

RAILWAY (BUTLER TO BRIGHTON) BILL 2009

Second Reading

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan) [8.00 pm]: Mr Acting Speaker —

Mr R.F. Johnson: Any chance of talking to the bill this time?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I was going to finish, but can I seek an extension?

[Member's time extended.]

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I would like to finish my remarks on this bill in relation to extending the railway from Butler to Brighton —

Mr P.T. Miles: That would be an excellent idea!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I thank the member for Wanneroo—another great contribution from the back row!

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr J.M. Francis): Thank you, members!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I look forward to hearing the member for Wanneroo stand and talk about public transport in this place. I would welcome his support for an Alexander Drive busway because that would help constituents in his electorate. I would also welcome his support to improve public transport throughout his electorate, including better east–west linkages. A number of people living in Darch–Madeley believe there needs to be better public transport links throughout the east Wanneroo area. I invite the member for Wanneroo —

Mr P.T. Miles: That is why I had the minister out there!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: So what has the member done?

Mr P.T. Miles: You go on; you're talking! I am very happy to speak at another time.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: What have you achieved?

Mr P.T. Miles: What have you done?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: In case the member did not realise, we are not in government.

Mr P.T. Miles: Exactly. That is why you're over there on the other side—you did not do anything! That is why I won the seat of Wanneroo. That is why I am the member for Wanneroo and not you!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We are two years in and this Liberal–National government has not added one extra kilometre of bus service throughout the suburbs, no rail line —

Mr P.T. Miles: That is not true.

Mr P. Abetz: We got an extra couple of kilometres in Southern River.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Sorry; maybe two kilometres—I underestimated! Two kilometres in Southern River.

Mr P.T. Miles: About 10 kilometres in my electorate has been extended.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: If the member for Wanneroo wants to stand up, he should stand and speak. He just sits there harping from his row.

Mr P.T. Miles: I am correcting the member's mistake!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member for Wanneroo never, never stands to provide a positive contribution to this place.

Several members interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: He should stand and speak for his electorate on public transport. I can stand here all night and point out how the member for Wanneroo never stands up for his electorate in this place.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Other people may not want to hear the member for West Swan in silence, but I do. I do not want any more shenanigans.

Several members interjected.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY - Wednesday, 16 June 2010]

p3962a-3980a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr David Templeman; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr John Quigley

The SPEAKER: Members, thank you! I want to hear from you, member for West Swan. I do not want to hear from anybody else. I am not interested.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I am trying, Mr Speaker. I value your protection.

As I said, we support this bill because Labor supports public transport and Labor supports rail lines throughout Perth. Of course the Labor Party has been the party of rail transport and public transport over the past three decades, and will continue to be.

I again reinforce my comments that we need to hear what this government is doing with the Ellenbrook rail line. We need certainty in the north east corridor on what the Liberal–National government is doing about its core election commitment to build the Ellenbrook rail line. We need to know if this government will build the Alexander Drive busway. I understand a study has been done and a further study has been commissioned. We need to know whether public transport will be improved through the north east corridor. These are answers that the community seeks. Again, we keep asking the questions but there seems to be no answers to what this government is doing with public transport in the north east corridor. We support this bill, but I urge this government to keep its election commitment to build the rail —

Mr J.E. McGrath: You will get it! Be patient.

Mr D.A. Templeman: Don't talk to him—he wants a station at South Perth!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I think the member for South Perth should be on our side rather than on that side!

We urge the Liberal–National government to keep its election commitment to build the Ellenbrook rail line. I urge the Liberal–National government to commit to the Alexander Drive busway.

MR B.S. WYATT (Victoria Park) [8.06 pm]: I, too, rise to make some comments about the Railway (Butler to Brighton) Bill 2009. It is always interesting when we talk about public transport, in particular public transport by way of train, in this house. Labor has a long and proud history when it comes to public transport in Western Australia; in particular when it comes to rail public transport in Western Australia. The government side should not be so proud of its history. I find it interesting that government members have come in here tonight desperate to talk about the Butler–Brighton bill. “What did you guys do?”, the member for Wanneroo yelled across the chamber, forgetting about that beautiful train line that goes down to Mandurah. The member for Mandurah certainly knows about that. A number of members of Parliament love and know and hold it in place, unlike the public transport spivs we hear from the other side. Government members have come in here waving around this bill for one reason. These spivs over there know why. The member for Ocean Reef knows why. The member for South Perth certainly knows because South Perth has been bitten by the spiv approach to public transport, particularly rail public transport, of this government. The only reason we see this piece of legislation is that the government has been burnt by the fact that for 20 years, since Charlie Court was Premier, not one inch of rail has been laid by the Liberal mob. We saw the Freo line closed by a Liberal government and reopened by a Labor government. We saw the Mandurah line built under the strong and reliable leadership of the member for Armadale. This mob was critical the whole way. It wanted the Kenwick diversion—take it out to Kenwick and somehow end up somewhere near Mandurah at some point or another at some point in the future! They were critical of the Mandurah line that now runs at capacity day in, day out. That is why we are here tonight speaking about the Butler–Brighton bill. The government does not want to face another election when it will be made crystal clear that this mob does not believe in public transport. That is why Ellenbrook has fallen off the forward estimates. That is why that rolled gold commitment of the Premier is suddenly a second-term commitment and, I dare say, will disappear off into the never–never, which the Premier likes to talk about.

It is interesting what the freedom of information process throws up when one starts analysing comments and commitments made by the government. Way back on 1 February 2009, a very significant media release was released by the Premier. Interestingly, the member for Cottesloe was described in this media release back on 1 February 2009 as the Premier, Treasurer and Minister for State Development. It seems quite fortuitous that way back in February 2009 he was already titling himself as the Treasurer, but under his smiling face was the smiling face of the former Treasurer, the member for Vasse. The title of the media release is “Health, education and public housing key priorities in capital works program”. It is a two-page media release setting out all the government's grand plans, including the Butler to Brighton rail line. What also came back from that freedom of information application were the various email exchanges between the various media spin doctors of the government who drafted the media release. It is always interesting to discover how things come out before they are spat out for the consumption of the great masses. One of the draft media statements that eventually resulted in the final copy of 1 February 2009 refers to new plans for redevelopment of the Perth foreshore involving greater private sector investment. It states —

NOTE: This needs to be clearer. We look like we are fudging the bad stuff here.

That is what one spin doctor said.

Point of Order

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I have a point of order. We are discussing the railway to Butler bill and the member on his feet is not addressing the bill. He is delving so far away that it is untrue.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, members!

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: We had to suffer virtually half an hour of the previous speaker talking about the Ellenbrook line. It had nothing to do with the Butler line. Mr Speaker, I urge you to ensure that members on their feet address the bill and not some spurious items gathered under freedom of information and other items that have nothing whatsoever to do with this bill.

Mr M. McGOWAN: The member has barely started his speech. He is broadly dealing with infrastructure developments in Western Australia relating to rail. He has merely gone on a short excursion from that. I am sure the Premier would agree that it would be in everyone's interest for a little bit of entertainment in this place.

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Victoria Park.

Mr R.F. Johnson: I had a point of order.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Debate Resumed

Mr B.S. WYATT: I return specifically to the Butler–Brighton rail line. What is interesting is that at the end of this draft media statement is a bunch of Q&As emailed from the Premier's senior policy officer on a number of issues contained in that draft media statement. One of the more interesting ones was the question: Butler/Brighton but no Ellenbrook—why? That is a very good question. The member for Swan Hills certainly had no idea when he was wandering around and saying to his local media that the government was still committed to Ellenbrook. The Premier knew it was gone. Back in February 2009, Ms Cant new it was gone; she was just unsure why. Another interesting question was: Princess Margaret; No commitment to 2014 as per election commitment—why? I know that the member for Hillarys is about to jump to his feet and get all cranky about the humiliating emails that came around. The questions continued with: Royalties for regions; cuts in city projects but no cuts in regional projects—why? Ms Cant should be occupying the position of chief of staff. She should be on that salary, because she raised the sorts of questions that need to be raised by this government. More interesting is the psychological and emotional support of the spivs on the other side to public transport. We know it is not true. We know they do not have a real commitment. They try to get something in there so that they cannot be accused of never building rail on their watch. The last time they did anything with rail was under Charlie and they shut down the Freo line. There was another useful email from Mr Tjorn Sibma on 2 February 2009 while this great media release was being prepared. It states —

If I am across the deliberations then I think we should refer to the rail extension as the Brighton rail extension rather than Butler–Brighton. It will assist in branding it as our project rather than Labor's.

They could not have Labor taking credit for this! They had to do it! The government is building rail! It is committed to rail! Never before has a Liberal government built any rail; it closed the Freo line because a beautiful freeway was going to go through there. It cannot call it the Butler to Brighton line! Fortunately, that little piece of advice did not make it all the way through to tonight. We now have before us the Railway (Butler to Brighton) Bill. I daresay we can move an amendment later to call it the ALP Railway (Butler to Brighton) Bill. Certainly Mr Sibma thought it needed to be re-branded in light of the fact that it was closer to being a Labor commitment than a Liberal commitment.

There is another email from Mr Blair Stratton on 1 February, the day on which that very significant media release came out about the capital works projects—the wonderful work that the Liberal–National coalition government was getting up to. He made some suggestions, the first of which was —

We should be referring to the railway as Brighton or Butler–Brighton but not Butler. See attached for the route.

We now know why they could not talk about Butler–Brighton and why it had to be Brighton, because God forbid that the Labor government that built the Mandurah line get some credit for the Butler–Brighton line. The second point he made, and this is a good one, was —

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY - Wednesday, 16 June 2010]

p3962a-3980a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr David Templeman; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr John Quigley

Perhaps we can strengthen the reference to public housing to highlight our understanding for people that may be struggling as a result of the economic crisis and the need to provide greater resources to help them.

Mr Stratton was obviously filled with compassion when it came to those poor people in public housing who were facing huge, savage increases in fees and charges from the Premier, the member for Cottesloe. The government needed to pretend that it cared about these people! There were a number of other points, but I like the final one, which states —

Perhaps as a follow up on Wednesday (Tuesday is the Reserve Bank announcement) Colin could announce his trip to Japan to highlight his economic leadership.

The commitment from this government to public transport is exactly what I have been saying: it is a facade. It will try to build this Labor Butler to Brighton railway line that Mr Sibma recognised was a Labor project and desperately tried to rename, but that somehow did not make it through the various spin doctors and all the way through to the drafting of the bill. This government has no commitment when it comes to real, meaningful construction of public transport. Ellenbrook was simply a last minute, “Oh my God, the Labor Party is committed to it; let’s do it”, leaving the member for Swan Hills hanging and wondering what was going on. He wandered around telling everybody that it was going to happen, but now it is not a commitment for a first-term government. It has been pushed out to the never-never. When it comes to public transport, this mob is a bunch of spivs. The emails highlight that. When the Butler to Brighton railway line is completed, I hope the Premier does what Mr Sibma would perhaps recommend; that is, to invite the Leader of the Opposition to come up and cut the ribbon!

MR W.J. JOHNSTON (Cannington) [8.17 pm]: It is always hard to follow the member for Victoria Park, who every day gets better and better at pointing out the truth of the Liberal Party. The Labor Party does support this bill. It is interesting when reading the parliamentary secretary’s second reading speech that the line was originally intended to be to Butler and that the Brighton station would be built at a later stage. The member for Mindarie carefully analysed why the decision to bypass the original decision and to move the station two and a half kilometres further north is a mistake. Decisions about public transport always involve choices. With the southern suburbs rail line, the choices made by the former Labor government were correct as they ensured that there was a rapid and direct route from the southern suburbs into the city. It is interesting that if the original proposal to take the train through Kenwick had occurred, it would have been faster for passengers to get off the train at Cockburn Central and to catch a bus up the freeway into the city rather than going on a very long detour through the eastern suburbs. The other thing that needs to be noted is that that proposal would have led to the doubling of the number of trains that would have run through the electorate of Cannington, which I represent.

The government is making a decision; it is making a choice to invest \$234 million, I think, in this proposal. There are other proposals around that also need to be considered. When we look at this bill, we have to, in deciding whether to support it, think about what other issues need to be dealt with in public transport. In the electorate of Cannington, several rail infrastructure issues need to be dealt with. There are some easy ones, such as getting the Minister for Transport to finally upgrade the Queens Park train station. I wrote to the minister when I was elected to Parliament and asked him what his plans were for the redevelopment of that train station. I was very pleased to get a letter back from him, saying that it would be redeveloped in the first half of 2009. When it was not redeveloped in the first half of 2009, I wrote to him again and asked him what his plans were for it to be redeveloped. He wrote back to me and said that it would be redeveloped in the first half of 2010. I have now written to him and asked him what his plans are for the station because it still has not been redeveloped. That has been a decision—a choice—and we see in this bill the choice the government is making about rail infrastructure. But that would be another choice that the government could make; it could adhere to its commitments and refurbish the Queens Park train station. As we see, the government is making this choice to extend the rail line from Butler to Brighton.

The government could, of course, make a decision to resolve the problems on William Street in the suburb of Beckenham. In Beckenham, we have a level crossing that simply does not work. We have a very poor rail station that is split on the eastern and western sides of William Street. That is a completely unsatisfactory arrangement. It is not a contemporary or modern train station. I note that the member for Bassendean is carefully listening to these comments. The member for Bassendean is very lucky, because the former Labor government did a great redevelopment of the Bassendean train station. From that we can see, similar to the Victoria Park train station, what a contemporary train station can really look like.

Mr M.P. Whitely interjected.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Absolutely. That is what I was getting to. That is a very good contribution that the member for Bassendean makes. The problem is that the volume of traffic on that rail line is increasing, with the

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr David Templeman; Mr Murray
Cowper; Mr John Quigley

larger number of people coming from the eastern suburbs with all the new developments such as Wungong and those south of Armadale, as well as the growth in the member for Darling Range's seat. This will not happen during the life of a Liberal government, but when the extension occurs from the Thornlie line further south, even more trains will be running. If we continue to have the situation with the William Street level crossing, that which is already dysfunctional will become impossible. Already, for half of every hour during peak times, that boom gate is down, and that level crossing does not work. There is also a very poor quality train station. When we look at this bill and see the decision of this government to spend \$240 million in the northern suburbs, we can see that the government is making a choice to do that, and it is a reasonable choice. However, it means that the government is not making the choice to refurbish that train station and upgrade that rail crossing in my electorate.

Then we move along in the electorate of Cannington to the level crossing at Wharf Street and Sevenoaks Street. This is another situation —

The SPEAKER: Member for Cannington, I draw your attention to the bill in front of the house. I respect that you might have some issues in your electorate and surrounding electorates, but the bill is about the proposed Butler to Brighton line.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Indeed. I appreciate the Speaker's direction and I will return to the bill.

As I explained, the government is making a choice, through this bill, to invest \$240.7 million of public money into the extension to Brighton, following a report done by the consultancy firm Syme Marmion and Co.

Mr W.R. Marmion: It's a good firm.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: The Minister for Housing makes an interjection about the quality of the firm.

In the parliamentary secretary's second reading speech, he talked about the growth in the number of people living in the northern suburbs. He indicated in his second reading speech that there are about 30 000 people living in the catchment area for the train station, which is interesting, because it is the same population in the catchment area for the train stations in the electorate of Cannington. Therefore, we can see that the government is making that decision to invest that money in that way to take account of the needs of those 30 000 people. What I am pointing out to you, Mr Speaker—I appreciate your assistance in ensuring that I stay true to the needs of the standing orders—is that the government could, of course, invest money in resolving the issues for those 30 000 people who live in the electorate of Cannington and who have to deal with the Wharf Street level crossing every day. Cars turning right off Sevenoaks Street into Wharf Street get caught; they cannot turn right because the boom gates are down for half of every hour during peak time. Therefore, there is a queue of cars on Sevenoaks Street that cannot exit onto Wharf Street. That then causes trouble for traffic in Sevenoaks Street also.

We could also look at the problems on Albany Highway past the Westfield Carousel Shopping Centre, which is directly impacted by the failure to invest in the upgrade of that intersection. That is a very complex issue. As I said, when we look at that report by Syme Marmion that identified those 30 000 people in that northern suburbs catchment area, and when we consider that that is the same as already exists in the catchment area for the Cannington rail stations, we can see that the government could make that decision. Fortunately, we do not have all the Mandurah trains coming through that level crossing, which would have made it completely impossible to function. We then go down to Hamilton Street as well. As the member for Cannington, I believe that I have a duty to advocate to the Parliament of Western Australia on behalf of the constituents of the seat of Cannington, and I proudly do that, because they are very important issues that I need to bring to the attention of the Parliament.

I know that the parliamentary secretary is in the chamber, and I am sure he is going to take careful note of this. I am sure that the parliamentary secretary will be pleased to know that I was happy to defend him yesterday in my contribution to the third reading debate on the budget. I could not possibly blame the parliamentary secretary for the problems to which I referred yesterday regarding the estimates process, when he clearly was not adequately briefed by the minister. Hopefully, the parliamentary secretary will appreciate the assistance that I am giving him today to draw his attention to these matters, which are very important to the constituents of my electorate. These are issues that are not being dealt with by the Railway (Butler to Brighton) Bill 2009. However, the government is choosing what it is doing with this bill. It is a bill to deal with those matters in the northern suburbs to follow on from the good work done by the member for Armadale in planning for the rail extension to the northern suburbs, which of course is building on the great work done by the Labor government in its first term of office in beginning the extension from Joondalup north, and building on the great work that the Labor government did in the 1990s when it built the northern suburbs rail line.

I was living in the northern suburbs when that rail line was originally opened, and I know from my own personal experience that the train line was so successful that the passenger numbers exceeded everybody's expectations. I

imagine that when this train line is extended further north, following on the plans of the member for Armadale, that will also be reflected in the patronage on this northern line. It shows that the entire state benefits from investment in public transport. It is not just the people who use the train line who get a benefit from the train line. Every Western Australian will benefit from this. If we make the state and the city more efficient, that is a benefit for the entire state. Even those who do not live in the northern suburbs will benefit from the increased efficiency of our public transport system. Every Western Australian will benefit from the reduction in demand for additional roads, the reduction in travel times and the increased efficiency of the city, even if they do not live in that area.

There will be great challenges for the city as it grows. Because the city has this north–south construction and it does not go much inland, it will be an increasing problem in the future. We have to think about how that will be handled. If the city is going to stretch 200 kilometres from the north to the south, we will end up with great pressures. We will have to start thinking about how to ensure that the eastern suburbs are properly serviced and given the benefits that flow to the coastal strip. It will be a challenge for this government and future governments to ensure that public investment is put into the eastern suburbs so that we do not continually have this very thin strip of suburbs on the coast without much of a hinterland. Communities in the electorates of Cannington and Gosnells are great places to live but they need that infrastructure investment to ensure that we do not end up with the problems of a 200 kilometre–long city; a thin strip up and down the coast. It will be in the interests of every Western Australian to see appropriate levels of investment in those eastern suburbs, not only in public transport infrastructure, which is very important and the subject of this bill, but also in schools and other services and roads et cetera.

The SPEAKER: Member for Cannington, I bring you back to the subject at hand—the Railway (Butler to Brighton) Bill 2009.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I do not intend to speak for much longer. I want to conclude by saying that it is interesting to note, as I understand the advice from the Public Transport Authority to the government, that when the government originally cancelled the northern rail extension that we are voting on tonight, it was advised that if it did not proceed with the project that was already effectively in front of it, it would not be able to extend any part of the metropolitan rail service before the next election. It would have left itself in the position in which it had never delivered one centimetre of additional rail whilst in government. Liberal–National Party governments have not built one additional railway. If the government had not proceeded with this plan, with some adjustments that the member for Mindarie described—the plan left to it by the member for Armadale—it would have got to the next election still not having delivered any rail line infrastructure in this state. The fact that the government did not match the Labor Party’s decision to order additional railcars means that there will be a shortage of railcars for this line in the future. As passenger numbers increase, the government will have an increasing problem delivering rail services without overcrowding the northern line. Whilst it is happy to roll out the extra railcars that were ordered by the member for Armadale, it has not increased the order and it has not put in a new order, which was the commitment of the Labor Party at the last election. Because it has not done that and because it takes so long for rail sets to be delivered, there will be an increasing problem of overcrowding on this northern rail extension, as with every other line, as the passenger numbers rise. That is because only those 45 additional railcars that the member for Armadale ordered will be delivered; no additional railcars will be delivered beyond that. With those comments, I conclude my remarks.

MR C.J. TALLENTIRE (Gosnells) [8.34 pm]: I rise to make a brief contribution on this piece of legislation that is supported by the opposition. It is a bill that shows that perhaps at long last the Liberal–National government is realising that there are great benefits in delivering on public transport and increasing our rail network. I am thankful that at long last a Liberal government wants to be involved in laying railway tracks, albeit only a short distance. Nevertheless, there is a preparedness to engage. When I heard the second reading speech by the parliamentary secretary—that speech was delivered some time ago—there was quite a bit of hesitation about how this train station and extension to the line would proceed and, indeed, whether it should proceed.

I thought it was very interesting that the parliamentary secretary mentioned that a study had suggested that perhaps there was not really the level of patronage required and there was some concern about whether the area would lend itself to the objectives of transit-oriented development. It is pleasing to see that people are becoming sceptical about some of these reports that seem to be put together immediately to knock public transport ideas. I know that we are debating the Railway (Butler to Brighton) Bill 2009, but in my electorate there is a very good proposal to extend the Thornlie train line through to Nicholson Road and Ranford Road. A consultant’s report by Syme Marmion and Co has been put together knocking that idea. The transport minister has decided to accept the advice of Syme Marmion. That is extremely disappointing. I suspect it was a little of the same sort of rhetoric—the same line of thinking—that was initially opposed to this rail line extension. On this occasion the

government has seen fit to ignore that advice. Why has the government not seen fit to see through the wrong advice on the Thornlie train line extension?

There is obviously a need to reinvestigate some of the consulting reports. I cannot help but feel that some of these reports are put together on the basis that they must give the desired recommendation of the government of the day. In other words, if the government of the day wants to proceed with a rail extension, the consultant's report will come back saying that, yes, it is a good idea. If the government of the day is hesitant about the idea of extending a train line, a report from Syme Marmion or any other consulting group will say that it is not quite up to scratch, the proposal does not meet the levels of patronage that it would normally expect or there is a problem with the amount of transit-oriented development land available around the station—any one of a number of excuses. Another excuse I have seen in these consulting reports relates to the likelihood of people switching to public transport instead of using their cars. I have seen a throwback to what we might call the Sir Charles Court era, where the Syme Marmion report relating to the Thornlie train line extension —

The SPEAKER: Member for Gosnells, I direct the same comments to you as I directed to the member for Cannington. We are dealing with the Railway (Butler to Brighton) Bill. That is what is before the house. That is what I expect to hear members speak to.

Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE: I am seeking to show that there is a parallel set of circumstances here. We have this notion in place that car travel is an easy and cheap alternative to public transport options. People still believe that the car option is viable. Yes, it is in many cases but the fact is that we are facing the onset of an era where fuel prices are likely to rise quite dramatically and the level of congestion on our roads increases day by day. No matter how many extra kilometres of road we build, congestion seems to follow and, therefore, the only answer is a better public transport system.

Extensions of rail lines are an integral part of that development of our public transport network. I say “integral part” because they are not the whole story. This is where I am worried that the learning curve that the Liberal–National government has embarked upon is not complete. It is just coming around to the idea of extending the train line, but it has not fully understood that it is about making sure that the network of other transport options that feed into a train station are just as important as the extension of the rail line itself. It is such an important point, because if it is not properly understood, we will very quickly get to a situation where we will be hearing complaints from people in the Butler and Brighton areas that there is not sufficient parking around the train stations. It is inevitable that we will hear those complaints because we are telling people that we will give them a train station, but we are not telling them that we will enhance the feeder bus services in the catchment area of the train station. We are not telling them about the other options they may have that would enable them to get quickly and efficiently to the transport hub of their local catchment area.

That brings me to an issue that I have had the opportunity to mention in other debates recently, which is the disbandment of TravelSmart. That program was funded by the state government, with money going to local governments so that local government offices were in a position to help local communities understand what transport options were available, to enable them to get to transport hubs such as the one we are proposing to construct through the Railway (Butler to Brighton) Bill 2009. That is a real shame, because it means that people will get only half the benefit. If we have to think about constructing massive car parking areas to cater for what will certainly be a very successful extension to our rail network, I think we are missing so many of the benefits. We need to couple to this bill the concept of expanding the bus networks and services and making sure that we are buying additional buses. I note from various budget papers that we are buying new buses, but only at replacement level; there is no new capacity coming on line with the buses that will be introduced. That means that there is no capacity to service the catchment area we will create along the Butler to Brighton rail line. That is a grave concern that I have.

I accept comments made by other members that when we focus on a particular stretch of railway line, we automatically have to go through a prioritisation process and make a conscious decision that the scarce amount of money that is available for the development and enhancement of the rail network will not be made available to other areas. I ask that we have a more transparent approach towards determining our transport priorities. We really need to engage the whole community when working out which rail extensions are to be the priority extensions. This time, the people in the Butler to Brighton area have struck gold, but there are many other people across the metropolitan area who are missing out because we have not gone through a good prioritisation process that could, in fact, lead to us having more funds available if we develop that groundswell of community support. I believe that it is there, and it has certainly been the experience of Labor governments that there is great community support for the enhancement of the rail network in Western Australia into the future. On this occasion, the Barnett Liberal–National government wants to provide only an extra few kilometres. The suspicion

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr David Templeman; Mr Murray
Cowper; Mr John Quigley

has been aired that this is just about putting the present government in a situation where it cannot be accused of never having laid a kilometre of rail track.

Nevertheless, I applaud the construction of this additional section of rail line; I think it is to be welcomed, but I urge the government to look very seriously at making sure that people are able to get to the train stations not just by car but by other means of transport, and that development around the train stations is such that it will have the vibrancy that comes through a mixture of commercial, residential and office-type premises, which automatically provides passive surveillance. There is nothing more sterile than just building a station for commuters that empties out after the daily commute time has ended. A range of crime problems emerge along with that sterile commuter-only concept, and before we know it, we need even more security in place, more CCTV and more capacity for security guards to swoop on graffiti artists.

The SPEAKER: Member, I will bring you back to the bill before the house, the Railway (Butler to Brighton) Bill 2009. Your comments are very general.

Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE: Thank you, Mr Speaker; I was airing my concerns about the station that is to be built on this stretch of railway line. It could end up being a sterile, single-use environment that would be a harbour for the criminal element. The alternative is to create a vibrant transport hub that has an excellent mix of shops, offices and residential properties in close proximity to the station, such that there is a constant feeling of activity and passive surveillance. I do not believe that one can think in isolation on these sorts of issues; we have to talk about transport and crime in the one sentence and we have to make sure that there is a connection there. It is all too reflective of the way in which much of our transport network has evolved in the past that it was seen as transport only, and that has led to the set of circumstances that in turn has led people to say, "I dare not use the train service at night; I'm too scared to use it because there's no-one around. The only people there are thugs and other undesirable elements." By coupling the extension of the train line with other good, sensible developments, we can make sure that we have an excellent stretch of rail line that is well-frequented, which means that people can enjoy it and use it more and more, and we will not fall into a downward spiral situation where people say that it is too dangerous to use and it becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy where fewer and fewer people use the line simply because they hear bad stories, and it becomes so underutilised that those poor brave souls who do use the line become vulnerable. The alternative—to make sure that there is plenty of activity—is the right way and the safe way to go.

I will conclude my remarks there. I support this legislation, but I hope the government will take my comments on board to ensure that we use this as an opportunity to develop a transport hub and that we make sure there is an adequately resourced feeder service of buses. We need to make sure that people are able to consider options beyond using their cars to take up car parking spaces around a new station on this stretch of line. The costs that go with those parking spaces around train stations are very high. Surveys conducted by the Public Transport Authority have found a ridiculous situation where most of the cars parked around train stations have travelled less than two kilometres. The Public Transport Authority has very efficiently conducted that survey by looking at the car registration numbers and married them up against the address of the owners of the cars.

The SPEAKER: Member for Gosnells, perhaps that might be a more appropriate question to ask the parliamentary secretary in consideration in detail. If the member is going to conclude his remarks, I suggest that he do so.

Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE: I thank you, Mr Speaker. I shall conclude my remarks by saying that I hope the government will take my comments on board.

MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah) [8.50 pm]: I believe it is important to share in the celebration of the Railway (Butler to Brighton) Bill 2009 and particularly the fact that the people in the northern suburbs who live in Butler and Brighton will benefit from this important infrastructure project. I was reading schedule 1 of the bill. You will be amazed to know, Mr Speaker, that I will actually be speaking to the bill! I noted with great interest in schedule 1 the information on page 3 of the bill, which determines where the railway line is to be constructed and its distance. I understand that it is 2.6 kilometres of rail. I think that is the net length of the proposed line. The member for Gosnells, in his contribution, alluded to the fact that we need to understand that a person who is born today will hopefully benefit from the vision of this and future governments. On that note, with the support of the Speaker, I mention a young person who was born today to the member for Willagee and his wife, Vic. Ava Ruby Tinley was born just after 7.30 this morning. We congratulate the member for Willagee, his wife Vic and their family. It is interesting to think that a child like Ava, who was born today, will, in the not too distant future, be seeking to utilise the infrastructure that governments of both persuasions put in place. Because of the spreading population of the northern suburbs, I can understand the anticipation of the people who live in those suburbs, including people who live in places like Ellenbrook and the suburbs mentioned by the member for

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr David Templeman; Mr Murray
Cowper; Mr John Quigley

Cannington in the eastern part of the metropolitan area, who currently are not serviced by important infrastructure, which in this case is rail.

I understand the anticipation of those communities because I have lived in my community for more than 20 years, and for 17 years I also lived in great anticipation of the building of the proposed rail link to Mandurah. There has always been an argument about who first proposed the rail link to Mandurah. The fact is that it was talked about for a long time. There were always documents, and statements were made and promises given at election time. We in the southern regional City of Mandurah also had great anticipation about important infrastructure. We waited a significant time for it, as did the entire population in the southern corridor. More than 400 000 people now live south of Fremantle, which is more than one-third of Perth's population. There are more than 70 000 people in the great regional City of Mandurah.

When governments build infrastructure that will have a lasting impact, it is important for us all; it does not matter whether we live in country Western Australia, regional Western Australia, the regional City of Mandurah or metropolitan Perth. We should accept and understand that although the infrastructure might not be being built in our area, it contributes to the net benefit of the state. In this case, it benefits the Perth metropolitan area in particular. Perth continues to stretch to the north through the suburbs of Butler, Brighton and Jindalee in the north. There are suburbs that I have never heard of. I recently visited Jindalee to have a look and I was amazed at the remarkable development that is occurring there. What we see, of course, are vastly growing communities where, unfortunately, the infrastructure that is required for them, particularly infrastructure that allows people in those growing communities to move or be moved about quickly, lags behind. I was very interested when this bill was introduced to the house —

Mr M.J. Cowper: When was that?

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: A number of months ago. I was very interested because I recognise that this railway line, certainly for the people living in the area, is greatly anticipated. I know that the member for Swan Hills—I was going to say Swan Lake!—has been muzzled tonight by a number of his members. He is passionate about his electorate. There are areas in his electorate like Butler and Brighton that need infrastructure. The people in Ellenbrook would certainly be anticipating that a government of the future, be it Labor or Liberal, would provide the important infrastructure that is required.

I have listened to the debate on this bill this afternoon and this evening and I was very interested in the wonderful contribution of the member for Victoria Park. I have not seen him so passionate for some time. He was obviously passionate and had some beautiful information. I noted that the Premier was wryly smiling during that interchange with the member for Victoria Park. I feel that perhaps the Premier was a little embarrassed. I know that the Leader of the House was particularly embarrassed. I thought I saw him mouthing words like, "How did this happen? Who did that? Who was it? Are they one of yours? What's happening?" I am a very good lip-reader! I am sure that is what was being mouthed.

I like to compliment people, so I will compliment the Minister for Commerce. I feel that he has gone through a bit of a makeover in the past week. I note that he has been down to Maurice Meade and has come out shining like a brass button! I am not sure whether the minister's frames are new. Obviously the Liberal Party has spent a little bit of money on the minister, although I would not like to say how much! They would have to spend a great deal of money on a makeover if they were to do anything to my good friend, the member for South Perth. They would probably have to spend a small fortune! He is waiting to be a minister of the future. In fact, most members on this side of the house support him as the next minister of the Liberal-National Party-Independent cobbled-together government that we currently have in Western Australia. I have probably rung the death knell of his political future!

The SPEAKER: Stay on topic, please, member!

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: Yes, on topic. When the young people of the future such as the Ava Ruby Tinleys of the world are seeking to find their way in the world, they will be the real beneficiaries of good public policy that is made by governments now and into the future. It is very important for us to consider the reports of the sort that came out earlier this week on the unsustainability of Perth as a city. It referred to the fact that urban growth has been allowed to run rampant and that the public transport system has to catch up, particularly the rail infrastructure and associated networks that the member for Gosnells has spoken about. I do not really care who gets the ultimate credit for this.

Mr C.J. Barnett: We do.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I know the Premier does because he does not have a very good record! That is the problem, so he needs a few chalk marks on his side of the ledger—there are a few gaps there. We will not go into

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr David Templeman; Mr Murray
Cowper; Mr John Quigley

the history because it has already been covered. He will probably be able to make only a little chalk mark on his side of the ledger. On its ledger, the Labor Party has the electrification of the whole metropolitan system, the extension of the southern rail line, the reinstating of the Perth to Fremantle railway line and the Clarkson and Thornlie extensions. Goodness me, I could be here all night but I will not. On the ledger of members opposite will be 2.7 kilometres of rail—a proud achievement!

Mr B.S. Wyatt: A Labor 2.7 kilometres.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: Yes; a proud achievement that builds on less than a millimetre that was added to the system when members opposite were last in government; when they were simply a coalition.

Mr C.J. Barnett: There's Claremont showgrounds railway station.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: Yes; the Claremont showgrounds little siding. It is a beautiful little siding! I can remember when the Premier was in opposition making a grievance in this place about, I think, three people in his electorate wanting to catch the train but were unable to. He was very aggrieved that day.

Mr C.J. Barnett: They were disabled constituents.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I thought they were elderly. He wanted them to get onto, I think, the Claremont station.

Mr C.J. Barnett: The platform height was wrong and they could not get the wheelchair up.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: They parked the Mercedes Benz at the Park 'n' Ride and were hoping to get onto the train; but I digress.

Mr C.J. Barnett: They were Homeswest tenants for your information.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: Now he has got rid of them; they have been dispatched, just as the Perth–Fremantle line was. This is a celebration. I am in a mood of reconciliation tonight. I am usually a little aggressive, but tonight I am much more conciliatory! This is a celebration for the people of Brighton–Butler and the nearby growing areas. It will be great when the railway extends further into Two Rocks, which I am sure is part of the wider plan. I hope for the sake of the member for Swan Hills that Ellenbrook gets on the list, because I fear for him. I want to see him here, but I fear for him!

Mr F.A. Alban: How long did it take you to get your train?

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I was elected in 2001; it was there within two terms. That was not too bad I thought. I do not claim the credit for the Mandurah rail line.

Mr F.A. Alban: How many people did you say are in your region? You mentioned 400 000 people.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: There are almost 100 000 in the Peel region.

Mr F.A. Alban: There are 17 000 in Ellenbrook and a handful more in West Swan.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: Does the member for Swan Hills not want them to get a train?

Mr F.A. Alban: I do.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I think the member is arguing against himself. I do not want to incite him; I have seen him incited, and it is not a pretty site!

Mr M. McGowan: Has he had a makeover?

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: No; that was cruel. The member for Swan Hills told me he was told that he had to get tougher and stand up to us. He was going to stand up to us this afternoon but he was muzzled by the Premier and the Leader of the House. They came around and got out the Dencorub and started to rub him down a bit and say, "Come on, you've just got to settle down a bit." I saw that.

The SPEAKER: Member for Mandurah and member for Swan Hills!

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: Yes, Mr Speaker. The Butler–Brighton bill.

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I thought he was saying that his constituents do not deserve a train line. I hope I misheard him. This is a celebration. The distance of 2.7 kilometres is a wonderful achievement that builds on a strong history of lack of achievement! But, as the Premier has rightly said, "We have to start somewhere with this and we are starting with 2.7 kilometres." I reckon the Premier will be out there with his little golden spikes to nail in the first one. "There's the first one," he'll say.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr David Templeman; Mr Murray
Cowper; Mr John Quigley

Mr B.S. Wyatt: Twenty-three more to go!

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: Exactly. “I’ll be there,” he’ll say. I will tell members what; probably every Liberal member will be there with his own spike and hammer and they will nail them in one after the other. The National Party will probably boycott this because it is not a royalties for regions project unless, of course, they reduce the metropolitan regional area down to the northern suburbs. I think the Premier will be there.

Ms R. Saffioti: The member for Mindarie will be there the day before.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: Yes, he probably will be there the day before and, in his inimitable way, he will go there with his silver spikes and pound them in and have huge placards everywhere saying “Labor delivers once again”!

Mr C.J. Barnett: It will be “Quigley delivers once again”.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I think my contribution has been positive this evening, as I like it to be in this place. Whilst the wording of this bill is sparse, and some would argue 2.7 kilometres is not a great distance —

Mr J.R. Quigley interjected.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: That is right, but it is a start. I will be celebrating and jumping in great anticipation. I will probably almost become moist with anticipation when the day comes that this section of rail is added to the electrified system that is the metropolitan system. Well done Premier! I am proud of him. I remember when he was trying to enshrine the state flag in history.

Mr M. McGowan: He had the wrong swan.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: He had the wrong swan. He had the outline of a goose rather than the proper swan motif.

The SPEAKER: Member for Mandurah!

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: However, I am proud of him. No-one else on this side might be, but I am, because that 2.7 kilometres is a massive achievement. It is something the Premier will be able to sell for years to come. When people look in the annals of history of this place and study the history of the Premiers of this state, they will say, “That fellow there drove the spike into the ground to ensure there was 2.7 kilometres of rail and that is a great achievement.” I am proud of the Premier. On that note, I will conclude my remarks.

MR M.J. COWPER (Murray–Wellington — Parliamentary Secretary) [9.08 pm] — in reply: I thank members on the other side for their contribution to this Railway (Butler to Brighton) Bill 2009. The opposition’s contribution to the second reading debate commenced on 26 November 2009 when the lead speaker, the member for Mindarie, gave his contribution to the house. I will endeavour to cover as many of the points as possible relevant to the bill that have been raised by the member for Mindarie and other members in this place. For the information of the member for Gosnells, who asked about the expenditure, the cost of building the 7.5 kilometres of rail extension to Butler is \$177 million from Clarkson station; \$28 million for a new communication network and fibre optic cables between the East Perth Public Transport Authority centre and the communications room at the 38-kilometre peg at the Nowergup depot and overhead wiring and support infrastructure works at the Nowergup and Mandurah railcar depots; \$8 million for acquisition of land for the railway reserve; and \$27 million for the acquisition of additional buses to service the expanded catchment of the station. As members can see, significant funding has been spent on this rail extension. The member for Mandurah made a rather amusing contribution to this debate. Notwithstanding the fact that it is 2.5 kilometres of additional rail, it is a substantial investment of \$244 million, which is not to be sneezed at. I am sure the people in the northern suburbs will benefit from it. Only as recently as yesterday I had cause to go to the northern suburbs, which is somewhere I do not often venture, particularly in the mornings. I had to travel to the member for Wanneroo’s electorate. On the return journey, given there had been a bit of rain, I was pretty much caught in a traffic jam right back to Ocean Reef Road.

Mr A.P. Jacob: What time was that?

Mr M.J. COWPER: That was before our party room meeting, which I was delayed getting to I might add. On the way up there I saw this bank of cars virtually all the way from the city right through to Ocean Reef Road. On the return journey, unfortunately, I had to queue up to get back to the city. It took considerable time to get into the city. I do not think there is any question about the need. The rail line has brought an efficient transport system to people who live in the northern suburbs. I know the member for Gosnells has a keen interest in this area. I sat in this 20 to 30-kilometre long “car park” and observed—very similar to my being caught in traffic jams on the southern line—that a number of cars contained only one occupant. We touched upon this during budget estimates last week. This is a culture that needs to change in Western Australia particularly in relation to

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY - Wednesday, 16 June 2010]

p3962a-3980a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr David Templeman; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr John Quigley

the use of motor vehicles. That is something we can perhaps discuss at a later date or, in a spirit of cooperation, look at these issues. The cost to widen or add additional lanes to freeways is very costly. Notwithstanding the fact there have been some comical remarks in respect to rail transport, everyone in this place will agree that in modern cities the most efficient way to move people to and from the city is by rail.

There are a number of other issues that we need to address in relation to the area that I share with the member for Mandurah, including employment opportunities. I am perplexed as to what people in the northern suburbs actually do for a living—other than build houses—as we continue to sprawl north. The vast majority of occupants who live in that area are reliant on trains to get to the city, which is primarily where work is located. I will put a plug in for our region, member for Mandurah—we have local industry and we have access to infrastructure that is already in place. I am perplexed as to why no consideration is given to rail transport in our region when we have the likes of Alcoa, Boddington gold mine, and the Wagerup, Pinjarra and Worsley refineries providing access to real and meaningful jobs. That is something that needs to be addressed when looking at an overall planning strategy for the future.

I hark back to 26 November last year when the member for Mindarie, in his very colourful way, put forward a number of contributions that I would like to respond to. The member for Mindarie raised some questions. I need to clarify some of the issues raised and also point out the facts as they stand. Early in the member for Mindarie's remarks he said that there was a plan to build a station three kilometres north of Clarkson in the suburb of Butler. The Butler station referred to is north of Lukin Drive. It is about five kilometres north of Clarkson in the suburb of Nowergup. Prior to the election, Labor's promise was to build a station at and a track to Butler by the end of next year; there would therefore be another 1 000 car bays about 3.5 kilometres north of Clarkson station and then beyond to Brighton by the end of 2014. That was the plan. The master plan produced by the previous government, which was endorsed in August 2008, advised that the station at Butler—which is the one that is five kilometres north of Clarkson, now known as Nowergup—should be commissioned by early 2012 with an option to extend to Brighton, and would be known as the Butler train station. It was to be examined as part of a master plan to the extent the railway from Butler to the next planned extension at Alkimos would be another 10 kilometres further north.

The member for Mindarie also mentioned, in relation to the Tokyu Corporation, that if the state can get the track to Alkimos, it would look at pre-funding the track through to Yanchep in the same way it pre-funded Marmion Avenue from Brighton all the way to Yanchep. My understanding is that in June 1997 the Tokyu Corporation transferred 60.9 hectares of land, at no cost, to the Western Australian Planning Commission for the railway and land for the future freeway extension. The member said that the bill therefore abandons the people of Butler. The member for Mindarie made an interesting point. The Butler station site will be covered by this bill. It is the government's intention to retain the land formerly known as Butler—or the area the member knows as Butler—and re-evaluate the case for a train station there in five years, after the Brighton station has been commissioned. That will be in late 2014.

The member for Mindarie commented that the Butler station, with its 1 000 parking bays, has been cancelled and the land will be leased to joint venturers for temporary parking at Brighton. The member asked what will happen when the lease runs out and developers want to sell that land. The member indicated there would be no parking available there. Cabinet has directed that final arrangements regarding the land for parking at Brighton be resolved jointly by the Minister for Transport and the Minister for Housing. The Public Transport Authority has advised that the land to allow parking 700 vehicles should be acquired freehold. Land to park a further 300 vehicles should be leased, say, for at least 12 years, after which time it will be reviewed.

For the information of members, I have a number of maps that may clarify where the Butler train station will be. It will actually be on Butler Drive, which is partly in the suburb of Butler. The maps also show the potential site for a future Nowergup station, which would be only 2.5 kilometres before the Butler station. As members will appreciate, this is a fast-growing area. Some time in the future I expect that there would be a need to put a station at Nowergup. According to the information I have been given, member for Mindarie, the land will be retained for the purposes of a future train station.

I refer to another comment that the member for Mindarie made. He said, now that the government has introduced a bill to Parliament to extend the line to Brighton, it will cancel the Butler station and rename the Brighton station "Butler". The point is this is not a matter for government intervention. The name "Brighton" is a marketing name developed by the Brighton joint venture, which has also nominated the major east-west corridor road as Brighton Boulevard.

Mr J.R. Quigley: Why are you calling it the Butler to Brighton station if it is only a marketing name?

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY - Wednesday, 16 June 2010]

p3962a-3980a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr David Templeman; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr John Quigley

Mr M.J. COWPER: When the actual subdivision was developed, they wanted to call it Brighton Boulevard. This was rejected by the Geographic Names Committee and it is now called Butler Boulevard. The Butler train station will be located at Butler Boulevard in Butler.

Mr J.R. Quigley: The parliamentary secretary is talking about the extension of the line from Butler to Brighton. That is the name of the legislation, yet he is still calling it Brighton.

Mr M.J. COWPER: That is something that is confusing, I admit. I wish to table the documents.

[See papers 2185 and 2186.]

Mr M.J. COWPER: The proposed station, on the north side of Butler Boulevard, will be called “Butler” because it is in the centre of Butler. There is no suburb of Brighton. It is simply a trade name by the local developer. Consistent with that, because the station further south formerly known as Butler lies within the suburb of Nowergup, it will accordingly be known as “Nowergup”.

I refer to another comment made by the member for Mindarie. He said after Karrakatta, the Showgrounds, Claremont, Swanbourne, Cottesloe and so on, the distance between Clarkson and Brighton is 7.5 kilometres. There is a precedent for siting train stations between Clarkson and Brighton.

Mr J.R. Quigley: The parliamentary secretary is confusing himself and the community—between Clarkson and Brighton—

Mr M.J. COWPER: Brighton, for all intents and purposes, does not exist as a locality. That has been identified by the Geographic Names Committee.

Mr J.R. Quigley: So why have you called the bill the extension of rail from Butler to Brighton?

Mr M.J. COWPER: The point, member, is that I did not call it that. That is the way it has been drafted and that is the way it has been presented before this house.

Mr J.R. Quigley: It is to confuse the population.

Mr M.J. COWPER: We would never build commuter rail stations as close as those on the Fremantle, Midland and Armadale lines. To illustrate how things work at present, the 19 suburban stations on the rapid transit network from Clarkson to Mandurah carry about 60 per cent of the total rail patronage, whilst the 46 suburban stations on the older network carry about 40 per cent of the total carriage of the city. On the Mandurah line, the distance between Murdoch and the next station south at Cockburn Central is just under seven kilometres. On the Joondalup line between Stirling and the next station north at Warwick the distance is 5.7 kilometres. In addition, the width of the corridor serving those stations is much greater than the width of the corridor serving the Clarkson and Butler stations, which is quite narrow in comparison and so will accommodate far fewer people. As members can appreciate, as those suburbs grow, so will the catchment and the requirement for additional services. What can be highlighted is that there will be too many stations, at least in the medium term, for such a narrow corridor, with Clarkson 33.2 kilometres from Perth; Butler, or Nowergup, 38.2 kilometres from Perth; Brighton 40.7 kilometres from Perth; and Alkimos 43 kilometres from Perth.

Mr J.R. Quigley: It is only three kilometres up to Alkimos?

Mr M.J. COWPER: Yes, according to those figures.

Mr J.R. Quigley: Which would be about the same distance as between Butler and Brighton.

Mr M.J. COWPER: That is yet to be finalised. I imagine that it will be subject to further reports. The project is worth \$243 million. On the understanding that the Brighton station will be completed before the Butler station and commissioned in December 2012, the estimated cost will be \$240.7 million compared with the previous proposal under Labor in 2008 to extend it as far as the station at Lukin Drive, which was then called Butler. It is now called Nowergup. The additional cost of the station at Butler is \$108 million. The Public Transport Authority told me it would cost \$25 million.

Mr J.R. Quigley: For the station?

Mr M.J. COWPER: That was the comment the member made.

Mr J.R. Quigley: That is what the PTA told us—\$23 million.

Mr M.J. COWPER: I think the member might have been confused, or the information was not properly relayed to him.

Mr J.R. Quigley: No, I wasn't confused.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr David Templeman; Mr Murray
Cowper; Mr John Quigley

Mr M.J. COWPER: That is the reference to the cost of the station at Butler. The member is correct inasmuch as the PTA advice related to the infrastructure only. To that must be added the cost of two trains, which is another \$25 million. The trains are not included in the project cost, as they were in a separate order of 15 trains placed about four years ago. I hope that in some way clarifies some of the points the member for Mindarie has raised.

There are only three clauses and one schedule to this bill. I know that the member for Mindarie and others may be keen to ask some further questions. I have an assistant who might be able to give us some detail on the questions that might be raised. I do not wish to further delay this bill. It is an important bill. It is important to the people of the northern suburbs. We need to progress it as expeditiously as the previous bill, which was the Railway (Tilley to Karara) Bill 2010. I thank members on the other side for that. It also demonstrates the commitment by this government to its important rail infrastructure in Western Australia. With that, I will wait to take questions on this bill during the consideration in detail stage.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Leave denied to proceed forthwith to third reading.

Consideration in Detail

Clause 1: Short title —

Mr B.S. WYATT: I will make some comments on the short title of the bill, which is the “Railway (Butler to Brighton) Act 2009”, and I will move an amendment to that clause. As I pointed out during my contribution to the second reading debate, it was interesting to go through the thought processes of the government when it went about making the commitment to the Railway (Butler to Brighton) Bill 2009. The member for Mandurah and member for Mindarie have gone through the history of this matter; that is, the net contribution of Liberal governments in the past few decades has been a 20-kilometre reduction in rail when it removed the Fremantle line. As the member for Mindarie has already pointed out, it is adding another 2.7 kilometres with this piece of legislation. We will round that up to three. The government will be left with a net rail position of minus 17 kilometres. As Mr Tjorn Sibma from the Premier’s office pointed out in his email of 2 February 2009 to all the senior staff of the Premier’s office, he had particular concerns that if the line were called the Brighton line, it would assist in branding it as the government’s project rather than Labor’s. Mr Sibma’s advice to change the name to the Brighton rail extension rather than the Butler to Brighton line was obviously ignored by the government. That piece of advice did not percolate through to the powers that be. We are now left with the Railway (Butler to Brighton) Bill 2009. Mr Sibma was right.

I refer to a front-page article in the *North Coast Times*, which was accompanied by a photo of the big dome of the member for Mindarie holding up a sign in the background that says “Barnett betrays Butler”. The article pointed out that in the first budget of the Barnett government—the 2009–10 budget—the money was not there for this project, so it was brought to a standstill. We know since then that the government was told that if it did not do this, its net rail position of 20 kilometres would remain. It needed to get its net rail position up to minus 17 kilometres, which will happen once this line is built. Mr Sibma was right. The member for Mindarie pulled down the pants of Hon Simon O’Brien. I remember seeing Hon Simon O’Brien looking rather glum on the television while the member for Mindarie, with his big sign saying “Barnett betrays Butler”, stood behind him and stole his thunder during the grand announcement that he wished to make. The member for Mindarie took it away. Mr Sibma is right; it is the Labor Party that has the brand when it comes to rail public transport. The Railway (Butler to Brighton) Bill 2009 is obviously reflective of Mr Sibma’s concern that this is a Labor project. It will be identified as a Labor project. It will be identified with the member for Mindarie regardless of the fact that the government is being somewhat deceptive with the naming of stations. I know the member for South Perth, who is unfortunately not here, has felt the heat of the government’s reluctance to honestly build stations that it had committed to. I know that the member for Swan Hills is sitting up there and stewing in his juices. He is on the record as saying that Ellenbrook does not deserve the Ellenbrook line because there are not enough people there. He will continue to stew on this issue. I move —

Page 2, line 2 — To insert before “*Railway (Butler to Brighton) Act 2009*” —

Labor

The amended title—the “Labor Railway (Butler to Brighton) Act 2009”—would reflect the advice received from Mr Sibma, who is clearly an astute, reliable and clever adviser who knew that when this bill was presented to the Parliament, the people of the northern suburbs would not be fooled; this is a Labor project.

Mr M. McGOWAN: I rise to support the amendment of the member for Victoria Park. It is an excellent amendment. I think it reflects the reality of public transport in this state and gives credit where credit is due. This

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr David Templeman; Mr Murray
Cowper; Mr John Quigley

project has been on the drawing board for us, as the Labor Party, for a long time. It is obvious that the Liberal Party recognises that, because this gentleman, Mr Sibma, has spilled the beans on the fear that the Liberal Party has that the credit for the railway in Perth and the expansion of the railway north would go to those who have the runs on the board in providing public transport in this city.

Mr R.F. Johnson: The railway to Mandurah was our plan, not yours.

Mr M. McGOWAN: I am pleased that the Leader of the House has interjected on me. Normally I am not happy, but on this occasion I am happy, because what he said is interesting. I think it was the Minister for Planning who said to me before, "Look, that was all our idea." Then I pointed out that when we introduced the legislation, the Liberal Party voted against it. He said, "No, no; I've got even better evidence than that. We built the tunnels that were necessary." There are three tunnels for the Perth to Mandurah railway. One goes all the way under the city. It is the one that had the tunnel boring machine that went all the way under the city; it was that massive machine that we imported. Do members recall the Liberals' argument that all the buildings were going to fall down? They said that all the buildings in the City of Perth were going to fall down because of that machine. However, there are two other tunnels on the freeway, and I know this very well because I catch the train regularly. In light of the Minister for Planning's commentary that the tunnels had been the massive Liberal Party contribution to the railway, I timed how long it takes to get through both tunnels put together. It takes five seconds. To travel from here to Mandurah on the train takes roughly 45 to 50 minutes. The total Liberal Party contribution to that railway is five seconds through those two tunnels. Therefore, the minister is technically correct; it is a joint effort between us and them. We provided 45 minutes of the travel time; they provided five seconds of the travel time along the railway.

The amendment might be considered by some people to be a bit of a stunt.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: Oh, come on!

Mr M. McGOWAN: Seriously; some people might think it is a bit of a stunt to draw attention to who is truly responsible for the excellent public transport system we have in this state. I might add that other states, in particular New South Wales and Queensland, have antiquated, slow public transport systems. When people from those states come here and look at our public transport system, they are absolutely wowed and gobsmacked by it. Who is responsible for that? It is not the Liberal Party, but those on this side; we are responsible. Who doubled the size of it? We doubled the size of it. Therefore, this amendment is designed to draw attention to who has had the broad responsibility for the rail system in this state over a long period. It is us. As I recall, it goes back to Sir Charles Court closing —

Mr C.J. Barnett: If you're so good, how come you lost seats in the northern suburbs?

Mr M. McGOWAN: We have more seats there than the Liberal Party has.

It goes back to the days of Sir Charles Court closing the railway from Perth to Fremantle. I know the true reason behind that. A very senior Liberal once told me, "We don't like all those people who catch trains coming into our suburbs. We don't really like them coming in here, because they get off at the train station and hang around our shops."

Mr B.S. Wyatt: They must be those people they worry about in public housing.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Yes. They are the postcode snobs of the western suburbs who say that they do not like those people from Rockingham coming into their suburbs; and they can get there a lot easier if they catch a train.

Mr T.G. Stephens: Why did they close the train line to Meekatharra in the same period?

Mr M. McGOWAN: Please tell.

The point I am making is that this amendment is designed to give due credit. However, Sir Charles Court did close the railway to Fremantle, but on top of that, as I understand the history as provided by the member for Armadale, there was not one single centimetre of railway in the metropolitan area ever provided by a Liberal government. The member for Armadale is a renowned historian. I constantly think of McIver station in East Perth, which was named after the former member for Northam—an ex-railwayman, who unfortunately died and therefore had the railway station named after him. I constantly think that the new Butler station should be named MacTiernan station. It would be a fitting tribute, and it would be a wonderful accolade by the Premier. It would show some big spiritedness. The Premier could finally rise above all that nastiness about doorknocking and "Why are you here?" and all that sort of stuff.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: I was so enthralled that I just wanted to hear a bit more of what the member for Rockingham was saying. I did not want to cut him off.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr David Templeman; Mr Murray
Cowper; Mr John Quigley

Mr M. McGOWAN: We are not going to delay the house much on this clause; we are not. I just want to finish by talking about a fitting accolade. When this legislation is passed to create another station at Butler, it would be a fitting accolade for the Premier to say, “In light of all the nastiness I have forced upon the member for Armadale, in light of all the unfair criticism I have put upon her, and in light of all the bile that I spew upon her every day in question time, I am prepared to make amends not only by providing a new railway station in Butler, but also by naming it after a person who deserves that level of accolade because of all her work on the railway system in this state.” I put it to the Premier as a serious proposition. In fact, we may even move an amendment to that effect—the MacTiernan station up there at Butler. I think we could design it in a way to adequately reflect her contribution. Perhaps there could even be a statue. That is something we could consider. Perhaps it could be a statue of the Premier and the member for Armadale —

Mr J.R. Quigley: Holding hands.

Mr M. McGOWAN: — embracing with a handshake out there to acknowledge her enormous contribution and the Liberal Party’s five seconds on that railway south. Hers is an enormous contribution. We will even throw in the Premier if he is prepared to agree to that. He can stand in this place right now and say “Yes; that is an excellent suggestion.” I will forevermore think that he is a good bloke if he does that.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: I rise in support of this amendment, which is to insert the word “Labor”, so that it is the “Labor Railway (Butler to Brighton) Act 2009”. The title and names used in this bill have confused all the population out there regarding what is actually happening and who is responsible; but, more than that, it has even confused the parliamentary secretary, because during his speech he said two things. The first was that there is no Brighton; it does not exist; that is just a marketing name by the developer, Satterley Property Group, and LandCorp. But it is in his own bill, so he has confused himself there. Then he said that the other station, which the Public Transport Authority told us is in Butler and which everyone believes is in Butler, is right on the line at Nowergup; therefore, we are going to call it Nowergup so it is all irrelevant. Therefore, the naming of this bill is terribly important.

Mr M.J. Cowper interjected.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: I take it from the interjection that the nomenclature committee has called that particular bit of land Nowergup and not Butler, although there are no houses in Nowergup because it is all reserve, and all the houses are in Butler —

Mr A.P. Jacob: There are houses in Nowergup.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: There are a few, but the mass of people are around the Butler station. Everyone is getting confused, including the government. It confused me. After I participated in the community protest about the cancellation of the project —

Mr C.J. Barnett: It was a one-man protest; it was you.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: It was lucky that a wide-angle lens was used and the hundreds and hundreds of people were captured. Does the member see it there on the paper I am holding up? The member has glasses, and he can see the hundreds of people on the bridge. It is lucky they were there. It is like those videos in Northbridge. They get the real action, not what the false allegation was. The Premier has falsely accused me by saying it was a one-man protest. I am going to tell all those people out there—all their names are on the petition—that the Premier does not even realise they exist as human beings.

We were very grateful and relieved at the Premier’s announcement that there would be a station at Brighton/Butler. That is what he was calling it. We were very pleased because this indicated a further extension of the line. We were all confused about where this station was to be located—Brighton or Butler. In his press releases, the Premier was saying that the government was going to extend the line to Brighton/Butler. That is what *The West* published. Now the government is saying that there is no Brighton and there was never going to be a station at Butler as it is now Nowergup. We are all confused.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: Maybe it will go where the South Perth station is.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: Over my dead body! Nothing is going south of Mindarie. It is very important that we clarify this, especially for the parliamentary secretary.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: He has no idea.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: That is right. The member’s amendment helps clarify the short title of the bill.

Mr D.A. Templeman: This is a baptism of fire for the parliamentary secretary.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr David Templeman; Mr Murray
Cowper; Mr John Quigley

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: That is right. He will come out of this better educated. This is a character-building exercise—an intelligence-building exercise, if that is possible. The amendment proposes to change the name of the bill to “Labor Railway (Butler to Brighton) Bill 2009”. There could not be a simpler amendment. It is an amendment of clarification. The people out there will come to Butler/Brighton as a result of an amendment that I will be moving to insert a new clause 4. The member for Victoria Park is helping the people of Mindarie—we are grateful, Victoria Park—by clarifying for them that this is the Labor railway from Butler to Brighton.

Mr B.S. WYATT: I want to make one brief final comment in light of the fact that I have moved an amendment to add the word “Labor” to the name of the bill, making it the “Labor Railway (Butler to Brighton) Bill 2009”. The points made by the member for Mindarie—I am grateful for his thanks—were very well made. It is curious that we have a piece of legislation referring to what I assume is a place that could otherwise be referred to as never-never land. We are building a train station to never-never land.

Mr M. McGowan: It’s a thought bubble.

Mr B.S. WYATT: Technically, the way I understand thought bubbles—I may be wrong—is that the thought bubble would have happened well before this. At some point along the way when Barnett betrayed Butler, the thought bubble became something in the budget. We stand confused. We have a bill before us on the Butler to Brighton railway and the parliamentary secretary mumbled in his reply that Brighton does not exist any more. The opposition is furiously scratching its head, thinking if that is the case, why do we have a bill to build a Butler to Brighton rail line? It is somewhat perplexing for the opposition how that could be. In any event, I refer again to that most astute of advisers, Mr Tjorn Sibma, who was identified very early on when the government was drafting its great media release outlining what it was doing by way of capital works to protect the people of Western Australia. I will conclude by reading the entirety of his email to the senior staff of the Premier’s office. It states —

If I am across the deliberations then I think we should refer to the rail extension as the Brighton rail extension (rather than Butler–Brighton). It will assist in branding it as our project, rather than Labor’s.

This highlights the point as to why the amendment is being moved. The Premier knows it. His staff know it. The people in Butler and what would otherwise be known as Brighton know it. When it comes to rail and public transport, the projects are inevitably identified with the Labor Party.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result —

Ayes (21)

Ms L.L. Baker	Mr M. McGowan	Mr E.S. Ripper	Mr P.B. Watson
Ms J.M. Freeman	Mr M.P. Murray	Mrs M.H. Roberts	Mr B.S. Wyatt
Mr J.N. Hyde	Mr A.P. O’Gorman	Ms R. Saffioti	Mr D.A. Templeman (<i>Teller</i>)
Mr W.J. Johnston	Mr P. Papalia	Mr T.G. Stephens	
Mr J.C. Kobelke	Mr J.R. Quigley	Mr C.J. Tallentire	
Mr F.M. Logan	Ms M.M. Quirk	Mr A.J. Waddell	

Noes (26)

Mr P. Abetz	Mr M.J. Cowper	Mr R.F. Johnson	Mr D.T. Redman
Mr F.A. Alban	Mr J.H.D. Day	Mr A. Krsticevic	Mr A.J. Simpson
Mr C.J. Barnett	Mr J.M. Francis	Mr W.R. Marmion	Mr M.W. Sutherland
Mr I.C. Blayney	Mr B.J. Grylls	Mr P.T. Miles	Mr T.K. Waldron
Mr G.M. Castrilli	Mrs L.M. Harvey	Ms A.R. Mitchell	Mr J.E. McGrath (<i>Teller</i>)
Mr V.A. Catania	Mr A.P. Jacob	Dr M.D. Nahan	
Dr E. Constable	Dr G.G. Jacobs	Mr C.C. Porter	

Pairs

Mr P.C. Tinley	Mr I.M. Britza
Mr R.H. Cook	Dr K.D. Hames
Mrs C.A. Martin	Mr T.R. Buswell

Amendment thus negated.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 2 and 3 put and passed.

New clause 4 —

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: I move —

Page 2, after line 9 — To insert the following to stand as new clause 4 —

4. Construction of two stations

The Authority shall construct on the railway line described in Schedule 1, two stations. The Authority shall construct a station with full parking facilities in Butler on the land acquired for this purpose by the Public Transport Authority adjacent to Lukin Drive, Butler which will be known as the Butler Station. The Authority shall further construct a railway station with full parking facilities in the locality known as Brighton in the approximate vicinity 750 metres north of the Tredegar Street and Connolly Drive intersection, Butler which shall be known as the Brighton Station.

The amendment is signed by me and dated 16 June 2010.

The reason I have moved this new clause is that the Public Transport Authority's recommendation to the previous government was that, first of all, the rail line be taken to the land that it had acquired adjacent to Lukin Drive, which it called Butler but which the parliamentary secretary now says is just the other side of the drawing line at Nowergup. I am not so concerned with that, because there is not a suburb called McIver, but there is a station called McIver. Stations are given their name according to either the suburb or common usage, and that area is definitely known by all the locals as Butler. If anyone asks, "Where was the Butler station going to be?", all those people would say, "Lukin Drive, because that's where we bought our house." When they bought their house from Satterley Property Group, which was the developer, in partnership with LandCorp, they were sold true cottage blocks with 15 or 17-metre frontages 45 kilometres from Perth on the basis that it would be compact housing from which they would be able to walk to the station at Butler. Those people bought land in Butler, and all that land has now gone. There is no advantage, I understand, for either the developer or its partner, LandCorp, to now pressure the government into honouring its commitment to build that station there, because now the government wants to build it in the locality of Brighton. I accept that it is still within the nomenclature committee's gazetted suburb of Butler. The government wants to build it in Brighton, which is where the developer and LandCorp want it. Although the population is not there—the population is beyond the end of the houses—they want it there because that will enable them to sell that land there, just as they sold that land to those suckers down near Lukin Drive. They treated my constituents like suckers. Those people committed themselves to buying the land and they built their houses, thinking that the station would be located there, but after they had done that, they were told that the station was going to be built further up. It is confusing why this has happened. We have to go back to Mr Sibma's email, in which he says —

If I'm across the deliberations —

They are not his deliberations; they must be the Premier's deliberations. In other words, if he understands the deliberations correctly, the station is going to be built further up the track than was promised to the community. He continues —

then I think we should refer to the rail extension as the Brighton rail extension ...

Hello, Mr Parliamentary Secretary, this is coming out of the Premier's office and is being circulated to all the senior staff of the Premier's office. They were to refer to the rail extension as the Brighton rail extension. The Premier's office had no hesitation in referring to this as the Brighton station at that stage. They were to refer to it as the Brighton station rather than the Butler-Brighton station because if they referred to it as the Brighton station, even though the parliamentary secretary has come into this place today to bag that name—I do not know what all the people who live in Brighton are going to think about what he and the Premier have had to say about their suburb —

Mr M.J. Cowper: Whatever you tell them, I imagine.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: No; it is what the paper will tell them on Friday night when it gets delivered.

Mr B.S. WYATT: I am very, very keen to hear the further comments of the member for Mindarie.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: I thank the member for Victoria Park for being so interested; I appreciate it. The people in that area understand that suburb and locality to be Brighton, just as the Department of the Premier and Cabinet understand it to be Brighton, but it wanted to pull a swiftie. They did not want to say that the Butler station was cancelled. Members should not forget that when the Public Transport Authority put out its press releases, it did not announce it as the Nowergup station at Lukin Drive; the Public Transport Authority announced that the line would be extended to Butler and that there would be station at Butler near Lukin Drive. That is what was

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr David Templeman; Mr Murray
Cowper; Mr John Quigley

announced. Now it is squirming around and saying that it is really Nowergup and that it was never promised, so the station three kilometres up the line is now called Butler station. It has confused the parliamentary secretary, who probably has not been north of Ocean Reef, and it has absolutely bamboozled the locals, which is what it was meant to do. It was meant to confuse them, because that was the purpose of Mr Sibma's suggestion in the email. He said, as he dunked another Granita into his cup of tea, that he thought the government should refer to it as the Brighton rail extension rather than the Butler–Brighton rail extension. The email stated —

It will assist in branding it as our project, rather than Labor's.

By that means, the government could deceive the people, so they are confused about who is responsible for the extension. More importantly, massive villages were built there for the elderly, and all the people around Lukin Drive and in the aged care facilities thought they would be able to get on their gophers and trundle off to the station to join the metropolitan train network and travel wherever they liked. Those poor people have been misled; they have made their investment in these villages, and there is not going to be a station there. Their gophers will run out of electricity before they can make it to where the Butler station is now going to be located. The government should have been frank and said that it was cancelling the Butler station, trampling on the promises that had been made to residents, and leaving them absolutely isolated. These elderly people and single-car working families will not easily be able to travel three or four kilometres north or south to get the train.

On 26 November I pointed out the other major problem. Everyone in the northern suburbs floods the Clarkson station. I would hate to fall over on the road; before I could get up, there would be a car parked on top of me. The parking at Clarkson is terrible; they have tried to park three-high! People are coming not only from Clarkson but also further north from Lukin Drive and Butler, where there is much higher density of population. The local newspaper thought that this shambolic situation would be resolved by 2011, with 800 parking bays at the new Butler station. Those poor people have all been misled; it is not going to be there. When the government builds a station at Brighton and calls it “Butler”, do members think that the people of Butler are going to jump in their cars and drive north when they want to travel south? Of course not; they will drive to the next station south, at Clarkson. This will never be resolved. Cancelling this station is a dreadful blow to the electorate of Mindarie and the community that bought into these retirement villages on the promise that they would be close to the train station. It has already cancelled. The government then comes along with all this spin, first of all calling it Butler, then Brighton–Butler, then Nowergup, then saying it does not exist. It is just dreadful.

New clause put and a division taken with the following result —

Ayes (20)

Ms L.L. Baker	Mr F.M. Logan	Mr J.R. Quigley	Mr C.J. Tallentire
Ms J.M. Freeman	Mr M. McGowan	Ms M.M. Quirk	Mr A.J. Waddell
Mr J.N. Hyde	Mr M.P. Murray	Mrs M.H. Roberts	Mr P.B. Watson
Mr W.J. Johnston	Mr A.P. O’Gorman	Ms R. Saffioti	Mr B.S. Wyatt
Mr J.C. Kobelke	Mr P. Papalia	Mr T.G. Stephens	Mr D.A. Templeman (<i>Teller</i>)

Noes (26)

Mr P. Abetz	Mr M.J. Cowper	Mr R.F. Johnson	Mr D.T. Redman
Mr F.A. Alban	Mr J.H.D. Day	Mr A. Krsticevic	Mr A.J. Simpson
Mr C.J. Barnett	Mr J.M. Francis	Mr W.R. Marmion	Mr M.W. Sutherland
Mr I.C. Blayney	Mr B.J. Grylls	Mr P.T. Miles	Mr T.K. Waldron
Mr G.M. Castrilli	Mrs L.M. Harvey	Ms A.R. Mitchell	Mr J.E. McGrath (<i>Teller</i>)
Mr V.A. Catania	Mr A.P. Jacob	Dr M.D. Nahan	
Dr E. Constable	Dr G.G. Jacobs	Mr C.C. Porter	

Pairs

Mr P.C. Tinley	Mr I.M. Britza
Mr R.H. Cook	Dr K.D. Hames
Mr E.S. Ripper	Mr T.R. Buswell

New clause thus negatived.

Schedule 1 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to third reading.

Third Reading

Extract from *Hansard*

[ASSEMBLY - Wednesday, 16 June 2010]

p3962a-3980a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr David Templeman; Mr Murray
Cowper; Mr John Quigley

Bill read a third time, on motion by **Mr M.J. Cowper** (Parliamentary Secretary), and transmitted to the Council.