

APPROPRIATION (CAPITAL 2016–17) BILL 2016

Third Reading

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

MR F.M. LOGAN (Cockburn) [2.53 pm]: I continue from where I left off before question time. The point I was making before question time relates to the issue of the budget papers not dealing with the funding or addressing the issue of private registered training organisations in Western Australia and the scamming of students by private RTOs in Western Australia, as highlighted by the Auditor General. It has also been highlighted, as I said, by the Senate inquiry into registered training organisations as well. But, more importantly, for Western Australia's point of view, the scamming that has been going on and the under-performance of private RTOs, as highlighted by the Auditor General in Western Australia in 2015, was not even referred to in the budget papers—and nor were the three recommendations made by the Auditor General, and no funding was made available.

The most important point is that given that the most vulnerable people who end up before the RTOs are young people in Western Australia looking for work, the very fact that this issue is not being addressed by the minister, by this budget, by the capital expenditure, is an absolute disgrace. If we go to the figures on youth unemployment in Australia across the states that have been provided by an organisation that is certainly not a leftie organisation, the Centre for Independent Studies, we see that Dr Patrick Carvalho in November last year stated that Western Australia's youth unemployment rate jumped from 5.8 per cent in 2008 to 11 per cent in 2015. That jump was reflected in Perth as well. There has been a massive spike in the rate of youth unemployment. Those people are the most vulnerable and face being ripped off by private RTOs. This government, even though it has been made well aware of this, as pointed out by the Auditor General, has done nothing about it. It is an absolute disgrace and I am glad I can bring this matter to the attention of the house once again.

MS S.F. McGURK (Fremantle) [2.58 pm]: I am looking forward to making a contribution on the capital components of the budget and the Appropriation (Capital 2016–17) Bill 2016. A number of components affect my electorate in particular. It would be no surprise to hear that I will commence my contribution with a discussion about the Perth Freight Link or the Perth freight farce, as I just referred to it.

There was a debate in this house yesterday and the point was made that political considerations have dominated the planning around this proposal, rather than sound planning or transparent considerations. I want to point out a number of indicators of that that I did not have an opportunity to raise yesterday. This point has been made a number of times, not least by Infrastructure Australia last year when it made the observation that the Perth Freight Link did not appear in the state budget in 2014, but it appeared in the federal budget; that was probably the most obvious indication that this project was not on the state government's radar. Infrastructure Australia observed that the freight link did not appear in a number of important planning documents—for instance, Perth–Peel@3.5million and the like. Perth Freight Link did not appear in a range of different important strategic documents.

I had occasion to go back and look at *Hansard* in regard to the upgrade of High Street and Stirling Highway. This matter has come up a few times recently and I had an opportunity to speak about it briefly yesterday. I think that the upgrade of that intersection is important regardless of whether the freight link goes ahead. If the freight link goes ahead and eventuates—I think it is such a mess that it will not go ahead—that intersection of High Street and Stirling Highway will have to be improved. Most people who are familiar with the area would be aware that if trucks are travelling out of the port east, they have to turn left from Stirling Highway onto Leach Highway at a set of traffic lights on an incline. The trucks have to accelerate up a slight incline, stop at a set of traffic lights and then accelerate and turn left. It is quite a tight turn. It is essentially a T. It is causing pollution, it is dangerous and it is noisy because the trucks have to stop and start and use their brakes. It is very disruptive for the community. As I said, it is causing pollution because the truck drivers have to accelerate. Most worryingly, it is quite dangerous. If those trucks had a poorly secured container on their load that fell off as they turned at that intersection, it would be a disaster if there was a passenger vehicle alongside, and that is quite conceivable. The industry has been calling for the upgrade of that road for some time because it is inefficient for trucks moving around that section of the highway. The residents have been calling for an upgrade of that road.

Even if the Perth Freight Link goes ahead, I understand that the placard loads will not use the tunnel. That was the latest information given by the minister, even though he previously told the residents of Palmyra that a tunnel would be able to accommodate placard loads. Most recently, I understand that he said that trucks carrying dangerous goods—that is, placard loads—will not use the tunnel; they will continue to use Leach Highway and that intersection. As I said yesterday, under the government's planning for the freight link and its plan to privatise the port, at this stage it is talking about 2.1 million containers in and out of Fremantle port—three times

the current number. If we combine those two facts, we will have a lot more trucks using that intersection of High Street and Stirling Highway. Whatever happens, that intersection will need to be improved. The last allocation from the state and federal governments was \$59 million each, so about \$118 million is needed to improve that intersection. It is crucial that it be improved for the safety and amenity of the residents and for the efficiency of the trucks using that road. That is not allocated in this budget, which indicates that the government is looking at nice-to-have luxury items but not paying attention to much-needed and crucial infrastructure for our communities.

I was looking through a *Hansard* relating to this issue and I came across a grievance that I made on 5 December 2013, six months prior to the announcement of the Perth Freight Link. I recall that 5 December 2013 was the last sitting day of the year. I remember that day because it was my birthday and it was a significant one for me. I made a grievance to the then Minister for Transport, Hon Troy Buswell, raising some of the design questions around that intersection. At that stage we had thought that the state and federal governments had allocated \$118 million for that intersection. People wanted the upgrade to occur but they were concerned that Main Roads had been left to its own devices to design that road upgrade and it was a bit overblown for the community, which wanted a four-lane reserve rather than a six-lane reserve. It wanted a narrower turning curve so the trucks did not go around the corner so fast. It wanted some pedestrian connectivity and some noise attenuation. They were the specific issues I raised in my grievance to the then Minister for Transport four or five months before the announcement of the Perth Freight Link. Troy Buswell responded to me by saying that he agreed that this upgrade needed to happen. He said he had been urging his department to get on and make it happen. I am not quoting him but this is the gist of what he said. He said he was frustrated that the residents and the City of Fremantle have not agreed with the design and that they were frustrating the progress of this upgrade because they could not quite agree on the design. He said that this really needed to happen for safety reasons. He said —

I want to get on and build this upgrade and get a much safer outcome for everybody.

That is what Troy Buswell said five months before the announcement of the Perth Freight Link. During the seven minutes allocated to reply to a grievance, he had the opportunity to say that the government was looking at the upgrade but there were more significant issues that he wanted to look at. There was no word of the planning for the \$2 billion freight link. I thought that was worth placing on the record as another example of how this freight link came out of nowhere. The lack of planning and proper consideration given to the alternatives has been obvious, and that is another example of it.

I mentioned that Infrastructure Australia has been critical of the Perth Freight Link project. Initially, it made the point that the Perth Freight Link proposal to Infrastructure Australia did not feature in any crucial and significant planning documents by the state government, an example being Perth and Peel@3.5 million. There is any number of other examples. Infrastructure Australia went away and had another look at the Perth Freight Link proposal. The Liberal Party likes to make much of the fact that Infrastructure Australia is now saying that it will give the project the tick and it thinks it has some merit. The Minister for Transport and certainly a number of federal ministers have said that Infrastructure Australia has given Perth Freight Link the tick as a high priority project. We need to go back and remember what Infrastructure Australia said in August last year when it made that assessment of the freight link. It made the point that 11 other options were given to Infrastructure Australia to address freight movements throughout Fremantle port. None of those other options were subjected to a benefit–cost ratio assessment. In Infrastructure Australia’s assessment of the Perth Freight Link, it was reported —

... although it had a “high level of confidence that the proposed solution would deliver net economic benefits” —

That is a quote that the Liberal Party relies much on —

a BCR was completed for only the current option which will see a 5.2km extension of the Roe Highway to Stock Road and a yet-to-be-determined new route from Stock Road to the Fremantle Port.

In fact, the BCR was only for Roe 8, and a yet-to-be-determined route from Stock Road all the way to Fremantle port, so the other options were not subject to a BCR, and none of the options given—Perth Freight Link or 11 other options—included the outer harbour at Kwinana. Infrastructure Australia gave an incredibly narrow amount of information. Although the Liberal Party says gleefully that Infrastructure Australia has said that this might have some merit, we need to keep in mind what little—in fact, scant—information Infrastructure Australia was given on the Perth Freight Link.

Another criticism of the freight link that we have spoken about in this house is that because the government is proposing to sink so much money into this road to Fremantle port, that it will blow out the number of containers in and out of Fremantle port much more than was previously planned prior to the freight link coming to our doorstep in May 2014. I think Hon Alannah MacTiernan referred to it as being like a spacecraft coming down; it

just appeared out of nowhere in May 2014. Prior to that announcement, the business case talked about the capacity of Fremantle port being at between 1.2 million and 1.4 million containers a year. That is what the initial Perth Freight Link documents referred to; it started to edge the capacity of Fremantle port up to 1.4 million containers. All the documents referred to 1.2 million containers a year but now we know that this government wants to push more than two million containers. In the briefing we had on the Fremantle Port Assets (Disposal) Bill 2016 we were told that the government's modelling was 2.1 million containers. That is about three times the number of containers we are currently seeing move in and out of Fremantle port.

I turn now to what a previous Minister for Transport, Hon Troy Buswell, said about this only five or six months before the Perth Freight Link announcement. I quote from the *Hansard* of Thursday, 28 November 2013, which states —

We are generally of the view that Fremantle can grow to about 1.2 million twenty-foot equivalent units in size; a couple of years ago, it was about 600 000, so that is a big step up in volumes. That will have impacts on transport linkages into the port, including the railway line, the bridge over the river, the urban rail and a whole lot of other things. We have to do a lot more work on making sure that that capacity can keep growing.

Six months before the Perth Freight Link announcement the then Minister for Transport said that the capacity of Fremantle port was 1.2 million containers, but after the freight link announcement and the sale of Fremantle port, the government will push the number of containers up to more than two million containers moving in and out of Fremantle port. That is not appropriate for a built-up area or for the middle of a metropolitan area. I think it will have negative impacts for the people not only immediately around the port, but also living down Leach Highway, where there will continue to be placarded loads and a number of trucks going in and out using that route. It will also have negative impacts for people north of the river because the government is going to triple the number of trucks going north of the river. Of course, it will make no sense for them to use the Perth Freight Link.

We have tried to get to the bottom of the number of placarded loads that will be going down Leach Highway as a result of not being able to use the proposed tunnel if that, in fact, is what ends up going ahead. I asked questions about that during the recent estimates hearings and an answer came back from the Minister for Transport to say that the government at this stage does not keep records of the number of placarded loads that form part of the traffic modelling. I have to say that I find it very difficult to believe that the government does not keep any statistics on the significant number of placarded loads that go in and out of Fremantle port. The government was a little tricky in the answer it provided by way of supplementary information B9 from Estimates Committee B. I asked what percentage of trucks entering Fremantle port had placarded loads, and the answer provided was —

Placarded vehicles are not specifically categorised as a separate subgroup of heavy vehicles, and therefore the traffic counters used to count vehicle movements do not differentiate between a placarded heavy vehicle or a non-placarded heavy vehicle.

I think the government knows how many placarded loads go in and out of Fremantle port and it should be up-front about providing that information. We know that the government's traffic modelling for Perth Freight Link has always been very rubbery. In fact, it has been very reticent about giving specific numbers on what the tripling of the number of containers going in and out of Fremantle port will mean for truck numbers.

The Minister for Transport tabled document 4144, which, as the member for Cannington has pointed out, makes for interesting reading if we look closely at it. I understand that it forms part of a broader Perth Freight Link document, dated April 2016, titled, "The Perth Freight Link Project—Developing Transport Networks; Delivering Safer Roads", which appears on the Main Roads website. In the document that was tabled, figure 5 is titled "Do Nothing". The member for Cannington correctly pointed out that the figures for 2021 under that scenario show that the number of heavy vehicles using Stirling Highway out of Fremantle port would be 1 000, but under figure 6, titled "Roe 8 and the Fremantle Tunnel", the number of heavy vehicles using Stirling Highway would be 1 300. That is 300 more trucks a day using Stirling Highway by 2021 as a result of Roe 8 and the Fremantle tunnel. If we extrapolate that over the year, we would get an extra 100 000 trucks using Stirling Highway as a result of Roe 8 and Fremantle tunnel being built than we would if they were not built. I find that extraordinary, and I think the member for Cannington finds that extraordinary. We want to know why that is the case. Why would we build Roe 8 and the Fremantle tunnel if they are going to deliver more trucks along Stirling Highway, which is already congested for people living north of the river?

Again, further questions were asked during the same Estimates Committee B hearing. The member for Cannington said that the traffic modelling suggested that building Roe 8 and the Fremantle tunnel would mean that an extra 100 000 trucks a year would use Stirling Highway and that an extra 36 000 trucks a year would use

Curtin Avenue. He pointed out that these were the figures without regulation and asked what the figures would be with regulation. The answer provided by way of supplementary information B8 was —

Existing strategic transport models in WA do not have the capability to model the details of heavy vehicle regulation. Main Roads is developing a solution to this as part of the Heavy Vehicle Charge System for the entire Perth Freight Link route from Muchea to Fremantle.

That was an attempt to get out of the fairly garbled answer that was given by the Minister for Transport during the actual estimates hearings on Tuesday 24 May, when the same question was put by the member for Cannington. The minister answered —

I do not have that document on me, and we are just trying to find that table. That document shows that a large number of trucks will still use Leach Highway. However, one of the key points is that that modelling was done before the regulation. We will be able to regulate the trucks that come out of the port to go along certain routes. This modelling was done before the regulation, so it does not allow for that. I am trying to pull up that chart because I do not think it shows that level of information.

The government is trying to hide behind the fact that it is still doing work on the toll and has not actually done any modelling. If no modelling has been done, how can it make claims about how many trucks Perth Freight Link and the tunnel will take off our roads? The whole thing is a farce. As I have said many times in this house, I think people understand that it is a farce. It makes much more sense to spend those dollars to plan and build the outer harbour and make modest improvements to the roads in and out of Fremantle port while the outer harbour is being built. The High Street–Stirling Highway intersection is an example of modest improvements that are needed. They are needed for safety and for truck efficiency, and they will be needed whether Perth Freight Link goes ahead or not. The Minister for Transport gets a bit confused about that upgrade. He seems to think it will impact on the people of Palmyra. It does not impact on the people of Palmyra. That upgrade, which had been planned for over 10 years, starts at Carrington Street and does not impact on the people of Palmyra, but it does impact on the golf course. Recently, I met with people from the Royal Fremantle Golf Club. They actually just want an outcome. They want to know what will happen with these upgrades. They have been in a period of uncertainty about those road upgrades for over a decade. Since this government took office in 2008, it has only added to that uncertainty. In saying that, I still supported the upgrade of that intersection, which would impact on the golf course, and opposed the freight link. The representatives from the Royal Fremantle Golf Club said they just want to know what is going on. They want certainty about whether the project will go ahead. As it is now, there is no certainty at all.

I have another example of Perth Freight Link being the result of political considerations rather than sound planning or good public policy in regard to our transport needs. Before the Perth Freight Link was announced, I understood that a Perth freight transport network plan would be released by the government. It was a comprehensive plan that would deal with how freight would be managed in the metropolitan area. I understand that has been sitting on the current Minister for Transport's desk and has never been released. The government has not even bothered to amend it to accommodate the Perth Freight Link. The whole plan has been shelved because it was quite obvious, when it came up with the freight link, that it was contrary to everything it had previously looked at.

I looked at a government website called the Western Trade Coast Australia website. In another example of how Perth Freight Link came out of the sky, that Western Trade Coast website, as I said, a government website, reported in March 2014—can I have a brief extension?

The ACTING SPEAKER: There are no extensions.

Ms S.F. McGURK: Sorry; I have had 30 minutes.

In March 2014, the government referred to the metropolitan network plan and said that it will —

... identify the principal road, rail, port and intermodal centres which form the strategic component of Perth freight transport network to which other freight corridors and freight centres, including local government roads, connect. The Plan will provide guidance and a coordinated approach to the ongoing integration and development of the future freight transport network for metropolitan Perth to 2031.

That sounds like a comprehensive plan. It was reported on a government website on 30 March 2014, about six weeks before the Perth Freight Link was announced by the federal government, but there was no mention of the Perth Freight Link on that site and, over two years later, that metropolitan freight network plan has yet to see the light of day.

There are so many examples of how poorly the Perth Freight Link has been planned. It is a political plan, not a transport plan. It is a political freight plan, not a good planning strategy for our metropolitan area. The electorate gets it. People understand that this is a poor plan. Despite the rigour with which the member for

Riverton, the Treasurer, tries to defend the freight link—yesterday he was desperately trying to say that it would save lives around Fiona Stanley Hospital—people understand that the better use of our dollars to meet our freight needs is to get on and plan and build the outer harbour.

MS L.L. BAKER (Maylands) [3.24 pm]: I rise to address the Appropriation (Capital 2016–17) Bill 2016. Last night I spoke a bit about the services aspects of this; today I want to raise some capital issues specifically to do with my electorate. It has ramifications across the state in some respects. I start with specific reference to budget paper No 2 in the Public Transport Authority of Western Australia section on the Forrestfield–Airport Link. There is another reference on page 743, in the dot points under “Significant Issues Impacting the Agency”. I will start to deal with those issues under the capital appropriations bill and how it reflects on the developments in my electorate, or perhaps I should say the lack of developments in my electorate—that might be more to the point.

To take members back a bit, about a year ago I started to ask questions in this house of the Minister for Transport about the Forrestfield–Airport Link and how it would be smoothed out when it got to Bayswater, which of course is the northern end of my electorate. It is fair to say that my community is extremely interested in this probably once-in-a-lifetime opportunity, if members think about it, to plan a future Bayswater that is vibrant, connected and offers a true inner-city urban experience and can take its part in the urban infill program, which we have to see in this state in order to keep up with housing demand and to bring transport and planning together. We started this discussion a year ago when the Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill was being debated and I asked the Minister for Transport what consultation had at that time commenced with the City of Bayswater. I was somewhat dismayed when the Minister for Planning at the time, Hon John Day, and Leader of the House, jumped to his feet to give a bit of extra information. He did not jump to his feet; he leant over and said to the Minister for Transport, who was sitting behind him—I will paraphrase—the implication was that there had been significant involvement with the Shire of Kalamunda in these discussions, which is of course the other end of the airport rail link where it dives underground at the airport. It is not actually at the airport; it is in High Wycombe. The Shire of Kalamunda had been extremely involved in all of the negotiations around how that was going to happen, including what the car park would look like, what the developments around the commencement of the tunnel would look like and what impact it would have on the surrounding areas. It related to the planning for that geographic area. The Leader of the House also went on to say that he had no knowledge of any consultation that the City of Bayswater had had at the time with the Minister for Transport or the Public Transport Authority to discuss what happens at the other end of the tunnel. That was a bit of an eye-opener for me, because at the time I had somewhat naively assumed that the mayor of the day—there is a different mayor now—would have taken the bit between his teeth and fairly assertively tried to put forward the need for redeveloping the City of Bayswater, particularly in the light of the extra 10 000 people who are projected to move to Morley in the coming 10 years and the additional 8 000 population that Bayswater expects in the not-too-distant future. Those two factors alone would have realistically meant that any mayor worth their salt would have been out there banging the drum for good investment in the redevelopment of Bayswater. However, that is historic; it did not happen.

We now have a whole new tranche of councillors and some really switched on and committed individuals who are very connected to their community, and they have been asking questions. They started by asking questions about the activation of the town centre of Bayswater, whether there was any activity or structure plan over the area and what the time frame would be for work in the area. They started by consulting with the community. The City of Bayswater ran a little charrette with local community members so they could talk basically about soft activation. They did not talk about infrastructure or capital works. Having spent \$1 million on the failed government amalgamation scheme that was shelved by this government a year ago, the City of Bayswater wasted a lot of taxpayers’ money, so money is a bit tight. The charrette that was run was very small and focused only on what the community could do to help activate Bayswater—what kinds of community gardens or street festivals could be run.

I am pretty horrified that that was the extent of the discussions in those days. It seemed to me to be an immense cop-out that any local government would have abrogated its responsibility for doing some planning around this, but things moved on. My very precious community has come forward and formed groups and is highly agitated about the future of the city now. A number of groups were formed and they are all keenly interested in the development, heritage, greening and future of the Bayswater train station and the city centre. I am very proud to say that the City of Bayswater has put some money towards a structure plan, but I seriously doubt that the structure plan for the town precinct that the City of Bayswater will get for \$120 000 will be sufficient to achieve a significant, forward-looking, state-of-the-art redevelopment of a major urban centre that has great potential for this state. I think for \$120 000 the city could probably work out how many flowerpots it could buy, and that would be about it. I am pleased to say that, along with the \$120 000 from the City of Bayswater, federal Labor has agreed to stump up an extra \$1 million, if it is elected at the forthcoming

federal election, to develop a structure plan. Those of us who have come from local government will understand how important it is to get that basic structure plan right for the future.

I have some questions about the Bayswater redevelopment that my colleagues asked of the minister representing the Minister for Planning in the committee hearing in the upper house yesterday. I cannot quote the transcript because I have only an uncorrected proof, but I will paraphrase what was said. I understand that the government bureaucrat representing the department talked about doing a lot of work with the local government around an area like Bayswater and mentioned that the City of Bayswater is doing some area structure planning around the train station. I understand that there was an indication that a senior planner from the Western Australian Planning Commission is providing some advice and support to the City of Bayswater with the tender it has let for \$120 000. We also were keen to find out whether the minister and the Planning Commission support the need to develop this new structure plan for Bayswater and we were given an unequivocal yes. The problem, of course, is that absolutely no work has been done, and nor will any work be done for \$120 000, to look at what will happen if the rail line is sunk through Bayswater to activate a transport-oriented development in that area. Again, it looks as though we will have an elaborate strategy for putting new flowerpots on a very old train station.

In fact, one of the members of the group took a photograph of the Doodlakine rail station and compared it almost directly with the station in Bayswater. Basically, the first thing that visitors will see when their train pops up out of the tunnel as it heads towards the glamorous, exciting new Perth will be the Doodlakine train station, which was built in the 1970s. I suspect that no government worth its salt would be very happy with that. I certainly would not be very happy with that. We want something impressive to show all these people who are going to flock to Perth to see the new water facilities and the various other things that we have to offer according to this budget, and that certainly is not a 30 or 40-year-old mustard-brick, flat, boring, single-storey train station that has very little to do with the heritage of the area and a lot more to do with what could be spent on the day. It is pretty horrendous. It is not only a dowdy little train station, but also splits the two halves of Bayswater right down the middle so that there can be no good urban planning around it. A subway runs under the train station and I have counted about six incidents when trucks got stuck under the subway and caused immense traffic problems for the east–west traffic flow.

From any angle that I look at this, it seems that it is a complete failure of the government to not have done the right planning around the redevelopment of the Bayswater town centre, to not have looked at the smart transport and planning options that need to be commissioned at the old heritage line between Bayswater and Perth, and to not have understood that this is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity. I do not know what the senior planner who is giving some support to the City of Bayswater's officers intends to add to the \$120 000. I am hearing nothing from the state government about its commitment to the Bayswater end of the Forrestfield–Airport Link project. I think that is a tragic loss, but it is certainly an issue that Metronet will solve. I am looking forward to seeing some smart, future planning for the Bayswater precinct, but it is certainly very clear that I am not going to get it from this Liberal government.

I would like to move on and talk briefly about another local issue. It is basically a really good solution to some of the antisocial behaviour and criminal activities around some of our shopping precincts and the like. I refer to the significant issues impacting the agency outlined in division 9, Western Australia Police, on pages 121 and 122 of volume 1 of the *Budget Statements*. Rather than talk about the policing model of arresting people for doing the wrong thing, I am personally much more interested in a model of social development that looks at preventing that from happening in the first place. In an area such as Maylands—moving down through my electorate, from Bayswater now to Maylands—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms J.M. Freeman): Member, you might just want to talk about the capital that is involved for police.

Ms L.L. BAKER: Absolutely. My understanding is that I can talk about the “Significant Issues Impacting the Agency.”

The ACTING SPEAKER: Capital is the bricks and mortar.

Ms L.L. BAKER: Yes. Bayswater Police Station is in my electorate and it will stay in my electorate. I am very happy that it is staying in my electorate. I have been doing work around a strategy with the support of the Bayswater police. There is a new sergeant there now and although I have not yet developed a working relationship with that officer, I hope that that relationship will develop as we move forward. What we have seen from the budget in the past is closed-circuit television cameras put into the area and arguments over whether the police station was going to close. All those things are about catching people doing the wrong thing, and that requires more capital investment, all the way down the line. It does not matter which way we look at it, we will have to spend more money to catch more people and lock them up for doing the wrong thing. My specific issue with that model is that it does not allow us to stop crime from happening in the first place. In order to do that, it

is really important that everybody understands their role. It is important that we create a safe, secure, welcoming and friendly space around the Maylands precinct, so that it is a place where people can support each other and work together to prevent crime.

When I talk about crime prevention through environmental design and how that impacts on capital expenditure, it simply means that the government does not have to spend so much on CCTV cameras and the like. The abbreviation that is commonly used is CPTED. That focuses on how to design and manage the street and its surroundings to help decrease opportunities for criminal and disruptive activity. CPTED is not just about the physical design of space, or what we are building and how we are building it; it is about how people, particularly in the business community in Maylands, connect, how they communicate with one another, how they cooperate on these issues and how they coordinate strategies to drive down crime. Businesses in Maylands have started to work together to decrease opportunities for crime and what is so good is that they do not have to work alone in this instance; ward councillor Catherine Ehrhardt is very keen on this strategy. The reason this CPTED project has worked really well in Maylands is that we have spent time with Edith Cowan University and are developing a model based on Professor Paul Cozens' "Think Crime!" strategy of preventing crime on the street. That project has received the support of a local not-for-profit agency and it specifically looks at homeless men, street drinking and drug and alcohol abuse, of which Maylands unfortunately has a significant percentage of people who suffer from a number of those issues. The not-for-profit agency is called 55 Central and the CEO, Kevin Dunn, took a keen interest in this when I started talking to him about the notion of working more closely with the business community. Some of the people he deals with were being accused of being perpetrators of crime and he was concerned that he needed to get to the bottom of this. This is a project that is working with a non-government sector, the city of Bayswater local government and me at a state level, to try to come up with a strategy and to educate shopkeepers and even customers on how to prevent crime through the use of a number of strategies.

Surveillance is one of the strategies. I will just run through a couple of them so members get the picture about what I am talking about before I move on to another topic. Things such as surveillance—watching and monitoring the presence of suspicious activity—can make people feel safer as well as impact on potential offenders' own behaviour because they are less likely to offend if they think they are being watched. Sure, we can have formal surveillance by the police and security patrols, such as is funded in the capital budget. We can have eyes-on-the-street programs, signage in businesses that tells people that they are being kept an eye on, CCTVs and better street lighting. We can ensure that we have lines of sight in a business, so shopkeepers do not put their merchandise across the line of sight that shows them who is coming in and out of their store. We can ensure ATMs are located in conspicuous places, not hidden in dark corners, and we can ensure landscaping does not impede the view of what is happening around us. We can manage how the street and business looks and look at its impact on how safe, attractive and inviting it is and how clean and well maintained it is. Attractive spaces tell people that that space is being responsibly managed and that certain behaviours are automatically then unacceptable. We need to ensure that things are repaired quickly and any sort of debris and graffiti is removed. Interestingly, the precinct of Maylands has just undertaken a fantastic graffiti project, in which it has invested in a number of street art projects that have been very effective in enlivening the area. I could discuss a number of other issues under the header of crime prevention through environmental design and I hope to pick them up later.

I will talk now about the agriculture budget; I assume that is okay. Under division 63, "Agriculture and Food" represented by the Minister for Agriculture and Food; Transport, it is interesting to note the outcomes and key effectiveness indicators on page 696, which describe profitable, innovative and sustainable agrifood and the benefits that that brings to Western Australia. It then goes on to explain supply chain issues in several business developments and productivity improvements in the sector. I want to talk about that in relation to the administration of the Animal Welfare Act 2002 and how that is being rolled out or not rolled out, I should say. The department commenced and recently completed an animal welfare review. It is very clear to me that the Animal Welfare Act is not being effectively managed and it needs far more investment and support from this government to make a significant effort and to have a realistic outcome that improves animal welfare in this state. That certainly is my understanding of the report that the animal welfare review produced that was commissioned by this government some months ago. The key demographics show that Perth has a population of 2.329 million people and Western Australia has a total population of 2.63 million. In WA, 56 per cent of householders own a pet. As at 2013, that was a total of 1.747 million pets in WA, with 333 000 dogs, 381 000 cats, and fish, birds and other pets following on from that. I want to talk about some issues that the Department of Agriculture and Food does not seem to clearly understand, including the increased instances of cruelty to and abuse and neglect of animals that are happening. These are animal welfare issues that the department is meant to be concerned about.

There have been significant increases in instances of cruelty, abuse and neglect: 16 500 calls were made to the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals cruelty line and 6 300 incidents were investigated by RSPCA inspectors, which is about 50 a day over the last 12 months. It is very clear that Western Australia lags significantly behind other states in the development and implementation of key standards, guidelines and codes

of practice for both livestock and companion animals. I have written to the Minister for Agriculture and Food several times to ask him why WA has not mandated a number of the codes for animal welfare that cross over livestock and companion animals. I have been very disappointed with his lack of attention to this issue.

There has also been poor investment in and administration of the Animal Welfare Act, which has led to poor coverage and inconsistencies in its implementation. The opportunities presented by the gaps in service provision at the moment are pretty clear. It would be really effective if, for instance, the government was to support the RSPCA with some capital works. Perhaps a major rescue or adoption centre or RSPCA facility in the south of the state, or in the south metropolitan area, would be effective. In many respects, money spent on those capital works would be a good investment for this government. However, there is nothing in the spending changes or the significant issues impacting the agency that I can find to indicate that this government is prepared to support the RSPCA's endeavours on this front. It would also be appropriate to fund additional animal welfare officers in this state. I am particularly interested in how the officers' roles could improve the welfare of animals. The locations for these additional officers that have been proposed to me, anyway, are Broome, Karratha, Carnarvon, Kalgoorlie–Esperance, Albany and Bunbury–Busselton. In fact, the state government should look at facilities to not only house half a dozen new inspectors, but also enable them to do their jobs more effectively in regional Western Australia.

Another issue that came out of the government's animal welfare review and a line item mentioned in the 2016 budget is a recommendation that the Animal Welfare Act 2002 be reviewed. I agree with that; it certainly needs to be reviewed as a matter of urgency. Work needs to be done to make the act far more effective. At the same time, the Animal Welfare Act should not be administered by the Department of Agriculture and Food because that is a complete conflict of interest. It was mentioned in the animal welfare review that the government recognised this conflict of interest, but it stated that ring-fencing would work within the department of agriculture. I am here to tell members that that does not work, it has not worked, and it will not work in the future. It is doing a major disservice to people who care about this issue and also to the animals that we work with every day, either in sport, as companion animals or as stock in our community.

That covers off on the issues I wanted to raise. I thank the Acting Speaker very much for her tolerance of my somewhat straying discussion at times. However, they are all issues referred in the budget and they have links to the capital appropriations over the next 12 months that we are looking at. It is fair to say that people in my electorate are pretty disappointed with what they see in the budget. Regarding services, I mentioned yesterday that there has been some capital works funding for one of my primary schools, Hillcrest Primary School, and that Inglewood Primary School will be the beneficiary of some capital works this year. That is good; I cannot deny that, and I mentioned that yesterday. It is not good that a major school such as John Forrest Secondary College is facing enormous pressures with extra students in the coming years. It will be forced to face that without the removal of a major asbestos problem in an old shed at the back of the school where children work to learn trades. Through an accident, a student could easily smash through a piece of asbestos and put themselves at great risk. None of that is acceptable and it is shameful that this government has seen fit to let another 12 months go by without removing the asbestos from John Forrest's premises, thereby making the children safe in the future.

DR A.D. BUTI (Armadale) [3.55 pm]: I also rise to contribute to the third reading debate on the Appropriation (Capital 2016–17) Bill 2016. The member for Maylands has a strong focus on human capital, which, of course, is the most important capital that we can think of. As we know, the federal Labor Party's campaign motto is "putting people first". I think that is what the member for Maylands sought to do, and I think we should all be doing that.

Ms L.L. Baker: Thank you.

[Quorum formed.]

Dr A.D. BUTI: Thank you very much, Madam Acting Speaker. I am sure that the Deputy Premier is not leaving. I am only joking—just a bit of humour! I refer to page 727 of the budget papers in volume 2 regarding the government's funding of Armadale Road's dual carriageway. The issue of the extension of the dual carriageway on Armadale Road is one of the most crucial infrastructure needs in the south eastern community of Western Australia. When I brought up this matter previously, the Minister for Corrective Services, whose electorate transverses this road, mentioned "Just watch this space" regarding funding of the North Lake Road bridge, but we are still watching this space and we have not seen anything. The current federal election is very interesting. As we know, the federal Labor Party has committed \$80 million of federal funding for the \$160 million North Lake Road bridge. It is imperative that this government also commits to the funding of the North Lake Road bridge. If it commits to the dual carriageway extension—which is like having a superhighway—and it does not commit to the bridge, it will be like going on a superhighway, and when people reach the end, they will have to get on a horse and cart to cross the freeway because there will be an absolute bottleneck. This government seems to practise infrastructure such as this. For instance, the Perth Freight Link

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 15 June 2016]

p3525b-3533a

Mr Fran Logan; Ms Simone McGurk; Ms Lisa Baker; Dr Tony Buti

project is a road that basically comes to an end before the port. The state government has committed to partly fund a dual carriageway extension, but it will not go that extra step and fund the North Lake Road bridge.

It is interesting to note the views of the Liberal candidate for the federal seat of Burt on the North Lake Road bridge. An article on the *Examiner* website headed, “O’Sullivan unconvinced bridge is necessary” states —

A Coalition commitment to the North Lake Road Bridge looks shaky with Liberal candidate for Burt Matt O’Sullivan saying it hasn’t been raised by residents with him as an issue as much as other projects.

That is because he does not get out and speak to the residents. All you see in Burt are posters of the Liberal candidate. I have not seen him out and about in the —

Dr M.D. Nahan interjected.

Dr A.D. BUTI: Madam Acting Speaker, I am not asking for an interjection from the Treasurer so can you please provide some protection for me please? The federal member for Burt goes on to say in the article —

“Would I like to see the bridge? Of course I would but let’s make sure we’re doing what is a priority,”

Debate adjourned, pursuant to standing orders.