

TRANSCRIPT

STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMY AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Subcommittee

Inquiry into infrastructure projects

Melbourne — 19 October 2016

Members

Mr Joshua Morris — Chair

Mr Khalil Eideh — Deputy Chair

Mr Jeff Bourman

Mr Nazih Elasmr

Mr Bernie Finn

Ms Colleen Hartland

Mr Shaun Leane

Mr Craig Ondarchie

Participating member

Ms Samantha Dunn

Staff

Secretary: Lilian Topic

Witnesses

Mr Michel Masson, chief executive officer, and

Ms Adele McCarthy, director, strategy, Infrastructure Victoria.

The CHAIR — I declare open the Standing Committee on the Economy and Infrastructure public hearing. Welcome to our witnesses and those present in the gallery. The committee is today hearing evidence in relation to our infrastructure inquiry, and the evidence today is being recorded. This hearing is to inform the third of at least six reports into infrastructure projects, and witnesses present may well be invited to attend future hearings as the inquiry continues. All evidence taken today is protected by parliamentary privilege, and therefore you are protected for what you say here today, but if you go outside and repeat those same things, those comments may not be protected by the same privilege. Thank you, Mr Masson, for coming along today to provide evidence, and you too, Ms McCarthy. I might just get you both to state your names and titles for the record and then move into any introductory comments. Then we will have some questions from the committee to follow.

Ms McCARTHY — Adele McCarthy, director, strategy, at Infrastructure Victoria.

Mr MASSON — Michel Masson, CEO, Infrastructure Victoria.

The CHAIR — Are there any introductory comments you would like to make?

Mr MASSON — Yes, absolutely. It is a pleasure to be back with you, because certainly a lot of things have happened since last time we saw each other, if only with the significant milestone for Infrastructure Victoria with the release of the draft 30-year infrastructure strategy. We do think that this work is certainly different in many different areas. For a start, it is the first ever statewide infrastructure strategy covering all sectors. Transport, education, environment, tourism, health, water — you name it, we cover it. The approach that we have taken clearly highlighted: how do we make the most of existing assets and how do we look at being a real change whilst at the same time taking, of course, into consideration the cross-generational projects that we have identified we need in the future? In fact this optimisation of existing assets had a clear emphasis on asset management and on how we leverage technology, because clearly the technology will be front and centre in how services will be delivered through infrastructure in the future.

We are an evidenced-based organisation, which means that every single one of the 134 draft recommendations which we released for the last round of consultation is backed up by evidence. In fact we transparently released more than 3000 pages of work which we commissioned, including a never-done-before comparative preliminary transport modelling and economic analysis of major capital work projects. We are very mindful that this report should be much more than a report. It should actually be useful and workable for the community, for the private sector and for the government when they prepare their final response. So we have been very mindful to make sure that we responded to the question, ‘What is the first action item that needs to be done on those recommendations in order for them to start being implemented?’. We want it to be a workable, practical report.

The final remark I would make is that we have been very, very eager to get community engagement all throughout the process in order to make sure that the community ownership is there when we table that report to Parliament. We did some citizen juries. We have done a lot of workshops. I think we met with about 80 per cent of the local governments face to face, with a very specific focus on regional Victoria. In fact, I am very proud to say that 70 per cent of the recommendations which you have in the draft report have a clear statewide impact. We are certainly now very eager to engage with the community and discuss the three most transformative recommendations which we have highlighted. Again, we certainly are not shying away from controversial issues, because we think that this is an area where Infrastructure Victoria can inform the debate within the community.

Those three very transformative recommendations are about intensifying housing development in established areas and leveraging of transport corridors where you have got public transport. It is about designing and implementing well-thought-through transport network pricing, which our modelling and evidence show will actually dwarf out of the water any major new road project in its ability to reduce congestion. The third one is: how do we tackle the issues around affordable and social housing, taking into consideration that today the equivalent of the city of Ballarat are Victorians facing housing stress?

So those three very transformative recommendations have received a mixed level of support, but to a certain extent this is the beginning of a discussion, this is the beginning of a debate and this will continue much more much after we table the final report to Parliament at your end. So it is a definitely a very exciting time, and we are very happy to engage with you on what we tabled accordingly.

The CHAIR — Excellent. Thank you, Mr Masson. I think both yourself and your organisation as well should be congratulated for the work that you have done to this point. I was fortunate enough to have a meeting with you just a number of weeks ago at which we discussed the citizens jury. I was hoping you might be able to give us just a brief overview about what the citizens jury was and what it did.

Mr MASSON — So the citizens jury was a very important part of our engagement, because we wanted to make sure that the general public had a part in shaping the recommendations which we will table to Parliament. So we organised two citizen juries through an independent not-for-profit organisation called newDemocracy. Two sets of citizens — 40 each, one in metropolitan Melbourne and the other one in Shepparton — met for six Saturdays across three months and were provided with all the evidence which Infrastructure Victoria was working with and had the ability to call on experts in order to answer the simple question: what does Victoria need in terms of infrastructure for the next 30 years?

On the sixth Saturday they published their report, which then listed some recommendations as to what options or what ideas, based upon the evidence that they were given, they selected as a priority. This report was an input — and it was just that, an input — to us. So it is very important to understand that that citizens jury report was commissioned by Infrastructure Victoria through newDemocracy.

So we looked at all the recommendations that the citizens juries put forward, and I think it is fair to say that out of 192 recommendations we have accepted 184. Some of those recommendations have actually helped us better frame our thinking. Clearly on some of them, based upon the evidence which we had and even though they were strongly supported, we came to back to the citizens juries and disclosed all the evidence which we had and why we did not take that into account.

So that was a very important piece of the consultation. This was not the only consultation that we have done, because we have actually organised some round tables with the private sector. I can say that local government was front and centre in our engagement, but it was definitely a very important one for Victorians randomly selected to actually look at the evidence and express a view.

The CHAIR — Great. One particular infrastructure project that is a specific part of our reference for this inquiry is a Melbourne Airport rail link. I understand the draft report suggests that it is going to be required in the medium term, the 15-to-30-year time frame. Can you talk a little more about why it is that it is important for Melbourne to have that airport rail link?

Mr MASSON — Absolutely. I have already mentioned that we commissioned a comparative transport modelling and economic analysis in order to go through the major rail and road projects. That enabled us to identify which of these projects, based upon an estimate of the cost, was actually providing the greatest benefits in the span of time that we were looking at. This is why the north-east link came very clearly as a winner, providing the greatest benefits all across Victoria and as a priority. We found a lot of surprise, but it is always better to be backed by strong evidence, the airport rail link came also as providing significant benefits in light of what cost it would incur.

The reason why we have actually positioned it between 15 and 30 years and not as a priority is because we think that one of the strengths of the report which we tabled, you know, for consultation, is to show the interdependencies of the recommendations instead of looking just specifically at one project per se. For instance, there is currently the widening of the Tullamarine Freeway, which will provide extra capacity to and from the airport. The north-east link, once built — and remember it comes before we actually recommend the airport — will equally provide more capacity on the Tullamarine and on the CityLink. If you couple that with another one of our recommendations, which is to maximise the efficiency of the services of SkyBus, then our evidence shows that you have actually enough to absorb the extra capacity needed in the next 10 years, which leaves some time to actually get cracking on what is the best design and what is the best route for at a time an airport rail link, where you have really got two options.

One, the one which we have actually taken into consideration, is to leverage upon the efficiency provided by the completion of the Melbourne Metro to use the existing rail line and the preserved corridor around Albion East to link basically the airport to the city and to the south-east. But you could equally argue that maybe we need a dedicated express Tullamarine link, which will be much more costly but which definitely is worthy of consideration, if only to make sure that we make an informed decision on what is the best solution that we need.

The CHAIR — One other particular part of the report I was interested in was the congestion charge coming into Melbourne. From what I understand there were two levels, an outer ring and then an inner ring of charge. Could you talk a little more about what that proposal was?

Mr MASSON — Absolutely. When we looked at the various projects but also at transport policies and technologies that could enable tackling congestion, we looked at the current discrepancy which we noticed, whereby when it comes to congestion there is a very strong emphasis on the supply side — that is, more trams and more roads — and little attention on the demand side. How do we actually manage demand for roads, for instance?

So we looked at the transport network pricing, which was publicly reduced to a congestion tax, which is one solution that we worked on with KPMG in order to try to model what would be the best. But there is a reason why we call that transport network pricing, of which road pricing is only one element. We think — and again the evidence and the model we released demonstrates it and examples internationally concur with that; you just have to look at Milan, Stockholm, London and very interestingly Auckland, which is in the process of looking at a whole-of-network congestion charge implementation — it all boils down to: how you provide a pricing signal that makes people think before they actually incur their travel, whilst at the same time providing an immediate benefit to those who do?

I think there is a focus to be had on that immediate benefit. Twenty per cent of the car trips currently taking place in the morning peak around Melbourne are non-related to work or education. Interestingly, the figure is the same in Sydney. In other words, one in five persons driving a car has got a choice of maybe not being there. All of the models show that if 5 per cent of the cars currently on the road in the morning peak were taken out, either through a deliberate choice of driving at another stage or through public transport, then we, Victorians, would feel the same perceived improvement as during the holiday season. That is all it takes, 5 per cent of those cars.

Now we are very mindful, and again this is what we focus on in that report, that it needs to take into consideration equity and equity also relies upon access to public transport. So the transport network pricing recommendation that we have got in this report should be read in conjunction with all of the recommendations which we have there in respect of more solutions in terms of public transport. This is also why we have had a strong focus on buses, coaches and bus rapid transits, in order to make sure that we provide this alternative way of being mobile if someone was to decide not to take the car.

The CHAIR — Before the election, the Premier spoke about the depoliticisation of infrastructure investment, so were you surprised when the Premier came out and rejected your proposal less than 24 hours after you had announced it?

Mr MASSON — We do take note that both the Leader of the Opposition and the Premier expressed a view on the transport network pricing, the congestion tax, very soon after our report was released. We do take notice of that, but we will concentrate on the due process in which the recommendations, which will be tabled in Parliament at year end, will be responded to by the government, whereby from the moment that we table to Parliament our report the government has 12 months to respond with their five-year plan in which they will focus on their priority projects and policies and regulations. So we will eagerly wait and see what the official responses will be.

Mr LEANE — Thanks for helping our committee today. As you said, this is a draft report and your final report will be at the end of this year.

Mr MASSON — Correct. December.

Mr LEANE — Thanks for giving us time. Obviously you would rather be working on that at the moment. It is interesting. I was actually going to touch on the congestion tax. The Premier did come out and say that it was not something that his government would entertain, but in saying that I know your ego can take it. Your work is around recommendations and a long-term vision as far as certain views and I suppose if other political parties want to embrace some of your suggestions, like the congestion tax, then that is all fair game because you are independent of any political party. So if the coalition did want to pick that up, then that is up to them.

Out of your three main recommendations, I was very pleased to see — I should have been surprised, but I was very pleased to see — an onus on social and affordable housing. Could you expand more on how you came to that as being one of your main three recommendations?

Ms McCARTHY — This is in a way an unusual topic to see included in an infrastructure strategy. I think a lot of people expect to see the usual transport links, utilities and so forth. But we have been through a deliberate process this year, starting with, ‘What do we want our infrastructure to achieve?’, and out of that first consultation we identified the need for affordable housing, particularly for vulnerable Victorians. Then we went through a process of further developing the evidence about: what are those needs, what is the quantum of the need and what are the projections over time? This one really stood out among all of them as being one where over time this is a problem that has not been addressed fully and it is sitting there now as really a very acute problem and, as Michel mentioned, the equivalent of the city of Ballarat in terms of vulnerable Victorians facing housing stress. This is a huge challenge, and it is a growing challenge as well. So looking across all of those needs, this really shone as one that needed intense effort and really to be highlighted in our report.

Mr LEANE — And as I said, I was actually quite pleased to see that. So with the consultation around this being one of your three main recommendations — I know there are a lot of recommendations, but I did want to get a conversation around these three in particular — I am not too sure if it went to the juries. With the consultation, did you flesh out any concerns in community views around having social housing near them?

Ms McCARTHY — This is not something that communities have fed directly to us, but it is certainly something that we are aware of through our consultation both with the private sector and with local governments, that this is a real challenge in terms of planning for affordable housing.

Mr LEANE — I suppose experience from years ago was that there was — and the amount of social affordable housing that you recommend would be dwarfed by what I am talking about now — decent-sized social affordable housing projects around Ferntree Gully and around Ringwood That is probably going back a few years now, I think when there was a federal injection into the stimulus package. The issue is that there can be political campaigns. There can be people all riled up against having people that cannot necessarily afford the housing where they live coming into their area. I am just wondering if that was on your radar at all?

Ms McCARTHY — In the work that we have done we are quite clear that the evidence is not just the need for the quantum of the additional affordable housing but also the location and that location is really fundamental. We have looked at the evidence about where are the one-bedroom houses that are affordable to someone on Newstart over the last decade, and you can see a clear pattern of them progressively moving further and further out in metropolitan Melbourne and disappearing. What that says is that the very vulnerable people who need access to services and need access to employment are being located precisely where those things are not.

So we have got recommendations that we have made regarding the opportunity to have inclusionary zoning, particularly where government land is made available for development in well-located places close to key centres or public transport, or indeed where government is actually making a substantial infrastructure investment and providing those services, to really make sure that we are leveraging that benefit to allow vulnerable Victorians to be located closer to services and employment.

Mr MASSON — We are also very mindful that when we have got a natural focus for vulnerable Victorians we are also talking about police officers, teachers, who are critical workers, and through the current situation are now pushed back further and further away from where their employment is.

Mr LEANE — From where they are teaching or where they are caring for people?

Mr MASSON — Absolutely.

Mr LEANE — You said that you identified particularly where government will be doing large infrastructure projects and the discussion around incorporating some affordable social housing. What sort of projects have you identified? And when you say large, what sort of large infrastructure projects?

Ms McCARTHY — We have not gone through the detail about what exactly are the sites or the projects that are opportunities, although in the more detailed description and the evidence that we have got underneath

that option, we have pointed to opportunities like the Arden precinct, where there is obviously major investment going on with the current Melbourne Metro project. There are great opportunities in terms of government land being available there, so integrating that planning is obviously a present opportunity that is available.

Mr LEANE — And I suppose, as you said, you have not recommended any particular project.

Ms McCARTHY — There are such opportunities.

Mr LEANE — You have identified there are a few obvious opportunities to put or recommend to government to put their mind to when they are spending a lot of money on something else, which may be public transport, to consider if there is the opportunity to incorporate social housing at the end product.

Mr MASSON — Absolutely, and very consistent also with our overall philosophy of how do we first and foremost make the most of what we currently have. We looked at the existing stock of social housing, and what struck us is that in many different instances you actually have a disconnect between the sort of lodging that you have got and those who actually need to have a roof. A large house with multiple bedrooms does not fit a couple or a single person, so one of our recommendations is to actually do that work and see where there is actually some refurbishment or rationalisation of what we currently have in order to better respond to the sort of markets that are a concern in getting that access to lodgement.

Ms HARTLAND — That was really interesting, as someone who grew up in what was then called the housing commission and has worked in the office of housing. That need for really good public housing is just so important, and it has been really distasteful in the past when, for political opportunism, people have actually run campaigns not wanting to live next to those kind of people. Well, having grown up as one of those kinds of people, I really appreciated that.

But the thing that I really wanted to focus on was around the health assessment, because in my 10 years in Parliament what I have seen are facilities are built based on marginal seats rather than on need. I am in the western suburbs, and you mentioned Footscray Hospital. I think everybody is becoming quite bored with my obsession with Footscray Hospital, but it is going to fall down. I know that you talk about a 5-to-10 or 15-year timescale, but I actually really wonder whether a hospital like Footscray can survive that long. If there was a mass casualty incident — and we are in a very industrial area — how would the emergency room possibly cope with 50 people coming through at the same time?

I do not think you have had a response yet from government on those issues but how would you be suggesting to government that they actually fund these health infrastructure projects and rebuilds of existing hospitals? Because obviously they are very expensive.

Ms McCARTHY — We have made some recommendations about the funding opportunities that are available for our major project recommendations, and a major hospital is one of those recommendations. Obviously general government revenue is always going to be a part of investments in a major public hospital, but we have also recommended that government look at opportunities for property development if there is surplus land and there are other opportunities that would be synergistic with a hospital, and as part of that potential for asset sales to actually plough that money back into getting the right facilities. It is a small one, but there is also an opportunity for donations and bequests for those sorts of facilities, which should always be channelled through where they can be.

Ms HARTLAND — That is an interesting one, because I think it works really well for some of the other big hospitals on complexes; it does not work in the west because we do not have that kind of major donor structure of, I suppose in some ways, the Melbourne or the Alfred, and they are doing more glamorous kind of medicine as well. So I think it is an interesting problem.

I know that you did not deal with the western distributor because it was before the time of the setting up, but if you had had the opportunity to actually review the western distributor — and especially considering that Infrastructure Australia in an estimates committee yesterday have said that they do not believe that there is a good business case — how do you think you could have assisted the government to have actually had a more independent view of that project?

Mr MASSON — It is very hard for us to speculate as to what it could have been, since we have not done that exercise at all. We have been so focused on the depth and the breadth of what we have got to cover to project in the next 30 years that we have been very mindful to consider all of the committed projects as part of our base case. We have not looked at all at the western distributor project, so it is very hard for us, and nor would it be appropriate, to start revisiting this one, since we have not done the work.

Ms HARTLAND — So if there was another western distributor-type project in the future, what assistance could you give the government to look at: is this value for money; is it going to achieve what Transurban says it is going to achieve?

Mr MASSON — I think that we are already in a completely different environment by virtue of this strategy existing and being backed by strong evidence in a transparent way. What will happen from the moment we table that final strategy to Parliament in December is that the government will then have the ability to tap into our recommendations, looking at our evidence, or come up with alternative projects. We certainly would be very interested — should the government decide to identify a significant capital project which we have not had on our radar screen nor recommended — to examine the evidence and the rationale for this becoming a priority project on their list, especially in the span of five years, that we would not have considered.

I think the probability for this is pretty small, and therefore we stand confident — and ready, with the evidence that we have accumulated and tabled as part of our recommendations — that the government will have enough material of quality in order to make some informed decisions as to which other projects, the significant ones, if we are talking about, you know, another western distributor, that they will select. Infrastructure Victoria is not on the procurement or on the delivery side. We cannot speculate on how the government would go about procuring it, because this is not something where we are in control.

Ms HARTLAND — On the congestion tax, while you were talking about that something really struck me. Obviously there is the issue that you have got to have rapid transport so that people have choices, but I can think of half a dozen places in the western suburbs, and I am sure it is happening in the northern suburbs in the growth areas. Caroline Springs is a classic example. It has a bus service, but the train station is not completed. It takes about an hour and a half on average to get from Caroline Springs into the city on the bus, and the service runs about every half an hour. So with the congestion tax, where you have really inadequate public transport — so people actually have little or no choice — how would you manage that? Would people be given exemptions because they have no choice about how they travel?

Mr MASSON — In the way that the mechanism will ultimately be designed, we are very mindful that we should look at these areas where clearly there is a lack of alternatives. Technology now offers enough flexibility to take that into consideration and also make sure that these people may face a different fare structure again, in terms of price signal. It is very important to keep that in mind, that we are not into the tolling for revenue collection that you pay for infrastructure; we are into the demand management, the pricing signal, that actually enables people to think as to whether this is the best way to do the travelling or not.

The best example that I use is when you book your holiday you have got the difference between the high season and the low season. Some people, you know, with no kids, will actually have the ability to choose and decide and go in the low season, and families will actually go in the peak season. But clearly, in designing that scheme we would have to be very careful and mindful of the equity side and making sure that these people who have no alternatives are actually treated accordingly.

The other thing also, the other opportunity which we see, is that there would be also an opportunity, again, to go always in that level of greater fairness and greater alignment between how much you use and how much you pay, based upon who you are, to look at maybe some concessions, which you have currently in the public transport but which you do not have, very clearly, when you use the last utility which is not regulated — that is, the roads.

Ms HARTLAND — One last question. Again, when you were talking about housing and you were talking about Arden Street, it is a really logical place that could be well redeveloped. It is really close to the city et cetera. Some councils have actually done audits on what public land they hold. I know in Footscray there is a massive amount of VicTrack land, because it is just the kind of place it is, a lot of industrial land which could not be built on because it is highly contaminated. Is that something that you would be recommending to government, that they actually look at how much land they currently own? I know when I was on the

Maribyrnong council and we did an audit of everything we owned, people were really shocked at just how much the city actually held and how many peppercorn leases there were et cetera, and some of that could have been developed for housing. So is that something that you would recommend to government, that they actually assess what they have got and what could be built on?

Ms McCARTHY — It is my understanding there has actually been quite a lot of work done just in recent years on this, and people do have that same discovery, ‘Oh, my God, there is so much land in prime locations’. We have not specifically made a recommendation to do further work on that, but obviously you must leverage that information in order to come to good conclusions about what the opportunities are.

Ms HARTLAND — I would have to say in the City of Maribyrnong the council owns nothing that is not contaminated, so that is a slight problem, because there are vast tracts of land. Some of it can be built on, some of it cannot, but it has always amazed me, considering the clear housing shortage we have, especially affordable housing, and the numbers of people now sleeping on the streets in a society that actually has money, why have we allowed it to go to that level? Thank you. That is really helpful.

The CHAIR — Come December, when your report is tabled in Parliament, if the Premier is to keep his word, should he not just adopt your report as the plan for investment into infrastructure in Victoria into the future?

Mr MASSON — We have always been very clear that Infrastructure Victoria was created to provide recommendations through this strategy based upon very strong evidence and in a transparent way. The government will have full flexibility to look at our recommendations, decide which ones they want to include into their plan and whatever new ones reflect their current policies, and that will form part of their five-year infrastructure plan. As per the Parliament Act, Infrastructure Victoria will then look every year at how the government is delivering on those commitments, and we will publish publicly a report on that. But the government are absolutely free to pick their recommendations and make their decisions.

The CHAIR — I only asked the question because it was prior to the election that the Premier said that it was through this process that investment in infrastructure was going to be depoliticised, there was going to be a body to inform government of how it is that they should invest into infrastructure. I certainly hear your point that you are advising the government, but I think that if the Premier is to keep his word, he should do as he said prior to the election.

I was hoping also to cover health infrastructure, as Ms Hartland has spoken of earlier. I note that need 3 of your draft document speaks to health and I note that the document refers to health care partnerships with community and private health care providers. I am just wondering: what opportunities do you see for private providers to take some of the demand pressure off the public system?

Ms McCARTHY — We have got some more detailed work on this. I might just take that on notice and provide it. There is a whole lot of evidence sitting behind this document which I would be happy to provide to the committee.

The CHAIR — That would be great. Obviously there are further opportunities for investment, whether it be a private floor at the women’s hospital in Frances Perry and the like, so I would be very interested to hear a bit more about that.

Obviously health infrastructure is vital to Victoria. You have not gone into a lot of specific detail in areas such as to say DHHS is releasing a statewide system design, services and infrastructure plan next year. Do you plan to stay out of the details of these types of health infrastructure plans and leave it to the department, or will you have a more active plan as it progresses?

Mr MASSON — This is a very good question, which enables me to give a little bit of clarification as to where our strategy is fitting into all of the good work which departments and agencies are currently doing. When you look at this year, we are clearly sprinting a marathon in producing this strategy covering all sectors. We have been very mindful to engage in an exclusive way with all of the departments and agencies on what analysis they have already done in order to make up our own mind on those and integrate that into what you have got there. But of course we are all working at different speeds and in different areas. DEDJTR, for instance, is in the process of finalising a network development strategy which, when it is released, will definitely

be a significant input into our refresh of the strategy. What the department of health is doing also with its 20-year plan will be a significant input next year, when it is published, in our refresh of the strategy.

Remember that this exercise is not a one-off; we are actually going to refresh the strategy between three and five years, and for the next refresh it will be three years in order to make sure that we consolidate all of the experience and know-how from this first exercise. So there is really almost like a dance between the strategic framework that we are providing now to the departments and agencies through this statewide, cross-sector strategic framework, which they take into consideration in order for them to do their sectoral strategic work, which is at a much greater level of granularity than what we can afford — and nor are we entitled to do that — but then it becomes a significant input into what we will look at in the future.

The CHAIR — Just one final one from me. At present we are seeing that Victoria is spending less than half of what New South Wales is on new transport infrastructure. Do you think it is good enough?

Mr MASSON — The work that we have done is to look at what investments are needed in terms of roads and in terms of public transport, and these are present and all costed into the recommendations that we are making there. I think that it is not so much a race between states; it is about taking into consideration the local issues and what we face as problems in Victoria. This is exactly what we have done in looking at the problems that we have got and the best solutions in order to address those.

The CHAIR — Any further questions?

Ms HARTLAND — I just wanted to comment. You said that there was a need for a private wing in Frances Perry. Actually, Frances Perry is a private hospital located within the women's hospital.

The CHAIR — Sorry, an additional floor, I was referring to.

Ms HARTLAND — No, it is already a private wing of the hospital.

The CHAIR — Yes. I was talking about additional capacity.

Mr LEANE — He wants another floor in the private hospital.

Ms HARTLAND — Right. So you want other people to be on waiting lists. Okay.

The CHAIR — Not at all.

Ms HARTLAND — Not equitable health care.

The CHAIR — Thank you very much for your presence today and for the evidence you have provided the committee. You will be provided with the transcript of today's evidence, and that will ultimately make its way onto the committee's website once you have had an opportunity to proofread it. Once again, thank you for your evidence today and thank you for the work that you have done.

Mr MASSON — Thank you very much.

Ms McCARTHY — Thank you.

Witnesses withdrew.