



Parliamentary Debates

(HANSARD)

FORTIETH PARLIAMENT
FIRST SESSION
2019

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 22 October 2019

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, 22 October 2019

THE SPEAKER (Mr P.B. Watson) took the chair at 2.00 pm, acknowledged country and read prayers.

DISTINGUISHED VISITORS — ZHEJIANG PROVINCIAL PEOPLE'S CONGRESS OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Statement by Speaker

THE SPEAKER (Mr P.B. Watson) [2.02 pm]: In the Speaker's gallery today is a delegation of members and staff from the Zhejiang Provincial People's Congress of the People's Republic of China. Attending with the delegation is the Consul General for the People's Republic of China in Perth, Madam Dong Zhihua, and the Consul, Mr Xu Haoqiang. I am having trouble here! The delegation is on a brief visit to Australia and will be spending time here in Western Australia and in New South Wales.

As many members know, Western Australia has a sister state relationship with the province of Zhejiang and has enjoyed a close friendship for over 30 years. Last year I led a delegation of WA members of Parliament to Zhejiang and it gives me great pleasure to welcome Mr Dai Zhenhua, a committee member of the Zhejiang Provincial People's Congress, and his colleagues to the Parliament of Western Australia. Please join me in welcoming them to Western Australia.

[Applause.].

VOLUNTARY ASSISTED DYING — ACCESS — TELEHEALTH

Statement by Minister for Health

MR R.H. COOK (Kwinana — Minister for Health) [2.03 pm]: I would like to update the house on concerns that provisions in the Commonwealth Criminal Code on counselling or inciting suicide over a carriage service such as telephone, internet or video may prevent the use of telehealth for the voluntary assisted dying process. Nothing in the Voluntary Assisted Dying Bill is inconsistent with the commonwealth Criminal Code. In fact, the bill makes it clear that it does not authorise the use of a method of communication if or to the extent that that use would be contrary to or inconsistent with commonwealth law.

The state has engaged, and will continue to engage, with the commonwealth about this issue. The commonwealth has kindly offered its assistance to the Department of Health in further considering this issue. If telehealth cannot be used as a method of communicating with people for the purposes of access to voluntary assisted dying in Western Australia, the WA health department will adopt alternative implementation strategies. Jurisdictions such as Victoria have similar restrictions and jurisdictions such as Canada face similar geographic challenges. In Victoria, for example, a direction has been issued that requires the provision of information to occur face to face.

Options currently being considered for Western Australia include a central hub that would link with networked spokes in regional and remote WA, and transport assistance to support face-to-face interactions. The hub would be able to receive requests for information on access to voluntary assisted dying and then facilitate the provision of information either by hard copy or in person. Assessments may need to be undertaken in person, with either the patient travelling to the practitioner or the practitioner travelling to the patient. If the bill passes and this is required, WA Health will provide packages to support access for regional patients where needed.

If the bill becomes law, there will be an implementation period of at least 18 months before the Voluntary Assisted Dying Act becomes operational. This time period will enable the Department of Health, in consultation with the commonwealth, to develop appropriate administrative measures to ensure compliance with state and commonwealth laws. The training for health professionals will reflect the outcome of the ongoing consultations between the state and the commonwealth.

We have been following the debate in both houses and are aware that this issue has been raised on a number of occasions by members concerned about the impact of commonwealth law on our proposed legislation. I can assure members that if the legislation is passed, we are confident that, as in Victoria, this issue will not compromise health professionals or prevent eligible Western Australians from accessing voluntary assisted dying.

INDIGENOUS PLAYERS ALLIANCE

Statement by Minister for Sport and Recreation

MR M.P. MURRAY (Collie–Preston — Minister for Sport and Recreation) [2.06 pm]: In the house today we have the chairman of the Indigenous Players Alliance, Des Headland, a former Fremantle Docker and Brisbane Lions premiership player; AFL players Michael O'Loughlin, Gavin Wanganeen, Che Cockatoo-Collins and Kevin Caton; along with historian Dr Sean Gorman. I will read my statement now.

The SPEAKER: It is a shame there are no Collingwood players there!

Mr M.P. MURRAY: I think we might have to reset the clock. Nothing like getting a free kick!

I rise today to inform the house of the fantastic work being done by the Indigenous Players Alliance and to express my full support of the group's objectives. The aim of the alliance is to support current and past Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander AFL players with the unique challenges they face before, during and after their AFL and AFLW careers. The IPA is chaired by Des Headland, a former Fremantle Docker and Lions premiership player, with past AFL players Michael O'Loughlin, Gavin Wanganeen, Che Cockatoo-Collins and Kevin Caton, and historian Dr Sean Gorman as interim directors.

The issue of life after sport is something that I am particularly passionate about. I know that professional sportspeople can struggle with retirement, when they find that they need to transition to a completely different life without the sporting career that in many cases has consumed the majority of their lives and played such an important part in who they are. However, the experiences of Indigenous players during their careers and their transition out of the AFL are unique.

The IPA is the peak body supporting Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander men and women both in and beyond football, providing a support network for past players, advocacy, research and financial literacy training for players and their families. The alliance also aims to work collaboratively to improve the AFL's recruitment, retention and transition processes for Indigenous players, increasing the prospects and agency of players both during and after their football careers.

It was a pleasure to host the Indigenous Players Alliance's board in Perth today, given the significant history of the contribution of Western Australian Indigenous players to the great game. I commend the work of Des and the board for their advocacy and cultural leadership, and I am honoured to have them in the gallery today. Thank you very much.

[Applause.]

ANIMAL WELFARE — RACEHORSES

Statement by Minister for Racing and Gaming

MR P. PAPALIA (Warnbro — Minister for Racing and Gaming) [2.09 pm]: Like many Western Australians, I had the displeasure of watching the 7.30 report last week that detailed the disgusting treatment of horses by an east coast abattoir. Instead of being humanely put down, these horses were abused appallingly and it was extremely heartbreaking to watch. As the Minister for Racing and Gaming, I want to ensure that such unacceptable behaviour does not occur in Western Australia now or ever. Although initial advice indicates that this is not occurring in our state, we have immediately sought to understand the landscape of abattoirs and knackeries in WA. In doing so, we have identified some challenges that we will address as soon as possible. One such challenge is the limitations of Racing and Wagering Western Australia's regulation of racehorses. Although RWWA monitors and regulates racehorses from their birth to their exit from the racing industry, oversight beyond racing is not afforded by current legislation or regulation. The practice can often be that racehorses are bought and onsold numerous times before a horse is euthanased or dies of natural causes. Western Australian racehorses that retire from racing are registered through the Single National System managed by Racing Australia. According to the SNS, 100 thoroughbred horses were registered as being euthanased or sent to an abattoir in 2018. RWWA is interrogating those figures to provide me with the most accurate data available.

Another challenge is that some racehorses and other horses are exported to South Australia for processing and we do not have visibility over the number involved in this process. Further, we understand that a number of unregistered private businesses process horses for pet meat. Again, racing authorities have no authority or visibility over this process.

As racing minister, I am committed to ensuring the highest possible standard for the treatment and welfare of racehorses from their birth to their death. I am committed to the humane treatment of these animals, regardless of their age or circumstances. This should be done because it is right and because I want to ensure the sustainability of this industry in Western Australia. We can ensure longevity of the industry only if it meets the highest possible standard of welfare. I believe this government, along with RWWA and the eligible bodies of racing, can provide excellent welfare standards for all racehorses and I have commenced work on a plan of action to address this matter. I expect to provide the Western Australian public with a further update in two weeks' time to outline the key tenets of the plan and begin the identified actions.

LEGION OF HONOUR — JOHN REVELL AND JAMES EDGAR

Statement by Minister for Veterans Issues

MR P.C. TINLEY (Willagee — Minister for Veterans Issues) [2.11 pm]: I rise today to inform the house of a very special ceremony that took place recently in Perth. Two distinguished veterans, Mr John Revell and Mr James Edgar, were awarded the highly prestigious Legion of Honour by the French Republic for their service to that country and the Allied cause during World War II. People like these two gentlemen, both now in their 90s, remind me every day of the extraordinary power of the human spirit and that the things that bind us are stronger than the things that divide us.

Mr John Revell hails from England and now resides in Perth. He joined the Royal Navy as a reservist at just 18 years of age. His service on British Navy vessels involved being part of the escorts for the Atlantic convoys that provided supplies for Russian troops via Murmansk. By the grand age of 20, he had been promoted to sub-lieutenant and transferred to the Special Operations Division under Admiral Lord Mountbatten. At 21 years of age, John experienced his first battle in Normandy and saw the tragedy of war. He was on LCT 737, which took part in Operation Infatuate II in November 1944, the code name for the invasion of the Dutch island of Walcheren. This was a major combined operations' amphibious landing against entrenched German defensive positions. John was wounded during this operation and had to be evacuated due to the shrapnel in his thigh.

We also honoured Mr James Edgar, a British citizen born in South Africa and now also living in Perth. James was recruited into the Special Operations Executive in the British–French section to train would-be agents being sent into France. He participated in several commando raids on the German-occupied Channel Islands in 1942. Mr Edgar parachuted into Burma to fight the Japanese in April 1945 and stayed in Sumatra until 1946 for peacekeeping operations. After the war ended, he became a veterinarian in Edinburgh and then joined the Ministry of Agriculture in Perth.

Today France is a powerful and important ally and we look forward to working with the French in the future to ensure global stability. I would like to thank the French Republic for bestowing this honour on two very worthy heroes. I would also like to acknowledge the RSL WA, which is dedicated to protecting the welfare of our returned heroes.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

ELECTRICITY DISCONNECTIONS

911. Mr D.C. NALDER to the Premier:

I refer to the record number of electricity disconnections in Western Australia as a result of the Premier's mean-spirited cost-of-living increases and to real concerns from the Western Australian Council of Social Service that struggling Western Australians are having to choose between heating and eating.

- (1) Can the Premier confirm that the number of electricity disconnections has doubled in the past three years?
- (2) What is he doing to address this cost-of-living crisis?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

Prior to answering the question, I acknowledge the members of the Indigenous Player Alliance who were in the Speaker's gallery a moment ago. Some of the sporting heroes of Australia are here today. Well done to the Minister for Sport and Recreation for having them here.

I also acknowledge in particular the delegation from Zhejiang province, our sister state, and Madam Dong, the consul general to Western Australia. I thank them all for coming to Western Australia and I hope very much they enjoy their visit.

- (1)–(2) The government acknowledges that many people in our community do it tough and many people struggle on a day-to-day basis. That is why in the last state budget, we brought down a budget with the lowest increase in fees and charges in 13 years. We brought down a budget that had an increase in electricity prices at the rate of inflation—1.75 per cent. The forward estimates that we inherited had the increase in electricity prices at seven per cent for this year. We reduced it from seven per cent to 1.75 per cent. That obviously had a significant impact on the budget, because, in effect, that was the government ensuring that there was some protection for people in the community when we put that in place.

The member asked me about the sorts of things we are doing. We have reinstated funding for financial counselling so that organisations across the community, such as the Salvos and organisations of that nature, can provide financial counselling, as they did before the budget cuts under the last government. We have increased the funding for the energy assistance payment for households and we have increased the funding for the hardship utility grant scheme to support people who might be having financial difficulties.

In the last two years of the last government, we found that the number of disconnections went up by 75 per cent in 2015–16 and 2016–17. I am advised that the rate of disconnections has gone up over the period 2017–18 to 2018–19 by less than two per cent. It is a little hypocritical on the part of the Liberal Party to run these arguments when its record was one of putting up electricity prices by over 80 per cent, an increase for households of over \$2 200 in fees and charges during its time in office at a time of record revenue. Then it blew out the state's debt levels to over \$40 billion, which we have to deal with, and now it pretends that that does not exist. We do our best to keep fees and charges for households down as much as we can. That is why we kept it at the lowest rate in 13 years.

ELECTRICITY DISCONNECTIONS

912. Mr D.C. NALDER to the Premier:

I have a supplementary question. When is the Premier going to stop the excuses and start doing something to help struggling Western Australians who have to choose between heating and eating?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

As I said—the member does not seem to listen—we put up fees and charges by the lowest level in 13 years.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mr M. McGOWAN: At the same time, we are the only government in Australia that has its finances under control. At the same time, we have increased support for families by providing additional funding for financial counsellors, the hardship utility grant scheme program and also the energy assistance payment. We know that lots of people in the community will still struggle and we are constantly monitoring what else we can do, but we have done a great deal in the last budget to support families and we will continue to do so.

MOUNT LOCKYER PRIMARY SCHOOL — ALBANY

913. Mrs R.M.J. CLARKE to the Premier:

Before I ask my question, on behalf of the member for Swan Hills, I would like to welcome the principal, deputy principal and the amazing student leaders from Anne Hamersley Primary School in the public gallery. Hello!

I refer to the announcement this morning about the new Mount Lockyer Primary School in Albany. What does this announcement mean for this government's commitment to regional jobs and quality education?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

I thank the member for the question. I am disappointed that the member for Albany did not ask this question!

The SPEAKER: I can.

Mr M. McGOWAN: This morning, the member for Albany and I were at Mount Lockyer Primary School in Albany, where I addressed a school assembly. I was very pleased to be able to announce that my government, at the urging of the local P&C, the local school community and the local member of Parliament, is delivering \$15.2 million to build a new Mount Lockyer Primary School for the students of Lockyer. Lockyer is booming. It has lots and lots of kids. The school itself is 65 years old and, to be fair, is very dated. Some money was set aside as part of our election commitment—\$3 million—to upgrade the school. Having inspected the school a few months ago, talked to the community and listened to the member for Albany, I decided, in conjunction with the education minister, that we would change our commitment and rebuild the school. This will ensure that there is a state-of-the-art school for the children of Lockyer and that we do not invest money in a rebuild when a new school is really needed. Some of the buildings were part of the Building the Education Revolution and some of the buildings are newer. If possible, we will keep those buildings as part of the redevelopment. The planning will now take place. Building construction will start late next year and we expect to open the school in early 2022.

In addition, work has started on the \$10 million upgrade to North Albany Senior High School and the Albany Secondary Education Support Centre, an important development for that high school, which is also a growing school, and for the kids in the education support centre.

The SPEAKER: It was a good day, Premier.

Mr M. McGOWAN: This is on top of our \$200 million school maintenance blitz that we announced a few weeks ago and part of our \$450 million infrastructure program for Western Australian schools across the state. It is expected that 200 jobs will be created to build this new school in Lockyer. Ensuring that our older schools get the attention they deserve is important. I was very pleased to announce this new school this morning for the important community of Albany and for the people of Lockyer, who I am sure will be very, very happy.

ROE 8 AND 9 — JOBS

914. Ms L. METTAM to the Premier:

I refer to the new Mayor of Melville, George Gear, who clearly stated on radio 6PR that he has no problem with Roe 8 and that he did not campaign against Roe 8. Why is the Premier desperately misrepresenting the outcomes of the local government election to justify his refusal to build this shovel-ready, job-creating Roe 8 and Roe 9 project?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members! I want to hear this answer.

Ms L. Mettam interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Vasse, you have asked your question.

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

I congratulate George Gear for becoming the Mayor of Melville. I think he is a breath of fresh air for Melville. I am sure that he will do a terrific job. I absolutely assure the house that after my parliamentary career finishes, I am not going back to local government. I am not going back there, but I am sure he will do a terrific job. I saw him

on Sunday, with the musical Minister for Culture and the Arts, at the announcement of the *Highway to Hell* project. George was thrilled with our announcement. He is already getting things done in his community. We announced the AC/DC program on Canning Highway, and George was there. It was very exciting.

I do know that during that election campaign for Melville, there was some discussion of Roe 8. I know that the federal member for Tangney, Mr Ben Morton—a very political operator, one might say—was out there campaigning for “Russell Aubrey for Mayor”. Look at this page. It says “Russell supports building Roe 8 and Roe 9”. What happened to Russell Aubrey? He lost! Mr Morton and the Liberal Party were out there writing to everyone across the community, demanding that people contact their candidates in the local government election to express their support for Roe 8. Who paid for that? Did federal electoral allowances pay for that? Did the Liberal Party pay for that? Where did the funding for that letter come from? I thought what Mr Morton did was quite unprecedented, and I think it is worthy of further inquiry to find out who paid for that campaign designed to try to influence a local government election. If federal government funds were used for that, I think further action needs to be taken. If it was funded via donations, who made the donations? Where did they come from? Mr Morton, a very political operator, needs to answer a few questions about this right now.

We know that Roe 8 is supported by the Leader of the Opposition. The goldmine was the Oliver Peterson program with the Leader of the Opposition! On 2 October 2019, the Leader of the Opposition said she is going to allocate another \$700 million to Roe 8 and Roe 9. That is a spending commitment right there, in black and white. Oliver Peterson, being the sharp interviewer that he is, asked her how she was going to fund it. She said, “We’ll reprioritise projects. We will just reprioritise some of the Labor projects to fund Roe 8 and Roe 9 because we believe it is that important.” Which projects? Is she talking about Ellenbrook rail? The member for Churchlands wants to get rid of Ellenbrook rail. Is the Leader of the Opposition going to get rid of Ellenbrook rail? Is that now her plan? I saw the member for Churchlands attacking Ellenbrook rail last night. Is that the Leader of the Opposition’s plan? Where is the \$700 million coming from? She is now 18 months from the election. She needs to answer these questions. She sits there in silence every question time.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: We ask the questions.

Mr M. McGOWAN: The Leader of the Opposition does not ask any questions. She said, “We ask the questions.” Her colleagues do, but she does not.

The reality is that there was a massive campaign by Mr Morton and the Liberal Party in relation to the Roe 8 project. They endorsed Russell Aubrey. Mr Aubrey was defeated. It was a rejection of the Liberal Party’s plans.

ROE 8 AND 9 — JOBS

915. Ms L. METTAM to the Premier:

I have a supplementary question. Can the Premier confirm that because he refused to build Roe 8 and Roe 9, the people of WA are missing out on 10 000 direct and indirect jobs on top of the 10 000 jobs forgone because his government has failed to lay a track of Metronet rail?

The SPEAKER: Member, it is a supplementary; it is not a speech. Can you just rephrase that and make it shorter? It is not a speech.

Ms L. METTAM: Because the Premier refused to build Roe 8 and Roe 9, can he confirm that the people of WA are missing out on 10 000 direct and indirect jobs?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

The answer is no. I also note that over the course of this project the opposition has produced lots of figures around this. I think the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who is also mute in the chamber, put out figures. I think some of the other spokespeople, including the shadow Treasurer, put out figures. Back in government, they put out figures. They varied from a couple of thousand up to 20 000. These figures for this magical road have moved around. We are doing what we committed to at the election—a long-term plan for freight and trade to meet the needs of Perth and Western Australia. All the Liberal Party wants to do is put a toll road in that stops short of Fremantle port by about three kilometres and, in the process, rip up the Beeliar wetlands. It was rejected in the election on its plan. That is what it went forward with.

Mr D.C. Nalder interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Bateman.

Mr M. McGOWAN: The person who is not mute, the shadow Treasurer, the member for Bateman, was so confident of the Roe 8 and Roe 9 plan that he jumped seats! Remember, the member for Bateman left poor old Matt Taylor floundering away; he left him over there while he jumped seats. He and Matt had the fight. I think the Liberal Party made a bad call there. I would have gone for Matt. He might have had a bit of staying power, unlike the member for Bateman. The tom-toms are beating for him—that he is on his way out the door because he is not getting paid enough here. That is what everyone is alleging about the member for Bateman.

Mr D.C. Nalder: Are you offering me a job?

Mr M. McGOWAN: We have standards!

The evidence is there. Ben Morton and the Liberal Party tried to interfere in that local government election campaign. They used extensive amounts of money and we do not know where it came from. Members opposite need to answer the question of who paid for that campaign to write to everyone in that community to try to pressure them.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mr M. McGOWAN: I note that no-one who signed the Liberal Party's pledge got elected.

MITCHELL FREEWAY — WIDENING

916. Mr D.R. MICHAEL to the Minister for Transport:

I refer to the McGowan Labor government's \$400 million investment in Perth's freeways, specifically the Mitchell Freeway widening project.

- (1) Can the minister outline to the house how the construction of this project will improve journey times for commuters and support local jobs?
- (2) Can the minister advise the house how this project builds on this government's record of road improvements across Western Australia?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI replied:

- (1)–(2) I thank the member for Balcatta for that question, because, unlike the Liberal Party, we are concerned about reducing congestion across the network—in the northern suburbs and in regional Western Australia—and improving road safety. The Liberal Party's unhealthy obsession continues, as was demonstrated by the question to the Premier today. The Liberal Party somehow claimed that it was not resoundingly defeated on the weekend when its number one person got defeated, given it was a referendum on Roe 8 and 9. That is what that council election was.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The Liberal Party wrote to every constituent, telling them that because these people signed the pledge, they should vote for them. The two chief proponents were Ben Morton and Russell Aubrey. Ben Morton endorsed Russell Aubrey and he lost. Every time this issue has been tested at an election, it has lost.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Dr M.D. Nahan: Bring it on!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Why did the member for Riverton not bring it on in eight and a half years? Why did he not build it? Members opposite were warming up and working it out for eight and a half years.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members, please. I want to hear this answer.

Mr F.M. Logan: Riverton did well, didn't he?

The SPEAKER: Minister!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Members opposite did nothing in eight and a half years and now they say that we have to build Roe 8. We are reducing congestion on our freeways. Mitchell Freeway is just an example. It is a great project that was announced yesterday. A lane will be added to that freeway to reduce congestion and improve safety. There have been over 800 accidents in that area over the past five years. We estimate that adding an additional lane between Hutton Street and Cedric Street will reduce congestion back to Powis Street because of the bank-up. There will be an additional exit out to Cedric Street to combat what I call the IKEA effect, which is the significant build-up of traffic that impacts the flow on the existing freeway. This great project will create more jobs in Western Australia. These projects across the freeway system are being built because we redirected the funds from Roe 8 and 9. They would not be happening under the Liberal Party. The northern suburbs and the southern suburbs would not be getting these projects. We are absolutely keen and committed to reducing congestion and improving the operability of the entire network. We will continue to roll out these projects, and there are many more to come. They will employ thousands of Western Australians, reduce congestion and improve road safety across the state.

PAYROLL TAX EXEMPTION THRESHOLD

917. Ms M.J. DAVIES to the Premier:

I refer to the series of financial windfalls that the state government has been the beneficiary of, including proceeds from the sale of public assets, the return of Western Australia's GST share and increased royalties. When can the small business sector expect relief from the insidious tax on jobs? When will the government increase the payroll tax exemption threshold?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

Obviously, we listen to the small business sector and, in fact, the entire business community of Western Australia. My government prides itself on having a good relationship with the business community of Western Australia. Whether they are small, medium or large businesses, we work with everyone across the community. A significant issue has been raised by the business community and we are currently listening to that. As I said before, they are the sorts of things that are desirable to do if the government can afford to reduce taxes—for example, payroll tax. However, we clearly have a priority of getting the state's finances back in check. It is true that we argued for and received a change to the GST system. I was very pleased to work with Malcolm Turnbull, the Prime Minister; Scott Morrison, the Treasurer; and Mathias Cormann to achieve that outcome, which was a good thing. We also worked very hard with BHP to receive a payment to resolve a longstanding royalty issue. We successfully resolved that issue and allocated that money to the new women's and babies' hospital, which will benefit city and regional women and babies for decades, if not centuries, to come. When the TAB is sold, over half of the proceeds will go to that hospital—35 per cent of the proceeds will go to regional racing infrastructure and 65 per cent will go to the new women's and babies' hospital. We are not blowing the proceeds. We are using the proceeds of our hard work for good outcomes, which will pay down Liberal–National government debt and build important infrastructure.

PAYROLL TAX EXEMPTION THRESHOLD**918. Ms M.J. DAVIES to the Premier:**

Thank you, Premier. I have a supplementary question. Will the Premier give small business some hope and commit to increasing the payroll tax exemption threshold in the next state budget, if not before?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

I repeat, we are listening to the small business community. We meet with its members regularly and we understand the issue. At the same time, we are the only government in Australia that is driving down debt. The Liberal government in New South Wales is driving it through the roof. The Liberal governments in South Australia and Tasmania are both driving it up, but not to the same degree. Other governments across the country are driving up debt. One government in Australia is driving down debt—that is, the Western Australian Labor government.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mr M. McGOWAN: We inherited forty thousand million dollars of debt from the Liberal–National government, which was clearly an issue that had to be dealt with. As we have shown in the last few weeks, we understand that job creation is important. Hence, we launched our school maintenance program, our hospital maintenance program, our cuts to TAFE fees for specific courses—very much focused on job creation—and our campaign to secure the Collins-class submarine full cycle docking contract for Western Australia. The other week, I announced the Chinatown redevelopment in Broome, and today I announced the construction of a new primary school in Mt Lockyer in Albany. We understand there is an issue. We are doing everything we can to have targeted initiatives to create jobs in Western Australia, and we will continue to do that.

PRISONS — INFRASTRUCTURE EXPANSION — BUNBURY**919. Mr D.T. PUNCH to the Minister for Corrective Services:**

My question is to the very hardworking Minister for Corrective Services. I refer to the McGowan Labor government's \$310 million funding commitment to increase the number of prison beds, specifically the opening of the new \$23.7 million 160-bed facility in Bunbury. Can the minister outline to the house how the construction of this project is an important step towards solving the overcrowding crisis created by the previous government at the same time as creating local jobs?

Mr F.M. LOGAN replied:

Thank you very much indeed, member for Bunbury, for that question. What a wonderful preamble as well!

I believe that everyone in this house is well aware of the mess the McGowan government inherited in the area of corrections. It was an absolute disaster. We literally had more prisoners than beds when we took over in March 2017. We have embarked on a major \$310 million expansion program of the prison estate, which will deliver 1 228 beds. The Bunbury facility is the first of those projects. I promised this house that it would be delivered at this time of the year. It has been delivered on time and we opened it on Friday. It was a great announcement and very welcomed by the locals, who did a fantastic job of reporting on the opening and what it contributed to the economy of the south west and Bunbury, in addition to what it will do to assist with the overcrowding issue within the prison estate. Over and above addressing the inherited problems from the previous Liberal–National government, this project is also the first of the Western Australian participation projects, as announced by the Premier. Those projects concentrate on using Western Australian taxpayers' money to get as many jobs as possible out of that expenditure. Can I inform the house of what we have created, as part of the Western Australian industry participation project in the south west, with the Bunbury Regional Prison expansion program. There were 25 local contractors working

on the project and that in turn created 847 local jobs. On top of that, over the last 12 months, 48 new apprenticeships were created as a result of that. In terms of the Western Australian participation project, it being the first, this is absolutely outstanding. It was nearly a 98 per cent local content in the contribution to that build program. It was a fantastic outcome. Over and above the building of the project and over and above the local jobs that it created, of course we have employed more people to ensure that we have the right staffing numbers down there. There are 65 new permanent jobs—all of them are local, member for Bunbury—that will be in that prison. As the member knows, we had a local training program for the prison officers down there, which is the first in many, many years. That in itself, over and above the build program, is another major contribution to job creation in Bunbury. It is really a very, very good outcome.

Finally, can I just say that, unlike the previous projects that were put together by the previous Liberal–National government—I point to the expansion of Greenough Regional Prison, by the member for Warren–Blackwood—what we have done is to ensure that all of the necessary support mechanisms, when we actually put more beds into a prison system, are there as well. All the previous government did was build beds; Greenough was a classic example. It did not address all the other support mechanisms that need to be in place when it did the expansion program.

Mr D.T. Redman interjected.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: In Bunbury—it just shows members how thin-skinned he is—we have expanded the kitchens, we have expanded the dining rooms and we have expanded the visitors' centres. All those things are critically necessary when one goes through these prison expansion programs, and they are things that the previous Liberal–National government did not deliver, and, consequently, we ended up with problems that we inherited in March 2017.

INTEREST RATES — KEYSTART LOANS

920. Mr D.C. NALDER to the Premier:

I refer to the Treasurer's comments yesterday on Gareth Parker's 6PR show, on which he complained that this government is paying loans to the commonwealth at four and half per cent interest rates when he could get market rates at around two per cent.

Why is your government asking for interest rate relief from the commonwealth government, when the Premier is refusing to provide similar interest rate relief to struggling Western Australians on Keystart, who are paying 4.79 per cent?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

I did not hear the Treasurer's remarks, but one thing is apparent in this question time: the shadow Treasurer is always afraid to ask the Treasurer a question. He is always afraid. The Leader of the Opposition does not ask any questions. Question time has become very odd over the course of the last few months. The opposition is now, essentially, comatose in question time. Whatever is on their phones is just so interesting, because they spend the entire time tapping away on the phones, so it is really interesting. Those who do interject do not add anything.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mr M. McGOWAN: Those who do interject should be on their phones, and those who are on their phones should probably be interjecting. It is just an observation.

I did not hear the Treasurer's remarks, but I saw an article in the newspaper. We are obviously seeking a similar arrangement to what has been secured for Tasmania in relation to historic housing debts in that there is an obligation on Western Australia, apparently, that goes back some years to repay some debt in relation to some public housing. Tasmania, through the efforts of Senator Jacqui Lambie, has had its housing debt waived. For the commonwealth to do it for one state—apparently it did it for South Australia as well—but not do it for other states, I do not think is a tenable position. I do not think that is a fair position.

Therefore, the Treasurer has now written to the federal Treasurer, which is right, to request the same deal for Western Australia that South Australia and Tasmania have received, on the basis that the payments that we were going to be making, which are, in effect, I think, \$30 million or so a year, would be invested in social housing and homelessness initiatives, which is an entirely reasonable and defensible position on the part of Western Australia. I expect everyone would support it.

The member then segued into Keystart. The thing about Keystart, as opposed to an ordinary loan, is that there is no mortgage insurance and there is a very low deposit. It is a sort of gateway loan. If people get into the housing market with no mortgage insurance and very low deposit, they prove they can do it and they move on to other financial institutions over time. That is the model that has been adopted, which was explained to members last week by the Minister for Housing. There was then the securitisation of the Keystart loan book, and that, I think, has added complexity to the interest rate argument. Members have to remember that there are a lot of benefits with Keystart. It has more available finance, no mortgage insurance and low deposit, which is attractive to a lot of people. That is opposed to a mainstream bank that may have, initially, a lower interest rate but a much higher deposit

levels and mortgage insurance, which makes it much more difficult to get a loan. We are, in effect, protecting the public interest, making loans available, making sure it is sustainable and defensible for the long-term, making sure Keystart does not go the way of other institutions of that nature in other states that went broke some years ago. Therefore, I think prudent financial management of Keystart and the state is a good thing to do.

INTEREST RATES — KEYSTART LOANS

921. Mr D.C. NALDER to the Premier:

I have a supplementary question. Why is the Premier's state government profiteering from struggling Western Australians by charging such a high interest rate on Keystart?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

A former senior bank executive complaining about the activities of financial institutions, in light of the royal commission, is a bit odd.

Mr D.C. Nalder interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Bateman!

Mr M. McGOWAN: It is a bit odd that that member would be the one out there in relation to this.

We note that Keystart needs to be managed sustainably and properly to make sure that we do not get the state into financial difficulty. Loans are made more easily available to people. We have lifted the income threshold so more people can receive a Keystart loan to support the housing industry. The housing industry is very happy with what we have done in relation to Keystart. It is a gateway loan. People get in. They get their loan, no mortgage insurance, low deposit, and then they can transition to another lender when they prove that they can manage their loan. I think that is a fair and reasonable thing to do. But we will leave it to, and work with, the financial experts in relation to how to manage Keystart. We will not respond to thought bubbles by the member for Bateman.

HIGHWAY TO HELL — PERTH FESTIVAL 2020

922. Mrs L.M. O'MALLEY to the Minister for Culture and the Arts:

I refer to the McGowan Labor government's ongoing commitment to supporting Perth Festival and, specifically, the headline act, the *Highway to Hell* event.

Can the minister outline to the house how this government, through this fantastic and unique event, is creating jobs and encouraging tourism at the same time as paying homage to an Australian rock legend?

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN replied:

What a great rock legend Bon Scott is. Of course, Western Australian history will forever epitomise that great musician —

The SPEAKER: Face the Chair, minister. Don't sing!

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: He was a great musician for Western Australia. It was great to be down there at Tompkins Park in the City of Melville on Sunday to announce what will be a remarkable close to the Perth Festival 2020. We will have a number of flatbed trucks traversing the so-called *Highway to Hell*, which was epitomised in that song from AC/DC, from the Raffles Hotel, past the Leopold Hotel, which was a very famous place that Bon used to go to and frequent, down to the traffic bridge. It will be a great family event. We will invite all of Western Australia and interstate and international visitors.

Mr P.A. Katsambanis interjected.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: What is wrong?

Mr P.A. Katsambanis: Will Angus be there?

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: He might be there. You never know, Angus could be there! I do not know whether the member for Dawesville will be there. He will look out of place in his three-piece suit. I do not know whether he will look in place.

The fact of the matter is that there will be a huge crowd. As we know, AC/DC is very well known across the world and has sold millions and millions of albums. It is an iconic Western Australian story.

We are going to have flatbed trucks going up the *Highway to Hell* and some magnificent entertainment. I will tell members about some of the performers who will be on the back of these trucks. Abbe May and Carla Geneve will be there. There will be community choirs; Dom Mariani; Hells Bells; the Jam Tarts, a very famous Western Australian band; the Pigram Brothers, a famous band from the member for Kimberley's part of the world; Amyl and the Sniffers, we will not go there! We will keep going: the Southern River Band; the Tommyhawks; and, member for Midland and Minister for Police, the Western Australia Police Force Pipe Band will be there. Just imagine the pipes playing *High Voltage*! Unfortunately we will reject the Liberal Party being on there; we are not going to

have them on the back of a rented Budget flatbed truck because they will probably want to sing *Goodbye and Good Riddance to Bad Luck*, which is a very famous AC/DC song. Of course, a subtle one for the member for North West Central is *Night of the Long Knives*, another very famous AC/DC song. The member could do that on the back of a three-wheeler tricycle!

It is going to be fantastic. We will invite lots of people. There will be tens of thousands of people. It is going to be a great thing for job creation, celebrating a Western Australian story. As the Premier said on Sunday, which was the best line on Sunday, we are doing all of this by investing in the creative regions, investing in Western Australian creatives, increasing the tourism product and opportunities to the world by bringing the budget *Back in Black*! That is what we have done. After the 2017 election, the Western Australian people were *Thunderstruck* by the appalling state of the economy left to us by members opposite.

NORTH WEST GAS DEVELOPMENT (WOODSIDE) AGREEMENT AMENDMENT BILL 2019

923. Mr D.T. REDMAN to the Premier:

I refer to the Railway (Roy Hill Infrastructure Pty Ltd) Agreement Bill 2010. In opposition, the Premier sought to amend the state agreement so that local participation plans were required to be laid on the table of both houses of Parliament. In light of the Premier's strong position of a government built on transparency, will he commit to amending the North West Gas Development (Woodside) Agreement Amendment Bill 2019 so that community development plans and local participation plans are also tabled in both houses of Parliament?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

I do remember that debate. The then Minister for State Development, Hon Colin Barnett, rejected the amendments I put forward and his arguments were quite reasonable.

Several members interjected.

Mr M. McGOWAN: They were.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mr V.A. Catania: Are you saying you were wrong?

Mr M. McGOWAN: No. His arguments were quite reasonable. What he said at the time —

Mr D.T. Redman interjected.

Mr M. McGOWAN: He said at the time that there had been a negotiation between Roy Hill and the state, which had formed a contract, which was already in existence, and that had come into Parliament. He thought that to subsequently attempt to amend that contract via Parliament was not the right thing to do. I have ruminated on what Mr Barnett had to say back then, and that is what he had to say. The other component, I suppose, where there is a point of difference, is that the Roy Hill agreement was new; it was greenfields. The Woodside agreement we have been dealing with in this place is brownfields; it has been around for 40 years. They are sort of existing arrangements, if you like.

The National Party will bring on a debate after question time and then we will actually debate the bill. It is an interesting strategy to adopt. The National Party will move a matter of public interest motion on a bill that we are currently debating. The National Party could have moved the MPI on something else and raised its points during debate on the bill, but who am I to question the tactics and strategic judgement of the National Party? It is a "cunning plan", no doubt, that Baldrick over here has in train but I am more than happy to answer questions during the MPI.

NORTH WEST GAS DEVELOPMENT (WOODSIDE) AGREEMENT AMENDMENT BILL 2019

924. Mr D.T. REDMAN to the Premier:

I have a supplementary question. How does the Premier explain his hypocrisy to the people of Karratha and the Pilbara given the very different position he took up when in opposition?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

The thing is that we are trying to preserve the long-term future of Karratha and the Pilbara. That is what we are trying to do. Everything the National Party says and does is about destroying their future.

Mr D.T. Redman interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Warren–Blackwood!

Mr M. McGOWAN: That is what it does. Everything the National Party ever does or says is anti them. What does the National Party think will happen to Karratha if this bill does not go through?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mr M. McGOWAN: What does it think will happen to Karratha if we cannot get Browse and Scarborough gas into the Burrup? What does it think will happen to Karratha? Half the jobs will disappear.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Leader of the National Party, you have an MPI coming up.

Mr M. McGOWAN: When we worked with Woodside to bring in the portal so that all the jobs were advertised to locals, what did National Party members do? They attacked it. When we worked with Woodside to make sure that it has sufficient accommodation so that it can employ people to build the plants needed when Browse and Scarborough come on, what did National Party members do? They attacked it. All the National Party does is pretend that it is onside, but its actions show that it is not.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: National Party members, please!

Mr M. McGOWAN: The member for Warren–Blackwood is the enemy of these projects.

Mr D.T. Redman: No, not at all.

Mr M. McGOWAN: You are the enemy of these projects.

Mr D.T. Redman interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Warren–Blackwood, I call you for the first time.

Mr M. McGOWAN: As we discussed during the debate on the bill last week, when James Price Point was happening and the National Party was a part of that, that was the enemy of bringing the gas onshore. That was another cunning plan by the last government that failed. We are working cooperatively with Woodside and the joint venture partners to bring the gas onshore and the National Party is missing the entire main game with its amendments, questions and the rest. The main game is getting alignment between the offshore partners and the onshore partners. That is the main game. The National Party does not seem to understand that. The main game is making sure that the multinationals onshore and offshore align.

Mr V.A. Catania interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for North West Central, I call you to order for the first time. It is not a shouting match.

Mr M. McGOWAN: The Nationals' friend over in Queensland, Matt Canavan—although, I must say I think he is a little bit different to this lot—gets the main game. He understands what the main game is. He is not running these anti-jobs arguments that the Nationals WA is. He wants to align the partners. We want to align the partners. The partners jumped out of alignment when the previous government did James Price Point. We have to put Humpty back together again. That is what this government is doing, but all we have is the National Party trying to push Humpty off the wall again!

NEERABUP GROUNDWATER TREATMENT PLANT

925. Ms S.E. WINTON to the Minister for Water:

I refer to the McGowan government's \$52 million investment to upgrade the Neerabup groundwater treatment plant. Can the minister advise the house why this project is needed and how it will support jobs in the northern suburbs?

Mr D.J. KELLY replied:

I thank the member for her support for jobs in her electorate. I am pleased to answer this question during what is National Water Week. Before I address the particular question, I would like, firstly, to pay tribute to a number of public sector workers who really assist us in delivering first-class water services in Western Australia. We are one of the few places in the world where people can turn on a tap and drink the water. Whether it is the public sector staff at the Water Corporation, Aqwest in Bunbury, Busselton Water or the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation, I would like the house to recognise the great work they do in delivering great water services and dealing with the impacts of climate change in WA.

As part of Water Week we announced the \$52 million project to upgrade the Neerabup groundwater treatment plant, which is the final stage of the groundwater replenishment project. That will see the amount of recycled water in Perth's drinking water system increased from 14 billion litres to 28 billion litres when it is completed in 2020. It is an absolutely outstanding project that will create 120 local jobs in Neerabup and will increase the capacity of that plant from 100 million litres of water a day to 150 million litres of water a day. It is an absolutely essential part of making sure that Perth has a sustainable water supply into the future. We are using water that would otherwise be essentially pumped out into the Indian Ocean. We are now treating it to a higher level,

almost to drinking water standards, then pumping it into the aquifer to be taken out later and used as drinking water. It will be treated again at Neerabup water treatment plant before it goes out to homes and becomes part of our drinking water supply.

This project has had a long history. People would be well familiar with the “State Water Recycling Strategy: An Overview” released in June 2008. It was released by the then Premier, Alan Carpenter, and by the late John Kobelke, who, at the time was the water resources minister. I have to say that John Kobelke was an absolutely fantastic water minister, and what was really important about this recycling strategy is that it identified for the very first time that groundwater replenishment, the use of treated wastewater, had the potential to be part of Perth’s water supply. In this strategy, in 2008, they committed \$3 million to start a trial of this technology and effectively quarantined the wastewater from the Beenyp wastewater treatment plant in Craigie for this use. Labor has always been the first mover when it comes to dealing with the impacts of climate change. We were the ones who began the desalination program. It was the Carpenter government that had the wisdom and the vision to start the research that has now become the groundwater replenishment scheme, which will deliver, as I said, 28 billion litres of water that will become part of Perth’s drinking water supply.

During National Water Week I am very pleased to advise the house that yet again, Labor governments are dealing with issues relating to climate change. We are securing Perth’s water supply. Whether it be in Perth, Denmark, Bunbury or the north west, we are the only ones that can be trusted with dealing with the impacts of climate change and ensuring that Western Australia has a sustainable drinking water supply going forward.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROCEDURE AND PRIVILEGES —
FIFTY-SIXTH REPORT — LEGAL ADVICE

926. Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS to the Attorney General:

I refer to several questions asked of the Attorney General in the other place concerning a letter from the Clerk of the Legislative Council to the State Solicitor of Western Australia, dated 28 August 2019, which the Attorney General has now admitted to showing to the media. Did the Attorney General show the letter to the media before or after it was tabled as part of the fifty-sixth report of the Legislative Council’s Standing Committee on Procedure and Privileges?

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY replied:

Before.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROCEDURE AND PRIVILEGES —
FIFTY-SIXTH REPORT — LEGAL ADVICE

927. Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS to the Attorney General:

I have a supplementary question. I thank the Attorney General for that answer. Why has it taken seven questions in the other place and a question in this place for the Attorney General to provide that answer, and can he now give us an actual date and place where he provided that letter to the media?

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY replied:

It is because that exact question was not asked, and, no, I cannot recall the exact date.

The SPEAKER: That is the end of question time.

PAPERS TABLED

Papers were tabled and ordered to lie upon the table of the house.

“DIRECTOR OF EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT ANNUAL REPORT 2018–19”

Correction — Statement by Speaker

THE SPEAKER (Mr P.B. Watson) [3.04 pm]: I received a letter dated 14 October from the Premier requesting that an erratum be added to the “Director of Equal Opportunity in Public Employment Annual Report 2018–19”, which was tabled on 17 September 2019. The erratum addresses an error on page 14 regarding diversity information and a percentage included in a graphic. Under the provisions of standing order 156, I authorise the necessary corrections to be attached as an erratum to the tabled paper.

[See paper 2947.]

HOUSING SECTOR

Notice of Motion

Mr D.C. Nalder gave notice that at the next sitting of the house he would move —

That this house condemns the McGowan Labor government for plunging the housing sector into its longest and deepest crisis, and calls on the Premier to immediately backflip on his ill-conceived foreign buyers tax and migration changes.

FLY IN, FLY OUT — PILBARA*Removal of Order — Statement by Speaker*

THE SPEAKER (Mr P.B. Watson) [3.05 pm]: In accordance with standing order 144A, the order of the day that appeared in the last notice paper as number 1 under private members' business has not been debated for more than 12 calendar months and has been removed from the notice paper.

NORTH WEST GAS DEVELOPMENT (WOODSIDE) AGREEMENT AMENDMENT BILL 2019*Matter of Public Interest*

THE SPEAKER (Mr P.B. Watson) informed the Assembly that he was in receipt within the prescribed time of a letter from the member for Warren–Blackwood seeking to debate a matter of public interest.

[In compliance with standing orders, at least five members rose in their places.]

MR D.T. REDMAN (Warren–Blackwood) [3.06 pm]: I move —

That this house calls on the McGowan government to have community development plans and local participation plans in the North West Gas Development (Woodside) Agreement Amendment Bill 2019 to be laid before each house of Parliament.

This issue is very important. It goes to the integrity of the current government and how, over time in Western Australia, successive governments have taken the time to amend our state agreements to make them contemporary, and to how society sits in Western Australia right now. The history of state agreements shows that they have been amended, renegotiated, and, at different points in time, whether it be iron ore bills, iron ore state agreements or some of the other state agreements around the state, have had very valid changes to reflect where the community is at. We have also seen statements recently from some fairly significant people in the resource sector, such as BHP chief executive Andrew Mackenzie. I quote from the Thursday, 10 October 2019 *Kalgoorlie Miner* —

BHP says big miners' profits will not survive if they simply pay lip service to the social and environmental toll of resource extraction, with the "social value" of a business decision increasingly important to a company's long-term future.

Even leaders in the resource sector recognise that a social licence needs to be managed with their activities in Western Australia. I do not think anyone in this house would disagree with that.

We had a pretty significant debate last Thursday during the consideration in detail stage of the bill that is before the Assembly right now. Before I go there, I want to go back to a bill that I referred to in my question to the Premier on the Railway (Roy Hill Infrastructure Pty Ltd) Agreement Bill 2010. It was put up by the then minister, and the Premier, when he was in opposition, moved an amendment to that state agreement bill. I was somewhat lectured last Thursday by the Minister for Mines and Petroleum, who made the point that we do not amend state agreement bills because there is a convention in this place, that both sides accept, that it is negotiated by the government with these particular companies and then it simply comes in here for ratification. We can interrogate one of those bills, but by tradition and convention we do not amend it. That is the position that I took up. We did not move an amendment. We debated the legislation and we raised the issues, but we did not move an amendment. We went back and did some research and found that the Premier has sought to amend a state agreement with a mining company. What he said was interesting. I will read out the amendment he moved at the consideration in detail stage —

Page 3, line 11 — To delete the line and substitute —

- (2) Subject to subsection (3), the implementation of the Agreement is authorised.
- (3) That, notwithstanding anything contained within the Agreement, the proponent Roy Hill Infrastructure Pty Ltd will submit to the Minister a Local Participation Plan which the Minister shall, within 6 months after the date of assent of this Act, cause to be laid before each House of Parliament.

The first point of significance is that the Premier sought to amend a state agreement. A minister of the day told me that that was against the convention of this place, but the Premier did that. The second thing is that there is a whole piece here about what a local participation plan is. It is pretty reflective of what is in the bill before us, the North West Gas Development (Woodside) Agreement Amendment Bill 2019, because the companies are required to do two components—a local participation plan and a community development plan. There is one difference. In 2010, the Premier sought to amend the bill so that the state agreement had to be tabled in both houses of Parliament. I appreciate when we negotiate with a company, we want to keep a level of flexibility around what sorts of plans it comes up with. The Premier's amendment was about a local participation plan. In the case of the bill we debated last week—we are now on to the third reading—it is about a local participation plan and a community development plan. I can understand that. The government purports to be transparent and it pushed a platform of transparency at the last election. The greatest level of transparency should be to make public those documents, a position that the Premier, when in opposition, sought for a state agreement bill. I asked the Premier a question today and he said that he thought the Premier of the day made a good argument and he backed up. It is another backflip from this government. I will not wear that position, because the Premier took it up in opposition. It is a simple issue. It is not a high threshold to chase down having those agreements tabled in Parliament.

Interestingly, the local participation plan in the now Premier's amendment had six points on what it would contain, including: a clear statement; detailed information on procurement practices; detailed information on businesses being introduced to the procurement officers that support that, detailed information on how local suppliers will be given the same opportunity as others in the supply chain; detailed information on the expected percentage of local content in those construction projects; and details of communication strategies. It was a pretty detailed effort from the then opposition, but when I quizzed the Premier hard last week in government, we got a pretty soft response and the softest response came in response to the question today. This massively flies in the face of a government that purports to be transparent and supporting the community. What better level of support is there for something fundamental to those communities, which the Premier has driven through this agreement, than a local participation plan and a community development plan being tabled in both houses? Make it public.

Let us look at what happened in the debate last week. The bill is before the Legislative Assembly. It is in the third reading stage and will go to the other place and be debated once it has moved through its current agenda. The bill has the two components of a local participation plan and a community development plan. When quizzing the Premier on this issue, we found out that there is no mandated requirement for the company to engage with the community to have a community development plan. The company could simply draft a plan and take it to the minister. There is no government signatory to that outcome. No-one from government signs off and says that either the local participation plan or the community development plan is okay. It is not a public document. The best it could come up with was annual reporting, but annual reporting against what? What are the companies saying that they will do before they report on what they did? It is annual reporting when no-one knows the level of requirement.

This matter goes to the government's level of transparency. It made a pitch in the 2017 election. It is not a big threshold. It is not hard to say that the companies must table these agreements. What is the cost of that? Today the Premier can commit to negotiating with the joint venture partners when it gets to the Legislative Council and say that all he is looking for is to not change what is in this bill but have the final agreement tabled so that the community can see it. Those who are endeavouring to participate in the outcomes of these companies' investments could see it. When we have some reporting against that, we would have a chance to have some measurable outcomes. I think that is not a big threshold. It is not hard for the Premier to take up this issue, go to the companies and say what the government is looking for. The amendment could be made in the other place. The bill could be passed there and brought back here through a message to the Assembly saying what the Council has agreed on and that it wants to change the agreement. The Premier can do that. According to his minister, I cannot do that, but the community would value that outcome.

It is also interesting that when that amendment was sought by the now Premier back in 2010, the house divided and nine of his current ministers voted for that particular amendment. He has a cabinet now with nine of his current ministers who supported the amendment that he put up when he was in opposition. Part of that was to seek to have those plans tabled in both houses. That is not a big threshold. In my view, the Premier could commit to doing that and have it passed to come back into the Assembly and I think he would get a pretty positive community response to that. We recognise that these are significant projects. The Nationals are not against the miners and the people who want to chase oil and gas and invest in this state. We support that. We have supported this bill and we will continue to support this bill in the other place. But we have to put the community back into community development plans and put local businesses back into local participation plans. That is the bit that is absent from the government's position. I will tell members who else is absent from this debate. That is the member for Pilbara.

The member for Pilbara read out his speech last week, which I am pretty sure someone else wrote for him. He is remarkably silent on this issue. He should be shouting from the rooftops and asking what the hell we are doing to support our local community. What is he doing to support his local community? A community development plan will have benefits for our community, but it does not even get to see it. It does not get to participate in it and say whether it is a good or bad thing and when it is reported on, there is nothing to report against. What is the member for Pilbara doing to ensure that he is coming in behind what the now Premier moved in 2010 to amend a previous state agreement against the advice of a current minister who says we should not be doing that, supported by nine of their ministers? It is not a big threshold for him to say that the government supports the position. This is not a big ask. We are simply asking for transparency from a government, which is espousing to be transparent, in negotiating outcomes for these companies. We know that happens at different points in time and it is right to happen because the leaders in the big companies are saying that social licence is now on the agenda. A really easy way to support this is through transparency so that people can see what they are negotiating. Nothing is happening at the local level from the member for Pilbara. He is silent on this issue. His silence on this issue is deafening. He should have heard the debate last Thursday and said, "What the hell is going on here?" When in opposition the member for Pilbara's government took up this position, but it is not happening now. This is not a big threshold for the Premier. He can sort this out by making changes in the other place. He can talk to the companies and if those companies do not come to the party and table it so that we can see it, what do they have to hide? I do not think this is a big threshold. This motion could have one of two results; either the government supports it and says that it will try to do that, or hypocrisy will abound and the government will go back on the position that this Premier and nine of his ministers took up when they were in opposition. That is not good enough. This is trying to put the community back in community development plans.

MRS L.M. HARVEY (Scarborough — Leader of the Opposition) [3.19 pm]: I rise on behalf of the opposition to contribute to this matter of public importance, which we support, with our partners in opposition, the Nationals WA. I note that some of the Premier's previous comments are now starting to catch up with him. The position that the Premier is now taking on the proposal that the National Party has brought to this chamber reeks of hypocrisy. As members in opposition, we fear that if this legislation to amend the North West Shelf agreement is passed, we will find ourselves in the same position as we were when the Western Australian Jobs Bill 2017 came through this place. Members on this side will remember that the WA jobs bill was designed by the Premier and the Labor government, purportedly, to secure more contracts and employment for Western Australian companies. We know that when that legislation came to this place, we found that "local" for the purpose of that legislation meant every state in Australia and New Zealand. The Premier's rhetoric in the community was that he was standing for Western Australian jobs and small companies and businesses; in actual fact, he was standing up for every single company in Toowoomba, Sydney, Auckland, Christchurch, Hobart and Melbourne. Under this legislation, any company in Australia or New Zealand has the same access as Western Australian companies to government tendering projects. In fact, the legislation has the effectiveness of being slapped with a wet lettuce leaf, because it does not in any way, shape or form compel the government to deliberately procure work from Western Australian companies.

Now we find ourselves with this new amending legislation that the Premier has brought forward. The Premier says that he is now taking the same position to require the tabling of community development and local participation plans as that taken by the former Premier, Hon Colin Barnett. However, when he was in opposition, the Premier himself stood in this place and said that he thought it was a good idea for community development and local participation plans to be tabled as part of the agreement. The Premier's excuse for this is that we have an existing project. The project is already operating. Why, then, is there a requirement to amend the legislation to introduce parameters for community development and local participation plans? It makes no sense to bring amending legislation to this place to define what community development and local participation plans should contain, and then to say in the same breath, "We don't need to have a requirement for those plans to be tabled in Parliament because the projects are already existing." Why amend the legislation to define them?

All we are asking from the Premier here today is to have the same standards of transparency and accountability that he demanded of the former government and that he said he would bring to Western Australia when he became Premier. That is all we are asking.

During the consideration in detail of the North West Gas Development (Woodside) Agreement Amendment Bill 2019, the Premier stated —

Companies are required to report to the government on local content. In my experience, those reports are generally made public, as we saw today with the South Flank ...

But the Premier is asserting by bringing this legislation to this place that there is a requirement to tighten up what is required of these companies with community development and local participation plans. All we are asking is for the government to actually put some teeth into it: require the plans to be tabled so that every member in this Parliament can rate these companies on how they perform against the tabled participation plans that would be available in this place. That is all we are asking of the Premier—exactly what he demanded of the former government. It was okay when he was the opposition leader. Now that he is the Premier and has the power to do this, he refuses to do it, and he needs to explain why.

MS M.J. DAVIES (Central Wheatbelt — Leader of the Nationals WA) [3.23 pm]: I rise to support this motion. I start by saying that the government should not be afraid to agree with this motion, because we know that it has stood in this place before and argued for exactly what we are arguing for now. We invite the government to set aside the political argument that is no doubt about to become part of this debate, and actually look back and reflect on the comments that it made in 2010 when it was arguing so vehemently for exactly these documents to be tabled. It is not an unreasonable ask, it is not an outlandish ask, and it is not over-the-top. I think it is very, very sensible. The transparency and accountability that we are asking for goes to the heart of the commitments that the government made running into the election, when it talked about this rolled-gold transparency that it would bring to government. I remind the Premier of his own comments. This was reported in *The West Australian* on 17 September back in 2018; this government had not been in power for very long, and there were already headlines that it was failing on its commitment to be transparent. The Premier said —

"We will strengthen governance, accountability and transparency across government," ...

"We will govern only in the interests of all Western Australians."

The debate we bring to the house today would allow it to achieve that exact outcome. It would allow us to demonstrate that when we debate very important state agreements that have implications for everyone in this community, because that resource is owned by everyone in the community, we can demonstrate as a government and as Parliament that we have done our job in making sure that there is ongoing benefit for the community of jobs and the social and economic infrastructure that comes along with these jobs.

In the next line of that article, the writer, Gary Adshead, states —

He loves talking the talk, but evidence is emerging that he is not walking the walk.

That is exactly what it will look like if the government stands up and says that it is not going to support this motion today. We are only asking that the work being done to develop these community development plans and local participation plans—we agree with this and we supported the legislation, so there can be no argument that we are trying to put the kibosh on this project or any other that we see delivering significant numbers of jobs for the state—be known so that the community can understand and judge, and that we as a Parliament can evaluate what these plans will deliver. As Members who have spoken previously have outlined, this is not inconsistent with the position that has been taken previously.

To be fair, when we were talking about the Roy Hill state agreement back in 2010, a majority of the comments made by the then Leader of the Opposition were in relation to the local participation plan, not in relation to the community development plans. But in the spirit of openness and accountability, we believe both of them should be treated the same.

I would like to go back and look at this commentary. In fact, the amendment that was discussed in detail was far stronger than the legislation that this government brought for our consideration. The amendment moved was very specific in relation to local participation plans. It seems to have lost some of that, and between the Premier's being in opposition and being in government, we have ended up with a slightly more wishy-washy outcome in this legislation.

The Premier made these comments back on 7 September 2010 —

There is a growing sense that we can achieve more from the mining industry.

...

The company will exploit at least one billion tonnes of Western Australia's iron ore resource. The price of iron ore has doubled recently; it is a very lucrative business. Companies are making a lot of money out of it. Is it too much to ask companies to produce a local participation plan up-front, along the same lines as the one suggested in my amendment?

The members for Gosnells, Cockburn and Cannington also spoke on the Roy Hill state agreement. The member for Cannington made an interesting contribution to the debate last week. He made the point to the member for Warren-Blackwood that, by convention, we do not amend state agreements. His own leader actually sought to do that, and then he spoke to that legislation in 2010. He made the point that Australia's approach to massive non-renewable resource projects has meant that we have not been getting full value from them. He spoke at length that we should potentially change our focus to extract greater value down the supply chain for Western Australia. He seems to have moved away from the downstream processing argument that Sir Charles Court made back in the day and has moved towards trying to find opportunities for job creation. I would have thought that this would be right up the Minister for Mines and Petroleum's alley—that he would be very open and accountable about the types of jobs being created and what was being delivered into the economy, as he puts it, moving away from the argument of downstream processing, which we have not been able to realise here in Western Australia. From my perspective, I think the most interesting contribution was from the now Deputy Premier, the member for Kwinana, who made a contribution and went into some detail about the Hebron project. Members might not be particularly familiar with this project because it is located offshore from the Newfoundland and Labrador province in the north east of Canada. It is a massive oil and gas project.

The member for Kwinana, the now Deputy Premier, spoke of the benefits of the Hebron agreement struck between the lead partner, Chevron, and the other companies involved in that project and the two provinces. The companies that are operating in our jurisdiction are used to doing these kinds of deals and are used to this kind of transparency in other jurisdictions. The member for Kwinana talked about the very specific terms of the benefits that would be delivered from the project. Obviously, it was public, because the member for Kwinana, the Deputy Prime Minister—sorry; I gave the Deputy Premier an elevation then! The Deputy Premier had access to this information. He stood in Parliament and talked about the very specific terms of this deal struck by the two provinces in Canada. Obviously, there are no issues for Chevron, as one of the participants, in having that information publicly known. Other jurisdictions are doing that. We do not think that what we in this place are asking for is unreasonable; in fact, it is done in other jurisdictions. They are big projects.

I might add that this was only in 2008. This was not struck back in the 1960s, 1970s or even the 1980s. This was in 2008. These companies are used to adhering to the requirements of the jurisdiction in which they operate. They will make sure that they adhere to the requirements here, so that they can continue to operate and develop the resources that belong to the state of Western Australia and Australia.

The Deputy Premier concluded his contribution by saying —

It is simply saying that the public would like to see a report from the proponent on the sort of local content that is likely to be accrued or the opportunities that are likely to be accrued from this project. It is a modest but rather useful amendment.

We are all in furious agreement at this point—whether we are in opposition or in government—that it is useful to the Parliament and the community to make these documents public and to table them in Parliament.

The member went on to speak about social licences. The quote was a bit of a cracker. This is something that the National Party has been quite strong on in government and also in opposition. We have continued to argue that there is a unique role for government when it negotiates on behalf of the people of Western Australia. It is a regulator and it is also trying to drive and attract investment in these long-term and very significant projects. Walking that fine line is difficult, and we understand that. We get criticised for asking the same questions and raising the same points that have been raised by the now government when it was in opposition. It galls me slightly when we are put into a box that suggests that we are critical of, or potentially opposed to, the mining industry and the oil and gas sector, when we are actually doing no more than what every member in this place has done at one point or another. On 7 September, the member for Kwinana talked about social licence in the debate on the Roy Hill agreement. He said —

It is called a social licence to operate. This is business 101 and it is something that our government should be familiarising the large proponents of this state with. The opportunity to exploit Western Australia's resources comes with more than a simple obligation to provide royalties and meet the legal requirements associated with the development. It comes with a responsibility to the broader community, which we often articulate as issues such as the environment, Aboriginal employment and, increasingly, opportunities to boost local content.

I could not say it any better. All we are asking for is that the information that will be contained in the local participation plan and the community development plan that will be developed as part of this state agreement be tabled so that everybody can understand what is supposed to be delivered. The Premier should not be afraid to do this. He should not be afraid to agree with this motion. We think it is sensible. There is no overreach. In fact, it is his own argument and that of many of his own ministers. We encourage him to support this motion and to consider moving the amendments himself.

MR V.A. CATANIA (North West Central) [3.33 pm]: The chickens are coming home to roost, are they not? This is about the hypocrisy of the Premier. The Premier says one thing in opposition and does another thing in government. The community participation plan is nothing but a motherhood statement. It is community participation without the participation of the community! There is hypocrisy in that alone! This clearly shows the lack of commitment by the Labor Party, which is meant to look after workers and their families and the people of the Pilbara. Where has the Labor Party gone? There is silence over there. The member for Pilbara now knows about the benefits of the royalties for regions investment. It covered for the lack of a community development plan by the companies. The royalties for regions program picked up that baton and ran. Royalties for regions investment ensured that there was a new hospital, schools, day care facilities and land. Over \$1 billion of royalties for regions investment occurred in Karratha because there was a lack of community participation by those very companies.

The Nationals WA are not anti-resources. We want to make sure that the communities of regional Western Australia—the communities of the Pilbara—are liveable, workable and family friendly to ensure that they can attract and retain people. That is why the community participation plans should be open and transparent. They should be tabled in Parliament so that they can be benchmarked and the people who were elected to represent Western Australian communities have the opportunity to scrutinise the level of commitment of these companies. At the end of the day, they are our resources and we have a right to oversee these companies and make sure that they are doing what is right.

In 2008, people could not do anything in Karratha; there was nothing to do. There were complaints. Royalties for regions investment took up the community development side and allowed Karratha to be redeveloped into the city that it is today. This government is holding Karratha up and saying, "Everybody come and have a look." The only way to continue that growth and to attract and retain people is to make sure that companies have a community participation plan that the community participates in, and to have Parliament scrutinise it and make sure that these companies are doing what is right for the community in those towns. Here is the Premier's opportunity. Do not be a hypocrite. That is the problem. Everyone is starting to see who the Premier really is. We know who he is.

Withdrawal of Remark

The SPEAKER: Member, you will withdraw the "hypocrite" remark, please.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: I withdraw, but we all know that he says one thing in opposition and does another in government.

The SPEAKER: Member, you will withdraw without that comment.

Mr V.A. Catania: I did.

The SPEAKER: No, you did not; you kept going. Just withdraw, please.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: I withdraw.

On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I withdrew and I was continuing on with my speech. I do not know what you are talking about.

The SPEAKER: I call you to order for the second time, member for North West Central.

Debate Resumed

MR M. McGOWAN (Rockingham — Minister for State Development, Jobs and Trade) [3.37 pm]: The government will not agree to the matter of public interest moved by the National Party and supported by the Leader of the Opposition and the Liberal Party. We will not support it for a range of reasons. It is interesting that the National Party has searched *Hansard* for what I may have said 10 years ago as a young man! It is true that I moved some amendments to a greenfields bill in relation to the Roy Hill project to ensure that there was some additional local participation. I recall that the Liberals and the Nationals voted against them. Members opposite are alleging that there has been hypocrisy. Look in the mirror.

Mr D.T. Redman: Here's your chance to fix it.

Mr M. McGOWAN: No. Look in the mirror. The member voted against it when he was a senior minister in the then government and, subsequently, when he became Leader of the National Party, he voted against it. That was the position. Earlier, I outlined to the member the position as it was explained to me by the then Premier, Colin Barnett. The point I want to make now is that this is a negotiated agreement with Woodside. It is designed to give us our best chance of getting Browse gas onshore to the North West Shelf. It is a negotiated agreement with one of Western Australia's premier companies; it is probably one of the top two companies based locally in Western Australia. The National Party and the Liberal Party want to unilaterally amend that agreement in this house via this motion. That is the position that the Liberal Party is now adopting.

Mr D.T. Redman interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Warren–Blackwood, you were heard in silence.

Mr M. McGOWAN: When the former government had numerous state agreements before this house during its eight and a half years in office, it did not do what it is now saying should be done. The National Party—the great enemy of the mining and oil and gas industries in Western Australia—did not move a single amendment. It did not say boo when it was in government. It is disturbing that the Liberal Party is now joining with the National Party. The tail is wagging the dog in conservative politics in Western Australia. We saw the tail wag the dog in the last government. What happened? Debt levels rose to \$40 billion. We witnessed the worst budgetary processes of anywhere in Australia. Treasury was very relieved when proper budgetary processes were introduced in Western Australia. We now have a government that is sensible with public money. There were two budget processes. Former ministers in the last government told me how disastrous it was. There was a National Party budget process and a Liberal Party budget process. The tail wagged the dog. Now the tail is wagging the dog again. As the Leader of the Opposition said, the National Party and the Liberal Party are partners in opposition and I assume that they will be partners in government again, which is interesting because the National Party made a commitment to spend \$1.7 billion the other day. These commitments will all have to be added up over the next 18 months. I do not want Western Australia to go back to the disastrous management of the state that occurred before. That is the reality when the Liberals and Nationals join forces in this alliance arrangement; all their promises—whatever thought bubbles come out—go onto the public balance sheet. That is what will happen if they are elected under the arrangements that existed last time, which appears to be what will occur again.

Although this government has the state back on track, with unemployment levels going down, employment going up and our public finances under control, the opposition will just blow it all again if it is re-elected. That is the reality of the arrangement. The Leader of the Opposition made a commitment of \$700 million the other day, and we saw a \$1.7 billion commitment by the National Party. They are all adding up already. There is still 18 months to go. That is \$2.4 billion right there. There are a range of others.

As I outlined to the house the other day, the bill will ensure that we have our best chance of getting Browse gas onshore. Members may have heard my comments on Thursday. It is about ensuring that we join with the federal government to get the partners to align so that the gas comes onshore. It is complex to understand but essentially the situation is that the North West Shelf joint venture partners are different from the Browse partners because they misaligned after the James Price Point fiasco. Two of the partners jumped out after James Price Point. Now there is a misalignment, so different interests are in play. We are trying to ensure that we pass the legislation. We join in pressuring all the partners to bring the gas onshore in Karratha, where it should be brought. All this criticism that the opposition engages in sends messages to international investors —

Mr D.T. Redman interjected.

Mr M. McGOWAN: The member's commentary is constantly anti-investment in the state.

Mr D.T. Redman interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Warren–Blackwood, you were heard in silence. Have the same respect for the Premier when he is talking.

Mr M. McGOWAN: When state agreement acts have been negotiated and legislation has come before the house over recent years, we have seen these community development plans or local participation plans. They happened under the last government and they are happening under ours. Their purpose is to formalise reporting to government of the sorts of local participation and community development that is made available by the proponents of these projects. When it comes to Woodside, there was no requirement for these plans under the existing act, so it is being inserted. It is not the case that Woodside has provided no community development or local participation—quite the contrary. A range of projects, particularly in Karratha, have been constructed by Woodside. It has spent hundreds of millions of dollars on community participation projects during the time it has been involved in Karratha. Whether it is the Karratha Leisureplex, early childhood centres, youth facilities, medical facilities or the like, Woodside has provided enormous community development contributions in Karratha.

When it comes to local participation, we worked with Woodside to set up the local jobs portal because we were concerned about people graduating from high school in Karratha and missing out on opportunities to work at Woodside. The local jobs portal is about making sure that jobs are advertised locally. The member for Pilbara and I launched that in conjunction with Woodside recently. Many jobs are advertised on that portal. Indeed, other companies have joined it. I know that it does not get much attention, but local participation and making sure that companies provide local job opportunities is a model for the world. Whether it is in the areas of health, apprenticeships, community facilities or the like, Woodside has provided a great deal of that sort of thing, which is essentially local participation and community development in Karratha. That would not have occurred without the existence of these plans under the act. We are putting these plans into the act. We have negotiated in exactly the same way as was done with other companies. We find that with other companies such as Rio, BHP and the like, similar requirements were put into state agreements under the last government, and similar arrangements exist. These companies report back and then all sorts of information is released in annual reports, local press releases, annual local content reports and the like. Lots of information is released.

I am not prepared to change a state agreement with Woodside in the manner that has been proposed by the Liberal and National Parties. Negotiations occurred and an agreement was reached. Government officers will have a conversation with Woodside about whether it would be interested in releasing those reports, because that would be contrary to the agreement. However, if it were agreeable to that, that would occur. I am not prepared to unilaterally change the state agreement in the house because of the attitude of the Liberals and Nationals on these matters.

I repeat: the position that the government is adopting is the same as that adopted by the previous government. When this issue was raised 10 years ago, the Liberal Party rejected it. In its subsequent seven years of office, it never required the release of these reports. It was only when it came to opposition that it started to say these things. The big issue, which all members opposite seem to have missed and do not seem to understand, is about getting the gas onshore. It is about ensuring that we get the Browse participants, who are not North West Shelf joint venture participants, to agree to bring the gas onshore. I outlined the publicly released figures relating to the Browse development the other day. The development will cost around \$30 billion and will create thousands of jobs. That is the development that we are trying to progress. That is the one that we are focused on. The jobs portal, the royalties contained in the Torosa field and the domestic gas supply will be great for Western Australia for the next 50 to 100 years. It will be great for us. It is low-emission energy, certainly compared with other energy sources. That is what we are trying to secure. In the meantime, the Liberals and Nationals come out with all this negative noise. It should be joining with us, as we joined with the federal government, to try to resolve this issue. It should not be making all this negative noise and having this cacophony around the place, showing all sorts of hostility.

The member for Pilbara, the Minister for Mines and Petroleum and I are working to try to get this project up because it will create jobs for the member for Pilbara—it will create jobs for all of us—it will create royalty income for the state, which this government will invest wisely, and it will ensure there is an ongoing domestic gas supply, which is essential to put down the pipeline. That is the main game. That is the big issue here and the one we are most focused on, but we will not agree to this quite irresponsible motion of the Nationals WA and the Liberal Party.

MR W.J. JOHNSTON (Cannington — Minister for Mines and Petroleum) [3.49 pm]: I am shocked that the Liberal Party is supporting this motion. I thought this would be one of those occasions on which the Nationals WA would be voting by themselves. It is inconceivable that the once great Liberal Party will vote against a state agreement. It is bizarre that the Liberal Party has abandoned its history by supporting this. I want members of the Liberal Party to think about what they are doing. Words are important, Liberal Party. Liberal Party members cannot come in here and say that a negotiated agreement is not important. If it is their position, members can say that this agreement is inadequate. There is nothing wrong with putting their position on the record if that is what they want to say, but for members of the Liberal Party to vote to undermine the very foundation of state agreements is outrageous.

I agreed with the member for Warren–Blackwood when he pointed out that the other day I made the point that it is not that Parliament does not have the power to amend a state agreement; it is that it chooses not to use that power. If we look at each of the occasions on which we have dealt with state agreements going back to the 1960s and all the debates that occurred, we will see that the Liberal Party always supported those agreements. Today, that has

ended. We are all used to the National Party going off on these irrelevant frolics. When they were in government, its members did not do any of the things they claimed. I remind the member for Warren–Blackwood about Kurra village. He spoke out against it many times and said they could not have it, but he supported it when it mattered and signed the lease for it. We are all used to the loose lips of the National Party. It attacked the mining industry in the state when it wanted to impose billions of dollars of taxation on the iron ore industry. We remember those things, but we always thought that the Liberal Party would stand in favour of state development.

If they want to, members opposite can say that they would not have made this agreement. That is fair enough. If they do not agree with securing the long-term supply of gas for this state for the next 50 years, they should say that in public; they should say that they are opposed to this breakthrough agreement that completely changes the nature of the gas supply industry in this state. Members should understand what we are doing through this agreement. We are creating a midstream gas processing facility that is not directly owned by the owners of the lease of the production licence. This is a breakthrough moment in Western Australia's energy development process. This will secure long-term domestic gas for Western Australian industry. Unlike the east coast, which has completely failed to properly manage its gas supply or energy system, we will have plenty of gas for domestic industry. In fact, gas will be available for new industry that locates in Western Australia. This is a breakthrough moment. Do members know what else it does? It secures the long-term future of the community of Karratha because it will allow for the continued operation of the North West Shelf gas plant. If that were shuttered, it would be a disaster for people in Karratha. Remember, most of the people who work at the North West Shelf gas plant live in Karratha. Most of the people who work there are not fly in, fly out workers. That is what people do not get. These workers live in houses in Karratha and have their kids in school in Karratha. The National Party's view is that we should shut down the whole system and not care about it; that is why it is a tragedy. We have had this debate about three or four times during this term of government. The Nationals just do not get how important this is. The bizarre thing that is happening today is that the Liberal Party is joining the National Party in undermining state agreements in Western Australia.

The Liberal Party says that these reports should be made public. Let us not forget that these reports would never have even existed until now. The joint venture partners will finally be reporting to government on their activities so that, for the first time ever, the government can hold them to account. Members opposite say they want to see those reports. They had plenty of opportunity—eight and a half years in government—to negotiate a new outcome. Members opposite should not forget that this agreement was amended during their term in government. They amended this very agreement, and I do not remember them voting against it or moving an amendment to even ask for these reports, much less for the reports to be public. We have written off the National Party because it does not care about state development or jobs in regional Western Australia. We understand that and have always understood that, but the Liberal Party has abandoned its history today. That is a disgrace. I particularly address the member for Nedlands. The idea that he will vote in favour of a unilateral amendment to a state agreement is the end of his capacity to speak —

Mr W.R. Marmion: There's no amendment.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: It calls on the McGowan government to have community development plans and local participation plans in the North West Gas Development (Woodside) Agreement Amendment Bill 2019 to be laid before each house of Parliament. The member for Nedlands is asking for a unilateral change to the terms of the agreement. That is a bizarre decision for a person who pretends to be interested in state development and regulatory certainty. Remember, Western Australia has been the single largest destination in the world for foreign investment over the last 20 years because of our regulatory stability. I think 30 per cent of all Chevron's investment and 20 per cent of Shell's investment is here in Western Australia. That is because we provide regulatory certainty. A deal is a deal. When the government of Western Australia enters into an agreement, industry knows that it will stand by that agreement. It is not to say that we agree with everything industry does, because that is clearly not the case. The point is that industry gets regulatory certainty.

Members should remember that the great advantage of this is that we will get access to the domestic gas that is potentially coming onshore. Let us not forget that the plan of members opposite nearly drove this gas—the Browse gas—to floating LNG. That was proposed because of the mess they made of this project. This has been no easy task. Senator Hon Matt Canavan and I talk regularly about this project because it is not easy to get it done. This is a complicated project involving a lot of different joint venture partners, each of whom has its own financial and business interests. It is a credit to the Premier that he has been able to get this agreement to a stage at which we have been able to ratify it. It is a credit to the Premier that he has been able to get to the cusp of the investment decisions for these two giant projects—Scarborough and Browse. When these two gas projects are complete and gas is flowing through Pluto and the North West Shelf, that will secure Western Australia's energy supply system for the next 30 or 40 years and set us up for the transition from natural gas to other energy sources. This is something that we should be celebrating. Members should not be getting in the way and trying to score cheap political points. As I say, we expect it of the National Party. The tragedy today is that the Liberal Party has abandoned its history and any interest in state development. Its members prefer to be friends with the National Party than friends of jobs in Western Australia.

Division

Question put and a division taken with the following result —

Ayes (17)

Mr I.C. Blayney
Mr V.A. Catania
Ms M.J. Davies
Mrs L.M. Harvey
Dr D.J. Honey

Mr P.A. Katsambanis
Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup
Mr A. Krsticevic
Mr S.K. L'Estrange
Mr W.R. Marmion

Mr J.E. McGrath
Ms L. Mettam
Dr M.D. Nahan
Mr D.C. Nalder
Mr D.T. Redman

Mr P.J. Rundle
Mrs A.K. Hayden (*Teller*)

Noes (35)

Ms L.L. Baker
Dr A.D. Buti
Mr J.N. Carey
Mrs R.M.J. Clarke
Mr R.H. Cook
Ms J. Farrer
Mr M.J. Folkard
Ms J.M. Freeman
Ms E.L. Hamilton

Mr T.J. Healy
Mr M. Hughes
Mr W.J. Johnston
Mr D.J. Kelly
Mr F.M. Logan
Mr M. McGowan
Ms S.F. McGurk
Mr K.J.J. Michel
Mr S.A. Millman

Mr Y. Mubarakai
Mrs L.M. O'Malley
Mr S.J. Price
Mr D.T. Punch
Mr J.R. Quigley
Ms M.M. Quirk
Mrs M.H. Roberts
Ms C.M. Rowe
Ms R. Saffioti

Ms J.J. Shaw
Mrs J.M.C. Stojkovski
Mr C.J. Tallentire
Mr D.A. Templeman
Mr P.C. Tinley
Mr R.R. Whitby
Ms S.E. Winton
Mr D.R. Michael (*Teller*)

Pairs

Mr R.S. Love
Mr K.M. O'Donnell

Mr B.S. Wyatt
Mr M.P. Murray

Question thus negated.

NORTH WEST GAS DEVELOPMENT (WOODSIDE) AGREEMENT AMENDMENT BILL 2019*Third Reading*

MR M. McGOWAN (Rockingham — Minister for State Development, Jobs and Trade) [4.03 pm]: I move —

That the bill be now read a third time.

MRS L.M. HARVEY (Scarborough — Leader of the Opposition) [4.03 pm]: I rise to make a contribution in the third reading debate of the North West Gas Development (Woodside) Agreement Amendment Bill 2019. I would like to address a couple of issues that arose during the consideration in detail stage. We were somewhat surprised that, evidently, there appears to be quite some confusion from the Premier about the Environmental Protection Authority assessment of the Browse project and indeed where the government policy is with its zero emissions policy by 2050. The Premier responded with what seemed to be a bit of confusion about whether there was going to be an opportunity to assess the extension of the North West Shelf project and have the EPA revise its assessment for the CO₂ requirement after the existing term finishes in 2046, or whether that assessment would be in 2071. It was apparent that the Premier did not know how the greenhouse gas policy or the Environmental Protection Act were being applied to the project, which, I thought, was concerning given the EPA released, with some controversy, its zero emissions policy on projects that emit over 100 000 tonnes of CO₂. I thought that was a bit curious given the Premier has obviously been involved—one would hope he has been involved—in the negotiations with the partners to the project and the signatories to the contract. However, when questioning the Premier during consideration in detail, it became apparent to the opposition that he was somewhat deficient in his knowledge of the legislation that he brought to Parliament and how other government policies and agencies were going to interact once this state agreement was in place with the gazettal of the bill.

We have just had some not inconsiderable debate about the community development plans and the local participation plans, and a matter of public interest was brought to this place by the Nationals WA about the Premier's position on these sorts of matters when he was in opposition. The Premier and the Minister for Mines and Petroleum, the member for Cannington, were at great pains to target that the Liberal Party was somehow deviating from its long-held position of being supportive of state agreements, and I want to clarify what our position was with the Nationals about that MPI. We were holding the Premier to account for comments that he made from opposition. When a member stands as the Leader of the Opposition and make comments and says, "If I were Premier, I would do X, Y, Z", when that member gets in to the position of Premier, the expectation is that they indeed do that.

Mr M. McGowan: I wasn't Leader of the Opposition.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: What the Premier said from opposition was that he thought that these community development plans should be a public document and be tabled so that these companies could be held to account for achieving the key performance indicators of the community development plan. Indeed, the Premier's posturing in this place about the amendments to this legislation has been about creating more opportunities for Western Australian

businesses and holding the partners in the North West Shelf venture to account for their community development plans and local participation plans. He says that by doing that, by putting the parameters of those plans into the legislation, he is holding the companies to account. That is simply not the truth. By putting that into the legislation without any accountability to the Parliament around performance or even letting people know the contents of those community development plans and local participation plans is not holding the companies to account. All we are doing from opposition is holding the Premier to account for what he is telling the community of Western Australia.

In these media releases and through all his posturing, the Premier is out there telling the community that he is a tough Premier, he is holding these oil and gas companies to account and he is making them be more accountable for community and local participation. The Premier is not holding them accountable by putting that provision in legislation because there are no KPIs. There are requirements for the contents of the community development plans and the local participation plans, but if the companies are not required to actually make public the document that says, “This is what we are going to do as part of our requirement under the state agreement and part of our social licence to operate under the state agreement, because we are pulling resources out of the ground that belong to the taxpayers and citizens of Western Australia. We will not only pay a royalty for that, because that is fair, but also promise to deliver for our communities. We promise to deliver more jobs and more contracts to Western Australian companies.”

If the government does not make the contents of the local participation plans and community development plans public, who will hold the joint venture partners to account? We will have to take the Premier’s word that he is holding them to account through the department of state development. The reason the requirement for community development and local participation plans is in the legislation is that the Premier says companies have not been accountable. Just saying that the plans are supposed to be in the legislation, without publishing them, does not make the companies accountable. The question remains: will these documents, the community development and local participation plans, which presumably will be lodged with the department of state development and required from these companies in exchange for extracting our resources—resources that belong to all Western Australians—be FOI-able from the department of state development? As part of the contract with Western Australian taxpayers, in exchange for the extraction of resources, companies need to develop communities, engage with Western Australian companies and create Western Australian jobs. But will the plans be FOI-able?

A great campaign is running, involving all the major news outlets, on the public’s right to know. What about the Western Australian public’s right to know what these resource companies are required to do in exchange for taking our resources out of the ground and making billions of dollars of profit in exchange for that? What about our communities’ right to know? Will these community development and local participation plans be subject to freedom of information requests? Will a journalist from *The West Australian*, for example, be able to make an FOI request to the department of state development and get their hands on these plans in order to rate our resource companies on what they said they were going to do against what they achieve? I would say to this house that the answer is probably no. Looking at this government’s performance on transparency, we have seen every FOI request extended over a six-month period, with requests to narrow the scope because the agencies are under-resourced. When push comes to shove and we finally say that we are going to the Information Commissioner because we want to get that information from this government, what do we get? We are told the document is commercial-in-confidence and cannot be released. The National Party brought a matter of public interest motion to this place to tell to the Premier that in forging this contract with the North West Shelf joint venture partners and bringing the state agreement to this place, the Premier had the opportunity—I am speaking to an empty chair; I assume the Premier has bluetooth access to what I am saying! However, in the Premier’s absence, I guess I will speak to the five Labor Party members in the chamber.

Mr D.R. Michael: Member, he will be back in two minutes. He just needed to go for a quick walk.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I thank the government Whip for that advice. However, it is customary in this place that when the minister responsible for legislation leaves the chamber, another minister sits in the chair to inform the absent minister of what has occurred in their absence. This is a third reading debate.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr T.J. Healy): Member, I know the government Whip has indicated that the Premier will be back in two minutes; it is also customary not to draw attention to a member’s absence. I also note the member’s concerns. If you can continue with your contribution to the third reading debate.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I thank the Acting Speaker. I have been in this place for quite some time and I can tell the Acting Speaker that when the minister responsible for legislation is absent from the Assembly chamber, it is customary practice for another minister to take their place.

The ACTING SPEAKER: That is certainly noted.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I have made my point and I will take the Acting Speaker’s counsel and move on.

I return to the public’s right to know. The Western Australian public has a right to know what those resource companies are required to do as part of their community development plans and local participation plans. We are being denied that opportunity because those plans will not be published. There is no accountability around what is in those

participation plans that are required from the joint venture partners in exchange for making billions of dollars out of extracting our resources from the ground. I think it is very disappointing. The National and Liberal Parties in opposition raised this issue as part of the matter of public interest motion the National Party brought to this chamber today. It is an opportunity that has gone begging against the background of this government's rhetoric and spin around creating more opportunities for Western Australian businesses. The government says that it is doing that by bringing this legislation into this place, but it will not tell us what it expects from companies in doing that. The government just says "more jobs". What is the value of that? How many more jobs? How do we determine whether Western Australian companies are actually being given an equal opportunity to apply for the contracts that these companies will need? Nothing in this legislation says that Western Australian engineers need to form 40 per cent of the workforce that will feed into this joint venture project. We do not have a figure, so we cannot hold the companies to account. We have to trust the Premier that there will be some figure in a secret community development plan and a secret local participation plan. What is the point of putting the plans into the legislation if there is no transparency on the targets? What are the key performance indicators? How can we ask whether the Premier is doing his job if we do not know what the company was supposed to achieve under its community development plan in relation to its scorecard? Under the Westminster system, the Premier would be accountable for noncompliance with the state agreement. But the Premier will not tell us what the KPIs are for the community development plans or the local participation plans, so we cannot hold him to account if the companies do not perform. Because the plans are secret, we cannot hold the Premier to account if those companies do not perform. The plans are secret unless the companies choose to release aspects of the plans. No doubt that would be for their own engagement with the community for their social licence to operate, but the expectation of WA taxpayers is that the government will hold them to account. It will put out the KPIs, measure the performance against those KPIs and take corrective action of some sort if they are not achieved. We have lost that opportunity in debating this legislation.

I also find it really interesting that when we bring these matters to this place, the Premier deals with them by pointing to the history of the Liberal Party's eight years in government and saying, "You didn't do it back then." The community voted out the former government in March 2017 and it expects the McGowan Labor government to perform. The community expects the government to perform based on the promises made during the election campaign. The promises were of gold-standard transparency. I am sorry, but the Premier gets an "F" for that, because the government does not reveal documents under FOI requests; it hides behind commercial-in-confidence claims and refuses to make public the KPIs to hold these companies to account under their community participation plans and local participation plans. The government keeps making excuses about why it cannot do that. Apparently in opposition the Premier was less informed, but now as Premier he knows better and that even though he is bringing to this place legislation to amend a state agreement, the government cannot amend a state agreement. I understand the state agreement needs to reflect the contract that was drawn up, but as part of the contract, with these new requirements around community development plans and community participation plans, one would think the companies would know what is expected of them and what they are expected to achieve in our community. The Premier and perhaps some bureaucrats in the department of state development might know, but the community will never know, because the plans are not required to be public and we are not allowed the opportunity to measure them. Now that he is in the hot seat, we get excuse after excuse from this Premier about why he cannot do things that he said he was going to do when he was in opposition. All that we get is excuses and media releases. There are no more excuses; the Premier needs to do what he said he would do during the election campaign; that is, deliver gold-standard transparency in every portfolio he looks after and every area of his government. The Premier is not delivering on that.

It also became apparent during consideration in detail that the government is working on a skilled local jobs bill to ensure local content on major private projects. At the moment, the Western Australian Jobs Act 2017 applies to only government projects, including government trading enterprises. It will be interesting to see what that legislation looks like. Apparently, it will align with the Australian government's participation plans under the Australian Jobs Act 2013. When questioned on how these bills would interact, the response was that whenever there is conflict, whichever is the best will prevail. We will wait with bated breath for this skilled local jobs bill to make the private sector accountable for the delivery of local content. We know that the WA Jobs Act, which is supposedly there to hold government trading enterprises and government agencies to account for going to Western Australian companies first, was a complete debacle, because the very legislation that the Premier brought to this place to say that he was going to deliver on WA jobs, by his own admission, opened up the opportunity for businesses in every other state of Australia, and in New Zealand, to tender for government projects. It was in the definition of the bill. "Local" means the states of Western Australia, South Australia, Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria and Tasmania, the Northern Territory and New Zealand, and every regional city and major capital city within those jurisdictions. Most Western Australians do not think of New South Wales as being local. It will be very interesting to see the legislation that the Premier is going to bring forward to require a skilled local jobs bill to require private companies and enterprises to create more opportunities for Western Australian businesses when the Premier's own jobs act could not make government enterprises or GTEs accountable to participate more with Western Australian businesses. It is quite extraordinary that the rhetoric attached to what the Premier says is not consistent with what he achieves. He is a rampant underachiever in trying to create Western Australian

jobs, and we know that, because the legislation he brought in is really clear that Western Australian government agencies and government trading enterprises have to consider the whole of Australia and the whole of New Zealand as local for the purposes of the legislation. It will be very interesting to see how the Premier thinks he can compel private enterprises to be accountable for Western Australian jobs when they can just turn around, look at the Western Australian government and ask, “Why don’t you walk the walk instead of talking the talk? Your own legislation in which you tried to make your government departments that you have control of deliver more jobs for Western Australia and deliver more contracts to Western Australian businesses doesn’t achieve it, can’t achieve it, and contracts are being awarded left, right and centre to businesses on the east coast.”

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr T.J. Healy): Leader of the Opposition, I know you will be talking about this bill in the third reading debate for this particular piece of legislation. I just draw you back to that.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Yes. When it comes to this place, we will be very interested to see how the skilled local jobs bill that the Premier spoke of during consideration in detail of this bill can in fact compel private enterprises to be accountable for delivering to Western Australian companies when the government cannot do it itself. It cannot do it and it is not doing it. This government is awarding multimillion-dollar contracts to companies that are housed on the east coast of Australia. That is a fact.

The other aspect of this legislation that we interrogated during consideration in detail was the domestic gas provisions. We know that a 15 per cent domestic gas requirement was inserted into the act in 2015, and according to what was revealed during consideration in detail, each future project using the North West Shelf, for example the Browse project, must satisfy the government that it will provide 15 per cent reserved gas before the project proceeds. This will be done through other arrangements with the government. Once again, we do not know what those arrangements are and we did not have any detail of what those arrangements would be. Once more, there is no accountability. We do not know whether this new extended agreement will comply with the domestic gas reservation policy. That policy was there to benefit Western Australians through the provision of a dedicated source of domestic gas supply, and, ultimately, what was hoped to be achieved was cheaper gas and energy prices for all Western Australian consumers. It is very unclear how the 15 per cent domestic gas reservation was going to be applied to this project, and this amending legislation did not go anywhere in any way to try to cover off on that. Based on that, our assumption is that the contract that has been struck between the joint venture partners and the government remains silent about the domestic gas reservation policy, and that is a concern. Energy security is a huge issue in modern economies. There is a lot of pressure for cleaner sources of energy, and obviously natural gas is a cleaner source of energy generation than coal and other sources. The Premier said that a statement of gas availability will be created to provide market information on domestic gas availability and that the state agreement contains a mechanism for independent review of marketing arrangements and domestic gas reservation. It will be interesting to see how that operates, because the domestic gas reservation policy is only as good as the pressure put on the companies to comply with the legislation. Unless a government is very strong willed and determined to achieve the intent of the domestic gas reservation policy, the companies will obviously not comply with it, because they would rather have the gas in their back pocket than deliver it to Western Australian consumers; that is business. I do not criticise the companies and I do not want anyone to hear my discourse today as a criticism in any way of these projects. These projects have been the making of Western Australia. Because of the investment of these major companies in Western Australia we have enjoyed, until recently, a very high standard of living in Western Australia. Lots of jobs have been created; indeed, towns exist in Western Australia that would not exist but for the sake of these projects. They are towns in very beautiful parts of Western Australia and places that I have a very strong local connection to. I am a supporter of these projects, but I am also a supporter of a strong government that holds companies to account when they are making billions of dollars out of our resources. A contract, as I said, is only as good as the guardians of the contract. If the transparency around the contracts is missing and if the contract is silent on the key performance indicators, there is no accountability. That is the matter that we raised earlier today.

We were pleased to see that the local government ratings measures will be changed as a result of this amending legislation. Every member of Parliament who ever goes to a regional local government will hear complaints from local governments about their frustration in trying to provide services to their community when they have businesses with a very big footprint not contributing their fair share. The Premier said that changing the rateability of buildings could achieve upwards of \$100 000 in additional rates per annum going into the local government to provide services to the communities of Karratha, Dampier and Roebourne, which is a good thing. I believe the Premier mentioned that water was previously provided to the project on non-commercial terms, and that has been changed to have water delivered to that project on commercial terms. That sounds like a good thing, too.

In closing, I just want to put on the record that the expectation of the opposition, and certainly my expectation, knowing the Premier’s experience in this place, was that during consideration in detail, obvious and expected questions would be asked around how this amending legislation and the state agreement interacts with the Environmental Protection Authority’s policies on CO₂ emissions. Our expectation was that somebody with the Premier’s longevity in this place—his previous experience as a minister, and he has been in the saddle now for two and a half years—would have expected those questions from the opposition and would have been across his brief

and been able to explain to us how this state agreement would interact with the EPA emissions policy on CO₂. That did not occur. Our expectation was that if we are to establish, by way of legislation and this contract, new arrangements for what the government expects through community development plans and local participation plans, there would be a requirement for the public of Western Australia to understand what is in those plans. Then we can give companies a scorecard and assess their achievement against their KPIs. How many Western Australia-based engineers or Western Australian engineering companies can expect a portion of the work should be out there. What is our target? Is it 20 per cent? Is it 40 per cent? Is it 100 per cent? Is that Western Australian companies or is that any company in Australia or New Zealand? We should at least have it in there as a KPI so that we can have a scorecard and rate these companies to see whether taxpayers are getting value for money and this state agreement is doing what the Premier said it would do. We are very disappointed with that and the culture of secrecy of this government. It has a culture of secrecy hiding behind commercial-in-confidence, not participating in the true spirit of the Freedom of Information Act and not making public documents that the Premier, by his own admission, said should be public contracts.

We are not saying that is our policy; we are saying that the Premier in opposition said it was his policy and now that he is in the hot seat, it is no longer his policy. He has not adequately explained why he has changed his mind on that when bringing in amending legislation to this place that is an opportunity to achieve what he said was the right thing to do. We are very disappointed in that. Every excuse the Premier gives somehow tries to lay blame on the former government with excuse after excuse after excuse. There are no more excuses, Premier. He is the one who can help the community of Western Australia understand that these companies are accountable to what is required under this legislation, and the government has missed that opportunity by choosing not to require those plans to be made public. I fully expect that if a journalist or any of our opposition members make a freedom of information application to the department of state development to find out what is in those state agreement local participation plans and community development plans, the government will hide behind commercial-in-confidence. That is really disappointing, because these assets from which the joint venture partners are going to make billions of dollars, admittedly while providing employment and other things, belong to the community of Western Australia. The community of Western Australia need to know whether they are sticking to the contract or failing the agreement. Due to the secrecy of this government, the public in Western Australia are told they have no right to know and have no opportunity to rate these companies and this government, which is holding these companies to account. I suspect it has been done that way because that is how the Premier likes it—all spin and no accountability.

MR D.T. REDMAN (Warren–Blackwood) [4.33 pm]: I also want to speak to the third reading of the North West Gas Development (Woodside) Agreement Amendment Bill 2019 and support the position that the Nationals WA, and indeed the Liberal Party and others, have taken in the debate on this bill. I state from the outset that we support this bill. Right the way through debate, our position to support the bill has been consistent. We have not chosen to argue or vote against it or the premise of what it is trying to achieve, and that has been a consistent position with the National Party with pretty much all state agreements, whether in government or opposition, for the management of significant mining investments in Western Australia going right back to the early 1960s.

I want to point out a little bit of debate that happened today in the matter of public interest. The National Party moved a motion to ask the Premier to table the community development plans and local participation plans. At no point did the motion make any reference to amending the state agreement. There was no reference to that. We were not asking to amend the state agreement. We were simply asking the Premier to table those agreements—those plans—in this place. That position could have been taken up with the companies and agreed to with them. It does not have to be legislated in the bill for the plans to be tabled here. That motion did not seek the house's support to amend the state agreement, yet the Minister for Mines and Petroleum who, quite frankly, could just about talk under water, wanted to stress the point that we are out there against the bill and trying to knock the bill on the head through amending it. He clearly did not read the motion because that is not what it says.

I would not think the motion was much of a threshold for the Premier of the state, who is leading the people of Western Australia in its partnership with significant mining companies for extracting assets owned by the people of Western Australia, to ask for some transparency in something that the government has chosen to legislate. Members should bear in mind that in a lot of the previous agreements, these were not written in the legislation. There may well have been local participation plans and community developments plans, but they were not written into the legislation. If we are going to choose to write it into legislation, we are choosing to answer questions on accountability to that. That is more than reasonable. The government has chosen to write it into the legislation presumably so that they can wave it around and say “Look what we have done”, when interrogation from the opposition last Wednesday showed it was not worth the paper it was written on. The simple step to close that accountability gap is to have the documents that are agreed to, presumably by government and companies when they are drafted, tabled and made public. There is nothing about thresholds of what they need to do for the community or whether we are asking them to build social infrastructure or deliver a bunch of scholarships to a high school. Nothing is defined in that. That can happen as a party to all those who are involved in developing those plans, including companies that might participate in the construction of a particular project. The government has chosen to put it in the bill, yet the legislation has no teeth to ensure that there is any accountability around that.

We chose to take a position today in the MPI that sought to do what the Premier chose to do in a previous state agreement in this place, and that was to ask for the simple accountability step of tabling the plans so that people can see what has been agreed on. I would not think that was a big step, yet the Premier was going to catch an argument that this is in conflict with the intent of the bill and all the things that were going to happen. I am pretty certain that the state government's response, as it quite rightly should be, will be that it is not going to shut down Woodside on the back of what happens in a community development plan. However, it is important for the community to know that there has been discussions on their interests as part owners in those extraction assets and what the company will do in response to gaining the right to extract those resources. I do not think the motion was unreasonable. It certainly was not in conflict with the intent of the bill. The National Party is supportive of the bill and it will go on to support state agreements in this place, and I am certain the same applies in the other place.

I think the notion of social licence is an important one. The mining companies have recognised that there is a shift. We have seen an increase in the amount of commentary on this. If it does not respond to that and if the government does not respond to it when it has influence, it has its head in the sand. I pointed out in my contribution to the second reading debate that there has been times in the past when there have been adjustments to state agreements to respond to community expectations and the changing nature of society. Now we are working with a fly in, fly out workforce, but in Charlie Court's day it was about building residential communities. It is a very different brief with a different push and different economic drivers. I do not agree with the notion of having a state agreement now reflect what it was drafted to be in the 1960s, 1970s, 1980s; in my view, it should change. We need to interrogate that, and the place to do so is Parliament. If we do not have transparency of some of those activities, it is difficult to do that. It is reasonable that there should be points in time when these change and are made contemporary. This is a point in time. We sought to have influence on an aspect of that. The government has chosen to knock it on the head, which, in my view, is a position of the utmost hypocrisy given the arguments it ran in 2010 and, in my view, should be running now.

Although a number of issues were raised, I want to speak on the issue of domgas.

The bill was silent on that, and the discussion was largely silent on that, other than the normal rhetoric the Premier came up with on what were the responsibilities, and the fact that it was introduced in the Carpenter leadership years. But the interesting statistics that I read out in my second reading contribution came from a question on notice that Hon Martin Aldridge put in the upper house. It is probably on the public record on the Department of Jobs, Tourism, Science and Innovation website, as I understand it. It is question on notice 2428 in the Legislative Council. Although it refers to four different projects—the North West Shelf, Gorgon, Pluto and Wheatstone—I want to reference again what I said about the North West Shelf project. One part of the question asks about the expected commitment of domestic gas in the North West Shelf project. The answer to that was that the expected commitment from the North West Shelf project as of now is 660 petajoules—that is the commitment to the domestic market, or domgas.

Hon Martin Aldridge's question 1(c) reads —

- (c) what is the difference between each LNG producer's expected domestic gas contribution (by volume of gas) compared to the actual volume of domestic gas bought onshore and into the market to date?

In other words, how much has come onshore for domgas? The difference is 636 petajoules, which means that 24 out of the full commitment of 660 petajoules has come onshore, so 3.6 per cent of the domestic gas commitment from the North West Shelf project has come on in supplying the domestic gas project. I have a couple of questions about that. Coming up, we know that the delivery of gas out of this project is coming down; that is one of the reasons there is an impetus for bringing on the other third party producers to keep the trains going. As the member for Riverton asked last week: What happens to the gas? What happens to the commitment? What is the landing point of that? What is the discussion between government and the North West Shelf joint venture partners in respect of this obligation that it has? It is an obligation that exists there now. What will happen to that gas and what should happen to that gas? I think at some point that question will come back and bite the government, the next government—whatever. I think it is a difficult problem. I am not sure I necessarily know the answers, but I know that we need a level of public accountability for what is happening. I find those figures quite staggering. There is a requirement in the agreements of domestic gas to market that in good faith. There are clearly some challenges with bringing on cheap energy in the Western Australian market, with longer-term type contracts. Those issues are being raised with various people in the business community, and, indeed, at a time when we are trying to drive down the pressures of costs of business, one of those costs of business is energy. In a state that has a lot of gas, it would be fantastic to be able to deliver good, cheap energy into our business community to support investment in any value-adding project, even down in metropolitan Perth. We have not had a response from the Premier on that.

It is a good time to engage in a discussion on responsibilities when there is a state agreement going in place—an agreement between the state and these parties on their next ventures, giving the security of the state agreement to that investment. However, on the other side, the state side of that agreement is its obligations in respect of domgas, community development plans and local participation plans. We believe accountability is coming up a little short on this. Whilst it is certainly not a show stopper for our position on the state agreement, it is important to raise this in this place. In the third reading, I would like to hear the Premier's response to the domgas commitments from

the North West Shelf project, what its obligations are, and, indeed, what is going to happen with that. When the gas runs down, what happens to the obligation? Does it just disappear or does it get picked up by other partners? I know that there are gas pipeline investments between Pluto and the gas trains in the North West Shelf project, which has some business interactions with gas flow, but it has not been entirely clear in the debate on this. I think the Premier should put on the public record how this government will manage that.

In closing, there are only certain times when government representing the people has a chance to negotiate various positions in support of the people of Western Australia's position in these arrangements, and these agreements are those times. It is appropriate that the government is interrogated on the interaction it has with the companies and the positions it settles out, rightly giving the security of investment through a state agreement, but also ensuring that obligations are met—not only obligations that are articulated here, but also obligations that are ever present in the current agreements that are in place. The example I used here was domgas.

The Nationals WA will support this bill. There are still lots of questions here, and I think the government has a bit of work to do to get back into the credibility space with the community. It needs to interact with the community to meet what are increasing social licence pressures on these companies for extracting resources that are owned by the people of Western Australia.

DR M.D. NAHAN (Riverton) [4.44 pm]: I would like to comment on the North West Gas Development (Woodside) Agreement Amendment Bill 2019. As the Leader of the Opposition indicated, the Liberal Party will support the bill for a whole range of good reasons. This bill is very important in that it provides future life to the North West Shelf project, which is the foundation project for the LNG sector in Australia, let alone in Western Australia. As the gas runs out in that project, it allows it to bring in gas from other fields, identified to be Scarborough and Browse—the others are yet to be decided—and it allows it to toll between Pluto and others. It provides life to one of the major firms and joint ventures in Western Australia. It is a very important project because we want to keep them alive, and so we support this.

I want to make a few comments about some of the issues that arose. First, the Premier made a bit of a historical revisionism of the James Price Point project. He argued that this is largely an exercise in trying to fix up the mess there. Let me correct the history of that. The Carpenter government in particular identified that the Inpex project was on the go, as was perhaps Browse, and it was important for the government of the day to identify a site so that those projects could come onshore. It spent \$20 million—plus paying people sit-down money for a couple of years trying to find a spot and found nothing. The Japanese who ran Inpex said, “Bugger this, we’re off to Darwin.” As a result, a \$34 billion project was invested into Darwin rather than Western Australia. That would have created a lot of jobs in Western Australia, which instead went to Darwin.

Of course, the Browse project was a very large project with a long history. Colin Barnett showed real leadership through the sit-down process and identified James Price Point. If that had been successful, it would have led to a new LNG site, \$80 billion worth of investment, and tens of thousands of jobs being created in Western Australia during a period when there was a sharp downturn. The Premier's historical revisionism is a bit distorted from his own narrow perspective. Let us face it, if it had been brought onshore, the James Price Point and Browse projects would have created more investment, more jobs and more exports than those now using the existing facilities of Woodside. I would put it that the James Price Point project was killed not so much by the process and definitely not by the actions of then Premier Colin Barnett, but rising costs in that area. I think that is the evidence.

I want to reiterate the points made by the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Warren–Blackwood. This bill interjects for the first time into the North West Shelf project local participation plans and community development plans—fair enough. Woodside is an excellent employer and an excellent contributor to the Western Australian and Karratha community, and has been for 40 years. It has done a great job, and I simply cannot see why it would not first object to these plans being inserted in the agreement act, but actually not allow them to be made public. It does it all the time. If we look at its website or material, we see that it tells us what it is doing. It is a very open and transparent company. I put it to you that the reason those are not going to be disclosed to the public is to protect the Premier in case he does not meet his own personal commitments. The lack of transparency is not to protect Woodside and the confidentiality of its actions but to protect the Premier and his government from scrutiny about his overblown commitments. That is the only way we can really interpret this.

The biggest concern to me is the greenhouse gas issue. We know that both these projects have a very high level of CO₂ emissions. According to the general press and the expert press, the biggest threat, besides the agreements between the companies, which I will say something about in a moment, is what will be done about CO₂ emissions. What are the policies of the state and commonwealth governments on CO₂ emissions? That will be the determining factor, particularly for Browse. The government and the Environmental Protection Authority have been all over the place on CO₂ emissions. Prior to the last federal election, the Labor Party was committed to having major reductions in CO₂ emissions. It was going to adopt the Shorten policy. I am not sure what the policy is now. During the campaign, the EPA came out with a policy of having basically zero emissions or 100 per cent offsets for large projects such as this—that is, zero net emissions, unless there are 100 per cent offsets. The Premier quashed that within a matter of days. I do not know what he said to the EPA, but the EPA ran back down its hole and said that it would look at this thing

again. Now the government's policy is that by 2050, the resources sector will have zero net emissions. That is exactly the same policy that the EPA put forward, which the Premier quashed. We have asked the Premier how that policy will apply to the North West Shelf and he has said that he will leave it up to the independent EPA. We saw from his actions on the EPA's recent proposal on CO₂ emissions on large projects that it is not independent, because when it came up with the policy, which it claimed it had developed by having dialogue with the industry, the Premier said, "No, you won't. Run away and redo it." We have a real issue. Policies on CO₂ emissions are completely uncertain.

This is an agreement act. Historically and recently, agreement act negotiations have involved governments and proponents sitting down and talking about the big issues that have to be resolved. One of them clearly is CO₂ emissions. The only reference to CO₂ emissions is that in the future, the North West Shelf will be assessed by the EPA and the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation. By the way, the North West Shelf has been largely exempt from federal and state government CO₂ and greenhouse gas policies up until this time. Now it will be exposed to them. We have asked the Premier what the policy will be going forward. He has said, "Don't ask me. Ask the EPA; it's independent." But we know that under the Premier, it is not. We saw it. He bragged. He stopped it. The big issue—he said that it is a joint venture—is CO₂ emissions. What is he going to do about it? It is not good enough to have an agreement and leave out a big issue. Has he done a deal with Woodside and the North West Shelf's joint venturers about CO₂ emissions or not? What is the policy on it? They are not going to develop these projects without a position from the state and commonwealth governments. They are not going to develop these projects without a statement from the EPA. What are they? The Premier is stating that the policy is that by 2050, which is within the expanded life of the project, there will be zero net emissions, but he cannot have that if he allows these projects to emit the amount of CO₂ that they are expected to emit. He might give them an exemption, but if he does that and he meets his policy requirements, other projects will have to pick up the load and compensate for them. If these projects go ahead, they will make a huge contribution to the total volume of CO₂ and other greenhouse gas emissions in Western Australia. What is the Premier's policy? That is one of the biggest issues. He has said that he wants these projects to go ahead by 2020, but he is not addressing one of the major issues, unless he has already done a deal that he is keeping secret, which is what I suspect has been done.

The Premier got stuck into BHP and Chevron. It was basically a veiled threat that they have to get onboard with Woodside and agree to the projects. I do not think there is any dispute about bringing Scarborough gas onto Pluto and then perhaps the North West Shelf project, but I have read in the press the debate about BHP and Chevron and Browse. My view is that the Premier crossed the line by getting involved in the legitimate discussions between the joint venture partners. He should leave that to them. They have a commercial interest to get the deal done. Hopefully, this will be a multi-decade project. It has to be done correctly. The state Premier should not heavy one party over the other, but that is what he did. Woodside is doing the same thing in the media, and that is fair enough. It is a party to the debate and it will use legitimate means to try to persuade those in the negotiations that its views should prevail and it might indeed be correct. The Premier has made a veiled threat to BHP and Chevron, both of which have made huge investments in this state and hopefully will continue to do so into the future. They have a legitimate reason to negotiate. I know why he did it. The press has said that a lot of LNG will come onstream in 2020–21, some of which will not get across the line, and that Woodside's concern is that if it does not get an agreement and develop the projects by that time, it will be potentially left behind. That is for Woodside to argue, and it is probably a legitimate argument. The Premier should not take a partisan position in the negotiations between legitimate joint venture partners, particularly ones of their standing, but he did in this case.

Another issue that has arisen, and again has been excluded, is the reservation policy. The member for Warren–Blackwood made the really important point that we have a reservation policy of 15 per cent. The North West Shelf was exempt because its domgas contract preceded the reservation policy. That is fair enough. I never knew the amount of domgas sales from the North West Shelf as a percentage of its total production. I doubt that it was 15 per cent, but that is a historical issue and we are not going to revise that. Under the reservation policy, 3.6 per cent of the total production of gas is going to the domestic market; in other words, the 15 per cent reservation policy is not binding. It is not doing what it was aimed to do. The aim was to get 15 per cent of the total production, excluding gas from the North West Shelf, onto the domestic market, but around 3.6 per cent is being achieved. This project will be a lifeblood for the future of the North West Shelf, Scarborough and Browse projects and will allow the North West Shelf venture partners to tie up the basin into the future. I would have expected that a government that brags about the reservation policy and has been confronted with the data that it is not producing anywhere near the volume of gas that it was intended and has been committed to produce would have embedded the reservation policy in this agreement. I think it will be embedded in the Browse and Scarborough agreements in the future; that is what the Premier said. The reality is that the North West Shelf will be the tolling agent for those joint ventures—Browse and Scarborough. It will be required to build the domgas facilities for them. Given the anomaly here and given the importance of gas going forward, I would have expected a commitment to a 15 per cent reservation to be reiterated and embedded for the first time in the North West Shelf contract, which I know Woodside would not want. I understand that, but it is something that the state should demand. I am sure it would have got bipartisan support.

Again, the North West Shelf project is simply being renewed for 25-plus years. We support that. It is basically starting from scratch using existing resources and hopefully opening it up to new fields. It is a lifeblood for

Woodside. The Premier identified a range of new things that went into the agreement act, some of which were local participation plans and community development plans, which he put in there for the first time, but he refuses to allow those to be tabled in the community or even in Parliament. That is strange. More important are the issues of CO₂, which will be a deal maker in the end. That will be the big issue. They were left out. The reservation policy, which is, in the long term, the area in which Western Australia benefits from these offshore projects, was also left out. That was not well done. We expect more of the Premier.

Again, I was intimately involved in the 2010–11 debate about what we wanted out of these gas projects. I can remember opposition members talking about being much more prescriptive in what Western Australia gets, not just a source of gas and the reservation policy, but local content. ExxonMobil was a participant in the Hibernia project, and Canada was the model. At that time, the opposition was very clear that if it had control over the government benches, it would enforce greater targeting and specificity of the local content. This is the first time that the government has had a chance to do it and it has squibbed it. It was easy with the talk in opposition, and easy with the whinging and whining, but when it got into government, what did it do? I suspect that Woodside would have agreed to a lot of these things. The Scarborough gas field went to offshore firms. From what we read in the press, when the Browse projects go to Leed Engineering, they will also go to a large multinational firm. Traditionally, those firms prefer to bring in global contractors. That is what happens in Queensland and Western Australia. It is incumbent upon the government to lean on those multinational firms when it lets contracts to make sure that they facilitate local contractors getting that work. There is no reference to that in this agreement. I am puzzled why, given what the government has said and given the needs of that sector in Western Australia.

I might add that, to a large extent, the Premier has essentially banked his election platform for 2021 on creating jobs in the resource sector. He has not, in this bill at least, in a transparent manner, put in place policies that would give us any assurance that if those projects went ahead, they would create many local jobs. They would create a lot of activity.

In his response to the matter of public interest, the Premier said that he agreed with what the former Premier, Colin Barnett, said about the Roy Hill project. There is a real difference between iron ore projects and LNG projects; that is, iron ore projects are largely civil construction, and 70 per cent or 80 per cent and sometimes 90 per cent of the activity is local content. Most of it will be local anyway, as were Roy Hill and the expansions of BHP and Rio. In recent times, LNG has increasingly had less local content. That is why we have to do more on these projects, not less. The Premier has chosen to take the line of least resistance. I think we know why. I do not think, from discussions during consideration in detail, that the Premier has addressed the brief. When quizzed, in an informative manner, not an aggressive manner, he did not know about major aspects and dimensions of the bill. He is just going through the motions. It was a disappointing presentation. As the Leader of the Opposition indicated, the Liberal Party supports the bill, but the real guts has been left out of this one. It is pretty sloppy.

MR W.R. MARMION (Nedlands — Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [5.03 pm]: I rise to make a few comments on the third reading of this very important bill for the economy of Karratha, Western Australia and, indeed, Australia. In that respect, the North West Gas Development (Woodside) Agreement Amendment Bill 2019 is one of the more significant bills that we have dealt with this year—perhaps in the past two years—because it has a direct economic benefit to Western Australia and, indeed, Australia. We obviously support the bill. We have made that very clear. There are aspects that I will reiterate, and I will probably reinforce some of the comments already made by the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Warren–Blackwood and the member for Riverton.

The town of Karratha was basically formed because of the North West Shelf gas project. As I might have mentioned during the second reading debate, I visited the new town of Karratha in 1985 as part of a tour. Interestingly, it was arranged and supported by the CEO of the Chamber of Minerals and Energy, Mr Peter Ellery—Hon Sue Ellery's father. He basically organised this tour. It was a fairly important tour to the north west for all the Commissioners of Main Roads. It was a cleverly arranged tour. It was Western Australia's turn to host all the Commissioners of Main Roads in Western Australia. The then WA Commissioner of Main Roads, Don Aitken, got sick of telling everyone in the eastern states, whenever he visited, how hard it was to build all these roads in the outback of Western Australia and that we needed more money. He chose to have the meetings of the Australian Road Research Board and the National Association of State Road Authorities in Port Hedland and the new town of Karratha. Those meetings always involved a two-day visit of the local city. On this particular visit, the plane arrived in Newman, which is where the tour started. A bus trip was organised from Newman to Port Hedland. I have to thank Mr Peter Ellery for being a strong contributor in putting together the program for the Commissioners of Main Roads.

When we got to Karratha, the state government officer running the development of Karratha—it may have been called the north west regional development authority—was Robyn Crane. Robyn took us around Karratha. There were about four blocks in the town at that stage. We stayed on the outskirts of the town of Karratha at the Karratha International Hotel. It was obvious why the town had to be built there. Rio Tinto's iron ore operations were at Dampier, and there was no room to expand the town of Dampier, so they had to go across the causeway. The next bit of high level land was at Karratha. If it were not for Woodside's project, the town of Karratha may not even exist.

This bill is essential for basically supporting existing infrastructure. Billions of dollars have been spent creating the North West Shelf gas project. Since 1985, the infrastructure that was put into Karratha during Liberal–National

terms of government, including the swimming pool, the high school and the medical facilities of Karratha, is second to none in the Western Australian regions. That highlights the significance of this bill. With all that investment and infrastructure, we want the current industries to continue. The most important thing about this bill is that it will drive the economy of Karratha to the year 2071. Issues arise in this bill about the extension of the project. A lot of those issues were mentioned by members of the opposition during the third reading debate. I will go through a couple of them. First, the domestic gas policy has been a huge benefit to Western Australia. It is highlighted by the gas prices that we enjoy in Western Australia compared with those in the eastern states. I do not have the latest data, but I do have some data that highlights the difference between gas prices.

I will start with wholesale gas prices, which I have some data about. In Victoria, it was \$10.67 a gigajoule in 2016, but in Western Australia it was \$5 a gigajoule. This data was compiled by a company that pulled together this information, which is probably fairly commercial, so we cannot be sure who was buying it, but they are comparable figures. In 2017, the wholesale price of gas in Western Australia was half the price of gas in Victoria. I will move to another comparison I have—for large industrial customers. It is probably not fair to compare Tasmania, but in Tasmania the price was \$12.21 a gigajoule in 2017, in Queensland it was \$8.15, but in Western Australia it was \$6.97—about \$7 a gigajoule. I know it has come down since then. It is significantly higher for small industrial customers. From 2015 to 2017, gas prices for industrial consumers in New South Wales went from \$9 to \$15. It was \$15 a gigajoule in 2017, which is incredibly high. The member for Riverton is shaking his head. That is for an industrial customer.

Dr M.D. Nahan: When we did the gas price inquiry in 2009, across the eastern seaboard gas was much less than it was here.

Mr W.R. MARMION: Correct. In fact, the ironic thing is that the data I have here shows that in 2015 the gas prices in Western Australia were reasonably comparable for industrial customers. Maybe they were a little less in some cases because they were obviously negotiated prices. From 2015 to 2017, something dramatic happened in the eastern states.

In my third reading contribution, I want to highlight the importance of managing the domestic gas policy. The member for Warren–Blackwood highlighted that 15 per cent is in reserve and has to come onshore. We are in control of our own destiny on price if we manage that reserve gas. That is one point I want to put on the record. I think it was put on the record very well by the member for Riverton. The highest risk issue which, again, was highlighted by the member for Riverton, is environmental approvals for offshore projects—any gas project that will be tolled at the North West Shelf gas facility. It would be handy to get some clarity about what the CO₂ emissions policy will be because its risk to this project is the elephant in the room—in this case, the elephant in the house. When I talk about risk, I am talking about the economic risk to the town of Karratha and to its existence. There is a risk to Western Australia and, indeed, Australia, which is the beneficiary of royalties from the gas. Another disappointing thing about gas is that royalties for offshore gas go to the commonwealth. It is awkward for the government of Western Australia to provide infrastructure such as schools, hospitals and swimming pools. Sometimes, if not always, it falls on the state government to provide infrastructure that supports these gas projects. It is important that we do not lose sight of developing onshore gas reserves. We look forward to seeing this government's policy in the future, even though it must tie in to the national policy on CO₂ emissions.

The government took the opportunity with this bill, as was discussed during the debate on the matter of public interest, to embed what I would call qualitative parameters with community development plans and local participation plans. I think “qualitative parameters” is the best way to describe what has been put into the bill because getting any quantitative KPIs or data is hard to fathom. In my second reading contribution, I raised the difficulty that the joint venture partners—the proponents—will have in negotiating with the department what is a reasonable community development plan. Indeed, Woodside could argue that over the many years that it has been there, it has been putting money into the community. Will that count? Can it come to the table with a list of all the projects it has done in Karratha over the last 15 years—such as footy shirts for all the local schools for a number of dollars, or a skateboard park? Will that count? We do not know.

That raises the issue that if there is not a rough idea of quantifying what the dollar rate might be, if someone else does another development, will it be related to the capital cost of the project, which might be a good thing to do? Another company might have a project of about one-tenth the capital cost, but the department might be able to negotiate a ball-burster of a community development program. If it is hidden, there is no visibility for the others. It is a bit like a high-paid person in a private company—the salary is hidden so we do not know whether there is parity. The member for Warren–Blackwood raised some very good points about why we might want to quantify and put on the record what the community development plans are. I think that was debated quite well. I think the member for Riverton also said that the proponents might be quite happy to have that put on the table because there will be no reason to renegotiate behind closed doors if something else is going on. Indeed, there might be a second project and one might be traded off with the other, but there will be no visibility.

I will close off by saying that this is a very important bill and the Liberal Party strongly supports it and looks forward to seeing it developed. I am looking forward to seeing gas coming onstream from both the Scarborough

field and the Browse Basin. As I mentioned in my second reading contribution, we would prefer the Torosa field to be the first of the three Browse fields to be brought onstream, because there will be a royalty income benefit to Western Australia, which I understand might be around the \$2 billion mark, or even more. It might be interesting to get a bit of a handle on what that figure might be, if the Premier has that on hand. I probably should have asked for that during the second reading debate. I think I am the last speaker on this bill from this side of the house. We look forward to its speedy passage through the other house. I am sure that when it passes this house this week—probably in less than an hour—it will be pushed to the other house and will have a speedy transition through the upper house because it is an important bill and of such economic significance that it rates a high priority in the other house.

MR M. McGOWAN (Rockingham — Minister for State Development, Jobs and Trade) [5.19 pm] — in reply: I thank members for their comprehensive contributions on the North West Gas Development (Woodside) Agreement Amendment Bill 2019. I will run through some of their points. Firstly, I thank members of both parts of the opposition for their support for the legislation. It is obviously a negotiated state agreement with Woodside; therefore, under the protocols around state agreements, we do not amend them in here. I dealt with the question of amendments to the bill by the house earlier in that it is not something that is a normal process in this house, and that has been a longstanding position. I explained the points around what occurred 10 years ago, but, in any event, we do not propose to amend the bill in this house or the other house. I hope that members do not seek to amend the bill in the other house because that would be an unfortunate development for this agreement.

In relation to the actual points that people raised about CO₂ emissions, the government handed down our climate change policy some months ago, which I think was very clear and which is our aspiration of net-zero emissions by 2050. We consulted both the environment movement and industry, and I note that both sides endorsed the policy that we released. That is the government's policy. The Environmental Protection Authority will come out with whatever its policy is, but the government's policy on these matters provides some certainty for investment and allows us to work cooperatively on reducing emissions.

I heard some member talk about the EPA assessments. Obviously, most of the projects are in commonwealth waters, and, clearly, matters in commonwealth waters have commonwealth-assessment processes. The EPA makes its decision on whether it needs to assess matters within Western Australia; that is a decision of the independent EPA. As far as I understand it, that is the position in relation to those matters.

A lot of the other issues raised by members related to the history of the Inpex Corporation and James Price Point, and some of the matters of domestic gas and the like. I will explain the government's policy on this. I have now said this numerous times in the house, but I repeat it again: our policy is to get Browse gas to Karratha, which will provide us with domestic gas. James Price Point, of course, may not have done that—it probably would not have done that—and the proposal was very disruptive for the Kimberley. Obviously, backfilling the Karratha gas plant will be good for Karratha and good for jobs in the Pilbara, which is our objective with this legislation.

We have used the opportunity of this legislation to fix some historic issues such as both the water and local government rating issues, which were raised last week. In terms of inserting a local participation plan requirement and a community development plan requirement, these are in accordance with other state agreements; the fact is that we have followed the practice of other state agreements. I outlined before that government representatives will speak to Woodside—considering it is already a negotiated agreement—as to whether those things can be released, which is further than any government has gone before in relation to those matters. We expect significant contributions to the community and significant local participation out of these agreements. That is our aim. I think we do that far more effectively than governments have done in the past, and we have had considerable success with both state government and private sector projects. If members look at some of the reporting that is out there now on some of the mine redevelopments, there have been some very high levels of local content, with some of the more recent mining projects in particular, and we would expect the same out of some of the gas projects if and when they go ahead.

We would like to see the approval for the front-end engineering and design component for the Browse project to start as soon as possible—hopefully next year. For Scarborough, which is due to come into the Pluto project, we hope for a final investment decision by Christmas. In any event, for both of them, we hope to get to a final investment decision as soon as possible. Between them, that is nearly \$50 billion of investment in Western Australia. They are \$50 billion projects of which a huge amount of the work will happen here, bearing in mind that some of the work is in offshore waters, which are outside of our control. We have worked cooperatively. The Minister for Mines and Petroleum has worked cooperatively with Mr Canavan in Canberra to bring both of those projects onshore. That is the main aim—the main game—with this legislation, and that is what we are working towards. We would like to progress this through the upper house as soon as possible. Obviously, there is another bill up there at the moment that will hopefully be dealt with by the end of this year. That other bill, of course, is very important. This bill is very important. There are some requirements under this bill that need to be dealt with within a certain time frame, and, from memory, I think that is 1 March, but obviously that will mean that we need to get this bill passed by the Legislative Council later this year or early next year in the interests of Western Australian jobs. I expect cooperation on that; I hope for cooperation on that. Otherwise, there could be further complications and further difficulties.

That is the government's plan. We are working cooperatively with industry. As members saw last week, I have taken up the case of Browse and Scarborough to send a message to all parties that I would like to see a resolution for those two, which, I think, have dragged on now for a long time. I think having both of those resolved would be very good for Western Australia, and would improve our domestic gas jobs, improve royalties for the state, and be a significant demonstration of confidence in the Western Australian economy.

With those remarks, I will end the debate.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

RAILWAY (METRONET) AMENDMENT BILL 2019

Second Reading

Resumed from 26 September.

MS L. METTAM (Vasse) [5.27 pm]: As the opposition lead speaker for the Railway (METRONET) Amendment Bill 2019, I rise to make a contribution on behalf of the opposition. First and foremost, I give our support for the bill and what it represents. It should not be of any surprise to people in this place that the Liberal opposition supports this bill. In fact, the Western Australian Liberal Party has provided the most significant support to Ellenbrook rail with \$500 million provided as a result of the federal Liberal government.

Ms R. Saffioti: That's the best comedy out!

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Ms L. METTAM: The best comedy out, I would say, is what this government has achieved in this portfolio—not one track of rail has been delivered and this government has taken over two years to come up with an alignment that it brought to the election. Very little has actually been achieved when it comes to its signature policy. With the \$500 million contribution from the federal government, the local member, Christian Porter, has been the only valuable and real support to Ellenbrook rail.

I will highlight some of the issues about timing and cost, which are a great feature of sensitivity of this government in relation to this project. I will also highlight some of the concerns raised by community members about the Metronet Ellenbrook rail project. I will obviously highlight the secrecy of this government and the fact that it went to the election talking about gold-standard transparency, but it is quite clear that we have seen something very different.

I will start by talking about the timing and the cost of the project. I have with me a copy of the Labor Party's election commitment on the Morley–Ellenbrook rail line. It clearly highlights that the commencement date for the line will be 2019 and that it will cost \$863 million. That is very different from what we are seeing delivered or at least talked about by the Minister for Transport and the McGowan government. We have already seen a 15 per cent budget blowout to at least \$1 billion for the Morley–Ellenbrook line, which is without factoring in some of the cost shifting that has taken place. When we look at the projected or promised project commencement date of 2019, we see quite clearly that this slide provided by the Metronet team on this project says something different. In fact, the slide says that the potential construction of the Morley–Ellenbrook line will start in Bayswater in 2022. That is three years later, obviously. It is telling that the McGowan government is sensitive about this project because it has since taken this page off its website. We asked questions in the other place today about Public Transport Authority officers being asked to sign non-disclosure statements on the timing of the project. Once again, we got a non-answer from the government that promised gold-standard transparency.

Members on this side of the house are very committed to public transport and we are very supportive of the Ellenbrook rail line, but we are concerned and we would like to see it progress. How great would it have been to see construction of that line start this year? It is disappointing that we are seeing something else. The opposition supports rail and we would like to see a lift in patronage as well. Patronage has flatlined under this government. It is no wonder when we consider that since this government came to office we have seen an overall 15 per cent increase in public transport fares. The government increased fares by 11 per cent in 2017–18; by two per cent in 2018–19; and by two per cent in 2019–20 as well. We also saw cruel increases in the first budget, with student fares going up by 16 per cent and standard fares by nine per cent.

An article published in *The West Australian* in July 2019 refers to the RAC's comments on this year's hike in fares. The article states —

The RAC, which compiled the figures, said any increase in public transport fares should not exceed the rate of inflation, which was just 1.2 per cent in the year to March.

The RAC obviously raised concerns about the 3.6 per cent and three per cent hits to fares to zone 3 and zone 4 stations respectively. At a time when we need to encourage more people to use public transport, it is important that we see incentives for using public transport. We know that the government has invested in a \$1.25 million campaign to encourage people to use public transport. That is certainly welcome, but why would the government do that at the same time as putting a heavy impost on people by raising the charge to utilise our public transport

system? It is a mixed message and we know that the people of Western Australia are particularly struggling at the moment. As the RAC says, any increase in transport fares that exceeds the rate of inflation will turn people off public transport. It would be a great disincentive for using public transport. I talked about the number of people using public transport flatlining. We have seen an increase in total boarding of only 1.1 per cent, or 1.6 per cent overall, at a time when we have had investment in facilities such as the Optus Stadium. Obviously, there is a great incentive for people to travel by public transport to the stadium. It is something that members on this side of the house supported.

I referred to the issue of transparency. We have tried to seek a lot of information from the government through the freedom of information process on the costings of this project. That is one reason it is important to see a significant uptake in patronage. But despite much talk and fanfare around this project, we have not seen the government's costings. We have seen already a recorded 15 per cent increase in the cost of the Morley–Ellenbrook rail line and there is a fair suspicion that hundreds of millions of dollars of costs have been shifted to other projects, such as the Bayswater station upgrade and Tonkin Highway gap, and no doubt this route will require significant investment in Perth train station as well. It is our role as members of the opposition to get an understanding of what this route will mean for not only the valuable Ellenbrook community, but also the taxpayer, particularly when the government, on the other hand, is creating disincentives by hiking the cost of public transport. We need to do more in public transport to create genuine incentives for people to utilise our public transport system, particularly at a time when we are seeing a significant increase in on-demand transport as well. We do not want a situation in which road use increases as a result of the competing challenges of the disruption, if you like, or advent, and growth of on-demand transport. We know that that is happening.

When it comes to the cost of this project, I have talked about the hidden costs associated with the investment in Bayswater and Perth stations and the Tonkin Highway gap. Of course, the opposition has sought to understand what the operating costs will be. I talked earlier about the fact that so far it is WA Liberal Party and particularly the federal Liberal government that have provided the only valuable investment in the Ellenbrook line. We are trying to ascertain what this line's operating cost will be. It is disappointing that we are yet to see a business case for this project. No business case has been presented yet. We know that the train network recovers about 25 per cent of costs through ticket sales and that the Metronet project will see potentially less patronage than the current level of demand.

According to the budget papers, the Forrestfield–Airport Link will have eight kilometres of rail. If delivered on time, it is anticipated that it will have 20 000 passengers a day, and the operating subsidy for that line will be about \$50 million. The Yanchep line will be 14.5 kilometres long, with 6 000 passengers a day by 2031. The Thornlie–Cockburn line will be 14.5 kilometres long, and we are anticipating 12 000 passengers per annum by 2031.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Ministers, if you want a conversation, perhaps you could take it outside because I cannot hear the member, and I think it is causing Hansard a few issues as well.

Ms L. METTAM: The Ellenbrook line will be 21 kilometres long, but the government has yet to provide a figure for passenger numbers. Obviously, the numbers are there, and there is an understanding of the operating costs. We are very keen to understand this, because it relates to the capacity of the line and what the route will be. On behalf of the community of Ellenbrook and the region, we are committed to ensuring that this project is the best that it can be. We must do more to encourage patronage. We touched on this earlier, but overall we have seen public transport patronage decline by about five per cent since 2014–15. That is why, with all these competing challenges, alignment is so important.

Bayswater station has been a significant challenge, particularly for the Public Transport Authority. On behalf of the community, and in particular the community in Midland, the opposition is really keen to understand the impact of three lines going through Bayswater station. There will need to be very separate times of travel. At peak times, when people are rushing into the city to go to work or an event, or when there is a heavier level of congestion, trains on the Midland line run every eight to 10 minutes. At other times, they run every 15 minutes. The government has certainly recognised the value of and high demand on the Midland line and it is another part of the Metronet project, so we are very keen to understand whether the alignment means that there will be any compromise to the frequency of trains for people travelling on the Midland line, Morley–Ellenbrook line or the Forrestfield–Airport Link. Also, what additional requirements will there be? These are fair questions to ask. The Liberal opposition supports the Ellenbrook rail line, and with funding being the only progress to date, we are really keen to understand what the overall cost will be.

Another issue that has been raised with me and members of the opposition is the concern around activity centres. The Labor government has a history of not completing transport projects properly. We heard from numerous community groups, particularly in Morley, about the alignment bypassing Morley; it will be two kilometres away. Issues have also been raised by the transport sector about the philosophy around transit-oriented developments and the walkability of suburbs. There are concerns that this alignment will automatically require additional public transport. I understand that a shuttle bus will potentially be required to get people from the supposed Morley line, which will be two kilometres from the Morley town centre or Galleria Shopping Centre, at the indicative site of

the Broun Avenue bridge. There are 200 businesses at the Morley Galleria that are very keen to understand how that connection will work, as we are, because it is important that if we have this investment in this line—so far welcomed from the federal Liberal government—we ensure that there is no reliance on vehicles and that the Ellenbrook rail line is the best that it can be. I cannot help but hark back to 2013 and reflect on Labor’s form of not delivering projects properly. An article written by Daniel Emerson and Beatrice Thomas in 2013 is titled, “Parties raise the stakes on the cost of Metronet plan”. At that time, the former member for Vasse and Minister for Transport talked about the Forrestfield–Airport Link. At that election, we had costed the Forrestfield–Airport Link as a \$1.9 billion proposal. Labor had what it thought was a cheaper plan, at only \$731 million. I quote from the article —

At \$1.9 billion, the proposal unveiled by Transport Minister Troy Buswell came with a far heftier price tag than Labor’s but he claimed his opponents would never be able to build it for \$731 million as promised.

We have found that already. It continues —

Mr Buswell and Premier Colin Barnett took the step of hiring a bus to take the media 1.5km from the international terminal to a hot, dusty Horrie Miller Drive roadside where they insisted Labor’s airport station would be.

The pair claimed passengers with suitcases and children in tow would be forced to catch a further shuttle bus to the airport under Labor’s Metronet plan.

They certainly highlighted that it was a transport solution that automatically required additional public transport or more vehicles on those roads. We have talked about some of the additional costs for the Tonkin Highway gap project and the upgrades to Perth station. There will obviously be operating costs, but there will also be the cost of a shuttle bus as a result of Morley station being two kilometres from the Morley town centre. I am also aware that the Department of Transport previously included a plan that had options to connect to these activity centres. We would be very supportive of seeing public transport connect with these activity centres so that public transport is the best that it can be.

Issues have been raised on the Facebook page about the Morley–ECU tunnel for the 4 500 students at Edith Cowan University, along with concerns that additional public transport will be required.

I referred to some of the commentary made by the transport sector. I will refer to the Centre for Urban Research and transit-oriented developments. I quote —

Train station precincts with more shops and apartment blocks are key to getting residents walking, a new report has found, with stations in Melbourne’s north and south-east ripe for redevelopment.

...

“The stations we’ve identified as ideal for reimagining as TODs have surrounding neighbourhoods with ‘destination features’ such as shops and community centres, multiple transport options, good street networks, residential density and retail opportunities.

“Rethinking train stations to make them about more than just transport is the future for a more healthy, liveable Melbourne.”

We have heard from the community and I have been sent many articles, such as that one, raising these concerns. This plan does not meet the opportunity of connecting with an activity centre, so we are certainly interested to understand how the additional public transport, whether shuttle buses or other mechanisms will be required, will compete with the current bus network, which is in high demand. We are very committed to Ellenbrook rail and ensuring that it is a good transport option. When I talk about activity centres, we need only to look at some of the TODs that have resulted in good outcomes—stations such as Subiaco and East Perth. Bringing people to civic centres is ideal and what we want to achieve with public transport. Not linking to stations—Rockingham station is outside Rockingham, and Mandurah station is the same—represents an opportunity cost.

Another topic I want to cover is the government’s secrecy around this plan. I have highlighted it in relation to the fact that there is no business case, even though the Treasury costings have obviously been done, and we have no indication from the government in response to any of the questions asked. I also want to raise the issue around Whiteman Park, because from the government’s front page on Ellenbrook rail and all its documentation on the new railway line, it is quite clear that the government has a plan to urbanise the Marshall Road lands north of Marshall Road. This is already marked for development, quite obviously. There is a great conflict, which has been highlighted to me from people in the community, about the transparency of the government and also its plans to do what has been attempted before. We know that in 2007 the Greens in the upper house moved a disallowance motion in response to the plans to urbanise this section of Whiteman Park. It was opposed by the Liberals and the Greens at that time. I will read a section of the debate on the disallowance motion by Hon Giz Watson, which states —

The rezoning of this part of the area designated as part of Whiteman Park is, in my view, a breach of the trust and understanding of the original owners who agreed to sell the land that they owned back in the

early 1970s. ... is clear that there was a mutual understanding that the land they were selling was to be owned and used by the community in perpetuity. ... southern portion of Whiteman Park was purchased under the commonwealth-state scheme whereby land purchases for specific purposes were funded two-thirds by the commonwealth and one-third by the state.

...

It is clear that this land has been earmarked for parks and recreation since that time. The current move by the government to rezone the land urban raises a question about the government keeping faith with the commitment given to the original vendors.

I also have an email from Vicki Marshall. As the alignment goes through this section of Whiteman Park, she is concerned that the government will take the opportunity to have another go at urbanising this land for residential development or something similar to pay for the budget, as it has blown out by about \$2 billion. I understand that after the front page on the alignment, the plan was published on the website and some media on this issue came out and the minister met with Vicki Marshall, but Vicki Marshall's concerns remain as they were before. I will read an email from Vicki Marshall —

This portion of land was sold by my father, along with many other land owners, to form what was to become Whiteman Park. This land was to be used for parks and recreation. These men had the foresight to see that future generations would need these areas, to give the people somewhere to go, to escape their suburban blocks and get back to nature, to enjoy valuable family time.

This land has been deemed "non-essential to the operation and integrity of Whiteman Park". I don't agree. This land forms a vital buffer between the park and urbanisation.

would like to know ... What are the plans for the land between the rail line and Marshall Road? I believe they are planning future urbanisation.

She also refers to the grievance and raises concern about this alignment being close to the watertable and the priority 3 water area. We are well versed with the government's talking points on this and whenever it comes up, its members refer to the Whiteman Park strategic plan that came out as a result of community consultation. It was not acted on by government, but it was the result of significant public consultation. What is clear from the Marshall Road lands plan is that this land would not be utilised for residential purposes. It also refers to a commitment to regional sporting fields and youth attractions. Vicki Marshall and others are concerned about the alignment that has been proposed and they are seeking some assurance from government that this alignment does not mean that there will be residential development.

We have asked numerous questions in this place to get some assurance for the community about the need to give them some peace of mind that the land around the alignment through the Marshall Road lands will be utilised for public open space. As I said, we have the Whiteman Park plan, which the government has talked about. I know in opposition, the minister certainly had some objection to the cemetery idea and I certainly can understand that. However, the space was dedicated to the community. There was a plan for regional sporting fields and youth attractions. Given the landowners' investment and the original agreement that was made, it is important that the commitment for this parcel of land to be for public use in perpetuity is respected. As I have stated, we have tried to get some assurance from the government, but we are yet to see that met.

Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.00 pm

Ms L. METTAM: I will highlight some of the comments of Vicki Marshall. Her father was Len Marshall, who was the shire president in the 1970s. He was instrumental in ensuring that this parcel of land was dedicated to community in perpetuity. I will quote from an email I received. She wrote —

This portion of land was sold by my father, along with many other land owners, to form what was to become Whiteman Park.

I highlighted earlier a few of the comments that she made about that. She continues —

I know that you can't stand in the way of progress but we can achieve a win for all. We can have the rail line and still keep the Marshall Road parcel for recreation purposes.

There has been talk of a sporting complex. At least this is still for the people, for recreation.

I would like to see a large portion still open bush land. They call it degraded farming land, however this is where the native rabbits are that the wedge tail eagle feed from. This area has also had sightings of the variegated fairywren which were thought to have disappeared from this area 30 years ago.

I know this land. It has so much potential. Lew Whiteman originally came up with the idea of developing the wetlands after reading an American magazine. The water table has already dropped drastically in the 50 years that I have witnessed. To put thousands of houses here would destroy Whiteman Park, and, more sadly, Mussel Pool, where it all began.

As I stated, the community is seeking an assurance from government that it will not be urbanising and putting in high density residential living to provide revenue for government. I know that when the minister was in opposition as the local member, she talked about the objection to the cemetery idea, which is completely fair enough. However, I should state that the previous plan also referred to a sporting complex and recreation facilities. But there were comments in the *Echo* on 4 December 2010 about the importance of engaging with the community about what this land will be used for. I quote the comments from the now Minister for Transport. She stated —

“A proposal to turn the land into housing was knocked back a number of years ago because of community opposition,” ...

“At the time, the public wanted this land to be public open space for everyone to enjoy.

“Given the history of this area of land, I believe it is important for the community to have their views represented.

“That’s why I am undertaking a survey to get a good understanding of the community position.”

Those sentiments are certainly something that, some nine years later, we are seeking some support for. One can only imagine the feeling among the Whiteman, Marshall and associated families and the community as well when they saw the plans on the front page of the paper and on the Metronet website that, from their perspective, had already assumed that there would be a transfer of that land for urban development. As I said, all we are seeking is an assurance from the minister and the McGowan government that the land surrounding the rail alignment will be dedicated to the community, and that there will be a commitment to the regional agreement.

As I have stated, the opposition well and truly support the proposed bill. As I have stated, it is thanks to the federal government that we have seen \$500 million invested in the Ellenbrook line—a great commitment from the local member, Christian Porter. Given the jobs that will be generated through the construction of this rail line, it is disappointing that we have only got to this point after over two years in government, after apparently going through 100 different options, only to come up with the option that was first proposed to the community in 2017. It raises the question of what this government has been doing in the meantime.

We have addressed some of the issues that have been raised by the community and those in the transport sector about how this line will connect with the transit-oriented development; to what extent this line will connect with the activity centres of local communities, the Morley Galleria, the 200 businesses there, and obviously all those people who we would like to see supported in their businesses; and how it will meet the objectives of public transport—to enliven centres and move people. Trains and public transport are very valuable because there is a great deal of regularity. We know that a rail line such as has been proposed is very much supported by the community. It is quite clear that the public of Western Australia like rail, but it is important that, if we are going to make a heavy investment in rail, we ensure that it meets the mark in capturing a great amount of patronage, and that it connects with our activity centres, supports our local businesses and sees a shift away from a reliance on vehicles on our roads, at a time when we are seeing a great growth in on-demand transport, which will also compete. Some people have said to me that the growth in on-demand transport over the next five years will see a trebling of the number of vehicles on our roads involved in on-demand transport, so it is important that public transport gets ahead of the game, and that we see that investment. During my short time as the shadow minister in this area, I have asked a lot of questions about the costs associated with this project. It would be very valuable for the taxpayers of Western Australia to understand that. We know that there has been a 15 per cent increase in the budget, but the cost should also capture the upgrade of Bayswater station, the upgrades to Perth station and what will be required there, and Tonkin Highway. Apart from the capital cost, we will also be looking at the operating cost of these lines. That is why we are really keen to understand those numbers. Without a business case having been submitted to Infrastructure Australia, and without a government with a respect for transparency, it is very difficult to get an idea of the costs.

We well and truly support the bill, as I have stated. It is important that we see enough growth in patronage to offset some of the costs of utilising public transport. That is why I have raised the concern about the 15 per cent increase in public transport fares at a time when the number of patrons has flatlined, and there has been a five per cent decrease in patronage since 2014–15. I also highlighted the importance of ensuring that our public transport is the best that it can be, and that we do not want to see a repeat of a scenario such as we saw during the 2013–14 election campaign, where the investment fell short of what would be acceptable to the public. I am talking about the Forrestfield–Airport Link, and the idea of relying on a bus service to support the train line for international visitors from Perth Airport. We are keen to understand what will be the costs of the shuttle as well. There will obviously be an automatic additional investment in public transport to support the Morley station to ensure that it meets its objectives of supporting retailers and traders in the Morley Galleria. Now that the state government has received the funding from the federal government, and it has an alignment that has effectively been in place since 2017, it is time for the McGowan government to get on with the job and deliver this project, which will create jobs, and will be supported. It is time for the government to provide its share of that investment and progress this project.

MR D.C. NALDER (Bateman) [7.15 pm]: I rise to make a small contribution to the debate on the Railway (METRONET) Amendment Bill 2019, around the Ellenbrook rail project. Specifically, coming from the position that I currently hold as shadow Treasurer, I will be looking at the financial aspects of it.

[Quorum formed.]

Mr D.C. NALDER: I had just started saying that the focus I wish to pursue, and the points I wish to make tonight, centre around the financial aspects of the Ellenbrook rail project, and some of the planning aspects as well. To deal first with the financial aspects, I am really concerned about the lack of transparency on this project. We have not really seen anything about patronage details for this project. When the Labor Party was in opposition, it was really focused on patronage details of the Ellenbrook line and the Forrestfield–Airport Link. Coupled with that, it is quite difficult to follow in the budget exactly what funding is allocated to each individual project under the so-called Metronet flagship. Specifically, what has been allocated to Ellenbrook, what is coming from the federal government, and what is coming from the state government, and when is it being applied? There is a real lack of transparency, and I do not think that is really the right way to run this. We need to be totally transparent on the full cost of this project.

It concerns me that it appears that a number of other projects are being run off the side. I can only guess that that is to make the business case for the Ellenbrook rail itself look better than it actually is. I believe that, potentially, the Bayswater station upgrade is being funded elsewhere, possibly through the FAL project, probably because of the spare half a billion dollars that was left in that by the former government. I think that the signalling project required because of this Ellenbrook rail is also being funded elsewhere. It was interesting to watch the government bring forward the pinch point on Tonkin Highway—something that we acknowledged always needed to be done. We support that project being undertaken. When I was minister, the cost was estimated to be \$270 million, and all of a sudden the government is saying that is now \$400 million, or something of that magnitude. It concerns me that some of the infrastructure for the Ellenbrook rail is actually being carried out under this project. It is all murky to me. There needs to be a clear and transparent process. I have no qualms that the Labor Party went to the election saying that this is its policy, and it has every right to get on and build it. I have no qualms about that whatsoever. I am not criticising that; however, it needs to be fully transparent in its costings, such that it can be scrutinised properly. It worries me that elements of this project are being funded elsewhere to make the underlying project stack up. That is of concern to me. If I am totally wrong, I look forward to the response from the minister to clarify those points for me and to point out exactly what the total funding is for this line, including all the other bits that are needed to get it onto Tonkin Highway, such as the upgrades to the Bayswater station et cetera. I am happy to be corrected by the minister if she can point that out. I would also like to know the federal contribution and the full state contribution and when it will be allocated, because I have been a little confused by the way it has been broken down in the budget at different times.

The other thing that I would like to raise about the Ellenbrook rail project is the planning. I again acknowledge that the government has been elected on a mandate and I respect that, but I still feel that it has missed an opportunity. It has overruled the department's views on what should have been done in this situation, given the advice that I received at the time. I point out that the Perth and Peel transport plan was not developed by the former government; it was developed by the department working with industry specialists. The then government did not influence the direction of the line to Ellenbrook. It was done by the department and planning specialists. Their recommendation—I still support this—was that our public transport network has to provide greater connectivity to our major activity centres. The CBD of Perth is not the only major activity centre. When I talk about activity centres, I am talking about hospitals, universities and major shopping centres. We need to provide greater connectivity to have mass movement of people by public transport to and from those activity centres. I feel that an opportunity has been lost with what the current government is doing. It has not taken the advice of the department and looked at the Perth and Peel transport plan, which was the first long-term planning that had been commissioned by the department for something like 50 or 60 years. Straightaway, this government disregarded that and decided to run a spur from the Bayswater line to Ellenbrook. Yes, it will cost more to get out there, albeit I am not clear on how much more because I am not clear on the full costings if I include all the other projects that seem to be linked to the Ellenbrook rail line. Connecting through Morley central, Edith Cowan University and into the CBD would provide a far superior public transport solution for the people of Ellenbrook, as well as the people in neighbouring suburbs. This is an opportunity that has been lost by the government. I believe it should have provided far greater connectivity than running it along there. One of the challenges we have if we run all our rail lines along freeway and highway corridors is that we then have to try to retrospectively create activity centres around freeway points such as at Canning Bridge and so forth. Some major activity centres such as the major shopping centres at Morley Galleria, Karrinyup, Innaloo, Garden City and so forth do not necessarily have the best services, although I think the 950 bus service to Morley Galleria is a great bus service. It is the most popular one in Perth and it is a great public transport solution, but I still think that mass transit movement through the centre of Morley would have made a lot more sense.

They are the two primary concerns that I wanted to raise. I repeat that it is about the transparency of the funding for the complete project. I feel that the government has not been as transparent as it should have been on all the costs associated with this project—not just the specific costs of laying some railway line at a certain point, but all the projects surrounding this one. There has been the benefit of the large lump sum of money that we left for

the Forrestfield–Airport Link. I feel there has been a lack of transparency. On this point, when I was Minister for Transport, there was a lot of pressure to run the Forrestfield–Airport Link along Tonkin Highway. In fact, the airport lobbied the government to run it along Tonkin Highway and follow the Labor route, which was to come in along Horrie Miller Drive and stop a kilometre from the airport. I know that the airport was keen on this; it felt that it could run a shuttle service and clip the ticket on a shuttle service to the airport. I am really pleased that we persevered with exploring other options, particularly because we were heavily criticised at the time for considering going underground. I get really disappointed with the likes of supposed academics like Peter Newman, who said in the media that it was a joke and would cost \$10 billion to go underground. I am glad that we persevered and looked at it properly. Instead of the Forrestfield–Airport Link costing \$2 billion, it came in at about \$1.3 billion by the time we added in project management costs and some contingencies.

Mr W.R. Marmion: So, way below \$10 billion.

Mr D.C. NALDER: Way below \$10 billion, but also way below the \$2 billion that we thought it would cost. In fact, from all the information that I received, because it was more direct, it became a cheaper solution than it would have been to go along Tonkin Highway. I think it provides a far superior customer outcome. That is what we have to do with our public transport—ensure that we make it a smart choice for people. A lot of people in Perth believe that driving a car is the first-class choice and that second-class citizens catch public transport. We as a city have to get to a point at which our public transport is seen as a smart solution, but, in doing so, we have to provide superior customer service and the most efficient and effective delivery of service. Although the Ellenbrook rail line will get to an end point and achieve the objective of what the government set out to do, I feel it is way short of being the best possible solution that there could have been for Western Australia over the long term. That is all I would like to say at this point. I look forward to hearing further contributions from my colleagues.

MR T.J. HEALY (Southern River) [7.26 pm]: I look forward to speaking on the fantastic Railway (METRONET) Amendment Bill 2019. It will be of no surprise to members that I am a big fan of Metronet. I am a big fan of trains and opening up communities. Members will be aware that the Ellenbrook project is a key part of my Thornlie–Cockburn train line. The member said before that the Ellenbrook line is the flagship of the Metronet program. I would like to say that the Thornlie–Cockburn line and the Canning Vale train stations are the flagship, but that item is certainly up for debate.

The Ellenbrook rail line is an important strategic project. It is a Labor government project. Rail projects are Labor government projects. The Ellenbrook rail line is a promise kept by Labor. The Ellenbrook rail line is the broken promise of the Liberals. It is the sad history of lazy Liberals who do not get around to building rail. It is the sad history of Liberal lies. Labor and Metronet will certainly work in the night to save the day. As I have mentioned, the Libs just do not do rail. They promise but they never deliver. I would like to quote the Minister for Transport, Rita Saffioti. There are a number of quotes from *Hansard*. I will quote the minister from 15 September 2015. As I am sure she is aware, she said —

The member for Southern River —

That is the former member for Southern River —

has to realise that the Liberal Party does not build rail lines until it is dragged kicking and screaming to them by the Labor Party. The Liberal Party does not build rail lines until the Labor Party initiates them or drags members opposite kicking and screaming to them.

Mr W.R. Marmion: The Forrestfield rail line that goes to the airport.

Mr T.J. HEALY: I will talk about that. The Labor government builds and opens train lines. We built the Joondalup line, we reopened the Fremantle line, we built the Mandurah line —

Mr D.C. Nalder: The Butler extension?

Mr T.J. HEALY: The Butler extension? I call that the Albert Jacob memorial line. I acknowledge that the Liberals built eight kilometres of track. We built the Mandurah and Thornlie lines, we are going to build the Yanchep and Byford lines, and we are building the Thornlie–Cockburn line. We started digging the airport line. The previous government said that it would do it, but there were delays and it never got around to it. Feel free to have a seat, member for Bateman.

One of the first mentions of the Ellenbrook line was made in this Parliament by a Labor member on 3 May 2001. At that time, the Midland line was proposed to be extended up the middle of Tonkin Highway to Ellenbrook. On 1 April 2004, the then member for Swan Hills, Jaye Radisich, a champion of this project, spoke about a railway to the Swan Valley and Ellenbrook.

Mrs M.H. Roberts interjected.

Mr T.J. HEALY: It was not an April Fools' Day joke. The problem is that for the next 20 years, the Liberal Party thought it was a hilarious joke to promise the Ellenbrook rail and never get around to doing it. Jaye Radisich fought for that for many years. On 1 September 2008, Labor promised to build the Ellenbrook rail line.

Mr D.R. Michael interjected.

Mr T.J. HEALY: I will talk about that moment in a little bit.

I want to thank Jaye Radisich, Ian Radisich, Rita Saffioti, Ken Travers and Alannah MacTiernan for putting this project forward. I also want to thank the East Metropolitan Region members of the Legislative Council, the guardians of this project—Alanna Clohesy, Sam Rowe, Matt Swinbourn, Amber-Jade Sanderson, Ljil Ravlich, Linda Savage, Jock Ferguson, Louise Pratt and Batong Pham.

Mr J.E. McGrath interjected.

Mr T.J. HEALY: Jock Ferguson was a member for East Metro. These are the people who, when the Liberals made these promises, stood by as the custodians and guardians of the flame of Metronet. When we build and redo the Bayswater, Morley, Noranda, Malaga, Whiteman Park and Ellenbrook stations, we should honour the memory of these fine people.

We all know that the Liberals promised the Ellenbrook rail again and again, and did not deliver. I would like to quote from an article by Liam Bartlett in PerthNow of 14 March 2015. It is headed “WA railroaded again over public transport”. He refers to what “railroaded” means, and says —

In this state it refers to the act of voting for a Liberal member of parliament under the assumption they will build you a railroad if they get in.

And further, when they do win the public vote, they will abandon the promise of rail and drop you ...

He continues —

... it is a fact that without Labor’s love of trains we would not enjoy our current network.

He then talked about Colin Barnett and said —

In a glossy flyer for the 2008 election, his candidate for Swan Hills, Frank Alban, used this headline: “A Liberal Government will build a rail line Ellenbrook and improve local bus services.”

He went further and used this slogan next to his name: “Delivering Rail for Ellenbrook.”

The then member for Swan Hills repeated a promise that Colin Barnett, who won as Premier, had made. The article continues —

Frank Alban was so confident, he even underlined “Rail”. No room for misinterpretation there. Vote for Frank, vote for a railway line—giddyup!

Even Colin was in the loco spirit. Interviewed by a TV reporter, he said: “We agree that’s the next logical extension of our rail system.”

The article concludes —

Well, the Liberals won, and in a strange case of *deja vu*, the public transport promises were derailed again. Two years later, Transport Minister Dean Nalder is claiming it’s too expensive.

And even better, he’s developed an epiphany, in the same way a manic savant will rattle off meaningless historical statistics.

The Liberal Party promised to build the Ellenbrook rail. It did not do it. The silence of Liberal Party members is astounding. Do they admit that in 2008, they promised to build the Ellenbrook rail line? Do they admit that in 2013, they promised to build the Ellenbrook rail line?

I would like to quote the great Frank Alban. He actually said it for them. I have the flyer in which he promised it, by the way. I have some great quotes from former Premier Barnett, in which he promised it, and promised it again. On 26 May 2011, Frank Alban said in this chamber —

Where does it say that the big Mr Alban will start the train for you?

He said that in this chamber. He said in a Liberal Party flyer —

LIBERALS WILL BUILD RAIL LINE TO ELLENBROOK

Delivering RAIL for Ellenbrook!

He said in another flyer —

A Liberal Government will build a rail line to Ellenbrook and improve local bus services.

Rail Infrastructure and bus services are a critical part of the Liberal Government’s plan to fix Labor’s disconnected public transport system.

He had the gall to say that. The flyer said also —

And that’s why a Liberal Government will spend up to \$850 million to build a rail line to Ellenbrook.

That is bizarre. The people of Ellenbrook were happy. They had been promised their rail line. Labor was promising it. The Liberals were promising it. It was a bipartisan notion. It was glorious. But we know that did not come to be.

I would like to quote Frank Alban again. He said that he did not say that in Parliament. He said that he had never put out a flyer. I ask members to listen to what he said on 26 May 2011. This is his explanation. I would never have gotten away with this as a candidate. In relation to his promise about the rail line, he said —

Candidates have the ability to promise trains, aeroplanes, aircraft carriers and helicopters—that is what candidates do.

No; that is not what candidates do. I did not do that. Other government members did not do that. Frank Alban was elected in 2008 on that promise. He was elected again in 2013 on that promise. I am sorry; I would never have gotten away with that in 2017.

Ms R. Saffioti: It is a little known fact that he used to call himself “Little Frankie”.

Several members interjected.

Ms R. Saffioti: He used the third person.

Mr T.J. HEALY: “Little Frankie” went on to say, on 26 May 2011 —

If members opposite have the courage, they should go to my electorate and say, “Frank Alban is dishonest.” Give it a go and see what happens!

That is what he said. I quote the *Hansard* of this Parliament.

Mrs M.H. Roberts: You should have taken his advice.

Mr T.J. HEALY: We did. We took his advice. We spoke to the people of Ellenbrook. That is why Jess Shaw is in this Parliament. The people of Ellenbrook agreed. They did not know why they had been lied to again and again. I know what Labor promised. In 2008, Labor promised to build the Ellenbrook train line. I will tell members why I know that. On 1 September 2008, when that promise was made, I was there with Alan Carpenter and Graham Giffard. It was my birthday. On 1 September 2008, a member who is now in this chamber gave me a big sign. He told me that we were building a train line to Ellenbrook, and my job was to stand behind Alan Carpenter and Graham Giffard and hold up that sign for the media conference. I know what we promised, because I was there.

Mrs M.H. Roberts interjected.

Mr T.J. HEALY: That is right. That is absolutely correct. Another candidate for that election was there as well. Members may not realise this, but at this event in 2008 was the media, Alan Carpenter and Graham Giffard. It was very exciting. A Frank Alban van rocked up. It was being driven around. I recall that the 2008 candidate who was driving that van was Alyssa Hayden. I have asked her about this, and she said no; she does not believe it was her. I remember that a person of her description was driving the Frank Alban van and circling our media conference. I will state that she said she did not do that

Withdrawal of Remark

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: Madam Acting Speaker, the member is making an imputation about a member who is not here to defend herself. He has admitted that she has said it was not her.

Mr T.J. HEALY: I withdraw.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms J.M. Freeman): The member is happy to withdraw.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I am not sure that to say the member was driving a truck is an adverse imputation.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: Madam Acting Speaker, I ask him to withdraw.

Mr T.J. HEALY: I withdraw.

Debate Resumed

Mr T.J. HEALY: What I will not withdraw is that I know that in 2008, we promised to build the Ellenbrook line. In 2008, the Liberal Party promised to build the Ellenbrook line. In 2013, we promised to build the Ellenbrook line. In 2013, the Liberal Party promised to build the Ellenbrook line, and it did not.

I would like to give members a quick briefing about Colin Barnett, the former Premier of this state, and quote some of the things that he said. These are my best *Hansard* hits about Ellenbrook. I saw it on the TV news, on my birthday. He promised it.

On 9 April 2009, the then Premier, Colin Barnett, was asked a question in this chamber about whether the government was still committed to the construction of the Ellenbrook rail line.

Colin Barnett answered as follows —

The issue of a rail line for Ellenbrook to the north-eastern suburbs of Perth came up during the election campaign ... Work will be done on preliminary planning and studies for that line during this term of government, and construction is anticipated in the second term of government.

Fantastic. Well done former Premier! There was money in the budget. Money was put towards this in the Liberal Party election costings in 2008. There was money in the state government budget. During a grievance on Ellenbrook rail, on 7 May 2009, the then Premier said —

I defy the member for West Swan to find where I have said that we will commence building a rail line in 2012. We have never said that.

The budget documents say, and I quote —

The Liberal Party's mid-year review document ... December 2008—stated that the construction of the Ellenbrook rail line will commence in this term of government. To quote from page 100 —

For those playing at home —

of the 2008–09 *Government Mid-year Financial Projections Statement* —

construction of the Ellenbrook Railway Line (Midland Line Spur) is expected to commence in 2010–11.

It refers to \$16.3 million in 2010–11 and \$52.6 million in 2011–12—over \$68 million—for the Ellenbrook rail line. The government's midyear review document confirms that construction would commence in this term of government. The Liberal Party's election costing booklet confirms the construction would commence in this term of government.

Colin Barnett further confirmed this on Thursday, 6 May 2010, when he said —

I made it very clear that I supported a rail line to Ellenbrook. I also said that if a Liberal government was elected, it would be a second-term project ...

Hang on! Boom, da, da! I love those little dances as we move along. During a matter of public interest on Thursday, 26 May 2011, on Liberal Party election costings, a public transport document was quoted. It states —

A Liberal Government will provide \$53 million over the next four years toward the construction of a new rail line to Ellenbrook ...

The Liberals lied to members; the Liberals lied to me; the Liberals lied to Ellenbrook. When asked about the Ellenbrook line after this—I have a quote here from 19 March 2015—Colin Barnett said, “We abandoned that project”. Every election was frustrating because at every election the Liberals promised a rail line to Ellenbrook, knowing that they were lying. They knew they would not do it. I have a very good quote from Premier McGowan about Colin Barnett, who is a very smart man. He is a brilliant strategist because he won the election. I do not disagree that he won a large number of seats for the other side. It was a convincing campaign. I know why we did not win that election—it was because we do not like to lie and put out mistruths. Premier McGowan said it well in relation to these promises —

The people of Western Australia have been conned ... the Premier reminds me of Victor Lustig ... He is the bloke who sold the Eiffel Tower twice! On two separate occasions he conned people by selling the Eiffel Tower when he had no capacity to do so. The Premier of this state is the Victor Lustig of Australian politics. He is the bloke who goes out there and says one thing when he knows it is not true, and that is exactly what he did in the lead-up to the state election when he conned the people of Western Australia with all these promises, some of which used public money, yet he knew prior to the election that he would not deliver on them.

Members, it is sad.

[Member's time extended.]

Mr T.J. HEALY: I refer to my very good friend “Little Frankie”, the former member for Swan Hills, and his first speech, which I will finish on later. In his first speech on Thursday, 13 November 2008, he said it so well —

The challenge is to get Ellenbrook back on track ...

Not long after that he criticised Labor for promising Ellenbrook rail. On 24 June 2014, the then member for Swan Hills, angry that we had promised Ellenbrook, again said —

The Labor Party again promised a train to Ellenbrook and it did those circles—ring-a-ring o'roses, a pocket full of posies—to transport the people of Ellenbrook around on its Metronet.

A government member: They all fell down.

Mr T.J. HEALY: In fact, they all fell down.

I now seek to provide commentary on the broken promises to Ellenbrook of some other Liberal members of Parliament. Former member for Vasse Troy Buswell told us that the Ellenbrook line was not needed. He said on 26 May 2011 that no more than 2 000 people a day would use the entire Ellenbrook line. He said the same thing about the Murdoch train station. He said that at peak time, that was the number of people who got on the train at Murdoch, and that people would not use the Ellenbrook line. It sounds like what was said about the Mandurah line—no-one wants to come to Perth from Mandurah. On 23 May 2012, Troy Buswell said —

Finally, I refer to the Labor Party's favourite issue—the railway line to Ellenbrook. The analysis we have had done states that in 2031 as many people would use that entire railway line as currently get on the train at Murdoch train station. In other words, we are not building it at the moment because demand does not sustain the investment.

...

We promised to build it because we thought the former Labor government would have done the work.

...

The member for Swan Hills can go out there next week and say, "I have got good news for you. Between 2062 and 2112, —

That is 100 years from now —

you will get a railway line in Ellenbrook!"

They are the promises from the Liberals!

It was the arrogance of taunting people from Ellenbrook that really astounded and frustrated me. I would like to draw on a couple of statements. I might start with the member for Darling Range when she was an upper house member. On 13 April 2011, she said —

The idea of a rail line to Ellenbrook was not even a thought for many residents of Ellenbrook until Hon Alan Carpenter raised it and made it a promise ... However, I want to inform fellow members of the real transport issues that have been affecting the residents of Ellenbrook for many, many years.

There was not even a thought for the residents of Ellenbrook!

Mrs A.K. Hayden interjected.

Mr T.J. HEALY: Okay. That is great to hear. I am glad she lived there. All I am saying is that it is frustrating that Liberal Party members say one thing and then do not do it. Of course, member, I now understand why the member for Darling Range lost a state election and a local government election in 2017. I think the people of Byford are starting to get wise. Does the member support Byford rail?

Mrs A.K. Hayden: Of course I do; do you?

Mr T.J. HEALY: Fantastic. Of course I support Byford rail. I am very, very impressed.

The now member for Hillarys, when also in the other place, said on 18 May 2016 —

Nobody is making excuses for how long it may have taken the government to deliver a public transport plan.

All we have are excuses. He also said —

It is funny that opposition members always want to hammer the government for the idea of fully costed projects. Quite clearly, opposition members do not understand what fully costed means ...

How dare he say that after the fully funded, fully costed 2013 state election? Comments of the member for Riverton were referred to in an article in *The West Australian* of 2 May 2016, and I quote —

Treasurer Mike Nahan admitted that the Ellenbrook voters had reason to be sceptical about the State Government's public transport promises as he revealed details of yet another Liberal plan to connect the growing northern community.

...

Dr Nahan said the Liberals should not have matched the Carpenter Labor government's promise for the rail line in 2008 ...

Members, I agree. Voters were sceptical at the election and they showed that they were sceptical of all Liberal Party promises. I will quote the member for Geraldton, if I can. In 2009, when he was a Liberal Party member of Parliament, he said —

On the subject of railways, I support the development as soon as we can of the Ellenbrook railway ...

I thank the member for Geraldton; I certainly appreciate that. The member for Scarborough said that the Ellenbrook line was overpromised and was breaking an election commitment. She accused Labor of overpromising and breaking election commitments.

The former member for Kalamunda, Liberal member John Day, also said on 26 May 2011 —

... what matters to the people of Ellenbrook is that a good public transport service is provided, and that is now the case.

He said that before the Liberal–National government had built the train line. He said that he, the Premier, and the former Minister for Transport went on a Transperth bus and visited Ellenbrook in December the year before. He went on to say that they learnt from the briefing that the residents of Ellenbrook were well satisfied with a very good public transport service. What arrogance! They were not satisfied with the previous government's public transport service. The former member for Joondalup, Jan Norberger, said in this place on 24 June 2014 —

The last thought bubble that came from members opposite, as we all know very well, was Metronet. That was not a thought bubble as much as it was a fantasy bubble. It was never going to happen.

Well, Jan, it is happening, and the Railway (METRONET) Amendment Bill 2019 is a key part of it.

Labor members love this quote from One Nation; even One Nation endorses us! Colin Tincknell said in the other place on 15 August 2019 —

There is no doubt the Labor Party has a better record when it comes to rail.

I do not often seek endorsement from One Nation, but it is getting pretty bad when even that side of politics is endorsing what we are doing.

The member for Bateman is another great advocate for public transport. He was one of our great hopes—someone who was going to save us and change the government of the day. I would like to quote him in this place on 24 June 2014. He said —

... I have already said that if we think of only rail, we will not actually deliver.

Not only did he not think of only rail; he also did not deliver! That was the frustrating part. If you do not deliver anyway, well, so be it. Here is another awesome *Hansard* quote from the member for Bateman on 15 September 2015 —

I have been in the press and said that I do not believe that a rail solution to Ellenbrook is needed for 10 to 20 years.

Ten to 20 years, he said! He continued —

Labor members think it should be done sooner than that, yet they will not commit to doing it next term.

Obviously, these things were said before we won the 2017 election. We clearly committed to it and people clearly liked it. That is why we are here and we are literally debating that legislation right now. The member for Bateman also said —

If they want to bring this project on quicker than the next 10 years, it will have to start construction next term. Are Labor members committed to starting construction of the Ellenbrook rail line next term if they win government?

Trust me, everyone knows we are going to do that. The final quote from this speech by the member for Bateman states —

One of the faults of this government is that we do not trumpet enough exactly what we do.

Members, trust me: everyone knows what that Liberal government did and did not do. On 24 June 2014, the member for Bateman said in this place —

The opposition talks about delivering the Mandurah rail line. Everyone knows that the Liberal Party started that. Opposition members claim that they finished that, but it is not even finished.

Members, everyone knows that the Liberals do not get around to starting rail lines, be it in Mandurah or at the airport. On 11 October 2017, the member for Bateman said —

We raised the concern that the Labor Party made a commitment in 2008 and 2013 to build Ellenbrook rail. In fact, all last term, the current Minister for Transport had a bumper sticker on her car that said, "Just build it."

That is, Metronet. It continues —

Members would think that, given that it made it an election commitment, the government would be pretty determined to just build it.

We are building it. The final quote I have from the member for Bateman is from 21 March 2018 —

There is a train line in the Perth and Peel transport plan. Look it up. The only difference is how we get to Ellenbrook, and the timing.

That is the entire problem—how we get there and the timing of the journey of this entire project for the last 10 years. The member for Bateman was the Minister for Transport. I remember when he came to this place and said that he had a vision. He was going to build rail, not delays. He was going to do all these wonderful things and break the horrible tradition the Liberals have on rail. He became transport minister and we were all excited; we thought things were going to happen. We held out such hope. The member for Bateman was going to challenge Premier Barnett and build all of Metronet, but he failed. He became just another Liberal. That was so frustrating after we had placed such hope in him.

Last weekend I saw *Star Wars: Episode III—Revenge of the Sith*. There was a moment that felt like when we were reaching out to the member for Bateman, saying, “You were the chosen one! You were supposed to destroy the Sith, not join them! You were supposed to bring balance to the Force. You were supposed to build Metronet, not leave it in darkness!” That is what the member for Bateman and the Liberals did. It was not until Mark “Luke Skywalker” McGowan came out in *A New Hope* with Rita “Princess Leia” Saffioti, boarded the *Millennium Falcon* and built that train line, that we got there.

I would like to close on a couple of quotes.

Ms R. Saffioti: Who’s Jar Jar Binks?

Mr T.J. HEALY: Can I say the member for Dawesville is Jar Jar Binks? My wife actually likes Jar Jar Binks, so that is a compliment in my house!

I will quote former Minister for Planning and Infrastructure Hon Alannah MacTiernan, referring to the Liberal Party’s track record on rail during debate on the Mandurah line in this place on 12 September 2002 —

You really are a mob of troglodytes.

That is a quote from *Hansard* of 2002. That sums up the Liberal Party. I will finish by quoting “Little Frankie”, the former member for Swan Hills. He said, in his first speech in this place—he says it so well —

... the promised land of Ellenbrook is better described as a land of promises, of which very few have been kept.

That is so true. Thank you.

MR W.R. MARMION (Nedlands — Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [7.55 pm]: I rise to support the Railway (METRONET) Amendment Bill 2019. It is actually a very simple bill. No-one has talked specifically about the mechanics of the bill, but I will start with the mechanics. It is basically supporting an alignment—simple as that. All we are actually doing through this legislation is amending the current legislation to incorporate a railway line from Bayswater to Ellenbrook, known as the Morley–Ellenbrook line. That is basically what we are doing in this bill; it has only eight clauses. An interesting thing that I did not know before I went to the briefing is that the alignment that will allow the construction of the Ellenbrook line is really only a line. It allows the final alignment to be within a two-kilometre reserve. We are basically debating the centre line of an alignment and allowing, through the Public Works Act, the final alignment to be approved within a two-kilometre corridor. That was a bit of a surprise to me, but then I realised that, historically, when we build a railway line, we need flexibility because there needs to be some leeway for making changes to the horizontal and vertical alignments of a railway line, particularly if we are going through difficult topography. This is fairly flat, so having a two-kilometre corridor allows us a hell of a lot of leeway in respect of getting the final alignment. That is the first comment I want to make on the bill, but that is probably just a matter of fact.

The way the alignment is described in the bill under proposed schedule 3, “Line of Morley–Ellenbrook Line”, is interesting. It really only specifies five key coordinated points, roughly going north–south. It does not have a precise alignment of points. The minister might like to explain why that is the case in her reply to the second reading debate. I do not think she is really listening, but maybe the advisers in the gallery are listening and will explain. If we compare this with an alignment for a road or a mining reserve, in those cases we actually specify the alignment fairly precisely in terms of the points. Clause 8 inserts schedule 3 after schedule 2, and specifically describes map grid coordinates for five points; but if we look at the alignment in the plan, there are more than five deviation points in the alignment that is part of the document titled “Railway Enabling Act”. The Public Transport Authority drawing number is referred to in the bill, which is important: it is 25–C–00–0014, revision B. That is the alignment presented as part of the bill, and the way I read it, it has more than five deviation points. I would be interested in the minister explaining this. The way I read schedule 3 is that the wording of the bill gives a rough idea of the alignment, with five specific points, but there is a fair bit of deviation in that. When the bill becomes an act, the number I just quoted from the Public Transport Authority drawing is that of the alignment that people will basically be referring to.

This is quite a simple bill, but I want to now talk about some of the reasons that alignment was chosen and ask questions about it. The minister might like to explain this. I will raise a number of questions about the benefits of the alignment that has been chosen. The first question we might ask about the alignment is what other options were considered for it. I have heard that some hundreds of options were looked at by other people, but at the stage of

project definition we usually get down to two, three or four alignments in contention, and, ideally, but maybe not, net present value analysis of the favoured three options is done to determine the parameters that each of them may have and thus the best alignment. Just because a net value analysis is done does not necessarily mean that the option with the best analysis is chosen, because it may have the highest capital cost and there may not be the money to build it. It would still be interesting to know whether any other alignments might have included other destinations or station locations. The member for Vasse mentioned Morley Galleria Shopping Centre. Do any alignments consider that? If those sort of options were considered, would there be a contribution by the owner of that property? Talking about that concept, were contributions by owners or interested parties who might benefit from the alignment considered for any of the alignment options? They could include councils. I remember that when the alignment for the Mandurah–Perth rail line was put into place—the member for South Perth will remember this—the City of South Perth was very keen that an option for a station opposite Richardson Park be considered.

Mr J.E. McGrath: We're still waiting for that.

Mr W.R. MARMION: We are still waiting.

I think the City of South Perth was asked to contribute \$1 million. It was such a long time ago, but I know that the alignment of the road was done such that there is a space in the road, which cost some money.

Mr J.E. McGrath interjected.

Mr W.R. MARMION: I know it was done, because I was involved in it.

Mr J.E. McGrath: You were working for Alannah!

Mr W.R. MARMION: No, I was not; I was working for the private sector doing work for Syme Marmion.

There was an issue that it was an added cost to the net present value of building the line from Perth to Mandurah and it would have had to have been contributed to. It was a good outcome, because there is now an option for a station to be put into South Perth one day. I use that as example of just one aspect—the member South Perth is here; that is why I used it—of myriad issues that have to be considered with the alignment that we are looking at this evening.

Mr J.E. McGrath: Can I just interject?

Mr W.R. MARMION: The member for South Perth certainly can.

Mr J.E. McGrath: The history of the South Perth train station was that when the Labor government decided to go along the freeway rather than through the route that our government was seeking, it needed a vote in the upper house to get it through, and a Greens member said, “I will support you, provided you put a station in South Perth.” We are still waiting.

Mr W.R. MARMION: I thank the member for South Perth for that interjection. I can add another unknown.

Mr J.E. McGrath: Mind you, we had a chance to do it, too.

Ms R. Saffioti: Just for the record, the member for South Perth said, “Mind you, we had a chance to do it, too”!

Mr W.R. MARMION: Just on that, without any further interjections, members, otherwise I will never finish, we are now talking about a totally different alignment, which is not even the one we are looking at.

Ms R. Saffioti: You started it.

Mr W.R. MARMION: I know!

While we are still on this, and even better, because this relates to net present value and alignments, another option was proposed by Leighton, which was actually to build the rail line. People from Leighton went to a University of Western Australia function where some of the final-year engineering students were presenting various random options for alignments. One group came up with an interesting option. Because the train line was already going underground in the centre of Perth, the option was to continue the underground alignment under the river and have an underground station in Mends Street and then have the train line pop up at the same spot on the freeway where the station would be. There would not need to be a station at Richardson Park because there would be one at Mends Street, which is closer to the Zoo. The benefit of that also was that there had already been costs for sinking, with the boring equipment on site. The distance between Perth and Mandurah would be shorter, so I think the net present value was a lot better. The minister at the time said that if Leighton could come back in four weeks and tell him that it would not cost an extra dollar, they would go with it, but four weeks was not enough time to take the risk. That is a side fact. I can always bring in those side facts if members like. For the record of *Hansard*, that is something of a lost opportunity.

I get back to the alignment we are talking about today. Before I get on to the alignment, I want to mention Ellenbrook. The history of Ellenbrook is fascinating because it is an example of building a residential area with a bit of a risk, although The Vines Resort was there already, in building a development further from Perth. There were perhaps a lot of other opportunities to build residential developments between Ellenbrook and Perth. I think the Ellenbrook development won international awards for its design. The people who developed Ellenbrook went overseas and

studied lots of different elements, and they came up with the design. People might remember 20 years ago when Ellenbrook was being advertised on television, the ad showed people walking down the streets. It was a very well designed suburb. It was based on different nodes as they developed. I cannot remember all the names. There was Coolamon. The minister will know all the different ones. Six different designs were developed. I think the plan was to make it a residential area of 30 000 people; that was the aim. The aim was also to try to make sure that the highest percentage of people as possible worked in the area, as was done in Yanchep. When creating a development, that is always the aim, and to get up to 30 per cent is pretty good. That was the aim. The company developing the area was LWP Property Group; I think it was the project developer.

Mr J.E. McGrath interjected.

MR W.R. MARMION: Yes.

Russell Perry was engaged as the project manager. He was well regarded. He was head of the Urban Development Institute of Australia at one stage. Unfortunately, he passed away from motor neuron disease a couple of years ago. He was possibly in line to become WA Planning Commissioner. He was a very good operator and designed the Ellenbrook precinct to try to get as much commercial activity as possible. Indeed, our company did work on an industrial incubator. There was already a business incubator in Ellenbrook at the very beginning, and we tried to get a commonwealth grant—Russell ran this—to get a light industrial incubator, but it did not get up. Ellenbrook has done very well. The last figures I saw showed that the population has not quite reached 30 000, but it is getting close, and the minister will probably know that is true. Transport has obviously always been the issue for Ellenbrook, as it has been for Yanchep. Today we will agree to an alignment that sets up a train line from Ellenbrook to Bayswater. The question we ask is whether that is the best alignment. I do not know. I am sure the minister will explain why it is the best alignment and whether other options were considered. If members look at a map of the proposed rail line, they will see that it is not a direct line. When trains travel along an alignment that is not a direct line, the journey will take longer. Governments have to look at the benefits of an alignment that does not go in a straight line. One benefit might be that it does not go through Whiteman Park. That might be the answer to one part of it. It might be that the government wants to pick up certain population densities to ensure a higher net present value of the project so it has aligned the rail in highly populated areas or areas that may be highly populated in the future. That raises another question: will this alignment allow for future residential areas? I asked the advisers whether the alignment will interfere with residents' land and the answer was yes. Some residents will be impacted and the minister might like to confirm whether land resumptions will be required. As I have mentioned in Parliament before, I was involved in land resumptions when I worked for Main Roads. We used to build roads before the metropolitan region scheme amendments had been done because we had agreement with the landowners in writing.

Madam Deputy Speaker, there is a bit of interference over there.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am, sorry, members; I think we have a little bit of noise going on. Please keep it quiet.

Mr W.R. MARMION: When governments decide to build alignments without owning all the land required for those alignments, they obviously have to acquire the land or reach an agreement with the landowners to sort out compensation later, and that is how we managed to work at Main Roads. We built extensions through properties or through the frontage of properties and we sorted out the paperwork later, and that was done by agreement. Some governments have not had that agreement, which was a problem with stage 4 of the Mitchell Freeway. Every time the two gentlemen from Main Roads went to resume a particular market gardener's land, they were confronted with a shotgun. He was not very keen to have his land resumed. We had to go through a very long process. I was told that it was a two-year process at Main Roads. If the government needs to acquire land that it does not own, this triggers the provisions of the Public Works Act 1902, so the government has the power.

[Member's time extended.]

Mr W.R. MARMION: I have not even started!

I would like to know whether that will add to the time of the project, which is another issue. The members for Vasse and Bateman raised the issue of costs, but timing is also an issue. As the member for Southern River said, this project has been talked about for decades and, obviously, the people who live in Ellenbrook are looking forward to it being completed. Information about the timing would be useful.

I had better look at my notes to see what I was going to talk about in the remaining 13 minutes. By way of background, I remember going to Mussel Pool, Whiteman Park, for the first time when I boarded in Perth. I did not believe that a place like that could exist. It felt a long way out of Perth when I visited as a young boy. I thought Guildford was a fair way from Perth, but it is a fair way from Guildford to Mussel Pool. I was fascinated by what a great place it was. People were saying that it could be the Kings Park of that area, it was such a big area. It is a great area. One of the benefits of the alignment is that it will service Whiteman Park in terms of people visiting it as a tourist attraction, which is a positive.

In talking about other alignments and options, I would like the minister to talk about any land value upgrades that might happen and whether the business case included land value upgrades. Obviously, an alignment alongside

Whiteman Park will not necessarily mean an increase in rates for Whiteman Park but what about the houses on the other side of the alignment? Has the Valuer-General given the minister any information to suggest that those property values will increase because of the alignment? Perhaps that is another good economic benefit for the local authority in that area.

I turn to some of the technical issues that I want to talk about. When governments build train lines that are basically spur lines, there are often storage issues with the sheds at the end of the alignment. It may be that during the day or at night, the trains are sent back to Perth or to some other spot along the line. The minister might like to advise the house whether there will be extra costs at the termination area for parallel lines to store some of the trains, whether they will need to be covered and whether the government will take advantage of any maintenance facilities to undertake maintenance of the trains if they are parked during the day and not needed until the peak hours. That leads to my next question, which has been raised by the member for Vasse. The alignment ties in with Bayswater station and it will be where the Midland, Forrestfield and Ellenbrook lines come together. It will be interesting to know whether there will be constraints on the capacity of trains going from Bayswater to Perth and how the separation of the three different lines will work. Obviously, it will work pretty easily off peak but what will the constraints be during the morning and evening peaks? If the population of Ellenbrook and the areas along the new Ellenbrook line grow over time, will this alignment last or will the government build a parallel line into Perth along the current alignment? Governments might take up what the member for Bateman said. The 20–35 had a different alignment and a different spur arrangement. Was that option considered before this one was put forward?

Another issue that the member for Vasse raised was patronage. When the minister made the Ellenbrook line announcement, she mentioned patronage figures. I am interested to know what patronage is expected because one of the issues with Ellenbrook is where people work. The ideal situation would be if 100 per cent of the people who live in Ellenbrook also work in Ellenbrook. It would be a fantastic and sustainable community, but obviously that is paradise and we do not get that. If they work in Joondalup, this alignment may not help and they might have to catch a bus or use their car. If they work in Midland, is there a benefit in catching a train to Bayswater and then catching a train to Midland or is catching a bus the best way to go? I would like some information about consumers in Ellenbrook. What public transport options will this create in terms of their destination and how will the alignment improve that? It may be that a significant number of people who live in Ellenbrook work in Perth, which means that the alignment is a pretty good solution. Mind you, it will not be a direct line so that will add a bit of extra time to the route.

I have covered most of the points that I wanted to. However, I should mention parallel shunting lines, which are sometimes needed for the operation of a train line. It is probably not a big issue in a greenfields development, but quite often residents object to parallel shunting lines being near their homes because they are noisy. Quite often the only place they are needed is near the termination end, but someone may have cleverly worked out where others need to go.

The member for Bateman raised another important issue about the actual cost of the project. There is the cost of not only building the Bayswater–Ellenbrook line, but also there will be other cost implications to upgrade the track between Bayswater and the city. What will be the cost to upgrade the Bayswater station and will there be ancillary costs to build any sheds, maintenance facilities and parallel lines? It will be interesting to know whether all those things have been put into the actual costings. Finally, when the government has done all that, will the likely capital costs, or even the broken up capital costs, go into the budget, and at what stage will the operational costs be put in? Does the minister have a rough idea about the actual profitability or loss of the line? When I was Minister for Transport for a brief period of six months, I was advised by the Public Transport Authority that the ballpark return on a line was, say, 30 per cent; in other words, if it cost \$1 billion to run the network, \$300 million in ticket sales would come in and the taxpayer of Western Australia would have to throw in \$700 million. Depending on patronage on the Ellenbrook line, it may be better than that, or if it is not as high as the current mean patronage on the network, it may be higher. I would be interested to know whether the PTA has advised the minister what those figures will be.

I will check to see whether there is something else I can throw in in the remaining four minutes. The minister might like to comment—I am sure it is going to be the same—on the fare structure and where the zones will be. Does she have any rough idea how many zones there will be? That could be a good selling point for the people of Ellenbrook. If they do not want to go all the way into Perth on the train, they might base their decision on whether to catch a bus or train to Midland on where the zones are.

Mr J.E. McGrath: What about the journey from Ellenbrook to the city? Has it been identified how long that will take?

Mr W.R. MARMION: Could the minister advise how many zones there will be and what the cost will be?

Mr J.E. McGrath: How long will it take?

Mr W.R. MARMION: I do not think the zones will be the same as those on the Mandurah line. I presume people will not pay as much for their journey to Perth as they do to travel between Mandurah and Perth, because it is a shorter route. It will be interesting to have a rough idea and to know whether the people of Ellenbrook have been advised what that timing will be.

I know that lots of other people are dying to speak on this bill! I do not want to hold up the bill, but I want to make sure I have covered all the things that I wanted to mention because last time I spoke on a bill I missed mentioning something.

Mr J.E. McGrath: What about where you have to change trains?

Mr W.R. MARMION: Yes. I will finish on one more very important point. When the train reaches Bayswater, will the train carry on to Perth or will people have to get off and get on another train every time or only sometimes? I would like a rough idea about that and would be interested in a percentage.

Mr J.E. McGrath: You might want to go to the airport. You might be going to London!

Mr W.R. MARMION: Member for South Perth, I am talking only about people who want to go to Perth. The minister is nodding her head; she understands what I am asking. If passengers are going from Ellenbrook to Perth, will they have to get off at Bayswater or will all the trains from Ellenbrook always go into Perth?

DR D.J. HONEY (Cottesloe) [8.24 pm]: As indicated by our lead speaker on the Railway (METRONET) Amendment Bill 2019, the member for Vasse, the Liberal Party supports the bill. However, it still has a number of concerns and questions given the discussion today. We often hear that public transport is a no-brainer and that we should dramatically grow public transport because of its intrinsic benefits, but it is interesting to look at public transport data. In the last census—these figures are statewide, so they will be a little biased by country figures, but still indicative—in Perth 80 per cent of the population drives to work; that is, eight out of 10. Only 8.1 per cent of people catch a train, bus or ferry to work and, in fact, just about half that many ride bikes or walk; that is, 3.8 per cent. Compare the billions and billions of dollars—possibly more than \$10 billion—invested in the train network to finish Metronet with expenditure on bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. Given the weight of commuter traffic carried by those other areas, it is a pretty weighty investment in trains and this is one thing that leads people and governments to ask questions. Although people think building train lines is a no-brainer, it is extremely expensive and governments have to make choices not to spend money in other crucial areas. People love trains. Perhaps, the Minister for Police is the only member who knows this because she was present during the Burke government. I stand to be corrected whether any other member was in here during the Burke government. However, the minister and others who are interested in politics know that the Liberal government in 1979 received enormous public criticism for closing the Fremantle train line. The Burke government was swept into power in 1983 for a number of reasons, but the Fremantle rail line was a big issue in that campaign. Professor Peter Newman was very prominent in the campaign to reopen the line. It is clear that people like trains. We acknowledge that the government went to the electorate with this proposal—it said it was going to do it—but it is worthwhile to share with the community at some stage the high cost of these projects. According to 2018–19 data, the average subsidy per passenger per journey for public transport is \$5.87. The average person who commutes to and from the city on a weekday is subsidised the better part of \$12 a day. The average fare paid is only \$2.01 per journey, so 75 per cent of the cost of running public transport is paid by a subsidy from taxpayers.

Mr J.R. Quigley: Is that why Charles Court shut down the Fremantle line?

Dr D.J. HONEY: You should know, Attorney General; you are a student of politics. The rumour at the time was that it was about improving the speed of the transport of tanks to the port of Fremantle, which sounds pretty fanciful. But I suspect that it was looking at the cost. We, the community, emotionally like trains, but I am saying that if we look at the cost of public transport, we find that there is an enormous cost for a very small percentage of the population. Less than 10 per cent of the population catches public transport when commuting to work.

Mrs M.H. Roberts interjected.

Dr D.J. HONEY: The Minister for Police was in Parliament at the time so she would be aware of that.

It is very costly, so these are real considerations. It is not just a matter of saying that we can build these lines anywhere, because there is a huge capital cost and, more than that, there is a huge operating cost. We have not seen how much this is going to add to the recurrent subsidy. I anticipate that it will be in the \$100 million-plus range, based on what we are told. That recurrent expenditure, year on year, will come out of other government programs. This project is committing governments for the next 30 years, to that recurrent expenditure, year on year. There is a real cost, and we need to see transparency on that. I know some members might be leaping to the debate book on this and talking about how motorists are subsidised as well. The RAC does an annual report on motorists' taxation as a percentage of revenue taken from motorists. I will not go through the whole report, but if we look at commonwealth and state tax on motorists, we can see that the total tax take is \$4.567 billion. That amount is taken each year in taxes and charges from motorists. The total spend in Western Australia on motorists by both governments is only \$2.935 billion. Only 64 per cent of the total revenue taken from motorists is actually spent on roads, so motorists are paying their way. Given that 80 per cent of the population in fact use motor vehicles to get to work, this is a huge commitment, not just now but also in the future. Recognising that people like cars, I am not sure that they are aware of the costs.

We have a particular concern with the route that this rail line will take, and I want to dwell on that a little bit in this discussion. It has raised a lot of concerns, and people have approached me about this in the electorate of

Cottesloe, which I know is not affected by this line. People from that area have come and seen me about the potential impact on Whiteman Park. People are concerned because they see this as a portent of urban development in what is called the Marshall Road area. One of the reasons they are concerned about that is that the Labor Party in this state has form in this area. The member for Vasse has already made reference to this, but if we look at *Hansard* for Tuesday, 26 June 2007, we see that Hon Giz Watson, in the other place, moved a disallowance motion that read —

That metropolitan region scheme amendment 1027/33, Whiteman Park and Environs, published in the *Government Gazette* on 30 March 2007 and tabled in the Legislative Council on 4 April 2007 under the Planning and Development Act 2005, be and is hereby disallowed.

I will not go through her entire speech, but I will highlight some parts of it. There was a proposal —

... to transfer 249 hectares of park and recreation reservation from the southern portion of Whiteman Park, referred to as the Marshall Road precinct, and 82 hectares of adjoining rural zoned land to the urban zone.

The Labor Party—some members opposite were part of that government at the time—has had its eyes on this area for urban development. That is why people are really concerned about this rail alignment through the Marshall Road precinct. Hon Giz Watson said —

The rezoning of this part of the area designated as part of Whiteman Park is, in my view, a breach of the trust and understanding of the original owners who agreed to sell the land that they owned back in the early 1970s.

Again, the member for Vasse went through that in detail, but that is something that people who live in that area care a lot about. The government should not kid itself on this. I am certain that a large number of people in Ellenbrook are very keen on this rail line. Equally, those same people are very keen on preserving Whiteman Park, and they are very concerned about what the government's real intentions are with this alignment. I will not go through the history of the allocation of land again. That was covered by the member for Vasse, but Hon Giz Watson covered areas that I am particularly interested in. One of them is water. One of the reasons that that area has been set aside was to protect the quality of water in the Gngangara water mound. She makes some salient points, that somehow this was taken from a priority 1 water area to allow urban development, but somehow or other the delineation of the required area matched the cadastral line for the excision of this area. I share her scepticism on that. The truth is that urban development of the Marshall Road lands would represent a threat to water quality. There are still bores in that area extracting groundwater for use in the Perth water scheme. I will not go on—Hon Giz Watson covered that well—but that is why the people in the area and members on this side of the house have very great concerns about the intentions of the government on this matter.

There are real reasons for a range of concerns. I was fascinated to see, in this place, the near hysteria over the Beeliar Park bill, dealing with four to six hectares of land that was going to be affected if Roe 8 continued on its proper alignment, and the park was not established. Here we are talking about 250 hectares of land. This is important land. I will go through some of the environmental values of that area. This is from the flora and fauna survey on the Whiteman Park website. There have been various discussions about environmental values in this area, but in that park there are over 100 bird species, including wedge-tailed eagles. Wedge-tailed eagles thrive on open grasslands. They very rarely feed in forests. They hunt their prey, by and large, on open grasslands. If we are taking 250 hectares of degraded bush and grasslands out of that park and turning it into urban development, we are taking away crucial feeding ground for the wedge-tailed eagles.

Ms R. Saffioti: Member, where does it say we are doing this?

Dr D.J. HONEY: I will go further, if the minister likes.

Ms R. Saffioti: You're talking about something the bill isn't doing.

Dr D.J. HONEY: I will go further. I am expressing concern, and we want absolute certainty from the government that this is not the first part of reinvigorating the 2007 plan to turn this into urban development. There are over 150 invertebrate species, and various amphibian species in the area. There are 32 reptile species, including the bearded dragon, the king skink and the long-necked turtle, which members here know is quite a significantly endangered species. There are eight mammal species, including the western grey kangaroo, the honey possum and the southern brown bandicoot. There is no doubt whatsoever that there are significant southern brown bandicoot populations in the Marshall Road area. There is the black-gloved wallaby and the short-billed echidna. We have talked about the birds: ibis, black swans, numerous duck species and the like. This is an important area that has important environmental values and, as I said, this government has form. The Labor Party has form.

Mr D.A. Templeman interjected.

Dr D.J. HONEY: I am sure the Leader of the House has had his eyes on turning that area into urban development.

Ms R. Saffioti: You're talking about the 2000 Richard Court plan.

Dr D.J. HONEY: I am happy for the minister to respond and reassure me on this.

Mr D.A. Templeman: You're shooting from the hip, and that Winchester's misfiring, sunshine.

Dr D.J. HONEY: There is no shooting from the hip here.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Ministers, I ask you both not to interject on the member who is on his feet. Thank you very much. Go ahead, member for Cottesloe.

Dr D.J. HONEY: The Leader of the House may consider this to be a very humorous matter, but I do not.

Mr D.A. Templeman: Wait until you hear my speech. I will slap you down, sunshine!

Dr D.J. HONEY: There he goes—he is a bit of a legend! Members opposite may think this is a bit of a joke, but we will remind them about this going into the next election.

Mr D.A. Templeman interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister!

Mr D.A. Templeman interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Excuse me, Leader of the House, I have asked you once before. I do not really want to start calling the Leader of the House —

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup: Throw him out!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: — or throwing him out, although that may not be a bad idea sometimes!

Dr D.J. HONEY: As I said, members opposite may consider this a bit of a joke, but the people who live in the northern suburbs do not consider this a bit of a joke. They consider Whiteman Park to be a special part of where they live, including people who live in Ellenbrook. My sister lives in Ellenbrook.

Mr T. Healy interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Forrestfield, we have just gone through the interjections; thank you.

Ms R. Saffioti: Member for Southern River.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is right—Southern River.

Mr T.J. Healy: You were right the first time!

Dr D.J. HONEY: Southern River is pretty close to this area, so obviously he knows what he is talking about!

Ms R. Saffioti: How close is it to Cottesloe?

Dr D.J. HONEY: My sister lives in Ellenbrook and so does my mum. I spend quite a bit of time there actually, minister, seeing both of them, because I care about my family. As excited as people are about the prospect of having a rail line, they are very, very concerned about this alignment through Marshall Road. In particular, they are very concerned that this is a portent of future action by the Labor Party to revisit its plan to turn this into an urban area.

Ms R. Saffioti: It was Richard Court's plan in 2000.

Dr D.J. HONEY: I care as much about what ex-Premier Court said on this matter as I do about tomorrow's weather. In fact, I care more about tomorrow's weather. I care that the Labor Party, which is in government, is making decisions —

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

Dr D.J. HONEY: I will refer to the member for Southern River because he has continued with the misleading that has been going on by this government. The government has been asked on many occasions during question time whether this land—the 250-odd hectares that will be split off from Whiteman Park by this rail line—will be zoned urban or whether it will guarantee that it will not rezone this land urban. On several occasions, all we have heard is the glib answer, “You were going to make it into a cemetery!” I want the government to answer that question specifically.

[Member's time extended.]

Dr D.J. HONEY: I am referring to the “Final Whiteman Park Strategic Plan 2017–2021”. The plan states —

Whiteman Park is composed of a number of distinct land use areas, which collectively define the Park.

...

4. Marshall Road lands—land sections on the southern section of the Park that provide both a buffer and integration with suburban developments to the south of the Park.

It refers to a number of potential land uses for that area, including —

- development of sporting fields in partnership with the City of Swan ...
- land for outdoor events and concerts ...
- short-term tourist accommodation including camping—Whiteman bushlands
- designated areas for weekend markets and/or ‘pop-up’ stores—Lord Street lands
- cemetery—Marshall Road lands
- areas designated for youth attractions ...

For government members to sit there —

Mr T. Healy interjected.

Dr D.J. HONEY: For government members, including the member for Southern River, to stand in this place and say that the previous government’s plans for this area were to turn it into a cemetery and imply that that was the only possible use for this area is completely misleading. The member for Southern River knows —

Mr T. Healy interjected.

Dr D.J. HONEY: Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Southern River, please do not interject.

Dr D.J. HONEY: The member knows that in fact that was one of a number of potential uses suggested for that area. It was implied that that was the only potential use for that area. The minister used that as justification for not answering the question. What I have not heard in this place —

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

Dr D.J. HONEY: I have not heard a categorical denial by the minister or the Premier —

Ms R. Saffioti: You are misleading the house!

Withdrawal of Remark

Dr D.J. HONEY: Deputy Speaker, I have been accused of misleading the house and I want the minister to withdraw.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is not a point of order or any reason to withdraw it, member for Cottesloe.

Dr D.J. HONEY: We get told that it is.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You should continue your speech without the minister’s interjections. Bad minister!

Debate Resumed

Dr D.J. HONEY: We want a categorical denial by the minister and the Premier that the Labor Party is not using this as the first stage of a plan to turn this into urban development. We want that to be really clear. As I say, members on that side may think this is a bit of a joke or a bit of a fantasy and that we are not to be concerned about it, but I tell them that the people who live in that area are very, very concerned about it. As I say, we will remind them about that —

Several members interjected.

Dr D.J. HONEY: We will remind members opposite about that leading into the next election, as we will remind them about their foolish plan to stop the Roe 8 highway. We are definitely relishing that one.

Ms S. Winton interjected.

Dr D.J. HONEY: We are really looking forward to that, member for Wanneroo, and looking forward to the next election as well!

I need to raise a number of other points in the short time that I have available, but I will not extend it too long. The first one is that we need clarity on the business case for this rail line. Rail transport is very expensive. The subsidy for rail transport takes away money that government would have for other purposes and other important social purposes.

Ms A. Sanderson interjected.

Dr D.J. HONEY: The member can answer these questions if she likes. We need a detailed business plan that shows how there is a net benefit to the community from this project, other than just saying that the government thinks it feels good or that this is a political imperative: “This is something we’re going to do because we think this is a vote winner on this particular issue.” This government has said that it will introduce Infrastructure Western Australia —

Ms S. Winton interjected.

Dr D.J. HONEY: We have not said that we are not supporting it. We want to understand the basis of it, because there has been no business case. We have asked and asked for it, member for Wanneroo, but we have not seen the business

case for this. This government has made a lot of moment of the fact that it is introducing Infrastructure Western Australia and that it will be a prudent spender of capital money. It will not spend money just for political expediency; it will spend money because it is the best value investment for the state. We want to see the business case for that.

This was touched on by previous members: I want to make it clear that we need clarity on the potential impact on commute times for people travelling on the Perth–Midland rail line. Two rail projects are now impacting on that line—the Forrestfield–Airport Link and this project. In the Town of Claremont in my electorate, by the time the Forrestfield–Airport Link trains come in, there will be only an eight-minute gap between trains. That has made pedestrian crossings difficult. When the Forrestfield–Airport Link and this line link with the Perth–Midland line, there is a real question about whether that will negatively impact on commute times for the Perth–Midland line. I understand that introduces quite substantial control and signalling issues. It would be worthwhile the minister telling us whether any modelling has been done on that and whether that will have a negative impact on passengers coming from Midland through that area. I will end on that. As I said, and has been made clear by our lead speaker on this matter, we are supporting this bill. We respect the fact that the government had a strong mandate for this at the last election, but there are important details to be clarified.

MS A. SANDERSON (Morley — Parliamentary Secretary) [8.49 pm]: I am very pleased to make a contribution to the debate on the Railway (METRONET) Amendment Bill 2019. I listened very carefully to the contributions of the last few speakers. The comments of the member for Cottesloe were quite surprising. The member for Cottesloe is like some throwback to the 1950s. His contribution was extraordinary. What a way to talk about public transport!

Mr T.J. Healy interjected.

Ms A. SANDERSON: Member, I am not taking interjections from either side of the house, but thank you.

The member for Cottesloe has found himself in the extraordinary position of making heartfelt pleas for an area that is not even part of Whiteman Park, but he has no regard for the Beeliar wetlands. He was happy for a road to be built straight through the Beeliar wetlands. This place went through weeks of consideration on the metropolitan region scheme amendment to protect the Beeliar wetlands. I heard nothing about feeding areas, birds and native wildlife. There was not one peep from that member on those issues. However, this area, which is not even part of Whiteman Park, is now of critical concern and forms the basis of the member's arguments about this particular rail line. The member for Cottesloe was very comfortable with literally building a road through the Beeliar wetlands. What an extraordinary position to take.

I listened intently to the member's comments about how public transport is very expensive and how that money could be spent on other things in the community. All members represent people who rely on public transport. They have no other option. They may be the only person in the hills to catch a bus on a particular route, but, were it not for that bus service, they would have no connection to the rest of their community and to the city. That is why public transport is so important to the people I represent. They need the bus service to go to the doctor or the shops, and to visit their friends. I recall the 80-year-old woman who was impacted by the decision of the former government to cancel the 354 bus service. That was her only connection and ability to do her shopping, go to the doctor and see her friends. That is why this government is investing in public transport. That is why Labor governments are committed to public transport. That is why public transport is so important. For the member for Cottesloe, who lives in a comfortable area, which has access to a train service and a reasonable public transport system, to make those kinds of comments is, frankly, very motivating for a member on this side of Parliament. It reminds me of the importance of being in government and why it is so important that we are on this side and members opposite are not.

The Morley–Ellenbrook rail line has a long and unfortunate history for the community. The first iteration was in 2008, when then Premier Alan Carpenter announced that it would form part of a broader transport vision if Labor were re-elected. I quote from his 2008 statement —

“Good government is about planning for the long term. Not the next election but the next generation.”

That is exactly what was planned then, and that is exactly what we are doing now with Metronet. He said also —

“We have doubled the size of the urban rail network in seven years so the Government has a track record in delivering on these significant projects.

That was the Gallop and Carpenter governments. The statement said also —

The Premier said the comprehensive plan would be delivered in stages over at least two decades and would include:

- extending the northern suburbs railway to Butler, Brighton, Alkimos and, ultimately, to Yanchep;
- ...
- a new dedicated link for Ellenbrook, connected to Perth via the existing Midland line;
- a dedicated public transport service to a remodelled Perth airport ...

It would also include new stations along the exiting rail lines.

This has been a vision for a very long time. Labor has been committed to the Ellenbrook rail line for a very long time. For me as a local, as a member for the East Metropolitan Region from 2013, and now as the member for Morley, it has been a long time coming. We are now doing it.

Two years after the Liberal Party was elected in 2008, we saw the long walk back by the former government from the Ellenbrook rail line. It was a shocker. The then Minister for Transport, Hon Simon O'Brien, announced that the government was looking at providing not a rail line, but an enhanced bus service. There was a lot of investigating, a lot of looking and a lot of developing.

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup: It takes time!

Ms A. SANDERSON: It does. The previous government said that numerous times over the past eight and a half years. It does take time to do it properly, but there is only so much time, member.

Hon Simon O'Brien said in his statement —

“At the heart of the Government’s proposal is the introduction of the Ellenbrook High Frequency Service—a direct link connecting the suburb with Bassendean train station and Morley bus station,” ...

The statement said also —

Mr O'Brien said enhancing bus services to Ellenbrook had long been a priority for the State Government.

I thought the Ellenbrook rail line was a priority. He went on to say —

“Since being elected I have been working with Swan Hills MLA Frank Alban to ensure that Ellenbrook’s voice is heard and that the community, which was so steadfastly ignored by the former Labor government, gets the enhanced bus services it deserves,” ...

The statement said also —

The Minister also said it was important to note that these changes were only an initial response to the public transport services in Ellenbrook.

My understanding is that at the 2008 election, the former government made an \$850 million commitment to build that rail line. It is clear that we have seen a walk back from that.

In 2013, the rapid bus service was abandoned. That was just before the election. The member for Dawesville is nodding. I am sure he was in the thick of it. There was a lot of hand-wringing: “What are we going to do? We have to come up with another solution. We will not be able to deliver this.” The Premier at the time, Colin Barnett, had said that the government made it clear that it was a second-term commitment. This was a reworking of John Howard’s core and non-core promises. Just before the 2013 election, the former government abandoned that second-term commitment.

Several members interjected.

Ms A. SANDERSON: I will talk about MAX light rail, but for now I will stick with the Morley–Ellenbrook rail line. I will read from a statement in 2014 —

New Transport Minister Dean Nalder has vowed to get Perth’s delayed \$2 billion light rail back on track—saying it may be faster and “smarter” to split the project into two parts.

My apologies. That was in relation to MAX, which I will get to. I have lost my place.

Back on the Morley–Ellenbrook line, we then move to 2016, when the then Minister for Transport, Bill Marmion, said that no-one in Ellenbrook had told him that they were upset about the plans.

Several members interjected.

Ms A. SANDERSON: That was the plans for a rapid bus transport service in Ellenbrook instead of the rail line. This was around the time of the release of the final Perth and Peel transport plan, which proposed a rapid bus service from Morley to Ellenbrook, due to be delivered in 10 to 20 years. It was not even a rail line. It was to be an enhanced, frequent and rapid bus service. A lot of superlatives were essentially put in front of “bus service” to describe what was going on. It was a mess. No-one knew what was going on.

I now want to talk about MAX light rail. That formed a key plank of the 2013 election campaign. The then Minister for Transport, Troy Buswell, and Ian Britza, the former member for Morley, stood outside Edith Cowan University with a map and said, “MAX light rail is the answer. We have canned the Morley–Ellenbrook line. We are hurting. People do not trust us on public transport. The north-eastern corridor is chronically under-served. We need to come up with a plan.” They came up with a plan, and MAX light rail it was. It was to start with a 22-kilometre line from Balga TAFE, then called Polytechnic West, to the CBD. In the Morley electorate, which I now represent, it would have serviced the residents of Nollamara and Dianella. The City of Stirling rezoned land along Alexander Drive to allow for high-density apartments. Apartments had been planned at Dianella Plaza Shopping Centre. That is still an empty lot. It is a wasteland.

We saw local government respond; it was a project under development. It responded by rezoning, appropriately, as it should have. The then Premier even encouraged people to buy land along the route, and it would have serviced

Nollamara and Dianella. It would have gone through Mirrabooka Shopping Centre, Cottonwood Crescent in north Dianella, Morley Drive north, Morley Drive and the Dianella Plaza Shopping Centre. It would then have continued through to Edith Cowan University, Mt Lawley, North Perth, the Perth area and the CBD. It would have been completed by 2018. It was presented with the fully funded, fully costed stamp that went across every one of the Liberal Party's election commitments and turned out to be the greatest lie of that campaign—fully funded, fully costed. I have to say that that commitment contributed to the shoring up of a number of seats, which was exactly what it was designed to do. It was a political approach to an issue that showed that the Liberal Party cannot be trusted on public transport. Morley, Balcatta and Mount Lawley were the seats it was trying to keep. That is exactly what the Liberal Party did. It was cynical and dishonest.

At no point had it made any serious approach to the federal government about funding it despite saying that it was fully funded and fully costed. No federal money was committed to this project at all. That was not apparent until after the election. The Liberals lied to the public about this project. We then saw Opposition Leader Tony Abbott, then soon to be Prime Minister, say to I think the Liberal Naphthine government, "Rail is not in our knitting. There will be no federal money for rail." The then federal opposition leader declared also —

"We have no history of funding urban rail and I think it's important that we stick to our knitting," ... "And the Commonwealth's knitting when it comes to funding infrastructure is roads."

It was clear that the Liberal government was never going to get federal funding. It did not have the funding. It was not fully funded and it was the greatest deception and the greatest lie of that campaign.

In December 2013, a year after the initial announcement, MAX light rail was deferred for three years as part of a suite of cuts and asset sales in an attempt to regain control of the state's finances, which were spiralling out of control and tanking under the feet of the government. In April 2014, just four months after that, the new Minister for Transport, Dean Nalder, changed MAX light rail plans when he suggested that it would be faster and smarter to split the project into two parts. PerthNow reports —

Mr Nalder said he considered the north–south route connecting Mirrabooka with the CBD a priority ahead of the proposed east–west line between Victoria Park and Nedlands.

This is the long walk back from MAX light rail. We have had the long walk back from the Morley–Ellenbrook line. We are now having the long walk back from MAX light rail. The member for Bateman insisted that the change was not a broken promise. He argued that the government was looking at buses, which were 50 per cent cheaper. We went from light rail to rapid buses.

My favourite part of the whole scenario is the floating of the idea of an underground rail line to Morley, another thought bubble from the former Minister for Transport. After deciding he would split MAX light rail, he essentially said, according to ABC News in 2016 —

An underground heavy rail line appears to have become the West Australian Government's preferred public transport option.

Premier Colin Barnett and Transport Minister Dean Nalder revealed a rail tunnel from Perth to Morley was being closely looked at, but construction would not start for many years.

We saw an awful lot of navel gazing and examination of projects under this government. It was unable to settle on a single project. I have to say that the underground rail line to Morley created a great deal of confusion in the community. People had no idea what was going on. MAX was still a possibility but after three years, although it had been expecting a rail line through Morley to Ellenbrook, it was talking about an underground tunnel to Morley, plus a rapid bus service. It was a complete mess. The idea of tunnelling to Morley under Beaufort Street or Fitzgerald Street was quite preposterous to most people in the community. Where would they put a station in the activity centre of Morley? How would it work? It was completely undercooked I think is the best way to put it. The Liberals were thinking about it but it would never happen for a very long time, so there was another distraction over here.

Less than a year later, essentially, the Liberals canned MAX light rail in favour of the Forrestfield–Airport Link. If we want to talk about business cases, neither the business case for MAX light rail nor the business case for the Forrestfield–Airport Link was made public. I have been handed a document by the Minister for Transport, in which she indicates that she made a request to the current Leader of the Opposition for the business case this year. We are talking about business cases and transparency, member for Cottesloe. This directly relates to the member.

[Member's time extended.]

Dr D.J. Honey interjected.

Ms A. SANDERSON: The note states —

I refer to his request on 18 June 2019 to allow the release of cabinet documents relating to the FAL and Perth Freight Link. As he is aware, as a rule, neither governments nor oppositions release cabinet-in-confidence documents for which they have responsibility to approve the release of.

This is a longstanding tradition of access to cabinet documents. The rule for access to cabinet documents applies to a Liberal government but not a Labor government. Is that the standard the member for Cottesloe is proposing? It seems to be.

Dr D.J. Honey: I'm proposing transparency.

Ms A. SANDERSON: The government chose the FAL over MAX. That was a decision it made but it made no financial or business case justification in the public realm. It was estimated that the planning and work that had gone into MAX light rail was worth about \$28 million. The \$28 million spent on that project was just canned. It was one of a litany of wasted opportunities and absolute financial wrecking that was imposed by the previous government on the state of Western Australia and why we now have to clean up that mess.

I could go on because this has been an issue in the community that I represent and have lived in for many, many years. It was chaos around transport planning. When we talk to people locally in the eastern suburbs, particularly in Morley–Noranda, when we say we are going to do this, the level of cynicism is real and palpable due to the constant broken promises by the government of members opposite. It is harder and harder to gain that trust and have those conversations with people. The only way to do that is by delivering and that is what we will do with the Morley–Ellenbrook rail line.

The Morley–Ellenbrook rail line was a key part of the then Carpenter government's proposal for 2008 and formed part of the Labor Party's 2013 Metronet election commitment and very much a part of the 2017 election commitment. Prior to that election, there was significant consultation with the community. Metronet forums were held across almost every seat where it was applicable in the metropolitan area, including those that did not have a rail line going through them. I held one in the seat of Morley in 2017, which was very well attended by local government, senior members of local government and the community. People put their views and talked about what they wanted. There was very detailed and considered consultation around this commitment and what it would look like for the community. After winning government in 2017, the government essentially had to start this project from scratch, and I have to give enormous credit to the Minister for Transport and her office. The progress that has been made to date is a credit to the Metronet team, a credit to the minister and a credit to the minister's office. I thank all those people for their work and their commitment to this project.

After detailed consideration of more than 100 options, the proposed alignment was announced this year, with stations in Morley, Noranda, Malaga, Whiteman Park and Ellenbrook, and a later planned station at Bennett Springs East to be developed when planning for the area is finalised. We have now put out the final route alignment and the train stations for the electorate I represent will be in Morley and Noranda. There has been a lot of discussion and conjecture in my community about why the Morley station is not situated at the Morley activity centre. The location of the train station in this route alignment is absolutely the right one, for a number of reasons. I absolutely support this location and have always supported it. The Morley activity centre has suffered significantly from, let us say, underdevelopment by local government, state government and the owners of Galleria Shopping Centre. I have had very frank and clear conversations with Galleria—that it is a totally underinvested-in asset. When I visit shopping centres in any other area, I see that they are totally different. I went to Westfield Carousel Shopping Centre a few weeks ago, which is really outside my world, and it is really a nice place to go to eat and spend time with your family. It is well-designed and is what shopping centres are evolving to become. Galleria is in a very sad state of affairs, I have to say, and I am quite honest about that; it is in disrepair.

Mr J.E. McGrath: It was ahead of its time.

Ms A. SANDERSON: It was; I remember when it was opened. It was fantastic. The bus station was moved, but it was absolutely the best place to be, but that was 30 years ago.

Mr T.J. Healy: Ian Britza's office being there ruined it for me!

Ms A. SANDERSON: Well, it did not add to it!

There are significant geographic challenges with placing a train station there as well. The road network is very congested and people have to get into and out of the station. We need to support communities and areas that need to be developed, with smarter land use, and actually support the people who live there. The Morley station location at Walter Road East and Tonkin Highway will support not only Morley residents, but also residents of Kiara, Beechboro, Lockridge and the eastern suburbs that have suffered from very, very poor access to public transport. It will also be connected to the Morley activity centre, without question. We will make sure that we increase density around the Morley activity centre, but the benefits of diversion to the Morley activity centre would not justify the cost. I have doorknocked and called upon the residents of the Morley area who live between the Morley activity centre and Tonkin Highway, and they are absolutely delighted that there is going to be a train station that they will be able to walk to. This is the right location for the station, and I am sure that the member for Bassendean will talk about the benefits on the other side of Tonkin Highway and the servicing of those communities that are quite significantly disadvantaged in a number of ways.

The Noranda station will also provide significant opportunities in that area. One of the biggest challenges for Noranda will be densification and rezoning. It is an ageing suburb but it is close to the CBD and we need to look at smart

density there. Simply subdividing the large, 800 square metre blocks in Noranda will not cut it; that is not smart density. We need good, strategic developments in that area, with quality design and good access to green spaces, so that Noranda residents can look at ageing in place and downsizing locally, and so that their children can afford to build or move into the area with access to public transport. I think the opportunities for both those suburbs are really significant. This is the biggest infrastructure investment that Morley and Noranda have seen for 30 years. This is truly transformational and I believe really, really strongly in this project.

There is increasing literacy around transport in the community and about the need for interchangeable transport, increasing bike routes, buses and trains. As people travel and we become a more global community—and yes, I believe we should be more global, not less global—they see the benefits of that. They go to other cities and see people living in high density or medium density, with good access to public transport. It often means that having a car is actually a bit of a pain. Finding parking is actually more of a disadvantage than an advantage, and I hope that over time we can genuinely make that transition as a community.

I live relatively close to two train stations, between Bayswater and Meltham. My partner cycles to work every day and we chose to live in a location that would allow him to continue to do that and that would allow our children to have access to good bus routes. My daughter is in year 7 and she gets the bus to school; I hope my son will also have the confidence to be able to do that from an early age. It is an important part of being independent as young people and learning how to manage and conduct yourself. We see isolation now in suburbs like Ellenbrook and even Noranda, which is not necessarily very isolated, but the bus routes are really challenged. They are not great; going suburb to suburb, it takes an hour on public transport to get from Noranda to Maylands. If you want to meet a friend for lunch in Maylands, which is a 10-minute drive from Noranda, it takes an hour on public transport and several changes. Even the suburbs that are closer to the CBD can be isolated, and that isolates our young people, which also feeds into a sense of disassociation and disconnection from community. It is important for people to be confident in their public transport and able to access and use it early on.

I am thrilled to see this bill. This is it; this is really happening. This is, finally, the step in the right direction that we need for our communities in Morley and Noranda. I want to say thank you and give credit to the Minister for Transport and the Metronet team for the work that they have done and continue to do on this project. I look forward to seeing it progress over the next couple of years.

MR Z.R.F. KIRKUP (Dawesville) [9.17 pm]: I, too, rise to join with the opposition, true to Liberal values, in supporting the Railway (METRONET) Amendment Bill 2019. That is, of course, because the Liberal Party supports rail in Western Australia and we have a long history of doing so. I note that the member for Morley praised the Minister for Transport. We hope she also similarly praises the federal member for Pearce, Christian Porter, for his exceptional advocacy in securing hundreds of millions of dollars to support his community.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms M.M. Quirk): Members! I will have to do an “Order!” if you do not watch it!

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Hopefully there will not be a similar committee inquiry into your stewardship of the house in that case, Acting Speaker!

Ms S.E. Winton interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Dawesville. Member for Wanneroo, thanks very much.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Of course, Christian Porter was out there —

Ms S.E. Winton interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Wanneroo!

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: The member for Wanneroo is very excited today! The Minister for Water talked about a new water plant somewhere in the northern suburbs —

Ms S.E. Winton interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I call you to order, member for Wanneroo.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Undoubtedly she will be lobbying him to make sure that there is no fluoride in that new water plant. I am sure the member for Wanneroo is very excited about that. We will try to bring it back to the railway at this point in time.

I am very glad the member for Wanneroo raised Christian Porter, who was out there, working tirelessly in his community, to make sure we secure hundreds of millions of dollars for this very important project.

Ms J.J. Shaw interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Swan Hills!

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: If there are any Labor members who want to talk on this bill, I hope they similarly sing his praises, because he is obviously an integral part of delivering this project by securing significant investment. Of course, that investment is true to the Liberal Party's form. We have invested hundreds of millions of dollars over the years now into rail right across Western Australia.

Mr T. Healy interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Southern River.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I find it very interesting when the Labor Party attacks the Liberal Party as somehow being the party that is anti-rail.

Ms S. Winton interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Wanneroo, I do not think the member is taking interjections.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I am trying my best to ignore the member for Wanneroo, Acting Speaker.

Ms S.E. Winton: I am trying to ask a question.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: This is not *Q&A*, mate!

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms M.M. Quirk): Member for Morley, member for Southern River, member for Wanneroo, shut up!

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I often note that when the Liberal Party exalts the virtue of rail as we have done here today, as the member for Vasse has done in supporting this bill, we are howled down as if we are anti-rail. There were the Labor Party's interjections on the member for Cottesloe before about the Fremantle line closure in 19 —

Mr T.J. Healy: You closed the Cottesloe train station!

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Southern River, I call you to order for the first time.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Member for Southern River, that was in 1979. We have moved on significantly since that time, but the member throws back again —

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Southern River, I am not going to give you an early mark, so there is obviously no point in interjecting.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: The member for Southern River throws back again to this 1979 dream that he has whereby somehow the Liberal Party is anti-rail when nothing could be further from the truth. The Liberal Party firmly supports rail right through Western Australia, and I think we hear that in us voicing our support here today for the Metronet amendment bill. I look forward to the member for Mandurah's contribution, and undoubtedly his history, as we walk through what happened with the Mandurah line, but he would of course concede that a Liberal–National government introduced the original bill. It did; the original legislation was passed in 1999. There were alignment changes, but the inception for the Mandurah line came under Liberal government. Again and again we see a history of achievement from the Liberal Party when it comes to rail investment right through Western Australia. Those opposite may dispute that, those opposite might suggest that somehow we are anti-rail, but nothing could be further from the truth.

Ms S. Winton interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Wanneroo! You clearly went to the function at the break!

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Thank you very much, Madam Acting Speaker.

Mr T. Healy interjected.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Very well done, member for Southern River!

I think, Acting Speaker, I will go through my contribution by a couple of —

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Dawesville, I counsel you not to be quite so provocative.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I cannot help but speak the truth, Acting Speaker, and if those members opposite do not like it, it is hardly my issue.

The ACTING SPEAKER: At least the minister is being restrained.

Mr D.J. Kelly: Nothing could be further from the truth, member for Dawesville.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I appreciate the member for Bassendean's interjection. I look forward —

Ms S. Winton interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Wanneroo, second time.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I look forward to the member for Wanneroo's contribution, and undoubtedly she will be praising the member for Pearce for achieving what he has for those northern suburbs. The Liberal Party cares about rail and the member for Pearce, Christian Porter, has done a great job in securing significant investment for his community. We will certainly all be singing his praises as we go through.

A number of members have spoken about the Forrestfield–Airport Link. One aspect of the Forrestfield–Airport Link that I remember quite fondly was in 2013, when the former transport spokesman for the Labor Party at the time, Hon Ken Travers, was confused about where there would be a station at the airport, when one would be built, under the Labor Party's plan for an airport link. The former transport spokesman decided that the Labor Party would try to pursue an airport link that would terminate 1.5 kilometres or thereabouts away from the terminal. There were interesting contributions, and I note that the member for North Metropolitan Region had to rush out and assure people that that would be a part of the project and somehow the train station would be in the airport, although nothing really showed that. The Liberal Party came up with a particularly great piece, which I was not part of manufacturing.

Several members interjected.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I actually was not; I would absolutely claim credit if it was me.

I am reminded of the material that the Liberal Party put out at the time that showed the contrast between Labor's rail promise in 2013 for the airport link and the Liberal Party's promise. When we decided to put rail to the airport, we made sure that the station was close to the airport.

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I do not know.

I think what the Labor Party and the former transport spokesman wanted to do at the time was interesting. People were confused.

Mr D.J. Kelly interjected.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: They were very confused, member for Bassendean.

Mr D.J. Kelly interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister!

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: They were very confused, so much so, that we decided to include that on our Liberal Party material. It was a great piece. Under the Labor Party's proposal people would take the train with their luggage and be confused when they got to the airport and would not know where to go—they would have to get on a bus or some other motor vehicle to try to get to the airport. That was the concept that the Labor Party came up with at the time. The Liberal Party plan was to build the railway that went into the airport, and that is exactly what was signed off with the design and construct model in 2016, I think —

Mr T.J. Healy: Did you start building it?

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: As we have all mentioned, member for Southern River, these things take time. But of course, it is important to put our money where our mouth is, and that is what the Liberal Party has done, and done consistently. We have put our money where our mouth is on a lot of these rail projects right now. I hope to hear the member for Southern River's contribution. On the back of his car he has a sign that says that the Labor Party is building two new train stations in Southern River. Well done on that piece of promotion; I think it is quite good. I think he should put a little credit on the sign saying, "Thanks to the coalition government." He should thank the Liberal Party for funding a large part of it through the rail and road project funding that we have invested quite significantly in. There could not be a better contrast in the two parties' plans for the airport link. Once again, I will hold up this piece of paper. There could not be a better contrast than the confusion that reigned under the former Labor Party transport spokesman's plan for airport rail versus that of the Liberal Party.

Ms R. Saffioti: What plan did you take to the election?

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Which one?

Ms R. Saffioti: Yes.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I think we took one that was direct into the airport. That was 2013 plan. I am relatively certain. There was a bus tour or something like that. It was great. In 2013 —

Ms R. Saffioti: Did you take the proposal the election?

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I am not familiar with that level of detail, but I know that in 2013 there was our plan for the airport rail versus the Labor Party's plan of confusion to reign. People backed the Liberal Party's plan, and that is what we started to deliver on when we were in the second term of government—the 2013 term of government. Once again, members should recognise the level of the Liberal Party's ongoing commitment to rail in Western Australia.

I turn to the Yanchep rail extension, the Thornlie–Cockburn link. Again, I think there is significant funding from the federal government for that. I am particularly pleased about the Thornlie–Cockburn link, because it is good for people coming up the Mandurah line to the stadium. Again, that is the stadium for which the former government would have built all that exceptional rail infrastructure that we invested in to help service it. People coming from Mandurah to the stadium to watch the footy or any other events will be able to cut in at Cockburn and go through.

Mr D.J. Kelly: Have you been?

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I have, minister. I look forward to the opportunity —

Mr D.J. Kelly: Taylor Swift?

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: No, not Taylor Swift, sadly.

Mr W.R. Marmion: I was there!

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: The member for Nedlands was there. He is a huge “Swiftie”—a huge fan. He loves it. I often think of the people who came to me during the election when we announced the Thornlie–Cockburn link as well, or a similar plan. We promoted it quite heavily. The idea of getting on the train going to the stadium really resonated for people in the community I represent. Again, the current government would not have put it at that site. We often talk about significant infrastructure investment, and I have to say that I do not think any party has done more for infrastructure investment in Western Australia than the Liberal Party. That is the underlying truth. Members opposite fire up because they get upset and they do not like facts. That is the problem. When they look at the significant investment under the former government, the coalition government —

Mr T. Healy interjected.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Look, member for Southern River —

Mr T. Healy interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Southern River!

Mr T. Healy interjected.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: The member is asking a lot of questions.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Southern River!

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Do not feel bad for me, member for Southern River. I think what is important here is that we talk about the Liberal’s continued legacy on rail, and we have a very clear legacy.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms M.M. Quirk): Member for Wanneroo and member for Southern River!

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: When I talk about that legacy, of course I include the Mandurah railway line. I undoubtedly look forward to the member for Mandurah’s contribution on the Railway (METRONET) Amendment Bill 2019 when he gets an opportunity to speak. But, of course, I make the point that the concept was originally legislated for by the Court government, I think it was, member for Nedlands.

Mr W.R. Marmion: Yes.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: That is right.

Mr D.J. Kelly: Back in 1979!

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: It was in 1999. As part of the cursory research that I did on the bill this evening, it was interesting to see the constant return to theme from the Labor Party. When Hon Alannah MacTiernan was the shadow Minister for Transport, she put out a media release that referred to the talking points that members are using now. She did a media release on the twentieth anniversary of the reopening of the Fremantle line. It was amazing. The Labor Party continues to perpetuate mistruths that the Liberal Party is anti-railway but nothing could be further from the truth. When members look at the impact that the Mandurah railway line has had —

Several members interjected.

Mr W.R. Marmion: We had to put in all the car parks to make the Mandurah rail line work.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: That is right, member for Nedlands, who has an engineering background. We always appreciate his level of insight into these issues. Some of the alignment changes resulted in constraints on the lines. The former government went through a massive train station car park investment program.

Mr W.R. Marmion interjected.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: That is right.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thanks, member for Nedlands. Don’t you start!

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Members can see the level of investment that we made in car parks. Once again, that reinforced our commitment to public transport and rail transport in Western Australia. I look forward to the member for Mandurah's contribution on Mandurah rail.

Ms S.E. Winton interjected.

A government member: He's very excited.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I am.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Wanneroo, if you've got an issue, make a point of order, otherwise please desist.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: The member for Wanneroo somehow suggested that I have a crush on the member for Mandurah because I enjoy his contributions in this place!

When people talk to me about the Mandurah railway line, they have suggested that it should have been built closer to town. This has been spoken about on a number of occasions by people in the community. It was located where it is now because, of course, it was assumed that the city would grow in that direction and meet the train station. It has in some part, but we are not quite there yet. That reinforces the point that when governments build these types of significant railway projects and train stations, they must meet where communities live. I had the opportunity of living in Subiaco when I worked for the former Premier, which was nice and close. I lived right on the train station in Subi Centro, which was very convenient. I am not sure whether the Wellard line is in the electorate of the member for Baldvis or the member for Kwinana, but it is well connected because it is right in the town centre. Those types of public transport integrations are really important.

Mr T.J. Healy interjected.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Sorry, member for Southern River?

Mr T.J. Healy: I said thank you for building the Wellard station.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Sure! From here on, I will ignore everything that the member for Southern River says.

The ACTING SPEAKER: And, can I counsel members, they might like to ignore everything the member for Dawesville says and we will get on a lot better. Thank you.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Thank you very much for that, Madam Acting Speaker, which I feel was a slight skew of the Chair, but anyway!

Mr T.J. Healy: I would stand up to defend your honour but I am not going to.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I cannot even hear the member for Southern River!

I listened with interest to what the member for Morley said about the placement of Morley train station. The Metronet website is an amazing exercise in spin. Well done to the Public Transport Authority on that! I think that every concern raised in the house is then reflected in the content produced online. After the member for Vasse spoke about the Whiteman Park issues, all of a sudden the website changed and referred to Whiteman Park. One cannot get a better agency in terms of its political response.

Mr D.J. Kelly interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Bassendean!

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I note the quote on the website about Morley station is that there is good connectivity with Galleria Shopping Centre. In looking at Google Maps, it looks like it is a number of kilometres from Galleria. I listened to what the member for Morley said about the activity centre and of trying to link that through. I assume that at some point there is likely to be a bus option or something like that because —

Ms R. Saffioti: You should've read the second sentence about route 950 connectivity.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Route 950 and its connectivity—there we go! I thank the minister very much. I am sure that that is on the website; and, if not, it will be soon.

I think there is a model that the state can look to at some point about working with developers to ensure greater involvement in building stations, which makes a lot more sense. Ideally, if we had the situation again, we would make sure that Galleria was integrated with what is going on, perhaps building it closer for better connectivity or something like that. I do not know. I remember when the bus station was first built at Galleria. I was amazed that the bus station was right near the shopping centre. I grew up in Midland and then I went to something quite flash like Galleria. Having the buses there was amazing. The member for Morley mentioned the isolation; it connected Midland to Morley. One hopes that new rail projects will do the same sort of thing.

The Ellenbrook rail was obviously very well supported by the Liberal Party in government. I seek a short extension.

[Member's time extended.]

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I thank the Acting Speaker very much. I am sure her enthusiasm will come through in *Hansard*!

The federal government's significant half a billion dollar investment in what is now called the Morley–Ellenbrook railway line reflects Christian Porter's commitment to his community. I was interested in the contributions of a number of members. Undoubtedly, the member for Maylands will talk about Bayswater station and getting rid of Bayswater bridge so that it will no longer be hit by all the trucks, which is a shame. It is good that trucks will not hit it, but the website is gone that counted the number of times it was hit. The stats are gone now. It was an important public safety initiative. I am very interested in the Bayswater development more broadly speaking because there is a lot of opportunity there. Again, that is probably a good example of a station that is quite well connected to the rest of the community.

The member for Cottesloe raised the point about constraint on that line. There will be three lines coming in—the Forrestfield–Airport Link, the Midland line and the new Ellenbrook–Morley line. That is probably now one of the larger junction-type stations, in quite a suburban atmosphere. That is what we have. I note that the website refers to noise concerns, so obviously noise concerns have been raised. Development opportunities exist and I imagine that there is density surrounding that in the proposal. The members for Cottesloe and Nedlands pointed to how it will all interact. I will be interested to see the logistics of that but, of course, experts do these types of things.

I have spoken about Morley station. I will not canvass what the member for Vasse said about the Whiteman Park issues but I note there is significant activity now. The member for Darling Range, who has experience in that area, having grown up in the eastern suburbs and spending much of her time out there, is an expert on Ellenbrook. We have seen Ellenbrook grow and change quite significantly and now we see the same with the Henley Brook area. I remember when some of my mates' parents had properties on Park Street and Henley Street, which are now estates. The member for Nedlands referred to alignment issues and the resumption of land; I assume that is why the road was taken up. I am interested to see how the overall development of the station will take part in this. The government will need to increase the number of train station car parks and the connecting bus routes that go along with that.

I will talk briefly about Forrestfield, which is a good example of a suburb that was very isolated from the rest of the community. The FAL has really opened that up and it continues to open it up. The idea of extending public transport to Forrestfield substantially changed that. Having gone to primary school in Woodlupine in Forrestfield, a lot of my family's friends are still there, and there is a marked change in the future of Forrestfield and that eastern suburb area. It is a good example of how public transport can improve a community overall and make it much better, and that is why there is a continual commitment from the Liberal Party to rail infrastructure.

I am conscious of your concerns, Acting Speaker, so I will make the rest of my contribution very short. However, I note that in a couple of other jurisdictions in which I have taken an interest in planning and public transport, as I am sure many of us do when we have the opportunity to look at those cities, I found something of interest. In Manhattan, New York, a new subway line has not been added since 1940. It was bizarre for me to learn that in I think 1946 subway ridership peaked and has declined ever since. There is an interesting conversation to be had about declining passenger numbers across public transport networks across the globe, especially when we take into account increasing automated vehicles and on-demand transport. There is more likelihood now that we will move towards a model that the minister has flagged previously of on-demand public transport, certainly in other jurisdictions, and on-demand buses or something similar. That is obviously a way to incentivise people to re-engage with the public transport network around them. That was interesting to me because most people would consider New York a good example of a city that is very well connected, but it has not added a new line since 1940.

Mr D.J. Kelly: Do you know the size of Manhattan?

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I know it is very constraining.

Mr D.J. Kelly: It's 60 square kilometres.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: But it has grown significantly rapidly.

Ms S.E. Winton: Would you cancel Ellenbrook?

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I am confused, member for Wanneroo. Welcome to the conversation here this evening. I realise that at some point in time you may have dozed off, but if you had not, you would have heard that we have a clear commitment to rail in Western Australia.

Ms J.J. Shaw: It's not hard.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I am not here for your entertainment, member for Swan Hills. I have to make sure that together with other members of the Liberal Party we assert the facts in the face of the barefaced lies that come from members opposite.

Several members interjected.

Point of Order

Mr T.J. HEALY: I rise on a point of order, Acting Speaker.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms M.M. Quirk): This will be good!

Mr T.J. HEALY: I refer to standing order 145. This conversation seems to be so pro-government that it is as though we have wandered into a debate on a matter of public interest about how good the government is on rail. I am lost. I apologise.

The ACTING SPEAKER: There is no point of order. Sit down, member.

Debate Resumed

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: The member for Vasse made a very positive contribution about how much the Liberal Party continues to support rail. That is what we are reflecting on in this debate. It is obvious that the Liberal Party has a strong commitment to rail. I look forward to the future of public transport and transport generally in Western Australia, and for Perth, noting its topographical challenges, and also the future technologies that exist that calls to the disruptive technology element that I help represent as part of the Liberal shadow cabinet. I think that disruptive technology will play an interesting role in public transport going forward and what that mix will look like. I have spoken at length about the need to ensure better community access to train stations as part of a heavy investment in rail. I think everyone supports that. Indeed, I know that the Liberal Party supports it; I know that Christian Porter supports it. I also know that right throughout the state and federal Liberal Party there is a strong commitment to rail right across Western Australia. That is why I am so pleased to support this bill.

MR D.J. KELLY (Bassendean — Minister for Water) [9.42 pm]: I am very pleased to rise to speak in favour of the Railway (METRONET) Amendment Bill 2019 that will see the building of the Morley–Ellenbrook train line. I am very proud to be part of a political party that has constantly supported public transport, in particular rail, in this state. I think the first petition that I ever signed was a petition against the Liberal Party’s plan to close the Fremantle rail line in 1979. It was one of the biggest petitions that the state has ever seen. The Liberal Party went ahead and closed the Fremantle train line, and that was really just the beginning of the Liberal Party’s real distaste for public transport. Thankfully, over the last couple of decades, Labor has really built the rail network here in Perth, Western Australia. We saw the reopening of the Fremantle train line and then the building of the Joondalup train line and the Mandurah train line. We are now seeing the completion of the Forrestfield–Airport Link by this Labor government, and we will now be seeing the building of the Morley–Ellenbrook line.

Mr T.J. Healy: And the Thornlie line.

Mr D.J. KELLY: I omitted to mention that the Thornlie line was also built by this Labor government. We have a proud history of supporting public transport, in particular rail.

For my electorate, the Morley–Ellenbrook line will be absolutely transformational. The line will leave Bayswater station, go up Tonkin Highway, take a right parallel with Reid Highway and then left up the side of Whiteman Park before it gets to Ellenbrook.

For the people of the electorate that I represent, the suburbs of Lockridge, Kiara and Beechboro in particular, and parts of Bayswater and Morley, it will be absolutely transformational. They suffer from being in a pocket that has really missed out on access to the rail network for far too long. The Carpenter Labor government promised the Ellenbrook train line in 2008. It lost that election because the Liberal Party falsely claimed, amongst other things, that it would build it. The Liberal Party then had eight years in which it did nothing to build the Ellenbrook train line. In fact, it did everything it could to frustrate it. For the electorate of Bassendean, for those suburbs of Lockridge, Kiara and, particularly, Beechboro, this new train line will be absolutely transformational. For the first time people who live in those suburbs will have access to the rail network in a convenient way. They will be able to get to the city, get to tertiary education and get access to jobs which they currently cannot. It will be absolutely transformational for those suburbs.

I want to say briefly how it will impact on Kiara College. Kiara College used to be Lockridge High School. The previous government recognised that Lockridge High School needed to be refreshed so it agreed to allow the college to change its name to Kiara College. But the previous government did not give the old Lockridge High School any additional resources. It allowed it to change its name, but essentially it is the same high school.

In this term in government, we committed to a major rebuild of Kiara College. That has significantly improved the standard of facilities at that high school. We are also doing something that successive governments have not done—that is, secure the future of the farm school. Kiara College has a fabulous farm school. It is not a toy; it is a genuine farm school. It wins prizes at the Royal Show. It beats commercial farmers at their own game. The stock raised at that high school wins ribbons at the Royal Show on a regular basis. Members should see the trophy cabinet.

One thing that has held back the future of Kiara College’s farm school is that the land it occupies is only leased from the Western Australian Planning Commission. This government has committed to transfer 12 hectares of land, which is what the school board has said is necessary for the future of the farm school, to the school to become a permanent part of the school. That will allow the school and the school board to plan for the future of the development of the farm school with certainty of tenure.

If we put together the redevelopment at Kiara College of those buildings and facilities—a new performing arts centre, a new student services centre and a specialist farm program—with the train station, which will be just down the road at the corner of Benara Road and Tonkin Highway, any student in the metropolitan area will be able to get to Kiara College for its specialist program. Not only will Kiara College have new facilities, be able to offer an enhanced educational experience for people who live in the catchment, which is Kiara, Lockridge, Beechboro and up the growth corridor of Dayton and Brabham and the like, but also the students of Brabham will be able to get on a train to get to Kiara College. Any kid who wants to do a specialist agriculture program will be able to get on a train and get to Kiara College. That is a concrete example of the way that the extension of the train line to Ellenbrook will have a significant knock-on effect on Kiara College. Kiara College now has a really bright future. Not only will the residents of Lockridge, Kiara and Beechboro get access to the train line, but they now have access to a first-class high school, something that previous governments were not willing to invest in.

The Morley–Ellenbrook line will also reduce congestion on the Midland line. That is a great benefit to the people of Bassendean. Currently, a lot of people drive from Ellenbrook down to Bassendean station, fill the car parks there, and get on the train to travel to the city. Obviously, with their own dedicated train line, the residents of Ellenbrook will not have to commute down to Bassendean. People who live in Ashfield and Bassendean will also get a great knock-on benefit from this new train line.

The other point I want to raise briefly is that we are now going to have railcar manufacturing at Bellevue, as part of our Metronet plan. It will provide a genuine opportunity for more jobs for people in the eastern suburbs. Members opposite said that we could not manufacture railcars in Western Australia. That is why, under the Liberal Party, only two per cent of the railcars for the metropolitan transport system were manufactured in Western Australia. Under the Metronet plan, it will be 50 per cent, and that will enable us to have a railcar manufacturing facility in Bellevue. For so many reasons, the Morley–Ellenbrook train line will be an absolute boost for residents of the Bassendean electorate.

I want to close by thanking the minister for the work she has done in getting this project on track. We have seen successive transport ministers on the Liberal side of politics do everything they can to frustrate this project. The minister has worked incredibly hard to get this project off the ground. I also want to thank the members of the Metronet team, who, I must say, have felt a bit of pressure to get the job done, because as a government we want to deliver this project to the community of Western Australia. I want to thank the Metronet team for the work it has done to date in getting this project off the ground and running. I appreciate the way that it has collaborated with other government agencies. As the Minister for Water, I am particularly pleased with the collaboration between the Metronet team, the Water Corporation and the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation to ensure that the Metronet rail precincts, where there will be significant opportunities for smart density, will be built in such a way to ensure that, as much as possible, they are waterwise. We firmly believe that the Metronet project is not just a rail project; it is actually a city-building project. Part of ensuring that our city is a modern city is to make sure that it not only has a world-class train system, but also looks at issues of water efficiency and being waterwise. I am amazed and so very pleased with the work that the Metronet team has done, and I look forward to seeing the work they and the minister deliver over the years to come.

Debate adjourned, on motion by **Mr D.A. Templeman (Leader of the House)**.

House adjourned at 9.53 pm

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Questions and answers are as supplied to Hansard.

HEALTH — HOSPITAL BEDS**5454. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Deputy Premier; Minister for Health; Mental Health:**

- (1) What was the average number of daily active beds for each month in the 2018–2019 financial year across each metropolitan hospital?
- (2) What is the total bed capacity for the same time period as (1) for each metropolitan hospital?

Mr R.H. Cook replied:

- (1)–(2) The average number of daily active beds and total bed capacity for each month in the 2018–2019 financial year across each metropolitan hospital:

Hospital	2018–19	Average number of daily active beds	Total bed capacity
Armadale–Kelmscott Memorial Hospital	Jul	218.1	222.0
	Aug	217.8	222.0
	Sep	218.0	222.0
	Oct	217.4	222.0
	Nov	214.5	222.0
	Dec	208.9	222.0
	Jan	209.7	222.0
	Feb	217.3	222.0
	Mar	213.0	222.0
	Apr	208.0	224.1
	May	212.7	226.0
	Jun	213.0	220.7
Bentley Hospital	Jul	168.2	189.8
	Aug	165.8	177.4
	Sep	172.8	186.4
	Oct	178.5	189.8
	Nov	179.1	189.6
	Dec	168.4	189.3
	Jan	167.1	196.0
	Feb	184.4	196.0
	Mar	182.4	196.0
	Apr	181.3	196.0
	May	186.3	196.0
	Jun	182.1	196.0
Fiona Stanley Hospital	Jul	685.4	739.4
	Aug	685.9	741.0
	Sep	681.5	741.0
	Oct	676.0	744.1
	Nov	665.9	741.2
	Dec	642.5	736.7

	Jan	627.7	735.5
	Feb	643.2	736.0
	Mar	651.1	731.4
	Apr	654.3	732.4
	May	650.6	721.0
	Jun	654.2	716.0
Frankland Centre	Jul	35.3	35.3
	Aug	35.0	35.0
	Sep	35.0	35.0
	Oct	34.8	35.0
	Nov	35.0	35.0
	Dec	35.0	35.0
	Jan	35.0	35.0
	Feb	35.0	35.0
	Mar	35.0	35.0
	Apr	35.0	35.0
	May	35.0	35.0
	Jun	35.0	35.0
Fremantle Hospital	Jul	208.0	223.0
	Aug	208.0	223.0
	Sep	208.0	223.0
	Oct	210.1	224.4
	Nov	214.0	227.0
	Dec	185.6	226.5
	Jan	195.9	231.2
	Feb	218.3	224.9
	Mar	220.0	224.0
	Apr	213.3	224.0
	May	219.9	224.0
	Jun	212.3	225.3
Graylands Hospital	Jul	133.1	133.1
	Aug	133.0	133.0
	Sep	133.0	133.0
	Oct	133.0	133.0
	Nov	133.1	133.1
	Dec	133.0	133.0
	Jan	133.0	133.0
	Feb	133.0	133.0
	Mar	133.0	133.0
	Apr	133.0	133.0
	May	133.0	133.0
	Jun	133.0	133.0

Kalamunda District Community Hospital	Jul	22.0	33.0
	Aug	22.0	33.0
	Sep	22.0	33.0
	Oct	22.0	33.0
	Nov	22.0	33.0
	Dec	22.0	33.0
	Jan	22.0	33.0
	Feb	22.0	33.0
	Mar	22.0	33.0
	Apr	22.0	33.0
	May	22.0	33.0
	Jun	22.0	33.0
King Edward Memorial Hospital for Women	Jul	199.2	230.0
	Aug	196.6	230.0
	Sep	196.0	230.0
	Oct	196.0	230.0
	Nov	200.1	230.0
	Dec	188.2	230.0
	Jan	174.5	227.3
	Feb	180.1	223.0
	Mar	177.0	223.0
	Apr	176.2	223.0
	May	177.7	223.0
	Jun	177.3	223.0
Murray District Hospital	Jul	15.0	25.0
	Aug	15.0	25.0
	Sep	15.0	25.0
	Oct	15.0	25.0
	Nov	15.0	25.0
	Dec	15.0	25.0
	Jan	15.0	25.0
	Feb	15.0	25.0
	Mar	15.0	25.0
	Apr	15.0	25.0
	May	15.0	25.0
	Jun	15.0	25.0
Osborne Park Hospital	Jul	144.2	173.0
	Aug	143.3	173.0
	Sep	142.8	173.0
	Oct	143.3	173.0
	Nov	144.3	173.0
	Dec	137.0	173.0

	Jan	139.7	173.0
	Feb	143.3	173.0
	Mar	144.4	156.6
	Apr	141.7	149.0
	May	144.5	149.0
	Jun	141.9	149.0
Perth Children's Hospital	Jul	214.7	243.0
	Aug	226.2	243.0
	Sep	219.0	243.0
	Oct	217.8	243.0
	Nov	213.9	243.0
	Dec	202.3	243.0
	Jan	191.9	243.0
	Feb	204.7	243.0
	Mar	210.5	243.0
	Apr	207.5	243.0
	May	212.5	242.2
	Jun	209.9	241.0
Rockingham General Hospital	Jul	169.4	187.0
	Aug	169.3	187.0
	Sep	169.5	187.0
	Oct	168.8	187.0
	Nov	163.6	187.0
	Dec	163.2	187.0
	Jan	163.4	187.0
	Feb	159.3	181.4
	Mar	163.9	187.0
	Apr	165.0	187.0
	May	165.9	187.0
	Jun	169.7	187.0
Royal Perth Hospital	Jul	431.8	449.9
	Aug	432.3	453.1
	Sep	428.8	450.8
	Oct	421.0	447.4
	Nov	426.7	448.8
	Dec	422.7	444.8
	Jan	413.8	441.9
	Feb	424.7	442.4
	Mar	433.1	445.9
	Apr	431.6	446.3
	May	438.8	450.9
	Jun	454.0	462.8

Selby Older Adult Mental Health Unit	Jul	40.0	40.0
	Aug	40.0	40.0
	Sep	40.0	40.0
	Oct	40.0	40.0
	Nov	40.0	40.0
	Dec	40.0	40.0
	Jan	40.0	40.0
	Feb	40.0	40.0
	Mar	40.0	40.0
	Apr	40.0	40.0
	May	40.0	40.0
	Jun	40.0	40.0
Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital	Jul	551.6	565.0
	Aug	553.3	565.0
	Sep	540.1	551.9
	Oct	535.1	549.0
	Nov	537.5	549.0
	Dec	502.9	547.2
	Jan	495.3	544.1
	Feb	514.5	549.3
	Mar	533.4	549.0
	Apr	526.6	549.0
	May	536.9	549.0
	Jun	536.5	549.0

HEALTH — HOSPITAL BEDS AND WARDS

5455. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Deputy Premier; Minister for Health; Mental Health:

Since 1 January 2018 have any beds or wards been closed across any metropolitan or regional hospitals, and if so:

- (a) How many, what were the dates they were closed and why were they closed?

Mr R.H. Cook replied:

I am advised:

- (a) Provision of the information sought by the Member would require a significant amount of time and research. This would unacceptably divert WA Health staff away from their normal duties. If the Member has a specific inquiry I will endeavour to provide a reply.

FIONA STANLEY HOSPITAL — DIGITAL OUTAGE

5456. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Deputy Premier; Minister for Health; Mental Health:

I refer to the planned digital outage at Fiona Stanley Hospital in May 2019, and ask:

- (a) How long was the digital outage;
- (b) What systems were affected;
- (c) What contingency plans were put in place;
- (d) Were there any unforeseen events, unplanned issues or adverse events which occurred that impacted or risked patient safety:
- (i) If so, what were the issues; and
- (e) What is the planned digital outage regime over the coming 12 months?

Mr R.H. Cook replied:

I am advised:

- (a) Approximately 5 minutes.
- (b) The outage core impact was on the network connectivity between Fiona Stanley Hospital (FSH) and the HSS core data centres. This had an impact to varying degrees on the following services:
 - Clinical applications Desktops, including remote desktop logins;
 - Desk phones and Cisco mobile devices.
 - Facilities Management Helpdesk and ICT Service Desk.
 - Facilities Management applications.
 - Mobile duress function (fixed duress was available).
 - Manual porter requests via InTouch.
 - Pharmacy applications.
 - RTLS.
 - MS Outlook.
 - Patient Entertainment System.
 - Managed equipment connections: Any of the managed equipment used on site such as MRI, CT and interventional labs will continue to work but could not be connected to network for transmission of imaging data.
 - Central Physiological Monitoring.
 - Whilst IELVS Network was unaffected, access via the Citrix application which assists in management of the iELVS services was not possible.
- (c) Contingency plans in place were as follows:
 - The FSH Paging Downtime Procedure was enacted;
 - Helpdesk services were split between FSH and Fremantle Hospital;
 - Local PST phones or mobile phones were used to communicate;
 - Car park boom gates were raised for the duration of the outage; and
 - Emergency operations centre for central co-ordination was in effect for the duration of the outage.
- (d) No.
 - (i) Not applicable.
- (e) As per the change and release management procedures, there are several initiatives that will result in future outages, including:
 - Regular server patching takes place every quarter.
 - The schedule allows for all onsite servers to be patched over a 3-month cycle with the next cycle starting in November 2019 and then continuing February 2020, May 2020 and August 2020.
 - Agility upgrade – date to be confirmed.
 - Delegate upgrade – date to be confirmed.
 - Project Evolve – FSH ICT Network Infrastructure equipment replacement: Across calendar year 2020 the progressive implementation of this project will result in many smaller ICT outages and potentially site wide outages – not yet planned or scheduled.

HOSPITALS AND HEALTH CAMPUSES — DIGITAL OUTAGES

5458. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Deputy Premier; Minister for Health; Mental Health:

- (1) For the 2018–19 financial year, did any hospital or service provider experience a planned digital outage and if so:
 - (a) What hospital or provider;
 - (b) How long was the digital outage;
 - (c) What systems were affected;
 - (d) What contingency plans were put in place; and

- (e) Were there any unforeseen events, unplanned issues or adverse events which occurred that impacted or risked patient or clinical safety:
- (i) If so, what were such issues?
- (2) For the 2019–20 financial year, are there any planned digital outages and if so:
- (a) For which hospital or provider;
- (b) How long is the digital outage expected to occur;
- (c) What systems are going to be affected; and
- (d) What contingency plans are going to be put in place?

Mr R.H. Cook replied:

- (1) For the 2018–19 financial year, the following planned digital outages occurred;

(a) Impacted Sites	(b) Outage Duration (dd:hh:mm)	(c) Systems affected
King Edward Memorial Hospital	00:09:59	KEMH internal communications network
All hospital sites	00:04:00	Clinical management system
All sites	00:03:45	Patient administration system
All tertiary hospital sites	00:01:00	Capacity management system
All sites	04:14:00	Human resource system
All hospital sites	00:05:00	Pathology system
All hospital sites with an emergency department	00:04:00	Emergency department system
All sites	00:04:00	Financial system
All sites	00:00:30	Internet access
All hospital sites with a theatre	00:04:00	Theatre management system
All hospital sites	00:01:00	Radiology system
All hospital sites	00:02:00	Radiology system
All hospital sites with access to the digital medical record system	00:07:00	Digital medical record system
All sites	00:02:00	Rostering system
All sites	00:02:00	Patient administration system
All hospital sites	00:00:20	Radiology system
All hospital sites with access to the digital medical record system	00:02:40	Digital medical record system
All hospital sites	00:07:00	Pharmacy system
All hospital sites	00:15:00	Pharmacy system
All sites	00:03:00	Patient administration system
All sites that provide Mental Health Services	00:04:00	Psychiatric services system
All hospital sites with a theatre	00:01:00	Theatre management system
All hospital sites	01:01:00	Pharmacy system
All sites	00:01:06	Patient administration system
All sites that provide Mental Health Services	00:04:00	Psychiatric services system
All sites	00:06:00	Financial system
All sites	00:02:00	Patient administration system

All sites	00:01:20	Patient administration system
All sites	00:01:08	Patient administration system
All hospital sites	00:02:30	Radiology system
All sites	00:02:00	Patient administration system
All sites	00:00:45	Internet
All sites	00:00:30	Internet
Perth Children's Hospital	00:02:00	PCH patient queue system
All sites	00:01:00	Financial system
All sites	00:05:00	Financial system
All hospital sites	00:01:30	Radiology system
All sites	01:00:00	E-mail system archiving functionality only
All sites	01:00:00	E-mail system archiving functionality only

- (d) Every hospital and health care site has a unique Business Continuity Plan in place that is implemented during digital outages.
- (e) No impact on patient or clinical safety for the events listed above has been identified.
- (i) Not applicable.
- (2) For the 2019–20 financial year, the following planned digital outages are scheduled to occur;

(a) Impacted sites	(b) Outage Duration (dd:hh:mm)	(c) Systems affected
All sites	00:01:00	My Health Record
All sites	00:00:15	Financial system
All sites	00:01:00	Financial system
Perth Children's Hospital	00:00:15	PCH Communication system
All sites	00:00:40	Financial system
All hospital sites with a theatre	00:01:00	Theatre management system
All sites that provide Mental Health Services	00:04:00	Psychiatric services system
All sites	00:06:00	Financial system
All sites that provide Mental Health Services	00:04:00	Psychiatric services system
All hospital sites	00:01:00	Pathology system
All sites	00:00:20	Internet
All sites	00:01:00	Financial system
All hospital sites	00:01:40	Radiology system
All sites	00:00:05	Financial system
All hospital sites	00:04:00	Radiology system
All sites	00:01:00	Financial system
State Cancer Centre	00:00:30	Cancer Centre Network
All hospital sites	00:01:00	Pathology system
All hospital sites	00:02:00	Pathology system
Osbourne Park Hospital	00:00:30	OPH Network
All sites	04:14:45	Human resource system

All sites	00:06:00	Financial system
All hospital sites	00:01:00	Pathology system
PathWest	00:00:30	PathWest Network
All sites	00:14:00	Patient billing system
All hospital sites	00:02:00	Radiology system
Armadale Hospital	00:00:30	Armadale Network
Royal Perth Hospital	00:00:30	RPH Network
Harry Perkins Site	00:00:30	Harry Perkins Centre Network
Perth Children's Hospital	00:00:30	PCH Network
Drug and Alcohol Centre Midland	00:02:00	DAM Network

- (d) Every hospital and health case site has a unique Business Continuity Plan in place that is implemented during digital outages.

HOSPITALS AND HEALTH CAMPUSES — MEDICAL EQUIPMENT

5460. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Deputy Premier; Minister for Health; Mental Health:

Since 17 March 2017, has any medical equipment malfunctioned or failed in any hospital or service provider, and if so:

- (a) What was the equipment and where is it located;
- (b) How did the equipment malfunction or fail;
- (c) Why did the equipment malfunction or fail;
- (d) On what date did the equipment malfunction or fail;
- (e) Were any operations cancelled or deferred due to the malfunction or failure:
 - (i) If so, how many and what cases;
- (f) Were any imaging appointments cancelled or deferred due to the malfunction or failure:
 - (i) If so, how many and what cases;
- (g) Did this failure pose a possible or an actual risk to patient or clinical safety:
 - (i) If so, what was the risk; and
- (h) What was the cost of repair or replacement?

Mr R.H. Cook replied:

I am advised:

- (a)–(h) Provision of the information sought by the Member would require a significant amount of time and research. This would unacceptably divert WA Health staff away from their normal duties. If the Member has a specific inquiry I will endeavour to provide a reply.

HEALTH — HEALTHY OPTIONS WA

5473. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Deputy Premier; Minister for Health; Mental Health:

I refer to the “Healthy Options WA: Food and Nutrition Policy for WA Health Services and Facilities – 2018–19 Statewide Audit of Policy Implementation”, and ask:

- (a) What was the breakdown of all costs associated with conducting and compiling the audit, and specifically:
 - (i) What were the total staff costs;
 - (ii) What were the total travel costs; and
 - (iii) What were the total printing costs;
- (b) How many staff (by head count) were dedicated to (a):
 - (i) What was the job category of each staff member;
- (c) What is the estimate number of hours spent on (a); and
- (d) Will the Minister table a list of all persons who were interviewed for the audit, when they were interviewed, by whom were they interviewed, where were they interviewed and for how long were they interviewed?

Mr R.H. Cook replied:

The Department of Health contracted the Western Australian School Canteen Association (WASCA) to conduct independent audits and compile results for the “Healthy Options WA: Food and Nutrition Policy for WA Health Services and Facilities – 2018–19 Statewide Audit of Policy Implementation”.

- (a)
 - (i) Total staff costs: \$80,617.01.
 - (ii) Total travel costs: \$1,937.62.
 - (iii) Printing costs were not incurred as data was collected using electronic survey tools.
 - (b) Three.
 - (i) WASCA Executive Officer (tertiary qualified nutritionist).
 - WASCA Project Coordinator (tertiary qualified nutritionist).
 - WASCA Project Officer (tertiary qualified dietitian).
 - (c) WASCA spent approximately 1500 hours.
 - (d) Interviews were conducted for the audit by WASCA project staff with the following:
 - Health Service Provider health promotion staff, on the audited site or via telephone in some regional sites.
 - Managers and staff (including volunteers) of retail food outlets, on each audited site.
- Interviews lasted 30 minutes to one hour and took place between September 2018 and January 2019.

HOSPITALS AND HEALTH CAMPUSES — VENDING MACHINES AND CATERING

5474. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Deputy Premier; Minister for Health; Mental Health:

- (1) For each hospital and service provider, will the Minister provide a summary of gross and net income generated from the provision of vending machines during:
 - (a) 2016–2017;
 - (b) 2017–2018;
 - (c) 2018–2019; and
 - (d) 2019 year to date?
- (2) For each hospital and service provider, will the Minister provide a summary of gross and net income generated from cafeteria and catering during:
 - (a) 2016–2017;
 - (b) 2017–2018;
 - (c) 2018–2019; and
 - (d) 2019 year to date?

Mr R.H. Cook replied:

- (1)–(2) [See tabled paper no 2945.]

HOSPITALS — SCHEDULE 8 MEDICINE

5478. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Deputy Premier; Minister for Health; Mental Health:

- (1) Since 17 March 2017 have any schedule 8 medicines been reported stolen from a hospital or service provider, and if so:
 - (a) What was the name of the medicine reported stolen;
 - (b) From what facility was it stolen; and
 - (c) What was the approximate value of the stolen medication?
- (2) Since 17 March 2017 have any schedule 8 medicines been reported lost from a hospital or service provider, and if so:
 - (a) What was the name of the medicine reported lost;
 - (b) From which facility was it lost; and
 - (c) What was the approximate value of the lost medication?

Mr R.H. Cook replied:

(1) Yes.

(a) Medicine	(b) Reporting Facility	(c) Cost (\$)
Dexamphetamine	Fiona Stanley Hospital	0.64
	Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital	
Fentanyl	Armadale Health Service	6.04
	Fiona Stanley Hospital	
	King Edward Memorial Hospital	
	Perth Childrens Hospital	
	Royal Perth Hospital	
Hydromorphone	Albany Health Campus	21.36
	Broome Hospital	
	Fiona Stanley Hospital	
	Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital	
Methadone	Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital	6.68
	Broome Hospital	
	Royal Perth Hospital	
Oxycodone	Boyup Brook	11.75
	Fiona Stanley Hospital	
	Peel Health Campus	
	Perth Childrens Hospital	
	Princess Margaret Hospital	

(2) Yes.

(a) Medicine	(b) Hospital	(c) Cost (\$)
Alprazolam	King Edward Memorial Hospital	0.52
	Fremantle Hospital	
Buprenorphine	Royal Perth Hospital	8.67
	Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital	
	Fiona Stanley Hospital	
	Fremantle Hospital	
	Busselton Hospital	
Codeine	Royal Perth Hospital	0.27
	Rockingham General Hospital	
	Bunbury Hospital	
Dexamphetamine	Princess Margaret Hospital	9.08
	Fiona Stanley Hospital	
	Armadale Health Service	
Fentanyl	Royal Perth Hospital	6.77
	Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital	
	Rockingham General Hospital	
	Fiona Stanley Hospital	
	Kalgoorlie Hospital	
	Coral Bay Pharmacy	
	Bunbury Hospital	

Hydromorphone	Royal Perth Hospital	12.69
	Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital	
	Osborne Park Hospital	
	Fiona Stanley Hospital	
	Bridgetown Hospital	
Ketamine	Royal Perth Hospital	11.35
Methadone	Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital	1.14
	Fiona Stanley Hospital	
	Fremantle Hospital	
Morphine	Royal Perth Hospital	14.82
	Kalamunda Hospital	
	King Edward Memorial Hospital	
	Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital	
	Fiona Stanley Hospital	
	North Midlands Health Service	
	Margaret River Hospital	
Oxycodone	Princess Margaret Hospital	18.66
	Armadale Health Service	
	Royal Perth Hospital	
	Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital	
	Osborne Park Hospital	
	Joondalup Health Campus	
	Rockingham General Hospital	
	Fiona Stanley Hospital	
	Noonkanbah Clinic	
	Hedland Health Campus	
	Nickol Bay Hospital	
	Nannup Hospital	
	Bunbury Hospital	
	Narrogin Hospital	
Pethidine	King Edward Memorial Hospital	1.70
Tapentadol	Royal Perth Hospital	26.24
	Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital	
	Osborne Park Hospital	
	Fiona Stanley Hospital	
	Bridgetown Hospital	

HOSPITALS — SCHEDULE 8 MEDICINE

5479. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Deputy Premier; Minister for Health; Mental Health:

(1) I refer to the disposal of schedule 8 medicines, and ask:

- (a) How much money has been spent on supervised transport to a waste management contractor during:
- (i) 2017;
 - (ii) 2018; and
 - (iii) 2019 year to date;

- (b) What contractor or entity provided supervised transport to a waste management contractor during the years above; and
- (c) What waste management contractor provided destruction services during the years above?
- (2) Have any medications been reported stolen during a supervised transport of a schedule 8 medication and if so:
 - (a) What was reported stolen, when, what was the value and quantity of the medication; and
 - (b) Where was the origination and intended destination for the medication?
- (3) Have any medications been reported lost during a supervised transport of a schedule 8 medication and if so:
 - (a) What was reported stolen, when, what was the value and quantity of the medication; and
 - (b) Where was the origination and intended destination for the medication?

Mr R.H. Cook replied:

I am advised:

- (1)
 - (a)
 - (i) \$2,309,061.54
 - (ii) \$2,499,785.91
 - (iii) \$657,184.69
 - (b)–(c) (i)–(iii) Daniels Health Services Pty Ltd, SITA Medicollect, Cleanaway Pty Ltd, Symbion and Suez Waste Management Company.
- (2) No.
 - (a)–(b) Not applicable.
- (3) WA Country Health Service advised there have been 2 incidents of lost schedule 8 medications during supervised transport.
 - (a)–(b) June 2018 – 5 Fentanyl 100microgram ampoules (\$5.88) were lost during transport between Carnarvon Pharmacy and Coral Bay Nursing Post.
July 2019 – 56 Oxycodone Sandoz 20mg tablets (\$12.94) were lost during transport between Symbion wholesaler and Port Hedland Pharmacy.

ABORIGINAL HEALTH SERVICES — GRANTS

5481. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Deputy Premier; Minister for Health; Mental Health:

For each year from 2016, will the Minister table a breakdown of grants provided to Aboriginal health services including:

- (a) The total annual value of the grants;
- (b) The name and location of the non-state government organisation receiving the grants; and
- (c) The services which have to be provided as part of the grant?

Mr R.H. Cook replied:

- (a)–(c) [See tabled paper no 2946.]

TRANSPORT — HILLARYS BOAT HARBOUR

5485. Mr P.A. Katsambanis to the Minister for Transport; Planning:

I refer to operations of the Hillarys Boat Harbour, and I ask:

- (a) what was the total amount in fees collected at Hillarys Boat Harbour for each of the years 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019 year to date;
- (b) what was the maintenance expenditure for Hillarys Boat Harbour in 2018 and 2019 year to date;
- (c) what has been the boat pen occupancy rate at Hillarys Boat Harbour for each of the years 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019 year to date;
- (d) How many people were on the waiting list for a boat pen at Hillarys Boat Harbour in 2018 and 2019 year to date; and
- (e) Has any funding been put aside for additional CCTV cameras for the car park of Hillarys Boat Harbour?

Ms R. Saffioti replied:

- (a) 2015–16 – \$2,331,538.25; 2016–17 – \$4,267,208.63; 2017–18 – \$3,026,077.11; 2018–19 – \$2,909,684.11; 2019–20 – \$446,563.29 (as at 30 August 2019)
- (b) 2018–19 – \$1,580,301.54; 2019–20 – \$104,048.95 (as at 30 August 2019)
- (c) 2015 – 98 per cent; 2016 – 98 per cent; 2017 – 98 per cent; 2018 – 81 per cent; 2019 – 73 per cent (as at 30 August 2019)
- (d) 2018 – 104; 2019 – 91 (as at 30 August 2019)
- (e) Yes.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT AUTHORITY — NOTIFIABLE OCCURRENCES

5486. Ms L. Mettam to the Minister for Transport:

I refer to the Public Transport Authority's reporting of notifiable occurrences, and I ask:

- (a) How many category A occurrences were there for each incident category including slips, trips and falls, trespass and level crossing occurrences for the years:
 - (i) 2017–18; and
 - (ii) 2018–19; and
- (b) How many category B occurrences were there for each incident category including slips, trips and falls, trespass and level crossing occurrences for the years:
 - (i) 2017–18; and
 - (ii) 2018–19?

Ms R. Saffioti replied:

Refer to the relevant Public Transport Authority Annual Report.

MODERN SLAVERY — GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

5496. Mr W.R. Marmion to the Treasurer; Minister for Finance; Aboriginal Affairs; Lands:

I refer to the recently passed Commonwealth legislation, the *Modern Slavery Act 2018*, and ask

- (a) How many government departments and agencies have assessed the risk of modern slavery in their supply chains;
- (b) What funding has each government department or agency allocated and over what timeframe to stamp out modern slavery in their supply chains;
- (c) How many suppliers to government departments and agencies were selected or rejected on sustainability measures (rather than price) from procurement decisions last year;
- (d) What steps is government taking beyond having policies to address sustainability risks in their supply chains;
- (e) How many state government suppliers did not meet criteria for appointment in the government's sustainable procurement policy and were subsequently rejected;
- (f) What proportion of each department's spend has been analysed for sustainability related risks (including modern slavery); and
- (g) Which departments and agencies have started to assess their sustainability and modern slavery risks following the Act being introduced?

Mr B.S. Wyatt replied:

- (a) Legal advice has been received that most State Government entities are not subject to the *Modern Slavery Act 2018* (Cth), including the Department of Finance. However, it is intended that Modern Slavery considerations are included in the Ethical Procurement project that the Department is progressing as part of a priority project with the Public Sector Reform Unit. As such, the Department has not yet undertaken a systematic assessment of its supply chains for the risk of modern slavery, either at the Department or whole-of-government level.
- (b) At this time, the Department of Finance does not have funding allocated in relation to eliminating modern slavery in its supply chains, and is unaware of the funding allocation or timeframes of other government entities.

- (c) State Government, goods and services, procurement decisions are made on the basis of value-for-money pursuant to the *State Supply Commission Act 1991* and associated policy suite. Value-for-money considerations include both cost and non-cost considerations, such as sustainability. Often there is never a single reason for a procurement decision and as such, the State Government does not track the justification for why a procurement decision was made and is unable to provide quantitative data to address this question.
- (d) As stated in the response to (a), the Department of Finance is responsible for the development of an Ethical Procurement framework for the State. Furthermore, opportunities to monitor supplier performance via the State's procurement processes are being explored. This is intended to provide the State with a means of ensuring government enters into contracts with ethically and environmentally responsible suppliers.
- (e) The Department of Finance does not gather information for itself, or on behalf of the State, on how many suppliers were selected or rejected on the basis of sustainability measures.
- (f) The Department of Finance has not undertaken comprehensive spend analysis for the purpose of identifying modern slavery risks or other sustainability related risks. At this point, the Department is unaware which government entities have undertaken spend analysis for this purpose.
- (g) As stated in the response to (a), many State Government entities are not subject to the *Modern Slavery Act 2018* (Cth). At this point, the Department of Finance is unaware of which government entities have started to assess their sustainability and modern slavery risks. When planning individual contracts, the Department of Finance determines the measures it will take to address sustainability considerations, such as ethical supply chains.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT — COUNTRY AGE PENSION FUEL CARD

5497. Mr D.T. Redman to the minister representing the Minister for Regional Development; Agriculture and Food; Ports; Minister Assisting the Minister for State Development, Jobs and Trade:

I refer to the Country Age Pension Fuel Card, and ask:

- (a) In the previous three years, how many fuel cards have been issued to country pensioners in Denmark, Walpole, Manjimup, Margaret River, Bridgetown, Boyup Brook, Nannup, Pemberton, Northcliffe and Augusta per year;
- (b) Of these cards, what is the total unexpended balance per year during the three year period;
- (c) What is the total cost of funds expended for fuel cards in regional Western Australia in the previous three years and what is the value of underspent cards; and
- (d) With the rising cost of fuel and taxi services, will the state government increase funding for fuel card holders?

Mr M. McGowan replied:

- (a)–(b) Data is not available at a town level. The data supplied below is by postcode, which is generally a larger area than the specified towns.

Town	Post Code	2016–17		2017–18		2018–19	
		(a)	(b)	(a)	(b)	(a)	(b)
Augusta	6290	345	15,800	326	15,086	345	15,727
Boyup Brook	6244	180	6,506	175	5,770	174	6,464
Bridgetown	6255	615	27,164	594	21,656	592	23,779
Denmark	6333	696	24,619	665	26,140	673	21,850
Manjimup	6258	743	35,889	716	35,067	704	35,856
Margaret River	6285	553	26,242	532	23,965	565	28,003
Nannup	6275	199	9,320	192	7,094	198	8,846
Northcliffe	6262	123	3,676	123	1,836	126	2,180
Pemberton	6260	155	6,529	151	5,874	153	5,450
Walpole	6398	108	3,826	105	3,674	105	3,182
Total		3,717	159,569	3,579	146,162	3,635	151,337

(c)

	total Budget	total expended	total underspend
2016–17	\$30,904,000	\$26,350,123	\$4,553,877
2017–18	\$30,986,000	\$26,162,000	\$4,823,064
2018–19	\$30,923,000	\$26,552,000	\$4,370,598

- (d) Funding allocations for the Country Aged Pension Fuel Card will be considered as part of the 2020–21 Budget process.

POLICE — MENTAL HEALTH ESCORTS

5525. Mr P.A. Katsambanis to the Minister for Police; Road Safety:

I refer to police officers performing the duties of mental health escorts, and ask:

- (a) Is there any quantitative measure for the number of hours police officers spend performing the role of mental health escorts;
- (b) In each of the years 2017, 2018 and 2019 year to date, on how many occasions did police officers act as mental health escorts; and
- (c) In 2018 and 2019 year to date, how many hours of police officer time was lost due to ‘ramping’ at emergency departments?

Mrs M.H. Roberts replied:

The Western Australian Police Force advise:

- (a) Between 1 January 2019 to 30 June 2019, in the Metropolitan Area, police officers spent an average of 3 hours 4 minutes performing mental health escorts of individuals subject to a Transport Order or Apprehension and Return Order under the Mental Health Act 2014. In Regional Western Australia, the average was 3 hours and 7 minutes.
 - (b) In 2017, police officers acted as mental health escorts on 950 occasions; in 2018 on 1367 occasions; and in 2019, to September, on 1322 occasions.
 - (c) This information is not available.
-

