effectively blocked by the airport.

At the beginning of the year, I actually began to think that the government had finally got it.

Hon Simon O'Brien: What was the third project? You mentioned the rail line to Butler.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Butler, Ellenbrook and the airport—three railway line services.

At first it looked as though the government had cancelled the Butler rail service project, but in February the Premier announced that, as a result of the review and in recognition of the need to provide stimulus, the government would get on with the job of extending the railway line to Butler and Brighton. That was part of a package of measures designed to create economic stimulus. The heading of an article that appeared in *The West Australian* on 13 October 2008 suggested that the Premier would make the rail link a top priority. Another article was headed "Barnett full steam ahead". Sorry; those were the wrong quotes. However, in February there was a general acceptance that the Butler railway line would go ahead and that it would become a priority for the government to get on and build the Butler and Brighton railway line.

In question time recently, I asked the Minister for Transport what was happening with the railway line extension to the northern suburbs: when would it start, and when was it likely to be completed? One would expect that if these projects were a priority, the government would be getting on with them. The minister answered that the government was considering the matter, along with a number of other infrastructure priorities, in framing the state budget. In February, we were told that this project had become a priority; by 8 April, it was suddenly back into the mix of projects for the purposes of considering the budget. When I asked the Minister for Transport about the cost, I became even more concerned about the answer I was given. He said that any announcement to extend the northern suburbs railway line would include an estimated cost of the works. Did that mean that the project was not going ahead? I also asked for details about estimated patronage, and was given an answer outlining estimated patronage for 2016. Media reports that came out at the time of the Premier's announcement back in February referred to completion of the rail line by as early as 2010; the previous government had anticipated to have it completed by the end of 2012, and 2016 is another four years on.

We need to find out from the government whether it is still committed to the Butler railway line, whether it is a priority, and whether it is a project that the government recognises as a stimulus measure for creating jobs in the community. Is the government going to get on with it, and is it definitely going to happen? The minister needs to

President; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Jon Ford; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Ljiljana Ravlich; Hon Dr Sally Talbot

guarantee to the house today that construction will start on the Butler railway line and that it will be completed during this term of Parliament. Will it be open during the term of this Parliament? This is a project that could create a significant number of jobs and help to reduce greenhouse gases. If this stimulus package project was urgent back in February, the government should be getting on with it now. The minister should not be providing the sorts of answers he has been giving to the house, which lead us to question whether this project will even go ahead during this term of government.

It was interesting that the minister today tabled a statement to the effect that the government was completely committed to the Ellenbrook railway line, and that claims by the opposition that the government is walking away from its commitment to the Ellenbrook railway line are false. However, let us examine this in a little more detail. During the election campaign, the Liberal Party made a commitment, as did the Labor Party, to commence construction of the rail line by 2012. That is a very important date, because the construction project for the Butler rail line would have created jobs up to 2012 and then, to provide continuity for workers in that area, there would have been another opportunity to create jobs on the Ellenbrook rail extension. That was the approach. During the last sitting of Parliament it was revealed that a planned study had been cancelled, which the minister referred to earlier today. My notes taken from the Tenders WA website state that the Public Transport Authority is to develop a railway link from Ellenbrook to connect with the existing train services on the Midland line. This involves railway alignment definition, engineering definition of structures and impacts on roads and utilities, location and concept development of stations, integration with land use, examination of environmental social heritage and costs for the rail link. That is a very detailed study designed to actually get on and build the railway line.

Hon Simon O'Brien: Did you kick off any of that when you were in office?

Hon KEN TRAVERS: We said we would be getting on with it. I do not have the time this afternoon to go through the history of the Liberal Party's record on public transport infrastructure—particularly with railway lines—but I hope one of my colleagues will be able to give the house a little reminder, and compare the Labor Party's record on it. We stand proud; the Liberal Party has never delivered a centimetre of railway track in its time.

Hon Simon O'Brien: I shall be delivering some centimetres of railway for you; don't worry!

Hon Ken Travers: It has never delivered a centimetre of railway track in the metropolitan area—full stop!

Hon Sally Talbot: It closed them down.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: The Liberal Party closed railway stations down.

A very important definition study had been planned that would have gotten right into the detail of where the route would go, where the stations would be situated, how the route would interact with the existing road network and the like. The study the minister has spoken of today is not a study along those lines. It is a study that will decide what public transport system the government will provide to Ellenbrook. I note that in its budget submission the Royal Automotive Club of WA suggested that the way to go was to actually cancel the railway line and commission a study to ascertain the best public transport system. If that is the case, the government should at least be honest about it. If it has decided to explore the public transport options for the Ellenbrook area, it should be honest and admit that it is breaching its election commitment. It should not try to tell us that it is still building a railway line if it knows it is doing a study into whether there should be a railway line. Let us be honest and say that we know this government will deny that and claim it is still building a railway line—deny it, deny it, deny it. Then a document will be produced that states that the best way of serving Ellenbrook is by some other public transport system such as buses. If it had been up to the Liberal Party, the Murdoch railway station—the busiest station on the Mandurah line—would be serviced by buses, not the fast, direct train route that is there today. If the Liberal Party had had its way, we would have had a bus service down the Mitchell Freeway instead of the railway line. All of those are now great success stories.

This study is about ditching the railway line and moving towards servicing Ellenbrook with bus transport. It is not about developing the railway line; it is about deciding how to best service the area with public transport. That is not a commitment to a railway line; it is a study into trying to get out of an election commitment, minister. Be honest about it! Do not try to hoodwink the people of Ellenbrook because they understand where this government is heading.

Another great disappointment is the shelving of the airport railway line that would have also serviced the foothills east of Perth. A combined federal-state study had been undertaken, and what happened? The Premier walked in on day one and during his first interview on 6PR said that it was off the agenda. The federal and state governments worked on this proposal to examine the timing involved and to develop the proposal for an airport railway line, and it is now off the agenda. I want the minister to tell me today whether the Liberal Party is still

President; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Jon Ford; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Ljiljana Ravlich; Hon Dr Sally Talbot

considering a railway line out to the airport; or is the line that was taken by the Premier now the line of the government, which is to can it?

Unfortunately, time does not allow me to talk about the numerous other regional projects that will not go ahead, but will the government give a commitment today that the *Australind* rail service will continue to operate? Will it give us a commitment that it will buy the rail carriages that need to be replaced during this term of government because of the ageing rolling stock on the *Australind* line? Will the government give that commitment today? If it gives these commitments, is the minister prepared to stand and say that he will resign if they do not go ahead? We have regional rail freight and the Greenbushes project, which are not public transport, but they are still very important transport infrastructure projects.

Hon Simon O'Brien: What about the railway you shut? People in glass houses!

Hon KEN TRAVERS: We were well on the way to getting it back up and running again.

Hon Simon O'Brien: No, you weren't! You tried and failed umpteen times!

Hon KEN TRAVERS: There are numerous projects that will help deal with the greenhouse gas issues and the climate change issues that we are faced with today, but, more importantly, there are a range of projects that would create jobs. If the extension of the northern suburbs railway line to Butler, as well as to Brighton—as proposed by the government, which is fantastic—is started, it could be completed by 2012. The government could then move on to the construction of the Ellenbrook railway. We need a clear commitment from this government today because we are getting mixed messages, such as about the study to even have a railway line to Ellenbrook. We know the record of the Liberal Party on these matters: it has had a history of promising and never delivering. I remember when I was a new member of this Parliament and I used to challenge the then Liberal-National Minister for Transport about the railway line to Clarkson. I kept being told it was going to happen, but it did not happen until Labor was elected. It was the same situation with the Greenwood railway station. The very same pattern is occurring today with the way this government is operating.

HON JON FORD (Mining and Pastoral) [3.56 pm]: I thank Hon Ken Travers for moving this urgency motion, because it is very important. I will talk about boating facilities such as ramps, moorings and jetties.

Hon Simon O'Brien: In a public transport sense, Jon?

Hon JON FORD: In a public transport sense.

Recreational facilities and public transport facilities—the way that people access the water for a whole range of things—are important. They must be strategically managed. Some weeks ago I listened with interest to the minister talk about increasing licensing fees for boats, and then talk about reinvesting those fees into boat infrastructure facilities such as boat ramps. The interesting thing about that and how it relates to this motion is planning. As a former fisheries minister, one of the things I have always objected to in answer to the steady call for more boat ramps is that it can be an input control. It is important to consider overall access and placement of boat ramps.

Who uses boat ramps? Depending on where they are, the users may be commercial water taxis or recreational fishers. I notice that the Swan River now has a motorised Venetian gondola that goes up and down the river.

Hon Simon O'Brien: Gondolas, gondolas, gondolas!

Hon JON FORD: That is the word! I thought it was a little out of place but it is quite cute!

The placement of boat ramps is important, as is how many vehicles are allowed into those areas, and that should be covered in the planning. One of the reasons there has always been difficulty in dealing with those issues is which category it comes under. The minister talked about whether it is a public transport issue or a recreational issue. Is it the responsibility of the Department for Planning and Infrastructure? When I was Minister for Fisheries I was always asked that question, and as the opposition spokesperson I am asked the same question.

We need to sort out where it fits. It is also important to consider access to water when planning major developments. Karratha is a great example of what happens in a big resources boom when cashed-up people move to an area and buy lots of big boats and there are no corresponding plans. There is no ability to plan for the future.

Commercial fuel jetties are another issue. The Department for Planning and Infrastructure enters into contracts with consortiums of people, some of whom are recreational people and some of whom are commercial people. They pay a large amount of money to go into partnership to supply fuel to all manner of vessels, whether they be recreational or commercial vessels or whatever. However, there is no consistency in how cost-recovery arrangements are applied. I understand that cost recovery in the metropolitan area is between 1c and 2c a litre, and cost recovery in areas further north is between 5c and 7c a litre. Because there does not seem to be

President; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Jon Ford; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Ljiljana Ravlich; Hon Dr Sally Talbot

agreement on how to police cost recovery, people bypass the infrastructure that has been paid for by taxpayers in partnership with commercial entities and fuel their vessels from tankers and out of drums in their cars, and that undermines the original cost-recovery effort that was planned.

I also refer to marinas for commercial boats. The new marinas are typically being used by large vessels, such as ferries, charter boats and private boats. I am advised that people are being told that if they want to buy a pen, they must buy a five-year lease up-front, because that is the amount of cost recovery that is required. If they go out of business within two years, they will lose their lease, which cannot be transferred. The message in all of that is that there does not seem to be a coherent plan for managing these facilities. This is a problem that successive governments have not been able to address. It is becoming a bigger and bigger issue every month. The government needs to address this problem in a coherent manner.

My colleague Hon Ken Travers was worried about not being able to go into the history of rail and other public transport, so I will touch on that matter. As Hon Ken Travers has said, the history of this state shows that successive Liberal governments have never invested in a single inch of rail line.

Hon Simon O'Brien: Centimetre, actually; you're out by 250 per cent.

Hon JON FORD: Were we talking about centimetres in 1977?

Hon Ken Travers: Centimetre, inch—you haven't done either.

Hon JON FORD: No. The Leader of the House was elected to this place in 1977. In 1979 the then Liberal government closed the Fremantle railway line. In July 1983 Labor reopened the Fremantle line.

Hon Simon O'Brien: Good old Burkie.

Hon JON FORD: I looked at all the people who were in Fremantle for May Day and imagined what it would be like trying to get to Fremantle if there were no Fremantle railway line. It is the centre for festivals. An incredible number of people catch the train to the Claremont Showgrounds. I do not know what the government of the day was thinking at that time.

In November 1987 Labor committed to the northern suburbs rail line. In 1987 Labor introduced the new *Australind* service. In September 1991 Labor introduced electric trains to the metropolitan rail system. In December 1992 the northern suburbs railway line commenced. In 1998 the Liberal government sold Westrail Freight Pty Ltd. I think it sold the Midland railway workshops at the same time. It was probably the biggest training base for hard metals trades in the state, and we have struggled to supply skilled tradespeople ever since. I think the Liberal government promised that it would not do that, but that is a different story. In October 2004 Labor opened the Clarkson extension. In August 2005 Labor opened the Thornlie spur. In December 2007 Labor opened the Mandurah line. Importantly, one issue in the state that needs to be addressed is the grain rail, and there was a bit of talk about that. There have been various commitments from various ministers in the government to address that issue.

Hon Simon O'Brien: You're straying away from the subject a bit.

Hon JON FORD: I hope that during the Liberal Party's time in government, it will have an opportunity to break its record and build a bit of rail line. I encourage the government to think much more broadly in a world which is suffering environmentally and which needs good public transport. Every time I am in Kings Park and I see the train going south, I think that we are finally cracking it as a modern city. However, there is a lot more work to do. We would like to see a coherent transport plan for the state.

HON RAY HALLIGAN (North Metropolitan) [4.06 pm]: It is interesting to hear from the first speaker, Hon Ken Travers, about this situation, knowing full well that he is my colleague in the North Metropolitan Region and he would be aware of some of the issues associated with infrastructure, or the lack thereof, in that region. One such issue is the lack of car parking around some railway stations on the northern line, particularly at Warwick and Greenwood. The second speaker, Hon Jon Ford, mentioned planning. I believe that might well be seen, certainly by members on this side of the chamber, as somewhat hypocritical. I just spoke about the lack of parking around some railway stations. Where was the planning associated with that? Where was the planning associated with the Mitchell Freeway and the number of lanes that were made available? If sufficient planning had been done, space would have been made available for additional lanes to be used or otherwise.

We are aware that a great deal of money has been allocated to and/or spent on two iconic pieces of infrastructure, both of which are south of the river. I have spoken in this chamber about them before. If the planning is to utilise all the surpluses in one year on one project, I do not consider that is in the best interests of all the people of Western Australia, particularly when there is an argument that there is a lack of planning for infrastructure and, more importantly, now that we are in an economic crisis that is a world phenomenon. This country and this state are caught up in this crisis, whether or not we like it. This government does not have the surpluses that the

President; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Jon Ford; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich; Hon Dr Sally Talbot

previous government had for so many years. Where was the planning for the infrastructure back in those days? It was non-existent, except for these two iconic pieces of infrastructure that individual ministers wanted to ensure that they put their thumb print on. While I am talking about planning for one of those iconic pieces of infrastructure, the then Minister for Health had to agree that the plans for Fiona Stanley Hospital were changing repeatedly because the initial work was not undertaken. There has been criticism of this government looking into the pre-tendering process, for want of a better term, and undertaking a cost-benefit analysis of all the variables associated with what is being proposed. When Fiona Stanley Hospital was being mooted, it was proposed to be one of the best hospitals in the state, and no doubt it would have been, but at that point in time the number of operating theatres to be included was unknown. The previous Minister for Health had to admit to Parliament that the number had changed because the doctors suggested they wanted more. What happened to the consultation? What happened to the planning up to that point in time? It appears that it was non-existent.

If we are talking about transport infrastructure and its benefits in the light of climate change as it is called, do members opposite agree with Mr Rudd that all the moneys that have suddenly been sent to a great number of people throughout Australia is the way to go? Why was some of that money not used for transport infrastructure?

Hon Ken Travers: Your government didn't ask the federal government for any money for public transport.

Hon RAY HALLIGAN: Dear, oh dear! So are Mr Rudd and Hon Ken Travers' colleagues in Canberra blinkered and know nought about what is happening here in Western Australia or in other parts of Australia?

Several members interjected.

Hon RAY HALLIGAN: That is a ridiculous argument. The federal government, at a parliamentary level, is wanting to take over all the government operations throughout Australia.

Hon Ken Travers: Who said that?

Hon RAY HALLIGAN: They do; they are all centralists. They want to take over the running of this country. Many of them want to do away with state government and have only local government with one federal government in control. If they are going to sit blinkered over in Canberra, who will ask them the questions that the current opposition suggests need to be asked? Who will make the requests that should go forward? No federal member from Western Australia spoke up. I know not where it would need to come from.

Hon Ken Travers interjected.

Hon RAY HALLIGAN: It was possibly from letters to the editor of *The West Australian*. Is that where they expected to receive the request from? There are plenty of federal Labor members in this state. What have they been doing for this state? I suggest that they are doing absolutely nothing.

Several members interjected.

Hon RAY HALLIGAN: Members opposite are putting forward the argument. I suggest they get to their feet later and explain to members —

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich: Put your pen down.

Hon RAY HALLIGAN: It is a pity it is not a paperclip.

The PRESIDENT: Order! A number of us have been in the house for quite some time, and by that I mean a number of years. We all know that the best way to assist members to deliver their speech is to interject on them.

Hon RAY HALLIGAN: The argument being put forward by the opposition is a spurious argument. All members opposite ever do is refer to railways and suggest that that is the only form of public transport. If the opposition had its way, we would not have any aircraft, particularly not jet aircraft; our planes would be propeller driven. That is the only possible way they can see people moving around this state.

Hon Ken Travers: Are you saying that we should consider a bus way to Ellenbrook? Should we consider that?

Hon RAY HALLIGAN: We must consider all forms of transport. Everything must be considered. We have to undertake a cost-benefit analysis. We must determine the variables. We certainly need to know the likely numbers associated with the movement of those people. A cost-benefit analysis must be done or we will end up with a situation similar to that with the Mandurah railway line. Members opposite continually talk about how good it is. They have spoken about a success story. They should define success.

Hon Ken Travers: People are using it.

Hon RAY HALLIGAN: Big deal! If two people a day are using the Mandurah line, are members opposite saying that is a success story?

Hon Ken Travers: Are you saying that it is not a success?

President; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Jon Ford; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Ljiljana Ravlich; Hon Dr Sally Talbot

Hon RAY HALLIGAN: No. This is exactly what members opposite do each and every time. When they cannot provide an answer, they try to put it back on the member who is questioning them. That is exactly what is happening at the moment. I asked for a simple definition of success and it cannot be provided. Are members opposite suggesting that the cost of \$2 000 million for a railway line to Mandurah, which will cost millions upon millions of dollars every year in operational losses, is a success? Prior to members opposite calling it a success, they have yet to determine how many people need to use it. But they are unable to do that. They have calculated nothing; they have planned nothing. All they ever wanted was to put their thumb print on a railway line to a particular destination. The cost to the people of Western Australia this year or for the next 50 years matters not. All members opposite want to be able to say is, "We built it." It matters not to them that it might bankrupt the state. They do not plan; they do not manage.

Hon Ken Travers: Ellenbrook railway is not going to bankrupt the state.

Hon RAY HALLIGAN: I ask again for members opposite to give me a definition of success. I hear nothing; it is non-existent. It never came through because they cannot provide it. They have not defined success. They have not determined what a successful operation is.

Hon Ken Travers interjected.

Hon RAY HALLIGAN: I have asked three times.

Hon Ken Travers: The success of the Mandurah rail line is determined by the fact that more people are using it than was predicted by either your master plan or our master plan, and the numbers are way up on it.

HON PAUL LLEWELLYN (South West) [4.16 pm]: I find it interesting to see where this debate takes us. The wording of this motion simply refers to the government's lack of ongoing planning for and construction of public transport infrastructure. However, the motion is far too broad; it might have been better for the wording to refer to a more focused proposition. The Greens (WA) are very committed to planning for transport and for public transport infrastructure. However, I would like to put on the record right now that that does not mean just rail. It means we must have a rational network of rail, bus transport, light-rail services, good public cycleways and pedestrian access with appropriate densities in our urban areas. This is not an all-or-nothing rail or bus argument; this is about what we should be doing to get the right mix.

I refer back to first principles: why do we need a public transport plan for Western Australia? The two overarching reasons in the Greens' view are as follows. It is true that we need to address the energy intensity of our current transport system and the long-term security of our energy in terms of peak oil. We need to get ready for the impending decrease in our oil supplies. We also need to address climate issues, but that is not absolutely essential to a good public transport strategy. We also need to look at the implications of economic stimulation and job creation through new infrastructure proposals. In the Greens' view, there are a number of compelling reasons that we should be going down the path of a good transport infrastructure plan, not the least of which involves consideration of energy—I refer to peak oil—climate change and the creation of liveable urban areas. With the movement of people, we must avoid congestion in our urban areas, for example, and achieve some rationality in the way we organise our cities in terms of public transport. The motion refers generally to public transport infrastructure; it does not really address rail freight and so on, although we have strayed into those areas.

If we were to take public transport infrastructure and look at what would be required, we would want it to be networked, convenient, fast and reliable. We would want to have connectivity so that people can easily interconnect between buses, trains, bicycles and pedestrian access, which means we must have proper population densities. The Mandurah railway line extends from Perth right down to the south. I travel on that railway line from time to time. There are four-lane highways on each side of the railway line. The rest of the land is sterilised by very large transmission lines, which means that people cannot live near the railway line. This creates a whole series of problems about the usefulness of the railway line. It means that people must drive their cars to the railway nodes. The railway nodes become congested because there are not enough parking lots. There are therefore some serious problems with the way in which the Mandurah railway line was set up in the first place. Senator Scott Ludlam, the Greens senator for Western Australia, has put forward "Light Rail for Perth", a light-rail transit plan for Perth. In that plan he sets out plans for a whole series of light-rail radial spurs along arterial routes. Those radial spurs would be interlinked with good bus services. A good public transport plan must have all the elements of good connectivity, good population density, reliability and meaningful destinations. Currently, some of the state's railway lines, and particularly the Mandurah railway line, do not have meaningful destinations. We need to look at that whole matter.

Hon Ken Travers: You need some spur lines to be developed and then fill in the network.

President; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Jon Ford; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Ljiljana Ravlich; Hon Dr Sally Talbot

Hon PAUL LLEWELLYN: We spent a lot of money, and I tend to agree. My view, which is not necessarily shared by all Greens, is that we should have spent that money on radial and light-rail networks that were interconnected with good bus transport and so on. We should then have good urban densities and good connectivity, so that we have meaningful destinations for the public transport infrastructure. This is good public planning. This is what the Greens have put on the table through Senator Scott Ludlam's light-rail plan for Perth. I encourage the Minister for Transport to look at Senator Scott Ludlam's light-rail plan for Perth, because it is one of the most well-thought-out propositions on the books at the moment.

Another consideration is how we pay for large-scale public infrastructure. I would like to introduce the topical issue of emissions trading. Emissions trading will result in a significant revenue take across all energy transactions in the economy, which could go into funding rail transport infrastructure; that is, not only rail transport infrastructure for population centres and public transport, but also rail transport infrastructure for freight lines, the agricultural region and so on. I would like to put on record right now that this is a federal and state responsibility. If emissions trading came into being and a price was put on carbon, part of that resource would go into funding large-scale public transport infrastructure and building an enormous network for light rail and heavy freight transport and would also help reconfigure the urban landscape so that transport would become cost effective. If we are talking about good investment, we need to be investing money in a cost-effective way, not on a wing and a prayer that somehow or other the area around the Mandurah railway line will be populated in the future, because that assumes that the current bad urban planning will be extended into the future. We believe that there should be more consolidation of the urban landscape to accommodate public transport in a rational way, because we simply cannot do it like that again.

Hon Ken Travers: That is what we were doing. That is what Wellard railway station is about.

Hon PAUL LLEWELLYN: I fully accept that we should look at the light rail proposition from Senator Scott Ludlam, which is on his website.

I will briefly touch on regional transport because we need to look at it. We should not be gutting the regional rail networks—not right now, because right now is the most important time for us to be consolidating the regional networks. As a member representing the South West Region, I believe that the *Australind* rail link should have five or seven services a day, not two. We should have a program for building the use of that service. The Bunbury to Manjimup line should be re-opened and it should have rail freight as well as public transport. The rail network in the wheatbelt should certainly be kept.

I come back to the fundamental argument of who pays for all of this and what are the consequences. My view is that the funding should not simply come out of state consolidated revenue but really needs to be funded by large-scale national programs, such as the emissions trading arrangements. That will generate the economic stimulus that we are talking about. Last night on the *Lateline* program Don Voelte of Woodside said that he would lose the opportunity with emissions trading of \$30 billion worth of gas fields. That may well be true, but there will be \$30 billion worth of other investment that will happen, not necessarily in gas fields but in public transport infrastructure and renewable energy technologies across Australia, so there is no loss.

HON SIMON O'BRIEN (South Metropolitan — Minister for Transport) [4.28 pm]: I rise to offer a response to some of the issues that have been raised by the mover of the motion and others. The substance of the question is indeed very broad, but specifically it refers to planning for and construction of public transport infrastructure. In addressing the question, the mover did not talk about busways or ferries—a most cost-effective and pleasant form of public transport in this state. He did not talk about the taxis and taxi infrastructure mess that had been left by the last administration. He did not talk about the structure of the state's regional airports or issues relating to intrastate air routes. He did not talk about free public transport for seniors. He did not talk about infrastructure associated with the NightRider bus services, which are there to assist in trouble spots —

Hon Ken Travers: Move for an extension of time, and I will be happy to.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: The member had his time—50 per cent more than I have. He moved a broad motion, yet he did not want to raise all these important matters. He did not even mention cycleways. One of his colleagues, Hon Jon Ford, who is normally a thoughtful person but must have just about been sent to sleep by Hon Ken Travers who was his lead-in, wanted to talk about recreational boating. Again, I am quite happy to talk about that as well. Members opposite all have notes to remind them about 1979 and a decision to close the Perth to Fremantle train service. That was 30 years ago. They should go back to high school and get over it. Plenty of occasions can be demonstrated when a government of this persuasion did this, this and this, and plenty of other occasions when a government of another persuasion did this, this and this. It does not matter what the broad areas of public policy are; I am sure that those involved in the debate could come up with some aspect of public policy and achievement for which either accolades or criticism could be given. I will not waste time responding

President; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Jon Ford; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich; Hon Dr Sally Talbot

to Hon Jon Ford by pointing out how it was Labor that cancelled the Canning Vale railway without any consultation and all the improvements that railway would have meant for people along the whole length of the Armadale railway line. Members of the former government do not want to talk about how they delayed the completion of a train service to Mandurah, Thomsons Lake and Rockingham, and all places in between, by several years and blew out the cost by a factor of 100 per cent. They do not want to talk about other elements of infrastructure that they tore down at great public expense for that particular exercise. I do not particularly want to talk about it either; I want to address the motion, which talks about the future planning and construction of public transport infrastructure.

My colleagues and I made an election commitment to develop a master plan—a blueprint, if you will—to integrate future public transport services in Perth. The work to develop a master plan commenced just after the government took office. There does not need to be any fanfare about it, but the work is going on. The work is going on because it was not done by the former government. I want to address all those matters that have been raised—and then some—in due course. I have raised most of them in my brief remarks so far. Perhaps Hon Paul Llewellyn and Hon Ray Halligan came closest to alluding to the need for rhyme and reason in what we are doing. That is what proper planning is all about. If the Labor Party had understood that one of its great failings was that it always tried to get the media and the publicity right before it even started to think about the correctness of its policies, Western Australia may have made more progress. However, Hon Ken Travers wants to talk about only three projects that were on the go at the time of the change of government. Three projects that were on the go! I listened to hear which three projects were on the go only to find that none of them was on the go under Labor. None of them at all! Let us take them one by one. The first was to extend the railway to Butler. Hon Ken Travers wants to know whether we have now reneged on an undertaking given by the Premier in, I think, early February that we would extend the northern rail to Brighton. That was a public undertaking! The budget will be out next week, and Hon Ken Travers wants to know where are all the plans, what date the project will start and what time the first person will put the kettle on! I do not have all the details and I am not prepared to table that information right now because the planning for the rail to Brighton has not finished, as the member well knows. Brighton is where the railway should be extended to. I look forward —

Hon Ken Travers: You could start construction to Butler today. It is all there to go to Butler today; it is ready to go. Your department has advised you of that.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: The trouble is that when the member's colleague, the former minister, gees him up about some of these things, she forgets to tell him certain things that he needs to know before he comes in here and starts leading with his chin. One of the first things that the member will be acquainted with—he will not have to demand it under freedom of information or come in here and demand to know—when I make sure he is briefed, as soon as it is available, about the rail extension to Brighton and about the compelling business case —

Hon Ken Travers: But why don't you start on construction to Butler now?

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: Hon Ken Travers does not understand that there is a compelling business case for building a rail line to Brighton that far exceeds and is superior to the case for building only to Butler. Why does he not know that? I will show him all the figures, and I will brief him nice and gently and —

Hon Ken Travers: I know the arguments.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: No; he does not know the facts because he did not do his homework! While Eric and Ljil were at Exmouth having holidays in August, the then Premier visited the Governor, without any reference to his colleagues. That is how well organised and how good Labor Party planning is! The former Premier visited the Governor and called an early election, ensuring members opposite had to make policy on the run, saying, "We're going to build a railway to here; well, no we haven't got a master plan, yet but we are sure there is something coming."

Point of Order

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Mr President, I do not think it appropriate for the member to refer to "Eric and Ljil"; it is Hon Eric Ripper and Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich.

Hon Ken Travers: Or the member for Belmont and Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich.

The PRESIDENT: Please continue, Minister for Transport.

Debate Resumed

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: I had no idea that my dear shrinking violet of a friend was so sensitive about such matters. If she does not want me to involve her in debate, that is fine.

President; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Jon Ford; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Ljiljana Ravlich; Hon Dr Sally Talbot

Hon Ken Travers has also tried to beat up the Ellenbrook situation. I made a ministerial statement in the chamber today. I can tell members something else about Ellenbrook; it was raised as a —

Hon Ken Travers interjected.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: Does the member want to hear this or not? Ellenbrook was raised as a last-gasp, another on-the-run commitment by the Carpenter government, during the last election. I remember seeing Hon Graham Giffard, as he was then, whacking in a post somewhere out there in a seat that Labor did not, in the end, win—probably because people saw through them. The Liberal Party matched that commitment for \$53 million to commence construction, but when we came to government we found that there had been no planning work done at all. Figures had been plucked out of the air. The likely cost, and this is without escalation, is going to be more than \$1.285 billion. We came to government and said, “Righto, let’s have a look at the plans”, but there were no plans! The Carpenter government made a promise and committed itself to another colossal amount of expenditure, having done no homework at all. The reason we are having to do that work now is that Labor did not do it before the election.

Furthermore, although the then Labor government had not done its homework and we now have to do that work, members opposite want also to know about an airport railway. This is another thing that we are examining for which those opposite again did not do their homework. That is why we are pursuing the public transport blueprint—so that this can be investigated properly.

HON SALLY TALBOT (South West) [4.07 pm]: Hon Simon O’Brien is remarkably agitated by this debate. He was actually looking reasonably calm. While members have been following the debate on this excellent motion by Hon Ken Travers, the minister remained relatively calm and, indeed, made some quite constructive interjections and got his notes together; that is, until his colleague Hon Ray Halligan stood and gave us the most extraordinary commentary on the Liberal’s policy, approach and attitude to public transport. I could see Hon Simon O’Brien getting more and more nervous about the direction his colleague was taking. Hon Ray Halligan seemed to be completely mystified by the way a public transport system is judged to be successful, which is whether it is meeting the needs of the passengers who are using the system. I suggest that Hon Ray Halligan take a train trip to Mandurah at any time of the day or night —

Hon Ray Halligan: I have been on more trains than you have had breakfasts!

Hon SALLY TALBOT: I doubt that, Hon Ray Halligan. I doubt that. I suggest that if the member takes a trip any time of the day or night, he will see trains full of people. He can see them from the freeway. He does not even have to catch a train if he is allergic to them. For heaven’s sake! What on earth is the member saying when he talks about building new trains and bankrupting the state? The Labor Party built the Perth-Mandurah railway debt free—something that we on this side of the house will always be proud of and something that will always be appreciated by the electorate. I do not know how members opposite can express any doubt about or be mystified by the success of the Perth-Mandurah railway. The Public Transport Authority and Transperth websites demonstrate the public satisfaction ratings. The section about trains demonstrates that between 86 and 92 per cent of passengers are satisfied. If we break the figures down and look only at passengers on the Mandurah railway line, it is clear that 96 per cent of Mandurah passengers are satisfied with the system. I would like to spend five minutes with the remaining four per cent talking about things such as the trains running on time, the availability of seats and the quality of the transport. We have heard an absolute string of nonsense from the other side, so I am not surprised that Hon Simon O’Brien was a little rattled when he got to his feet.

The other thing that I think must be very disconcerting when one has the misfortune to be sitting in the seats opposite us is the truth of the fact that these people who are now in government never built one centimetre of train track during their last two terms in office—not one centimetre of train track! Indeed, not only did members opposite not build train tracks, but they sold off what we had and they closed it down. It is no good for Hon Simon O’Brien to say that that was a long time ago. The people who use that train system today do not think it is a long time ago; they associate the minister’s party with closing train lines and they associate our party, the Australian Labor Party, with building train lines.

I will not take up much more of the house’s time because I know other people want to make a contribution to close this debate.

HON KEN TRAVERS (North Metropolitan) [4.41 pm] — in reply: I would have been more than happy if we had had the time to have the debate about all the different levels of public transport infrastructure, such as whether the government is getting on with ordering the buses that we need and all the other issues, because an integrated system is needed. I do not disagree with that. Light rail is a part of it, but we need to develop densities to sustain light rail. However, we need the spine—namely, the heavy rail system, which means putting in place

President; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Jon Ford; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Ljiljana Ravlich; Hon Dr Sally Talbot

the Ellenbrook, Butler, airport, Mandurah, northern suburbs, Midland and Fremantle lines. They are the key spines of our public transport system and we must work to integrate those and mix them together.

However, I thought two very telling points came out this afternoon. Even though he cannot quite bring himself to say it, it was made very clear that what the minister is talking about is that the government is not committed to an Ellenbrook railway line; it is committed to a study into whether to have an Ellenbrook railway line, which is very different from its election commitment. Its election commitment was to build the Ellenbrook line starting in 2012, and the minister has made it very clear today that the government is now looking at whether to build a railway line or to provide some other form of public transport. The other issue that I thought was interesting —

Hon Simon O'Brien: We will provide an appropriate solution.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: An appropriate solution, but that may not be a railway line. Is that not right, minister—it may not be a railway line?

Hon Simon O'Brien: Are you committing a future Labor government to spend whatever it costs? Are you? Because you haven't done your homework, mate!

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I am holding the minister accountable to his election commitments. He gave them and he cannot sit there and say, "Oh, but we were just copying Labor so you can't hold us responsible now for our election commitments because it wasn't really my commitment; I was just copying." If the minister was at school, he would be sacked for that! He would be kicked out; he would be expelled for copying.

Another thing that came out very clearly is that the government is not committed to the Butler railway station, but only to a Brighton railway station.

Motion lapsed, pursuant to standing orders.