

Submission
Peter Brohier
23 August 2006

This lists a number of propositions that the Productivity Commission may wish to consider:

1. Can the way the BSPVES is applied have a significant impact on sea freight volumes?
2. Are Tasmania and Victoria in competition with all other states, and do they require equal links to so compete?
3. Should equalised surface access between all states compete with each other, and also against air?
4. Is this approach one of sound policy?
5. The focus of the BSPVES was not just intended as a car subsidy.
6. The uncapped BSPVES funding and scheme has allowed for comprehensive highway equivalence to be introduced since 1996.
7. The BSPVES encourages inefficient travel choices not based on the same decisions as are made for road travel.
8. The Auslink network or grid replaces the sea links that were the highways between capitals many years ago. The network should replace this connection between Victoria and Tasmania.
9. Cost and capacity have been found to be the major determinants of crossing Bass Strait but substantial definitive studies undertaken since 1996 have not looked at comprehensive highway equivalent fares?
10. Nobody is trying to take TFES from Tasmania, just to enhance it.
11. Sufficient capacity is in Bass Strait to grow both the freight and passenger market and a sea highway will grow it.
12. The BSPVES was not just for Tasmania.
13. Tasmania is not remote as it is close to largest economic corridor in Australia.
14. Tasmanian industries can be offered highway equivalence in lieu of TFES and all industries would be better off.
15. With an Auslink connection the cost of consumer goods would fall.
16. Victorian industries suffer the same impediment (and greater) than Tasmanian ones regarding access to the Tasmanian market.
17. The reasons for Auslink apply to all states, not just some.
18. Canberra should leave access up to Auslink linkages and not meddle with issues of determining disadvantage.
19. Bass Strait is a link that can deliver highway equivalence and this is more preferable than subsidies.
20. Subsidies may be appropriate for external territories, not states.
21. Inter-capital highway equivalence should be delivered in preference to other support where equivalence can be delivered.
22. If there is a comprehensive and proper Auslink connection, and if TFES is not paid directly paid to shippers, north-bound TFES for exports may not be regarded as an export subsidy.
23. Under Auslink, interstate corridors outside metropolitan areas are usually a Commonwealth responsibility.
24. Tasmania can protect its natural beauty whilst growing its cities.

25. Tasmania will be guaranteed the certainty of an interstate link under Auslink rather than under ministerial largess for TFES.
26. Auslink will offer South Eastern Australian business the same certainty equal to other inter-capital links
27. Putting Auslink or TFES and the BSPVES out to open tender will substantially reduce administrative costs and may avoid any export subsidy argument.
28. Can Tasmanian owned ferries easily deliver highway equivalence using day time crossings and apply one ship on a shorter route to save fuel cost and increase turnaround times using highway equivalent fares?
29. Can this outcome be achieved within about a month?
30. Will the Coalition maintain its 1996 offer to upgrade the BSPVES and do so now in line with average inter-capital Auslink travel costs, not national highway equivalence?
31. Has Tasmania taken any steps to reject a National Highway connection since 1996?
32. What impact does the lack of a critical mass or size of Tasmania's population have on consumer prices within Tasmania and how does this relate to the application of TFES and BSPVES?
33. Is the PM right in saying that Bass Strait is the greatest impediment to population, investment and jobs for Tasmania?
34. Did The Prime Minister or Coalition offer to put in place a Tasmanian Sea Highway as part of the National Highway?
35. Should the Productivity Commission maintain this intention for people, vehicles and freight?
36. Have two Prime Ministers, one on two occasions attempted to deliver highway equivalence and why have they not succeeded?
37. Does Tasmania choose the "isolated" and "disadvantage" argument in lieu of embracing highway equivalence?
38. If it does, is it right to do so?
39. Should the whole of Australia enjoy competition policy and access to a national transport grid without Government intervention?
40. During Auslink negotiations, did Victoria ask for an Auslink link and Tasmania not ask for one, and if not, why not?
41. Has Tasmania invested enough in Bass Strait not to be asked for any more money if an Auslink connection were introduced?
42. Isn't federal Bass Strait funding, equally, about the interests of at least two states?
43. Should BSPVES monitoring reports be about whether the BSPVES delivers highway equivalence or is the BSPVES scheme aimed to provide something else?
44. Why has the Federal Government not targeted the BSPVES to deliver highway equivalence?
45. In 1996 did the Coalition expect sea - based competition to occur in Bass Strait to bring down passenger fares?
46. What factors may have discouraged such competition?
47. What could be done with the BSPVES to deliver comprehensive highway equivalence overnight?

48. Is there overcapacity in freight services that can be filled by having Tasmania connected to an extension of the Hume Highway (Auslink) by sea, via northern Tasmania?
49. Can Tasmanian cities grow without destroying its natural beauty?
50. Do all Australians and their businesses and corporations have equal rights to an Auslink integrated national transport network
51. Are there any states that may trade an inter-capital link for exports for the hope that international freighters would come to their ports?
52. Would it be a better investment to model the impact of extending the Hume corridor to Hobart, not just to model the current TFES impact?
53. Do we know of any one that wants to remove TFES instead of strengthening it?
54. Does Victoria support a full Auslink linkage?
55. Does maintenance of the limited current TFES and the BSPVES skew access and development in both Victoria and Tasmania?
56. Are mainland suppliers bearing the cost or equalizing the cost of sending goods to Tasmania and is this mainly because the existing Tasmanian market is small?
57. If that market grew, why all businesses have access to Auslink?
58. Is separation by water on the nation's shortest inter-capital link any justification for different treatment to access over deserts, rivers and mountains?
59. If Auslink inter-capital expenditure has already been justified, say to Western Australia why is modelling needed to justify the Bass Strait link?
60. Wouldn't this link be the only one connecting Victoria and Tasmania whilst other states have many links?
61. As the Commonwealth has in the past confined Auslink to land and some minor interconnecting water links, why should it not now allow the negotiation of substantial inter-connecting land links around this interstate Auslink sea-based corridor?
62. How can Canberra justify not providing a third inter-capital link for Melbourne?
63. Should the Nation have equal right to freely move across this country on what is said to be an integrated national transport plan
64. Did the people of Australia and Tasmania give the clearest mandate for a National Highway to Tasmania in 1996?
65. Why hasn't it happened?