



Parliamentary Debates

(HANSARD)

THIRTY-NINTH PARLIAMENT
FIRST SESSION
2016

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 25 August 2016

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, 25 August 2016

THE SPEAKER (Mr M.W. Sutherland) took the chair at 9.00 am, and read prayers.

HERITAGE BILL 2016

Appropriations

Message from the Governor received and read recommending appropriations for the bill.

PAPERS TABLED

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

OSBORNE PARK HOSPITAL

Grievance

MR R.H. COOK (Kwinana — Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [9.02 am]: My grievance this morning is to the Minister for Health. I wish to speak today on the past and, I guess more importantly, the future of Osborne Park Hospital. Under this government, Osborne Park Hospital has been a story of benign neglect. It is a hospital with a great history, but unfortunately under the stewardship of the Liberal–National government it has no future. It is a hospital around which a whole range of promises have been made and plans put in place, only for them to be cancelled and walked away from in subsequent years. Today I am calling on the minister to provide some detail to the chamber about his long-term plans for the hospital, which, quite frankly, has struggled under his and his predecessor’s stewardship.

I want to look briefly at the sorts of plans that have been in place. Under the “WA Health Clinical Services Framework 2010–2020”, it was identified that Osborne Park Hospital would become a specialist hospital by 2014 without an emergency department, so it would undertake a lot of elective surgery and so on. That would have seen its beds grow from around 207 as it was then to 259 by 2020–21. An important element of that was the inclusion of 50 mental health beds—there were just 24 in 2007–08 and that number was to grow to 74. In the “WA Health Clinical Services Framework 2014–2024”, those plans disappeared altogether and we went on to another iteration of what the hospital might look like. It notes the expansion of one extra operating theatre at that hospital, realised, from recollection—the minister may wish to correct me—from commonwealth funding. The clinical services framework stated that the hospital should undertake a range of services, possibly with an emergency department. We have this sort of dithering around the future of the hospital. The government is not providing a long-term future for it.

The budget shows how this hospital has been treated; it paints a real picture of how there is no long-term plan for this hospital. In 2009–10, the first budget of the Barnett government, there was \$44 million for the reconfiguration. This was for, by and large, the expansion of mental health services. In 2010–11, that configuration was still washing around the system but had been pushed out to the forward estimates, and only \$125 000 was spent in 2009–10. The reconfiguration was further pushed out in the 2011–12 budget; it was still in there, but in 2010–11 only \$80 000 had been spent on the reconfiguration. In the 2012–13 budget, the reconfiguration disappeared altogether out of the forward estimates. We roll forward to the 2013–14 budget estimates and there is no mention of it, but in 2014–15 all of a sudden a 500-bay car park appears in the government’s considerations.

Ms M.M. Quirk interjected.

Mr R.H. COOK: Indeed, they did charge it for a moment, member for Girrawheen, only for that to be turned around by the efforts of the former local member, Hon John Kobelke. In 2014–15, the notion of the additional car parking was moseying forward. It was put down for \$3.5 million, but in the following year the government managed to spend only \$350 000 of that. But in the 2015–16 budget, all of a sudden a new reconfiguration came up for the hospital. That reconfiguration was pegged to start in 2018–19, but lo we roll forward to the 2016–17 budget and that reconfiguration disappears out of the forward estimates once again.

It is a sad reflection on this government that we have had this constant process of planning to do something and then the government walking away from those plans. We do not have those mental health beds. That is an issue on which I have been campaigning for many years. We need to retire the mental health beds from Graylands Hospital and build our capacity at Osborne Park Hospital. One thing we know, which the clinical services framework is constantly reminding us about, is that we have had a massive expansion of population in the northern suburbs, particularly in the far northern suburbs, so building our hospital capacity in the northern suburbs is incredibly important. We cannot continue this process of dithering. I draw the minister very briefly to

the Con Michael report of May 2015 in which he said that Osborne Park Hospital is supposed to have level 4 hospital neonatal services but is providing only level 3 neonatal services, and there are no specific nursery facilities on-site. He said that the facility is probably underutilised for maternity care, is not attracting the midwives it needs and needs extra resources in order for it to meet its capacity as a maternity hospital.

I am calling on the minister today to provide the community and Parliament with a long-term plan—a vision—for Osborne Park Hospital. I understand that not all these decisions have been made by this minister; some were made by the member for Dawesville when he was in that role, but what we have seen from this government is a history of benign neglect. This is a hospital that had a great history, but unfortunately this government has provided it with no future. I am seeking from the minister today some clarity and long-term vision for this hospital.

MR J.H.D. DAY (Kalamunda — Minister for Health) [9.10 am]: Osborne Park Hospital is one of the very significant public hospital facilities in the Perth metropolitan area and it has a very strong future, just as it has a proud and strong history. Originally opened in 1962, it is a 206-bed secondary public hospital that provides for three main specialties—rehabilitation and aged care, surgery and obstetrics. The hospital has five operating theatres and two procedure rooms, which, I understand, have recently been upgraded. The hospital is very much recognised for its excellence in nursing and patient care. A significant amount of operating theatre activity is undertaken at the hospital, with 50 operating lists a week, including a comprehensive range of surgical specialties—namely, orthopaedics; general surgery; gynaecology; ear, nose and throat surgery; neurology; ophthalmology; neurosurgery; and plastic surgery. It is also a significant employment provider in the mid-north metropolitan area, with approximately 570 full-time equivalents employed at the hospital. With that number of beds and that number of staff, there has been a significant amount of patient activity in 2015–16, with approximately 13 000 patients admitted to the hospital. Of those, 6 000 people had elective surgery, and 90 000 outpatient appointments are provided for annually. A change has been underway in the mix of employment arrangements for surgeons because visiting medical practitioners who are privately practising medical practitioners and who are contracted to the state for public work are gradually being replaced by staff doctors who are employed on a sessional basis. This is part of the program to reduce staffing costs and improve theatre efficiency. The elective surgery reform program is moving some less complex elective surgery from Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital to Osborne Park Hospital, which is enabling Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital to undertake more complex surgical cases than was the case previously.

Osborne Park Hospital plays an important role in the provision of public health and hospital services in the Perth metropolitan area, and there are no plans to change that. Further planning will be undertaken for the needs of the northern metropolitan area as further growth occurs. We discussed that last week when we talked about Joondalup Health Campus at which, I reiterate, there has been a substantial investment in recent years, resulting in a substantial increase in the capacity at Joondalup Health Campus, which also provides for the northern metropolitan area.

This issue needs to be considered in the context of the overall redevelopment of the public hospital system that has occurred in the state. This government, as I have said plenty of times before and will say again, has spent about \$7 billion on rebuilding the hospital system throughout Western Australia, including in the metropolitan area. Residents of the northern suburbs of Perth have certainly been beneficiaries of that, as has everybody else right across Western Australia. The amount of recurrent expenditure allocated by this government to public health and hospital services has almost doubled in the time since we came to government in 2008 through to the current year, increasing from about \$4.8 billion to \$8.6 billion. Our commitment to providing world-class and high quantity health and hospital services to people in the state, including in the Osborne Park catchment area, really has been unprecedented. As I have said before, since I was in this role previously, the amount of expenditure on public health and hospital services has almost quadrupled. Our commitment has been very strong and is demonstrated in the services that are provided across all our hospitals, including those at Osborne Park Hospital. Further planning will be undertaken to determine what is appropriate to provide by way of growth at Osborne Park Hospital and other hospitals, including Joondalup Health Campus, as I said last week, and to confirm the roles of Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital, Royal Perth Hospital, Fiona Stanley Hospital and so on. Of course, also relevant to residents of the Osborne Park catchment area is the new Perth Children's Hospital, which is currently close to completion. As has been discussed on many occasions, we would like that to have been opened by now. It is unfortunate that it is not, but it is getting close to that point and it will certainly provide world-class facilities and services for children and families from the Osborne Park catchment area.

There has been an issue with the car parking arrangements at Osborne Park Hospital. The government, I understand, has allocated \$3 million to expand the car park with an additional 300 bays. The preferred car park location is on the western boundary of the hospital site between the ring-road and Mitchell Freeway, which is currently remnant bushland. This location, I am advised, will have the least impact on future development opportunities at the hospital and will provide close proximity access to the rehabilitation, aged-care and surgical admission points, and will equalise parking access across the site. It is intended that there be a continuation of free public parking, which is intended for use by the general public when they visit the hospital. I am advised

that tenders will close on 6 September. The contract is scheduled to be awarded late September, with construction commencing in October. Practical completion is due for December 2016. I know that the member for Balcatta has raised this issue and has a strong interest in getting additional car parking bays at Osborne Park Hospital. I am advised that that development approval has been received from the City of Stirling and that the car park is scheduled to open in January next year. All the above demonstrates our very strong commitment to Osborne Park Hospital.

STEP-UP, STEP-DOWN SUBACUTE MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY — KALGOORLIE–BOULDER

Grievance

MS W.M. DUNCAN (Kalgoorlie — Deputy Speaker) [9.17 am]: My grievance today is to the Minister for Mental Health. At the outset, I thank the minister for her indulgence, because we have had a couple of unavoidable delays with this grievance. However, the issue I want to raise is critically important to the people of the goldfields, particularly those in Kalgoorlie–Boulder. The issue is the need for a step-up, step-down subacute mental health facility in Kalgoorlie–Boulder. This issue was first brought to my attention by Suzie Williams and Sherril Ball, who are both members of the Council of Official Visitors. They are also horse lovers. They had their horses down on the beach at Stockyard Creek on New Year's Eve in either 2011 or 2012. I went to visit them, being a horse lover myself. At about 11 minutes to midnight on New Year's Eve, they cornered me and harangued me about the need for a subacute facility in the goldfields for people with a mental illness. I note that in November 2012, the National Mental Health Commission report card Chairman, Alan Fels, said that regional people with mental health issues are more likely to suffer long-term physical illness and that access to services in regional, rural and remote areas is very difficult. In 2009, the WA Country Health Service goldfields mental health profile found that one in 10 adults over 16 years of age in the goldfields, report mental health problems and that community mental health services are accessed by residents at a significantly higher rate than that of the rest of the state. This was discussed in 2012 and in November that year, the then Minister for Mental Health, Hon Helen Morton, noted that \$2.5 million was allocated for a six-bed subacute facility in the goldfields, which was anticipated to be available in 2014–15. Minister, it disappeared from the 2014 state budget. I wrote to Hon Helen Morton expressing my concern and she responded in July by saying that she expected the facility to be fully operational by 2016–17, or sooner if possible. Although there was still no provision for it in the forward estimates of the 2015 state budget, \$10.7 million was allocated to Karratha and Bunbury. I raised the issue again with the Minister for Mental Health and she assured me that planning was well underway, with construction due to start by the end of the year. The Minister for Mental Health said —

“The State Government is committed to providing a subacute step-up, step-down facility for the Goldfields region, to be fully operational in 2016–17.”

Then the big announcement came. The former Minister for Mental Health, Hon Helen Morton, was in Kalgoorlie for the regional cabinet on 29 June 2015 and stood on the site in Davidson Street where a new six-bed subacute facility would be built at a cost of \$3 million with \$1.3 million per annum to operate it. In her discussions with the media, reported the next day in the *Kalgoorlie Miner*, she said that 10 beds would be optimal. The article states —

“The need for these facilities came through loud and clear because people were being told they were not sick enough to go to hospital,” ...

By early 2016, that is this year, minister, we were hearing about the mental health unit at the hospital being operated at over-capacity in some months—up to 103 per cent. The then minister said —

“There is no requirement for more acute beds in Kalgoorlie,”... “What is needed is a complimentary sub-acute facility for which this Government has already identified a site and consultation and planning are well advanced.”

Imagine our dismay when in the 2016 budget there was no capital funding and the operational funding had been removed. The current Minister for Mental Health was very new in the portfolio, so I understand that this was a difficult time for her, but she responded to media inquiries saying that people with mental illness were —

... being catered for by the six-bed inpatient mental health facility at Kalgoorlie Hospital,” ...

But Kalgoorlie is the only regional city in Western Australia that does not have a step-up, step-down facility to support its hospital. The government's own Western Australian Mental Health, Alcohol and Other Drug Services Plan, called “Better Choices. Better Lives”, published in December 2016, noted that —

... modelling shows that to meet demand, a total of 21 beds are required ...

in the goldfields. That document confirmed the commitment to six community beds in Kalgoorlie–Boulder. We are told that in 2013–14, a mental health bed in hospital costs \$1 234 a day, compared with \$453 a day in a subacute centre and also, in the minister's own media statement announcing the facility, it was noted that half or 43 per cent of people in hospital for mental health problems could be discharged if there was a subacute facility available. Patrick McGorry noted that our system responds too late. Minister, our mental health

advocates have had to gird their loins again and start campaigning. They had a meeting, we have gathered petitions with 550 signatures and on one of those petitions, there was a sticky note that read, “Please use this comment in your campaign.” The comment on the bottom of the petition written in red ink reads —

In loving memory of ‘Aaron Lloyd Thomas Ball’ 27 June 1983

Suicided to escape his mental illness 22 December 2013. ...

Just another day in the lucky country ey!

I was speaking to Aaron’s mother yesterday to ensure that I had permission to quote this in Parliament and she said that Aaron would have greatly supported our campaign. He knew the need for this facility, his family needed this facility and that is why it is so important to have this subacute facility, for not only those with mental illness, but also their family and their carers. Minister, please do not mess with the heads of vulnerable people. Please reinstate this funding and build the facility as soon as possible.

MS A.R. MITCHELL (Kingsley — Minister for Mental Health) [9.23 am]: I thank the member for Kalgoorlie for the grievance and I acknowledge her commitment to securing the facility for people in the goldfields. I also acknowledge the member for Eyre, because he has also been a very strong advocate in this area and I recognise his concern for people with mental health issues in the goldfields region, which is one that I often get when I am in most regional areas. As the member has highlighted, it is a place where it is important that they have similar services to what is available in the metropolitan area.

I can assure the member that the goldfields subacute facility remains a priority for the government. As the member says, it is in the mental health plan. It will be built but at this point in time the prioritised facilities are in Rockingham, Karratha, Broome and Bunbury. That is the decision that has been made. It does not mean the goldfields facility has been forgotten; it is temporarily not on the original list. I certainly spoke about it in budget estimates; the member for Eyre asked me questions and the member was in the chamber at the same time. The Mental Health Commissioner also made comments accordingly for the member for Kalgoorlie. One of the things I was concerned to do was ensure I knew what facilities were available for people in the goldfields area during this time so that they were not left without anything. The member, as a member of the government, is quite aware of a number of those, but I wish to put them on the record. As the member mentioned, the Mental Health Commission purchases services from the WA Country Health Service for the provision of the public mental health services in the goldfields. It provides the Kalgoorlie mental health inpatient service which, as the member said, is a six-bed authorised facility under the Mental Health Act; the Kalgoorlie–Boulder Mental Health service incorporated in the Kalgoorlie community adult, Kalgoorlie–Esperance community older adult and Kalgoorlie child and adolescent services; and the Esperance Community Health Services, incorporating the Esperance community adult and the Esperance child and adolescent service. The Mental Health Commission also funds a range of non-government organisations to provide mental health services in the goldfields. They include those for personal support and counselling services. They are provided by Centrecare in Kalgoorlie and the Bay of Isles Community Outreach in Esperance. These services aim to provide ongoing support for people with persistent mental health problems.

The member has heard me say, and when I am out and about I often say, that it is very important we get to people early to prevent intervention that sees people going into an inpatient facility. At the same time, allied with mental health are alcohol and drug issues, as they impact very much on mental health. The Mental Health Commission also funds a range of non-government organisations to provide alcohol and drug services in the goldfields, among the other services. Firstly, the Goldfields Community Alcohol and Drug Service provides alcohol and drug counselling and prevention activities from their offices in Kalgoorlie and Esperance. In the 2015 calendar year, the Goldfields Community Alcohol and Drug Service provided services to 736 individuals. Hope Community Services is the provider of this service and the lead agency for the headspace consortium in Kalgoorlie. There is also a 19-bed sobering up centre in Kalgoorlie. On average, there are 1 800 admissions to this service a year. There is also a ten-bed residential rehabilitation service in Kalgoorlie, as well as a 46-bed facility in Esperance. In 2015, the Goldfields Rehabilitation Service reported 164 treatment episodes. It also recently received \$2.73 million in royalties for regions funding to build a new facility that will provide an additional 18 residential beds.

I certainly acknowledge that funding for the goldfields subacute facility was allocated in the 2012–13 budget with support from 2014–15 onwards and I have said that to the member personally, publicly and through the media. Since that time, recurrent funding for a goldfields subacute facility has been deferred—it has not been cancelled, it has been deferred—in light of issues around the demand for the service and the long-term need for non-acute long-stay beds rather than traditional subacute facilities. I have said it once and I will say it again, it has not been cancelled, it has been postponed and the member can be assured that I am doing the best I can to get the commitment to the goldfields put back in place as soon as I can. We are looking to see what we can do to achieve that. I can also assure the member and her constituents that we will continue to monitor the delivery of mental health services in the goldfields and consider any further initiatives for the area that we can achieve in future budget processes.

COLLIE HOSPITAL — SURGICAL PROCEDURES*Grievance*

MR M.P. MURRAY (Collie-Preston) [9.29 am]: Before I do my grievance, I extend my sympathy for the victims and displaced persons from the recent earthquake in Italy, especially from my community which has a large Italian background.

My grievance today centres around South West Health Campus and the Collie Hospital. It is, of course, to the Minister for Health. Recently, Hon Sally Talbot asked question without notice 688 in the upper house about surgical procedures that had been removed from the hospital. It is of concern to our community that \$7 million is being spent, albeit belatedly, to upgrade the hospital while services are being taken away. Doctors have contacted me about this, but there is a further problem beyond just removing services from Collie. It means that patients have to travel to Bunbury, and are put on the waiting list there, which then puts extra pressure on other people in the south west. Bunbury is a regional centre, and I understand a lot of work is being done there, but while we have the facilities in Collie to do these operations, we should be doing them there. Tonsillectomies were mentioned in the answer given in the upper house, along with things like abscesses and boils. Those sorts of cases are also being referred down the hill to Bunbury.

Some untruths were told in the answer given in the upper house about mechanisms the government had put in place to assist patients and their families with costs of travel and accommodation. The answer stated that patients could use the patient assisted travel scheme, and all of us in the country area know what that is. However, to claim assistance under PATS, a patient who needs general surgery must reside outside a 100-kilometre range from the centre providing the service. For patients who need cancer treatment and kidney dialysis the range is 70 kilometres. As the minister probably knows, having visited there recently, Collie is 60 kilometres from Bunbury, so patients there do not qualify for PATS except under special circumstances, which exist for people requiring dialysis. They go in two or maybe three times a week. In the main, patients in Collie cannot claim under PATS. The answer in the upper house was therefore misleading. In the first place, Collie residents do not really want PATS; they want the operations to be done in Collie. The procedures are not overly onerous, and the stays in hospital are not that long.

What is the point of having a \$7 million upgrade of a hospital, when it is not going to provide adequate services? It is ridiculous. One can understand why this government is in trouble with its funding, if that is the way we are going to proceed down the line. Further upgrades are needed. I understand that the wards and the operating theatre need extra work. I understand that some work is being done in this round on the operating theatre, but regular issues in the hospital include the breakdown of the air-conditioning system. The other night, the temperature was minus one, and we had no air conditioning. I had the same problem 12 months ago, when I was in there myself. The nurses were wearing gloves because the air-conditioning system had broken down.

That is a side issue, and I come back to the main issue of my grievance. I believe that Collie is fairly well serviced with doctors with the skills to carry out operations that, although I would not call them minor, are at the lower end of the scale. The real issue is: why are we not doing them in Collie? I had that question asked, but no-one has actually mentioned the reason for the change. The answer was safety reasons, but what does that mean when we talk about operations that people should be having in their own communities? I am sure that these procedures are still done in areas such as Manjimup, with the same population. Because we are a bit closer to Bunbury, our services have been dropped off for the sake of convenience. It is not about saving money and it is not about services. Every time we move someone down to Bunbury to have an operation, someone in that region moves down the list. We know there is a problem with waiting lists for operations. It also means that some of those people will suffer for extended periods when they do not need to. Like any member of this house, I think we should be working very hard to limit the suffering for people all over the south west. I ask that the minister look into this matter, give the Collie community an answer about why this has happened and rectify the situation by putting those operations back into Collie Hospital so people from the Collie community do not have to travel to line up in the queue at Bunbury to get these minor procedures.

MR J.H.D. DAY (Kalamunda — Minister for Health) [9.35 am]: In response to the issues raised by the member for Collie-Preston, I understand that some changes have been made recently, but are intended to be temporary. I will explain the situation. The Western Australian Country Health Service continually reviews the scope of surgical procedures delivered in small hospitals to ensure that a safe and contemporary level of service is maintained. Everyone would understand that that is a responsibility that WACHS needs to fulfil.

A review has been commenced to ensure that the level of surgery performed at Collie Hospital is consistent with the WA Health clinical services framework. The general practitioner who previously undertook surgery at Collie Hospital is not currently credentialed to undertake surgery, and the WACHS surgical lead is currently reviewing the doctor's credentialing statements and scope of practice. As a result, if visiting surgeons to Collie Hospital are unable to add the required patients to their list, some surgical procedures undertaken under general anaesthetic may need to be transferred to Bunbury Hospital. However, this is only a potential outcome

and does not reflect a permanent change in the service provision at Collie Hospital. While this review is being undertaken, some procedures previously booked have been temporarily postponed and some in the approved list have been brought forward.

The procedures currently not able to be performed, unless visiting surgeons are able to add them to their list and have the required support, such as nursing support and 24-hour cover, include appendectomies, tonsillectomies, abscess drainage requiring a general anaesthetic, hernia repairs, haemorrhoidectomies, fistula repairs, gland biopsies and other procedures requiring a general anaesthetic. The procedures that can currently be performed include minor surgery such as skin lesions, vasectomies, circumcisions, abscess drainage under a local anaesthetic and other minor procedures not requiring a general anaesthetic. I am advised that, because of this situation, Collie Hospital has cancelled surgeries for four patients who required tonsillectomies and one patient with a perianal abscess, whose surgery was cancelled on 23 August 2016.

This is intended to be a temporary situation, but clearly WACHS and the government have a responsibility to ensure that appropriate clinical standards are maintained at Collie Hospital and all our other hospitals and that patient safety is the paramount consideration. That is why some changes have been put in place in recent times, while this review of the capacity for surgery to be undertaken at Collie Hospital is carried out. In relation to patient safety considerations, it is required that a surgeon have formal training in surgery, current experience in the management of each condition, an ongoing minimum number of cases in different procedures to ensure proficiency and ongoing professional development and upskilling in new procedures and equipment to ensure safe and contemporary practice. There needs to be capital infrastructure that supports surgical services, including operating theatres, sterilisation, inpatient infrastructure and contemporary equipment. The nursing staff need to be trained and experienced in surgical management, surgical equipment, sterilisation, recovery requirements and post-operative care. There is a requirement for maintenance of minimum case level numbers and ongoing professional development to ensure skill level and training in contemporary nursing management and the use of surgical equipment. Access to an intensive care unit or high dependency unit is secondary to the increasing requirement for patients to have in-depth management post-operatively due to other health conditions or complexities and the increased requirements for access to blood products, both planned and unplanned. There needs to be access to imaging and pathology services, particularly after hours, to support emergency situations. There needs to be access to the pharmacy and stores inventory. There needs to be post-operative support and management, including access to allied health professionals. These standards are continually reviewed and updated to ensure that they meet contemporary standards of patient care.

As the member for Collie–Preston mentioned, a capital redevelopment is underway at Collie Hospital. I was pleased to visit the \$7.8 million project at the end of April with the Minister for Regional Development. The scope of works includes a major refurbishment and extension of the emergency department. It also includes a fit-out of the new administration centre, new hospital and ambulance entries, new equipment and medical stores, and new reception and triage areas, waiting areas and treatment bays. We have made a significant commitment to maintaining high-quality services at Collie Hospital, with a scope of practice that is appropriate for the capacity, training and qualifications of the medical staff providing that treatment. As I said, a review is underway. Some temporary changes have been made to ensure that clinical standards are maintained in the short term. I expect that once the review is completed, if the appropriate standards can be guaranteed to be maintained, the previous arrangements will be put back in place. As I said, patient safety and clinical standards are paramount, and that depends on the qualifications and the credentialing of the doctors concerned.

LEEWIN BARRACKS SITE, EAST FREMANTLE — DEVELOPMENT

Grievance

MR M.H. TAYLOR (Bateman — Parliamentary Secretary) [9.42 am]: Prior to entering Parliament three and a half years ago, I worked for 10 years in sustainable development planning. Initially at the CSIRO and later as a sole trading consultant, I worked on some of Western Australia's largest urban and industrial developments, including Alkimos Beach and Latitude 32. While at the CSIRO, I was asked to be project director for the "Wungong Urban Water Master Plan". This was Western Australia's largest master plan, covering 1 500 hectares for a 15 000-household development near Armadale. I am proud that this project won WA's top planning award for 2007. One of my motivations for entering Parliament was to ensure that the expected doubling of Perth's population by 2050 is achieved in a way that improves our already famous liveability and lifestyle. One matter of special importance to me is the pending development of the Leeuwin Barracks site in East Fremantle, which I seek to raise today with the Minister for Planning. I first brought this matter to the attention of the former Minister for Planning, whose response to my subsequent written correspondence reassured me that the Department of Planning was liaising with the Town of East Fremantle and the landowner to create an appropriate planning framework that would ensure desirable outcomes.

Today, as the endorsed Liberal candidate for the electorate of Bicton, I wish to seek an update on this planning process and to put on record a range of issues that we as a state government will need to consider as this planning and development progress. The development of the Leeuwin site within the Bicton electorate not only

impacts local residents, but also its size and prime riverfront location make it a very special site of significance for the region and our capital city. I also have a personal connection to this site because my family home was about one kilometre away and I spent much of my childhood along the stretch of river surrounding Leeuwin Barracks. This unique long-term project presents an amazing opportunity for the community and all levels of government to work together to create a vibrant precinct that will deliver triple-bottom-line benefits for many generations to come. The federal Department of Defence is the landowner, so I have been in regular dialogue with my federal colleague ex-brigadier Senator Linda Reynolds, who shares my commitment to ensuring that all levels of government cooperate to achieve the best outcome for the community. I also recently met with the Town of East Fremantle Mayor, Jim O'Neil, and CEO, Gary Tuffin. As the responsible local government, the Town of East Fremantle will lead the creation of a master plan that will be used to guide more detailed subsequent planning and development processes. The town is eager to work with the state and federal governments to ensure a strong community outcome. I want to highlight some matters for the minister's awareness based on those conversations.

Firstly, controls need to be put in place to ensure that excessive density is not granted on the site. I imagine that this will need to occur at the scheme amendment stage because changes to the town planning regulations structure plans mean that these documents are now regarded as only non-binding guidelines. The Town of East Fremantle has expressed to me that it does not want a repeat of what has happened recently in South Perth regarding height and density beyond the community's expectations. We need to ensure that a highly qualified state government representative is intimately involved in the master planning to provide expert guidance and an efficient and effective single point of access to state government. Further, the Town of East Fremantle advises me that there is currently no developer contribution scheme to allow it to facilitate additional funding for this project. I believe that we have a duty to ensure that the local government is adequately funded so that the planning and development process can be conducted in a thorough and comprehensive manner befitting this project of great local and regional significance.

The redevelopment of the Leeuwin site will need to be incorporated into long-term planning documents, such as Perth and Peel@3.5 million. The town informs me that the current population and density projections exclude this site, yet the surrounding areas are low density. The redevelopment creates an exciting new potential for activity, and this will need to be factored into transport planning, including an assessment of the public transport needs of the redeveloped site. Although the emphasis of the initial discussions seems to be on residential development, the site also lends itself to commercial development, and this ought to be considered from the outset. We also need to consider how we can utilise the existing buildings while the planning process is being finalised. The last thing anyone wants is for buildings on this prime site to sit vacant for years. As the project moves from the planning to the construction phase, we will also need to consider things such as the current overhead powerlines that traverse the site, which could easily be put underground in the process. I am sure that local residents would appreciate the improved reliability and the government would save on ongoing maintenance costs. Construction will also need to take into account the various drainage, waste and stormwater management considerations to minimise any potential impacts on the Swan River. The area surrounding the site is made up of mostly local roads, and there are roundabouts on Preston Point Road either side heading to and from the site. This will need to be factored into the construction phase as a huge number of demolition and construction vehicles will require access to the site over a long time. This will put enormous pressure on the existing road network and cause considerable disruption to local residents. Further, the road infrastructure will need to be upgraded to cater for the increased vehicular traffic following the redevelopment, in addition to extra public transport, as I have already highlighted.

In conclusion, as the minister can see, a range of issues will need to be addressed in preparation for the development of the Leeuwin Barracks site. This site represents an amazing opportunity for the local community of East Fremantle and for the greater community of Bicton and the Perth metropolitan area. I am committed to utilising my extensive planning knowledge and experience to work with the various local, state and federal government agencies to ensure that the redevelopment of this site produces the best outcome for our community. I also invite anyone who wants to be informed of the progress of this site to contact me by email and I will gladly pass on their feedback and keep them updated as progress is made.

MR J. NORBERGER (Joondalup — Parliamentary Secretary) [9.48 am]: On behalf of the Minister for Planning, I thank the member for the grievance. Certainly, the Leeuwin Barracks site is a very significant site in the Bicton electorate. In a moment I will get back to some of the activities both the minister and I have already undertaken for that site. However, it is probably worthwhile running through some of the history of the site and some of the steps that are required in the near future to bring that development to fruition, some of which have been touched on by the member.

Leeuwin Barracks, formerly known as HMAS *Leeuwin* naval base, is located in East Fremantle. It is of a fairly significant size. It is 14.3 hectares which, considering the urban densification around that area, is a significant opportunity for a potential development site. It is owned by the commonwealth government. It is a Defence property, but obviously the Department of Defence has expressed an intention to redevelop the site as

it is no longer required for strategic purposes; hence why it is such a fantastic opportunity for the community if it is done well and if it is done right. The Town of East Fremantle, in conjunction with the Department of Defence, is undertaking a master planning process over the site. To assist in this process, a consultant team has been assembled, which incorporates traffic, environment, heritage, architectural, place making and urban design experts. The master planning process also includes a design charrette and stakeholders, including community members, which I think is an important addition, and they will collaborate on a vision for the development. The charrette will be an opportunity for the public to engage in and influence any potential masterplan outcome. This will run over the week commencing 12 September 2016 for the public to attend during several open sessions. A presentation of the outcomes will then be given on the evening on Thursday, 15 September. I believe further details are available on the Town of East Fremantle website. I have no doubt that the member for Bateman will be involved in that process and keep his community informed.

The master plan will provide a level of certainty to prospective developers, who are equally important. That will assist the Department of Defence in disposing of the property and realising an appropriate market value. It is expected that the master plan will be presented by the council by the end of 2016 for consideration, so it will be great to see some progress being made on that site. That is a step in the right direction. Although at this stage the state government is not a decision-maker in the process, the Department of Defence and the Town of East Fremantle are managing the process. That said, I assure the member that the minister, the director general of Planning and I have visited the site with the Town of East Fremantle, as we have been doing with many local government authorities. As such, the minister is intimately aware of the importance of the site and the importance of getting it right, doing infill well, doing density well and being mindful of the community expectations. We have had a tour around the site as well. The director general of Planning made it known to the Town of East Fremantle, as she has made known to other local government authorities, that when such strategic planning decisions on a big parcel of land like this are being made, it is important to engage early with the Department of Planning. That should give the member and his community some encouragement to know that we are on top of that. Having local members such as him, especially when they have such a good, strong background in planning, certainly cannot be a bad thing. The member for Bateman's involvement in and coordination of communications with the community can only benefit the ultimate outcome. Certainly, the Minister for Planning, the staff and I will continue to be available to assist in any way we can. It is fair to say that we want to see an outstanding outcome for the community. If it is done, it will be a great example of infill done well. It is a fantastic, beautiful location. It is great when local members take such an active interest in important local matters. The minister and I look forward to working with the member for Bateman to see this project progress. The member is quite right: the Town of East Fremantle thus far is doing a very good job and it is aware of how important it is to get it right. We look forward to working with the member, the Town of East Fremantle and the Department of Defence to ensure that this project is developed well and on time for the local community. I thank the member.

JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE CORRUPTION AND CRIME COMMISSION

Twenty-ninth Report — "A suppression order in regard to two former officers of the Corruption and Crime Commission" — Tabling

MR P.B. WATSON (Albany) [9.54 am]: I present for tabling the twenty-ninth report of the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission, entitled "A suppression order in regard to two former officers of the Corruption and Crime Commission".

[See paper 4465.]

Mr P.B. WATSON: This report by the joint standing committee provides the Western Australian Parliament with information concerning the granting of a suppression order in relation to the identities of two former officers of the CCC. The order was granted on 20 November 2014 in the Perth Magistrates Court by Deputy Chief Magistrate Woods and remains in place.

The two former officers were charged by WA Police on 14 August 2014 with offences relating to the false accounting and reporting of a \$1 000 cash advance in May 2011, which, instead of being used for official purposes, was given by one of the accused to the other. One of the accused was also charged with giving false evidence to the CCC during a private hearing inquiring into the matter. The matters leading to the charges have previously been reported to Parliament by the joint standing committee. The committee's nineteenth report, "Parliamentary Inspector's report on misconduct and related issues in the Corruption and Crime Commission", outlined 23 allegations of misconduct that had been made against commission staff and investigated by WAPOL.

This report, and the later twenty-fifth report, "Parliamentary Inspector's Report on Allegations of Misconduct Made Against Officers in the Corruption and Crime Commission's Electronic Collection Unit", garnered widespread public attention. The committee was concerned that members of the Western Australian public who had read or heard about these allegations would wish to know of any later charges and prosecution of officers of the commission. The public's trust in the state's integrity system relies on knowing that commission officers who have broken the law are charged, prosecuted and punished, like any other member of the public.

At their initial hearing, an application was made by lawyers for each of the accused, without notice, for a suppression order pursuant to section 171(4)(b) of the Criminal Procedure Act 2004. The accused's lawyers submitted that any identification of the accused as former CCC employees would subject them and their families to significant risk to their personal safety from unidentified people who were the subject of CCC investigations they had participated in. Information gathered by the commission during an adjournment of the hearing could not rule out the possibility that the two accused former officers may at some time have followed members of organised crime organisations or bikies, but this was thought unlikely.

It is the committee's recommendation that for any future court cases involving serving, or former, officers of the CCC, the commission prepare for the prosecution detailed briefing notes on the officers' tasks and roles within the commission so they can properly present the facts to the court should a suppression order be applied for. A draft of the committee's report was provided for comment to the Parliamentary Inspector of the Corruption and Crime Commission, Hon Michael Murray, QC; the Commissioner of the Corruption and Crime Commission, Hon John McKechnie, QC; and the Director of Public Prosecutions, Mr Joseph McGrath, SC. The parliamentary inspector and the DPP had no comment to make on the draft report. A copy of the CCC commissioner's response is included in appendix 4 of the report and the committee has taken that response into account when adopting this final report.

I thank my fellow committee members for their input into this report: the committee's chairman, Hon Nick Goiran, MLC, member for South Metropolitan Region; the member for Forrestfield, Mr Nathan Morton, MLA; and the member for South West Region, Hon Adele Farina, MLC. The committee's secretariat, Dr David Worth and Ms Jovita Hogan, provided committee members with timely support.

Thirtieth Report — "Annual Report 2015–16" — Tabling

MR P.B. WATSON (Albany) [9.58 am]: I present for tabling the thirtieth report of the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission, "Annual Report 2015–16".

[See paper 4466.]

Mr P.B. WATSON: The principal role of the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission, as provided for in standing order 289 of the Legislative Assembly, is to monitor and report to Parliament on the exercise of the functions of the Corruption and Crime Commission and the Parliamentary Inspector of the Corruption and Crime Commission. This annual report outlines the work of the committee for the period 1 July 2015 to 30 June 2016 in the thirty-ninth Parliament.

The committee has tabled seven reports in Parliament in the past year. Much of the committee's work during this period has dealt with reporting on the outcome of allegations of misconduct made against Corruption and Crime Commission officers. The committee's first report this year on this subject reported on allegations made against three officers of the commission's electronic collections unit.

The second report was as a result of a number of serious allegations of misconduct made against officers of the commission's then operational support unit. As disappointing as these matters were, the committee was advised by Commissioner McKechnie, QC, that procedures are now in place at the CCC that provide for better governance. Mr McKechnie has said, "I am quite as confident as one can be that the problems that occurred will not occur again, or will be picked up earlier."

Following from this, the committee was pleased to report on two protocols developed by the Parliamentary Inspector of the Corruption and Crime Commission, Hon Michael Murray, QC; the Corruption and Crime Commission Commissioner, Hon John McKechnie, QC; and the Public Sector Commissioner, Mr Mal Wauchope. These two protocols assist the effective operation of the Corruption, Crime and Misconduct Act 2003 by ensuring that the parliamentary inspector retains the responsibility for overseeing any allegation of misconduct made against commission officers, other than the most trivial. It is expected that the parliamentary inspector will report on the effectiveness of these protocols in his 2015–16 annual report.

During this reporting period, the committee suspended its inquiry into whether the Corruption and Crime Commission should be able to prosecute its own charges, which it had commenced in June 2014 and on which it had intended to report in December 2015. The subject matter of this inquiry has been a matter of interest to the committee for some time. Some preliminary inquiries were made by the committee in the thirty-eighth Parliament. The inquiry was suspended as a result of an appeal to the Supreme Court that was examining the power of the CCC to commence and continue prosecutions. The committee was concerned that by continuing with its inquiry, it would inevitably overlap with matters being considered by the Court of Appeal. The committee, when ceasing its inquiry, reported to Parliament that it would re-examine the issue and consider whether to reinstate its inquiry with the existing, or modified, terms of reference once the Court of Appeal had handed down its judgement.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all those who have appeared before the committee over the past year as witnesses. In particular, I would like to thank the CCC commissioner, Hon John McKechnie, QC, who has undertaken a substantial reshaping of the commission since being appointed on 1 April 2015. I would also

like to personally thank the Commissioner of Police, Dr Karl O'Callaghan, APM; and the parliamentary inspector, Hon Michael Murray, QC, and their staff, for assisting the committee to effectively carry out its oversight role.

I would like to record my thanks to my fellow committee members, whose support and professionalism I have very much appreciated over the past year: the committee chairman, Hon Nick Goiran, MLC, member for South Metropolitan Region; Mr Nathan Morton, MLA, member for Forrestfield; and Hon Adele Farina, MLC, member for South West. I am also grateful for the support of the committee's principal research officer, Dr David Worth, and research officer, Ms Jovita Hogan, who ably supported the committee members in their work and who continue to provide professional and timely support to the committee.

JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON AUDIT

Seventh Report — "Review of the Operation and Effectiveness of the Auditor General Act 2006" — Tabling

DR K.D. HAMES (Dawesville) [10.03 am]: I present for tabling the seventh report of the Joint Standing Committee on Audit, titled "Review of the Operation and Effectiveness of the *Auditor General Act 2006*".

[See paper 4467.]

Dr K.D. HAMES: The chair of the committee, Hon Ken Travers, is presenting an identical copy of this report in the other place.

At the start, I want to thank Andrew Hawkes, the advisory officer to the committee, and Tracey Sharpe, the committee clerk.

The report that I have just tabled advises the two houses of this Parliament of the findings and recommendations of the Joint Standing Committee on Audit following our review of the operation and effectiveness of the Auditor General Act 2006, as required by section 48 of that act. The Auditor General Act 2006 is ranked second out of the legislation in 10 jurisdictions—the Australian states and territories, the commonwealth and New Zealand—for safeguarding the independence of the Auditor General due to its wide mandate and discretion. However, the report identifies a number of areas in which the act impedes the Auditor General from performing his functions. This is most clearly the case in relation to his power to compel documents and information from agencies when those documents are subject to cabinet confidentiality or legal professional privilege. The committee urgently recommends that the Auditor General Act be amended to provide the Auditor General with the power to compel the production of these documents, as originally intended by the act. However, the committee accepts that cabinet documents would not be disclosed to parliamentary committees.

The committee makes a number of recommendations to improve the operation and effectiveness of this act, including in relation to the Auditor General's "follow-the-dollar" provisions; disclosing information obtained in the course of an audit engagement; and future reviews of the act. Unusually, the committee has recommended its own abolition and that its exclusive functions of making recommendations and reviewing the Auditor General Act 2006 be transferred to the Legislative Council Standing Committee on Estimates and Financial Operations.

The Committee extends its appreciation to Vista Advisory Pty Limited and HWL Ebsworth Lawyers for their valuable reports, and to Colin Murphy, Auditor General, and his office for their cooperation during the review process.

I commend the report to the house.

LOAN BILL 2016

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by **Dr M.D. Nahan (Treasurer)**, and read a first time.

Explanatory memorandum presented by the Treasurer.

Second Reading

DR M.D. NAHAN (Riverton — Treasurer) [10.06 am]: I move —

That the bill be now read a second time.

Borrowing for general public purposes, as distinct from borrowing by statutory authorities with borrowing powers in their enabling acts, must be authorised by Loan Acts. This bill seeks a new Loan Act authorisation of \$1.7 billion to meet the estimated borrowing requirements of the consolidated account until 30 June 2017.

Members may recall that the Loan Act 2015 authorised \$8 billion in consolidated account general purpose borrowing. When that bill was introduced in April 2015, I indicated that it was expected to provide authority for sufficient central borrowings to cover the needs of the consolidated account to the end of 2016–17. Also, based on the 2015–16 budget forecasts, that bill included a \$1.5 billion "buffer" for any unexpected changes in the borrowing needs of the consolidated account over the two-year period to 30 June 2017.

As subsequently detailed in the 2015–16 midyear review and 2016–17 budget, unprecedented writedowns in revenue have continued since the Loan Act 2015 was enacted. We are now entering a third consecutive year of contracting annual revenue, with a total \$9.3 billion reduction in the general government revenue estimates over the period 2015–16 to 2018–19 since the 2015–16 budget was finalised.

The government has introduced further savings measures to address the weaker revenue outlook, with \$1.3 billion in net debt savings from new measures written into the estimates in the December 2015 midyear review, and a further \$1.3 billion of savings in the 2016–17 budget. However, unless we were to make unsustainable cuts to services or pass the burden to households and businesses, these measures clearly cannot make up for the continuing contractions in revenue.

This unprecedented decline in revenue means that the borrowing authorisation in the Loan Act 2015 is now expected to be exhausted by 31 October 2016. Accordingly, an increase in the authorised borrowing limit is required to meet the additional borrowing needs arising from this change in the revenue outlook.

The proposed \$1.7 billion authorisation in the Loan Bill 2016 allows for an additional \$500 million in excess of the Loan Act 2015 authorisation to meet the needs of the consolidated account reflected in the 2016–17 budget. The remaining \$1.2 billion authorisation in the bill restores a buffer for the remainder of the 2016–17 year. As with all previous Loan Act authorisations, any unused borrowing authority not drawn by 30 June 2017 will remain available for borrowing requirements in 2017–18.

I remind the house that loan bills are administrative in nature. The borrowings authorised by the current bill were reflected in the 2016–17 budget, and there are no additional costs in excess of the approved forward estimates associated with the passage of this authority. In accordance with clause 4 of the bill, the proceeds of all loans raised under this authority must be paid into the consolidated account. The moneys will then be advanced to agencies as required by appropriations in the budget. Details of consolidated account appropriations are laid out in the budget papers that have been tabled in this house and examined in detail by members through the estimates hearings process, with the third reading of the 2016–17 budget appropriation bills dealt with by this house on 14 June 2016.

In accordance with clause 5 of the bill, in addition to seeking the authority for loan raisings, the bill also permanently appropriates moneys from the consolidated account to meet principal repayments, interest and other expenses of borrowings under this authority.

I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned, on motion by **Mr W.J. Johnston**.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT AMENDMENT (AUDITING) BILL 2016

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by **Mr A.J. Simpson (Minister for Local Government)**, and read a first time.

Explanatory memorandum presented by the minister.

Second Reading

MR A.J. SIMPSON (Darling Range — Minister for Local Government) [10.12 am]: I move —

That the bill be now read a second time.

I am pleased to introduce the Local Government Amendment (Auditing) Bill 2016. An important focus of this Liberal–National government is to improve the accountability and transparency of local governments to their communities and to provide for independent oversight of the sector. This bill introduces changes to broaden the Auditor General’s scope of powers to undertake and report on local government financial and performance audits to do just this.

The changes introduced by this bill are in line with the Corruption and Crime Commission recommendations that the jurisdiction of the Auditor General be extended to include local governments. The CCC commented that there seems to be no reason why local governments should have lower standards of accountability than state government authorities. Furthermore, on 26 November 2015, the Public Accounts Committee tabled a report on improving local government accountability. The committee recommended that the Auditor General’s scope of powers be broadened to include financial and performance auditing of local governments in order to raise the standard of accountability applicable to local governments to a level more consistent with public sector agencies.

Local governments will benefit because the Auditor General will be able to identify instances of noncompliance, wastage, inefficiency or ineffectiveness and proactively bring these to the attention of local government. This will not only improve local governments’ understanding of their financial position, including threats to their sustainability, but also provide local governments with the ability to take corrective action in a timely way. In this way, ratepayers’ funds and community interests are better protected. Oversight of auditing by the

Office of the Auditor General will allow benchmarking of local governments by members of their community, who will have improved access to an independent assessment of a local government's financial position and will enable them to hold their local government to greater account.

This bill allows the Auditor General to contract out some or all of the financial audits, but all audits will be done under the supervision of the Auditor General and the Office of the Auditor General. Local governments will be responsible for the costs associated with financial audits, as is currently the case. A number of firms audit the local government sector, half of which are already accredited with the Office of the Auditor General. The Auditor General has said that he recognises the importance of audit firms in country areas continuing to have a role in the auditing of local governments. The OAG intends to support and assist small regional auditing firms to upskill so that they can meet and comply with key aspects of the Australian auditing and assurance standards.

In line with the Public Accounts Committee's recommendation, the bill also introduces a new category of audits known as performance audits. These audits examine the economy, efficiency and effectiveness of programs and organisations, including compliance with legislative provisions and internal policies. The bill gives the Auditor General the power to conduct such audits, which may focus on a particular issue or theme, and may target particular local governments and related bodies. This is in line with the approach adopted in other jurisdictions and with what applies to state government agencies. The policy intention of this bill is that although financial audits will be paid for by local governments, the funding of performance audits will be by the state government.

This bill will also bring about changes to the way local governments are required to publish and report on audits and their annual reports. Audit reports are included in annual reports and many local governments already publish these on their websites. This bill will make it a requirement for all local governments to publish their annual reports on their official websites so that members of the community can easily find and review them, should they wish to. This is yet another example of the Liberal-National government's commitment to ensuring that Western Australians benefit from responsive, accountable and transparent local governments. The community has a reasonable expectation that government at all levels is open and accountable, and local government is no exception.

I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned, on motion by **Mr W.J. Johnston**.

HIGHWAYS (LIABILITY FOR STRAYING ANIMALS) AMENDMENT BILL 2016

First Reading

Bill read a first time, on motion by **Mrs L.M. Harvey (Minister for Police)**.

Explanatory memorandum presented by the minister.

Second Reading

MRS L.M. HARVEY (Scarborough — Minister for Police) [10.16 am]: I move —

That the bill be now read a second time.

This bill is aimed at updating the current cap on damages recoverable for loss caused by animals that stray onto roads under the Highways (Liability for Straying Animals) Act 1983. The act was passed to clarify the law governing civil liability for straying animals by specifically providing that liability for loss caused by animals that stray onto roads is governed by the law of negligence. The act contains an upper limit beyond which damages in respect of any one accident cannot be awarded against the keeper of the straying animal that caused the loss. The intent of the limit was to ensure that keepers of animals such as farmers and graziers would be able to obtain insurance cover at a reasonable price to indemnify them against loss caused by their animals straying onto roads. This limit was set at \$500 000, in accordance with the recommendation of the Law Reform Commission of Western Australia in its report titled "Project No 11—Part II: Liability for Stock Straying on to the Highway".

This limit on recoverable damages has not been updated since the act came into effect in 1983. In light of inflation and increases in other awards of damages over the last three decades, the cap is outdated and may unfairly restrict the damages recoverable by a road user injured in an accident caused by straying stock, thus denying them due compensation for the harm done and loss caused to them. To address this, the bill will remove the current cap from the act and provide that it be prescribed in regulations. This will allow greater flexibility in adjusting the cap from time to time to ensure that it is current and in line with trends in court awards of damages by way of compensation, and will provide for the indexation of the cap so that it can be varied annually in line with the wage price index.

The current act does not contain any regulation-making power. As such, the proposed changes to the limit on damages recoverable will be implemented in a two-step process. As the first step, the present bill will amend the

current act to remove the existing outdated limit and introduce the power to enable the Governor to make regulations necessary or convenient for giving effect to the act. It is intended that the bill will commence on proclamation. Following the bill's assent, but prior to its commencement, regulations will be drafted specifying the new limit and providing that the limit will be indexed by reference to the wage price index as published by the Australian Statistician. The proclamation of the bill and the gazettal of the proposed regulations will be timed to ensure a seamless transition to the new updated limit on recoverable damages.

I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned, on motion by **Mr W.J. Johnston**.

MISUSE OF DRUGS AMENDMENT (SEARCH POWERS) BILL 2016

Second Reading

Resumed from 30 June.

MR W.J. JOHNSTON (Cannington) [10.19 am]: I indicate that I am not the lead speaker for the opposition, but I want to make some comments on the Misuse of Drugs Amendment (Search Powers) Bill 2016. There is no question that the biggest issue related to community safety is the use of illegal drugs. The figures are startling. I note that the minister pointed out in her second reading speech that there has been a massive increase in the seizure of methamphetamine in Western Australia. She said in her speech that in 2014, 122.7 kilograms of meth was seized; in the 2015 financial year, that increased by more than 100 per cent to 276.2 kilograms; and in the half-year to Christmas last year, 418 kilograms of meth was seized. Yet we all know that rivers of methamphetamine are still circulating in our suburbs, and that has been demonstrated by the fact that the government is now monitoring the sewerage system. It was found that over two tonnes of meth is getting into our sewage. I note, too, that the Minister for Police outlined in her speech the seizures by the Australian Federal Police. I am not sure how many of the seizures that she referred to in Western Australia were seizures by Western Australia Police and how many were by the AFP.

I note that one observation that was made years ago when I worked in customs—I was not a customs officer like Hon Ken Travers, who today will retire from the other house; he was in fact on the frontline of the customs service, but I did not have that role, as I was just an administrative officer—was that most of the drugs that come into Australia come in through bulk cargo across our wharves because that is where the huge volumes of material are. If 300 000 or 400 000 containers are being moved across the wharf at Fremantle, or millions across the wharves in other states, it is simply impossible to examine every container. Once upon a time, it was the job of a customs officer to stand at the bottom of the gangway when a ship pulled in and inspect everybody and everything that came off it, but that was back in the 1930s and 1940s.

Ms M.M. Quirk: The good old days!

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: The good old days one could say. With the huge volumes of imports now, it is just not possible to do that type of direct examination of every item coming into the country. Hundreds of thousands of containers come into the country, and it is clear that that is where most of the drugs come through because it is impossible to check all those containers. Drugs can be hidden easily. They can be hidden inside crockery plates and machine parts and, indeed, within the frame of the steel containers. In fact, there was a famous case in New South Wales in which unclaimed empty containers were sold at auction and distributed around country New South Wales, and one of the people who purchased a container was welding the container and found drugs in the frame. The police later investigated it. I think about 12 or 14 containers had been auctioned off and they all contained drugs. Whoever had imported them had obviously been spooked for some reason and had not collected the containers with the drugs, which were sold to the community. Nobody knew that they contained tonnes of drugs. In fact, the police could not be certain that they had recovered all the containers, because obviously, although detailed records are kept of imports and exports, abandoned containers are not closely monitored. That is a story of the sorts of things that happen with drugs.

There was recently a seizure in Western Australia by the customs service, the Federal Police and the state police. A fishing boat came in through Geraldton. The drugs were not seized from the boat; they were seized in my electorate of Cannington. The interesting question was whether the police got all the drugs. They were not aware of when the drugs came off the boat—I think 200 kilograms were seized from the house in East Cannington—so they were not sure whether that was all the drugs that were originally on the boat. This is one of the problems: it is easy to hide drugs.

The minister said in her speech that interstate couriers and Australia Post are unwitting couriers of drugs. I am sure that you would be aware, Mr Acting Speaker, that the post office has a right to open anything other than a letter. A letter has a special class under federal law. A letter can contain only paper; it cannot contain anything else. Sometimes people put drugs in an ordinary letter and send it, but when it gets scanned, the drugs are picked up, and then the postal service and the customs service have a right to open the letter. The Federal Police use

customs powers to search for drugs because customs powers are much wider than most other search powers. If anything other than a piece of paper is put in a letter, it ceases to be a letter and the post office has a right to open the item. Again, the volume of parcels has gone up massively and so the chance of detection obviously falls as the volume goes up.

The minister spoke in her second reading speech about seven operations at the Australia Post facility at the airport. The minister said that there were seizures of 361 grams of meth and 11.45 kilograms of cannabis, with 16 charges laid from that. We can see that drugs were found in each of the seven operations. Just to give members a picture of the ratio of seizures to drugs in the community, I note that 361 grams of meth is one-four-thousandth of the drugs that are in circulation in Western Australia. Western Australia Police, the Australian Federal Police, the Australian customs service and the Australian Border Force work hard to fight against the importation of drugs, but it is a very difficult task and that means that there is a river of tonnes of meth in our community.

All of us who were here last week and listened to the inspiring personal story of the member for Collie–Preston can see the huge impact that drugs can have on families and the need to make sure that adequate services are available for people to deal with the personal impacts of drug use. An observation made to me many years ago by a pharmacist was that once a person is addicted to drugs, they will probably need some form of treatment for the rest of their life. It is a grim reminder that someone who has been addicted to serious chemical products, even when they have ceased to be an addict, will have treatment for their whole life. It is a frightening thought. As I say, the member for Collie–Preston's speech was very powerful and moving. Those of us who were in the chamber at the time thought he was very brave to make that speech, and I add my congratulations to him for what he was prepared to say.

One of the issues that come up, I am sure, for you, Mr Acting Speaker, as it does occasionally for me, is drug houses and the difficulty for police dealing with them. There was a drug house in Thornlie, on the eastern edge of my current boundary, and it was quite a number of years before we were able to get it closed. Fortunately, in the end, the south east district police were able to close it. These drug houses cause huge damage; they significantly impact on the amenity of the suburbs because people turn up late at night to buy drugs, cars come and go and people use drugs in nearby parks and leave syringes there. To the credit of the City of Gosnells, it made a commitment and continued to send out rangers so that if drug paraphernalia was lying around, it was cleaned up quite quickly. But there is still the inconvenience of the council's resources being focused on that rather than on other services. Also, the sheer amenity of the suburb is reduced and neighbours are nervous about what goes on. Generally speaking, the person running the drug house wants a good relationship with their neighbours because they do not want to have disputes, but hundreds of other people turn up, many of whom are affected by drugs in the way the minister's speech described. I will talk in a minute about the problems that arise from drug use that are visited upon the neighbours. Someone backing out of their driveway might be cut off by a person affected by drugs and they could get into an argument about who was at fault. These are things that my constituents who lived near the drug house actually experienced. It took three years to finally get the problem moved on. The police have made the point that when they raided that drug house—they raided it a number of times—there were never enough drugs in the house to support a charge of sell and supply, only possession. It took them quite a long time to deal with it.

I note that 200 kilograms of drugs were seized in East Cannington. I think it was reported as being worth about \$150 million. If two tonnes of drugs end up in sewage, that means that \$3 billion has been flowing back to criminals. That is an unbelievable amount of money.

Mr P.C. Tinley interjected.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: That is right; a huge volume of money is probably generally flowing out of Australia. Although the manufacture of meth in suburban houses is a problem—we have all seen famous cases of these residential drug kitchens blowing up and injuring people and drug laboratories being run in houses even with children in them—clearly, the big volume of drugs is imported from either the east coast or, more particularly, overseas. That means that \$3 billion to pay for those two tonnes of drugs is being taken out of ordinary folks' pockets and put in the pockets of crime syndicates. A person my age—I am becoming an old man these days—can probably recall the Royal Commission on the Activities of the Federated Ship Painters and Dockers Union, which exposed the Mr Asia drug syndicate and, of course, the bottom-of-the-harbour tax scheme as well. This has been a problem for a long time. The Australian Crime Commission was established as a result of the royal commission's findings. I note that before the member for Girrawheen came to Parliament, she was involved in that anti-drug architecture when she worked at the National Crime Authority, which arose straight out of that royal commission. The member for Girrawheen was senior counsel for the National Crime Authority fighting drug dealers. That was part of her journey that brought her to the Parliament here in Western Australia. Some people can talk about fighting crime and other people actually fight crime.

[Member's time extended.]

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I want to talk about the impact of drugs. The minister provided some interesting statistics on the first page of her second reading speech when she explained —

methamphetamine users are 1.6 times more likely to commit robbery, 1.8 times more likely to commit burglary, 2.1 more times likely to arm themselves with weapons and 1.5 times more likely to commit property offences than non-users

I draw attention to part of the member for Collie–Preston’s contribution in which he said that when people get hooked on meth, they steal from anyone, including their family. We know that a lot of the crime that supports drug habits is not from random people; it is from the families of people who become addicted to this substance. There is no question that the spike in property crime and burglaries that we have seen over the last year or year and a half is contributed to by the meth epidemic. Equally, there is a lot of unreported crime in which the victims are close family members and close friends of the person who is addicted. Much of that crime is not reported because people do not want to involve the criminal justice system when close family relatives are affected. That leads to the issue of treatment facilities. One of the things about that that comes to my mind is the number of times we hear reports on the radio, particularly from Gary Adshead on radio station 6PR, when he might interview people involved in a rehabilitation service who have trouble with planning laws to get their facilities running. Objections may be made on planning grounds against the location of a drug rehabilitation service. That is very disappointing. We all recognise the huge problem this is and we are bringing in legislation like the Misuse of Drugs Amendment (Search Powers) Bill 2016 to extend police powers to where they were previously not available and increase the capacity for police to search the vehicles of ordinary people without suspicion, but not without reason. It does things that we previously would not have considered appropriate. However, because the crisis in meth use is so bad, we are looking at things that we would not have previously agreed to, yet, in the siting and placement of rehabilitation services, we are getting caught up in planning and zoning rules. That does not make sense. We need to commit to giving the rehabilitation services that are available in our community the greatest opportunities. If there are artificial rules, that would not be so. Within a block of my house, there is a facility for people with issues. That was done by Jim McGinty and there was no objection. There is also a men’s hostel at the end of my street. Victoria Park is now quite a middle-class suburb but we can accommodate these things. People need to look into their hearts before they raise those types of petty planning objections to rehabilitation facilities. We have to make sure that people can get access to these types of facilities. They also need to be proximate to the families of the recovering people. I take on board what my friend the member for Collie–Preston talked about with the separation from his daughter during the early stage of her rehabilitation and the need for her to go through that. Clearly, people will get better rehabilitation outcomes if they have family support. It is quite important to make sure that the facilities are pretty close to where people live. We cannot just say we will stick them out in the hills. They have to be in suburban areas where people can get to them, otherwise we are not providing the best services for the community.

The Labor Party does not unnecessarily give additional powers to the police and we will not unnecessarily give additional powers to the police today. However, sometimes there is justification for additional powers in certain circumstances. Of course, there needs to be a trail of accountability for those powers; that is the bargain we have. As police themselves say—and they are right—it is not policing of the community, but community policing; it is the police providing security to the community as part of the community. All the people I know have great respect for the police service and the very difficult job it does. Police need the powers that are required to successfully execute the difficult tasks that we ask them to do. Occasionally, we need to give them additional powers, which is what we are doing with the Misuse of Drugs Amendment (Search Powers) Bill 2016. Of course, that is necessarily not unlimited and the police service would not want it to be unlimited. No police office in Australia would look at the Philippines and say, “That’s what we should do” but currently in the Philippines, there is a process of extrajudicial killing of people who are involved in drugs. The last thing I heard was that 1 200 people had been killed through extrajudicial killings. About 800 of the killings were by the police and about 400 were by vigilante gangs.

As reported before, I lived in Indonesia in the early 1980s and there was a similar practice in Indonesia. It was called the “Mysterious Killings”. At the time—about 1983 to 1985—it meant dissidents were also victims of extrajudicial killings. Under the cover of extremist law and order, there was a crackdown on dissidents as well.

[Interruption.]

Mr R.F. Johnson: I apologise, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: That’s okay; it was a lovely tune, member for Hillarys.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: That is the second member of the morning. I think the member for Vasse’s phone went off earlier, and now the member for Hillarys.

The current situation in the Philippines is completely and utterly excessive and nobody in Australia wants to support that. I make the point that there are always limits, in two ways. Firstly, we are a democratic society and

we do not want the security apparatus to have unlimited powers; and secondly, it does not work. It does not get the outcome that we are looking for. There are better outcomes when it is done in connection with the community.

The effect on the community is enormous. Members can talk to people, as I have done, who work in emergency departments of hospitals and listen to reports on radio of what happens in emergency departments. A couple of months ago, I was in the city on a Sunday for just the ordinary sort of Sunday shopping. I am not saying that either of the people involved in what I am about to describe were necessarily on meth, but they did give that appearance. Two blokes got stuck into each other and had a big fight right in the middle of Murray Street mall outside one of those little arcades. One guy went down and the bloke who was standing up started kicking him. A hundred people were looking at them as they walked past with their kids but I was the only person who went over and separated them.

Ms R. Saffioti: Did you?

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Yes, I know; a big weakling like me. A big muscle-building bloke came over after I had separated the two guys to help me.

Mr P.C. Tinley: To take the glory?

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: No, he did not take the glory, he actually thanked me. He was a very nice guy; I do not know his name or anything. It affects everyone. Even if we do not personally know somebody who has been impacted by the scourge, it reaches out into our community and affects everybody. Everywhere we go, there is an impact.

Mr P.B. Watson interjected.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Yes, that is right. It is a terrible situation and we need to take action. There is \$3 billion running around in this industry that is trading on the misery of Western Australians. It is something that we should be prepared to take action on. It cannot just be a law and order response; it has to be a community response and it has to include rehabilitation—it has to include all these things. It cannot just be about law and order or police powers; it has to be a broader strategy than that. I think everybody in the chamber would agree with that comment; I do not think there is any way it would be disputed.

Debate interrupted.

[Continued on page 5337.]

LIBERAL–NATIONAL GOVERNMENT — ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL PLAN FOR WESTERN AUSTRALIA

Standing Orders Suspension — Motion

MR M. McGOWAN (Rockingham — Leader of the Opposition) [10.49 am] — without notice: I move —

That so much of standing orders be suspended so as to allow the following motion to be moved forthwith —

That this house condemns the Liberal–National government for the collapse of coherent cabinet government resulting in the lack of an economic and financial plan for Western Australia.

This is a matter of some urgency, and I will explain to the house why. We just saw the Treasurer introduce a bill to borrow another \$1.7 billion. That is on top of the bill last year to borrow \$8 billion in order for government to function. The government is now going to run out of money. The state of Western Australia under the Liberal–National government is going to run out of money in October if these laws are not introduced. We are at the end of August and the government is introducing legislation so that it can continue to function. It must be passed by October or else we are going to run out of money. What a shambles of a government! What a hopeless government that we are now in this dire financial position after eight years of its profligate, hopeless rule. It comes on top of other recent developments, such as the lack of coherent, proper management of the cabinet. We have the National Party at war with itself. We have the National Party at war with the Liberal Party. We have Liberal Party ministers at war with one another. Then there is the revelation today, which I will go into if the Leader of the House agrees to this suspension, that the transport minister cannot get an appointment to see the Premier. The transport minister of Western Australia has said that he cannot get a meeting with the Premier of Western Australia. The Deputy Premier shakes her head, but she is just as responsible. Every single Liberal and National minister is responsible for this shambles in Western Australia.

Point of Order

Mr J.H.D. DAY: I think the Leader of the Opposition is getting into the substance of what he wants to talk about rather than really making the case as to why standing orders should be very unusually suspended.

However, so as to not waste the time of the house, we will agree to a maximum of 20 minutes for government members and 20 minutes for non-government members. I indicate that if the Leader of the Opposition sits down, I will move that.

THE SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, are you happy with 20 minutes each way?

Mr M. McGOWAN: I am satisfied with 20 minutes a side in relation to this issue. Other members might have a view. I think it deserves longer than that in light of recent developments, but if the government wants to truncate debate to 20 minutes a side, we would accept that. Other members might have a view.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I think it is only fair that as the only Independent member of this chamber, I have the opportunity to speak on this very important motion on the financial state that we face in Western Australia.

Mr J.H.D. Day: You can speak. No-one is stopping you speaking.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Under normal practices I would not get the normal five minutes that Independents get with a matter of public interest because this is not an MPI. I would like to move an amendment that five minutes be allocated to the Independent members should they so choose. I would like to move that amendment. I would like to get an indication from the Leader of the House whether he is prepared to accept that amendment.

Mr J.H.D. Day: No.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: He is not. Okay. We have seen the shambles that this Leader of the House has caused in this chamber over the last two days. Disgraceful! He has been gagging debates on very important issues. I will take the opportunity just to say a few words —

Mrs L.M. Harvey interjected.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Why don't you be quiet!

The SPEAKER: Thank you! Deputy Premier! Let us just get some normalcy back into this. Basically, the Leader of the House is not prepared to extend —

Mr J.H.D. Day: I will, being as generous as I am.

The SPEAKER: It has been extended by five minutes.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: So I will get five minutes to speak on the motion?

The SPEAKER: That is right.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Thank you.

Standing Orders Suspension — Amendment to Motion

MR J.H.D. DAY (Kalamunda — Leader of the House) [10.54 am]: I move to add to the motion -

To insert after “forthwith” —

, subject to the debate being limited to 20 minutes for government members, 20 minutes for non-government members and five minutes, if necessary, for Independent members.

Amendment put and passed.

Standing Orders Suspension — Motion, as Amended

The SPEAKER: Members, as this is a motion without notice to suspend standing orders, it will need the support of an absolute majority for it to proceed. If I hear a dissentient voice, I will be required to divide the Assembly.

Question put and passed with an absolute majority.

Motion

MR M. McGOWAN (Rockingham — Leader of the Opposition) [10.55 am]: I move the motion.

Earlier today the Treasurer moved the Loan Bill 2016—another \$1.7 billion worth of borrowing just to allow the general government sector of Western Australia to continue to operate. The Liberal–National government passed an \$8 billion loan bill last year—\$8 billion!—in order to allow the ordinary business of government to continue to operate, and that money is going to run out in October. Without this new Loan Bill, the business of government will stop in Western Australia. That is how incompetent and catastrophic the management of this state has been—we now have an unprecedented nearly \$10 billion of additional borrowings in the course of one year just to allow the ordinary business of government to continue to function. I think it is appropriate that on this day, when this catastrophic piece of information has come forward, we suspend the standing orders to discuss the incompetent and irresponsible management of Western Australia under the Barnett Liberal–National government. Is it any wonder that the state is now in this position, considering the breakdown of cabinet government in this state? I have never seen anything like it in the history of this country, where we have the

National Party at war with itself; we have the National Party at war with the Liberal Party; we have the National Party proposing a huge new tax in Western Australia; we have Liberal Party ministers at war with one another; and we have Liberal Party ministers—the transport minister and the Treasurer—having secret meetings in Shenton Park to discuss the future of the Premier of Western Australia. The transport minister said in July this year that there was no reason to change from the Premier “right at this point”. The Treasurer of Western Australia, when discussing the internal turmoil inside the government, said —

“It could be numerous things but it isn’t coming from the backbench.”

The clear implication of that statement is that it is coming from the frontbench. There is this internal disputation between the Treasurer and the transport minister of this government. It is divided; it is dysfunctional; it is chaotic—that is the government of Western Australia. If any greater evidence was ever needed, it has come today, when the transport minister of Western Australia admitted publicly that he has been trying to get a meeting with the Premier of Western Australia for weeks and that he cannot get one. This is the transport minister, who is responsible for billions of dollars of government projects, and the Premier refuses to meet him. How can government function in Western Australia when it is so divided, so dysfunctional and so chaotic that the Premier of Western Australia will not meet with his transport minister, who is responsible for billions of dollars of government contracts? This is an unprecedented level of chaos and, I suspect, dislike between the Premier and his ministers. How is that playing out? Across Western Australia, the community and the business community are sick and tired of the management of this state by this government. We hear it everywhere and see evidence of it everywhere, but is there any greater evidence than the figures that came out last week that showed that the unemployment rate in Western Australia is now higher than the unemployment rate in Tasmania? The Premier was offering himself up to go and run Tasmania a few years ago. These days they would not give him a permit to enter! Western Australia has 6.3 per cent unemployment; Tasmania has 6.2 per cent. That translates to 90 300 unemployed Western Australians. People across the community and in the business community are saying that there is no coherent economic narrative or plan by the Liberal–National government. There is no plan by the Liberal–National government to deal with the unemployment crisis confronting our state. Only Labor has a plan for jobs.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members! Members for North West Central and Cockburn—there is a whole lot of you now—I do not want to hear from you again. I want to hear the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr M. McGOWAN: The Liberal–National government does not have a narrative, a plan or a way of dealing with the economic crisis confronting Western Australia, which is manifested by an unemployment rate higher than that in Tasmania. Only Labor has a plan for jobs. The government is not capable of producing one because its cabinet is divided and dysfunctional and its members are at war with one another.

Mr V.A. Catania interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for North West Central, I have been very lenient with you. I call you to order for the first time.

Mr M. McGOWAN: A shocking situation confronts the people of this state. Let us then go to the debt and deficit situation confronting our state. As we have said, when the government arrived in office, the state’s debt was \$3.6 billion. By 2019–20, it will be \$40.2 billion—more than a thousand per cent increase in debt under the auspices of this government. It is now above \$30 billion on its watch. We have a deficit of \$3.9 billion—higher than the totality of the debt accumulated in the 108 years in the lead-up to the formation of this government. This government has created a catastrophic situation in Western Australia. Recently, we have seen some evidence that the public out there is working out that the situation that now confronts our state is the fault of this government. Then it comes to the magic solution that was proposed—the privatisation solution. The National Party will not support the sale of Fremantle port, so that will not happen, and it appears that the Premier does not support the sale of Western Power. The government is divided and dysfunctional, and any solutions it comes up with are shot down internally before they even start.

Mr V.A. Catania interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for North West Central! Leader of the Opposition, carry on.

Mr M. McGOWAN: This is the situation that the state now finds itself in. We have a government with no plan, no cohesion and no leadership. We have a Premier without the courage to deal with the internal issues that have confronted him, and we saw that in his attitude towards the National Party. We have a Premier who has not shown the courage to deal with the disputation within his cabinet, and we will see whether he has the courage over the course of the next day. We have a Premier who clearly does not want to be here, but he does not have faith in any of his potential Liberal Party successors.

Mr A. Krsticevic interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Carine, I call you to order.

Mr M. McGOWAN: He does not have faith in any of his potential Liberal Party successors, so he is hanging on by his fingertips until after the next election.

Mrs L.M. Harvey interjected.

The SPEAKER: Deputy Premier!

Mr M. McGOWAN: Even then, the Premier's plan is this: wreck the finances, create the worst unemployment on record, and then, after the next election, retire, leaving the mess for whoever is there to pick it up. That is the Liberal Party's plan for Western Australia, and the public of Western Australia has worked it out and it has worked the government out. That is the mess it has left this state in. It is just writ large—I repeat—by the hatred, the lack of capacity to work together, the undermining and the different policy positions publicly expressed by members of cabinet. The Premier allows it all to happen on a daily basis because he will not rein in cabinet ministers. He will not say, "This is the plan" or "This is the process." He will not even meet with cabinet ministers. It is dysfunctional; it is hopeless. It cannot be allowed to continue, because the people of the state of Western Australia are the ones who are suffering as a consequence of this failure—this inability of the cabinet of Western Australia to even work together.

MR J.H.D. DAY (Kalamunda — Leader of the House) [11.06 am]: There is no way that we support this motion. It is pretty rich coming from the —

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. Member for Bassendean!

Mr J.H.D. DAY: It is pretty cowardly coming from the opposition on a day that the Premier is not here because he is in the Pilbara fulfilling his duties as Premier of the state—the Pilbara is an important part of the state where an enormous amount has happened since this government came into office in September 2008.

Mr P.B. Watson interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Albany, you were very indignant when I did not call the member for North West Central. I am giving you a chance. Stop shouting out.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: It is pretty rich coming from the opposition and from the Labor Party, given the record that they had when they were in government, with one minister after another being brought before the Corruption and Crime Commission, and the chaos and the dishonesty —

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Thank you; wall of noise. Member for Cockburn!

Dr A.D. Buti interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Armadale, I call you to order for the first time.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: — and the control that certain individuals had over the Labor government when Labor was in office before. Remember Brian Burke ringing up and speaking to ministers. He would say, "Jump" and they would say, "How high?"

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mr J.H.D. DAY: That is the path the Labor Party is going down again—the very cosy deals.

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for West Swan, I call you to order for the first time.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: Very cosy deals existed between the Labor Party and certain business interests back in the late 1980s and the early 1990s, and reflected again when Labor was in government again, particularly from 2005 through to 2008.

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for West Swan.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: We are seeing the union control and domination of the Labor Party and the Labor government coming through again and the —

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mr J.H.D. DAY: — union movement, the backroom operators and the union heavies.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Girrawheen, I call you to order for the first time. Member for Armadale, I call you to order for the second time. Member for Warnbro, you were also very indignant when I was not calling the member for North West Central, so now you have just had a chance as well.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: The union heavies and their puppets in the Labor Party are salivating at the prospect of a union-controlled Labor government getting back into office and not acting in the interests of workers or the wider community but doing very cosy deals with certain business operators around town, just the way it did before. That is the only way the modern Labor Party knows how to operate. Labor is very keen to receive donations from certain interests. It is very keen to put the public interest aside and do preferential deals to its own advantage.

Several members interjected.

Point of Order

Ms M.M. QUIRK: The Leader of the House is reflecting on the reputation of us all. Unless he can name specifics, I suspect he should shut up.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Have you finished your point of order?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Yes.

Debate Resumed

Mr J.H.D. DAY: I know a few people around town are not happy that because of the circumstances brought about through no fault of this government we had to find a means to raise additional revenue two years ago. We needed to increase land tax. No-one likes increasing taxes, but given the government's very narrow tax base, we have had little alternative.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Mandurah, please. I call you to order for the first time. The Leader of the Opposition was heard in relative silence, so let us have a bit of leeway both ways.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: In the context that we have had a record low share of the national goods and services tax collection and a substantial decrease in revenue as a result of decreased royalty income, we have had no alternative but to seek ways to find revenue so that we can pay our nurses, teachers, police, doctors, child protection workers, prison officers and so on at the high level that they deserve and have become used to in recent years. That is the reason for the state's financial pressure at the moment. It is not because of what is being spent on capital works projects; it is a question of not having the revenue that we need to pay expenses—primarily, the salaries of public servants.

I would like to know the Labor Party's plan and how it believes it will address this issue. It is running around promising everything to everyone, but as we get closer to the election, a few questions will need to be asked of, and answered by, the Labor Party about its plan, rather than its members just holding up glossy booklets and so on. The Labor Party is very good at making announcements and putting up signs, but it is not very good at delivering projects. Since this government has been in office and under the leadership of Premier Colin Barnett, the member for Cottesloe, we have seen a determination to get the state moving to complete projects that in some cases have been talked about for decades or, in the case of the Perth City Link project, a century. The Labor Party announced it and had glossy brochures and so on, but it never did it. I remember the Labor Party talking about proposed hospital projects; it put up signs, but it never did them. These projects have been completed. There is a \$7 billion rebuild of the public hospital system and a substantial expansion of the public transport system, which is happening, including the Forrestfield–Airport rail link. These projects had been talked about for years and under the direction and leadership of the member for Cottesloe, they are being completed. If people do not like that sort of record and the transformation of the city and regional centres in Western Australia, they need to front up and say so.

The record of this government is strong and proud. We are focused on providing good government to the state and we will continue to do so.

MR R.F. JOHNSON (Hillarys) [11.14 am]: In prefacing my remarks, I say that it is essential that every member in this house has the right to speak on any motion or any debate on behalf of the residents whom they represent. Despite the Leader of the House trying to gag me —

Several members interjected.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: He was not going to accept the amendment until he got wiser counsel from people around him who said, "No, you better let him speak." I am appreciative to those people who gave the Leader of the House that advice.

If we do not learn from history, we are bound to repeat it. This government is bringing up stuff from 30 years ago. WA Inc was a disgraceful time. I am the first to admit that. Over the last few years we have been heading towards another WA Inc. If anybody cannot sleep at night, I suggest they look up *Hansard* and look at the speeches I have made—my responses to budget speeches and Addresses-in-Reply—and they will see what I have predicted for the last four years.

Several members interjected.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Mr Speaker, please protect me from those hooligans over there.

The SPEAKER: Please sit down, member for Hillarys. I hear a lot of noise. I am battling to hear the member for Hillarys. I do not want the wall of noise.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Some of them cannot handle —

Mr S.K. L'Estrange interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Churchlands, I call you to order for the first time.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I will simply not succumb to bullying, I assure members. If members get bored and cannot sleep, read the speeches I have made. For the last four years, I have predicted—three years ago, two years ago and now—exactly where we would be and the financial crisis that faces us. We are now borrowing money to pay wages. That was happening many years ago. What a disgraceful situation for this government to be in. The Premier has been spending money like a drunken sailor.

Mr P.T. Miles interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Wanneroo, I call you to order for the first time.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I have predicted for the last four years—every single year—what the state debt would be; we are now nudging \$40 billion.

Dr K.D. Hames interjected.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Why don't you be quiet, you nasty little person who double dips into the public purse!

The SPEAKER: Let us keep it through the Chair.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Let me predict this: as there are no plans to cut expenditure, even if we sell assets, the state debt within the next three years will be \$50 billion. Members should wait and see. I have been right so far. I was right about losing the AAA credit rating. I was right about the level of debt nudging \$40 billion. I was right about the tens of thousands of people who have lost their jobs. I was right about all those things and the budget deficit that we now face.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: The Premier was right to sack you.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Look, do not try to be relevant, minister. You are not relevant. You have got no real support. You can laugh and smile and it will not get you anywhere. You might get away with it with some suckers, but you will not get away with it with people who have brains.

At the end of the day —

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: That is enough! Member for Dawesville, that is enough. I call you to order for the first time.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Some members are asking how I would address the debt. What would I do? I have already addressed that. I certainly would not be putting a \$5 tax on our major mining corporations. That would see even more tens of thousands of jobs lost. Why would we tax business? Conservative governments never tax business up to the hilt such as this government is trying to do now. The Liberal Party does not want to do it, but the National Party wants to do it or at least the Leader of the National Party wants to do it. I do not think every member of the National Party wants to do it. They will nod their heads and show unity—God bless you; good luck to you. You are getting it in your party; you do not get it in that party. At the end of the day, if the government starts taxing business —

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Warnbro and Minister for Regional Development, this is not your debate. Let us hear from the member for Hillarys.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

If the National Party starts taxing the hell out of businesses, it will see tens of thousands of jobs go out the window. This state cannot afford that. We have record unemployment in this state—I think it is the highest rate in the last 30 years. The government has to take responsibility for that. If the government wants to sell assets,

good—sell assets. However, it should not sell strategic or income-bearing assets. Sell the stadium! If that is such a wonderful asset, sell the stadium! The government will not find a buyer for it—not in a million years—because it will be a loss-making, subsidised liability for this state for decades to come. For decades to come it will have to be subsidised by whichever government is in power after next March.

I have also put forward the suggestion that if the government wants to save money, it should abolish royalties for regions. This government is spending \$1 billion a year on a thought bubble—a policy. It was a great idea from the National Party. It got it elected and gave it the balance of power in 2008. I have always said it was a great policy for the National Party to get elected—absolutely. However, it is a cost that we cannot afford. We cannot afford \$1 billion. It is discriminatory. It discriminates against metropolitan —

Ms M.J. Davies interjected.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Please do not interject. I get five minutes; that is all, and I have two minutes left.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Thank you! The question is that the motion be agreed to. The Treasurer.

DR M.D. NAHAN (Riverton — Treasurer) [11.20 am]: Mr Speaker —

An opposition member interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I am not going to take political advice from this person, who parachutes into a seat from Cottesloe or wherever he lives.

I thank members opposite for bringing up this motion. I think they have forgotten why they lost the 2008 election.

Ms L. Mettam: They did nothing!

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Exactly. The former Labor government was awash with money. It had the largest windfall revenue in the state's history. Transfer fees went up from \$500 million a year when the Labor government first came in and peaked at \$2.5 billion. Payroll tax was growing at 12 to 15 per cent a year. The government was awash with money. However, what did it do with it?

Government members: Nothing!

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The Labor government was going to do something, but it did not. It did a few things—this is important. It built Perth Arena, at three times the initial cost. It put some money aside for Fiona Stanley Hospital, at four times the cost. It built the Mandurah railway, at twice the cost.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Mandurah, I was hoping you would stop, but you will not. I call you to order for the second time.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: At the 2008 election, the Labor government belatedly said, “We have to do something; let's promise some more”, and it promised “Dubai on the Swan”—Elizabeth Quay, in other words. It also promised a stadium, Fiona Stanley Hospital, and a new Perth Museum. The theme was “Carps the Builder”.

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: And “Spaghetti-net”!

Dr M.D. NAHAN: No. That was second one. It also proposed a massive \$11 billion increase in debt. We cannot build those things without borrowing.

Mr P. Papalia interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Warnbro!

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The reason we came from nowhere and won the 2008 election is because we committed to build the infrastructure that is needed in the state.

Government members: Hear, hear!

Dr M.D. NAHAN: That is what we did. We did not build “Dubai on the Swan” in our first term. We did not build the stadium in our first term. We built Fiona Stanley hospital, on budget and on time. We are building the new Museum. We are building the infrastructure of this state. As the Treasurer responsible for the debt associated with that, I am not backing off from that. These people opposite would have liked us not to do that, because that would have meant that we lost the subsequent election. But we did not do that. We did what was needed and what the people of this state wanted, and we won that election. We won the 2013 election with the largest margin ever.

Several members interjected.

Withdrawal of Remark

The SPEAKER: Member for Willagee! Member for Armadale! I want you to withdraw that. You said, “You lied.”

Mr P.C. TINLEY: Mr Speaker, I said they are Liberal lies. I was referring to the Liberal Party, not individuals.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. I will improve my hearing, then, member for Willagee. Be careful what you say, member for Armadale.

Debate Resumed

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Within a few months of coming to government, in our first term, we had the GFC. We managed the state through that. We had a whole range of issues. We had Labor’s proposal for a mining tax. That would have gutted the state’s revenue. We stopped that. We got on and built the infrastructure that this state needs and that we are all enjoying.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Fremantle! Member for Warnbro!

Dr M.D. NAHAN: After the 2013 election, we came in with another wave of capital build. The Labor Party came in with Metronet—“Spaghetti-net”. That was the largest additional capital spend ever promoted by an opposition, with no real offsets. Good God! If the opposition had won that election, the state’s books would have been much worse. The opposition is trying to pretend that is not the case. Since the election, we have been hit with the largest withdrawal —

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for West Swan, there is plenty of time left. Listen to what the Treasurer has to say, and you can respond.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: We have continued the capital spend, creating over 90 000 jobs. We have been criticised every inch of the way by people opposite. We have to interpret that as meaning that members opposite would not do it. They do want those jobs. They want no new schools and no new roads—nothing. Members opposite have to be accountable for what they say. Importantly, over the last three years, we have done the greatest degree of reform to expenditure in this state’s history. Expenditure growth was 2.4 per cent last year, and going lower. Members opposite have resisted every one of our reforms, which have reduced expenditure by \$25 billion. Every member opposite has stood in this place and complained and whinged and whined and said they would not do it—supporting their union mates. They have resisted every reform that we have put forward. The wannabe Treasurer, the member for Victoria Park, was asked how he was going to address the future, and he said, “I’m going to restrain growth.” However, he has resisted along the way every initiative that we have done. What are members opposite going to do? What they will do, if we read their little red book, is open the books and expenditure to the people who put them here—the union movement.

Mr J.R. Quigley interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Butler!

Dr M.D. NAHAN: We have undertaken the greatest reforms to the public sector in this state’s history. Members opposite will wind them back.

MS M.J. DAVIES (Central Wheatbelt — Minister for Water) [11.27 am]: Mr Speaker —

Mr R.F. Johnson interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Hillarys!

Ms M.J. DAVIES: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Mr R.F. Johnson interjected

The SPEAKER: Member for Hillarys, I have been pretty lenient with you. I call you to order for the first time.

Ms M.J. DAVIES: What an absolutely ridiculous motion! The opposition has the gall to suggest that we have a collapsed cabinet and that we have not done anything for the last eight years. What a ridiculous motion! The opposition is grasping at straws.

Mr M. McGowan interjected.

The SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, I call you to order for the first time. I cannot hear a word that the minister is saying. Let us get this thing moving.

Ms M.J. DAVIES: This state government —

Ms M.M. Quirk interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Girrawheen, I call you to order for the second time.

Ms M.J. DAVIES: This state government has shepherded this state through the biggest mining boom we have seen in the history of Western Australia.

Mr D.J. Kelly interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Bassendean!

Ms M.J. DAVIES: We have seen 500 000 people move to this state. That has required new housing, new water services, new transport, new health systems, new teachers and new schools. We do all this in an environment —

Mr P. Papalia interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Warnbro, I call you to order for the first time.

Ms M.J. DAVIES: We do all this in an environment —

Mr D.J. Kelly interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Bassendean, I call you to order for the first time. We are starting to bog badly.

Ms M.J. DAVIES: We do all this in an environment in which we have a diminishing GST return. We have managed to pay and retain staff in an environment in which they were competing against an extraordinary movement in the mining sector. We have managed to do this in this environment. We have delivered significant outcomes for this state. I know where the revenue streams from members opposite will come from if they see themselves on this side. It will be goodbye royalties for regions.

Let me talk about the things that we have managed to do in alliance. Despite some of the differences that we have, we have managed to rebuild regional Western Australia and this state. We have seen the biggest upgrades to our health system in the history of regional Western Australia. We have seen new hospitals, doctors and nurses. We have support services such as the Royal Flying Doctor Service and aged-care services. We have invested in our schools and mobile phone towers. This state government has managed to do this. We have also managed to bring the entire state into the twenty-first century. We can look at the changes that we have seen in the Perth metropolitan areas. We have our differences. It is an alliance. The National Party reserves its right to have a policy position that at times differs from that of our partners in government. It makes government more robust. We are prepared to debate it. We will put those policies on the table. We have done that. We have seen that in public in the last two to three weeks. We are talking about a policy that we will continue to prosecute. We are entitled to continue to prosecute that. If members look at what we have done over the last eight years, they will see that when we have had differences in the past, we have managed to deliver outstanding outcomes for the people of Western Australia. We will stand very proudly on that record going to the next election. This is not a dysfunctional government. A dysfunctional government does not deliver the things that this state government has done in the last eight years. The Nationals do not resile from having a proposal to debate in public at the next election.

Mr D.J. Kelly interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Bassendean!

Ms M.J. DAVIES: That is part of the alliance agreement that we absolutely understand. Members opposite do not understand it. We do not need to explain it to them. The punters out there absolutely understand what this state government has done.

We do not support this motion. We will stand very proud on the policy that we have been talking about. We absolutely reject what the member for Hillarys has been saying about taxes. It is not a tax; it is a fair charge. We are not talking about mums and dads and small businesses having to foot the bill for a flawed GST system. Those mining companies can afford to pay their fair share. That is exactly what we are talking about and we will prosecute that argument to the next election.

MR B.S. WYATT (Victoria Park) [11.32 am]: I look forward to hearing from the Deputy Premier. The last time I heard from her, she was comparing gross assets with net debt. I look forward to hearing from her —

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: The wall of noise. Member for North West Central, member for Wanneroo, I am not going to warn you again. I do not want to hear from you.

Mr B.S. WYATT: I enjoyed the speech of the Deputy Leader of the National Party. “Nothing wrong with us”, she said, with the eyes of the Minister for Regional Development boring into her back. Every single time the issues around the dysfunctional cabinet processes are raised, they say, “Oh, there’s nothing wrong. It’s all okay. We’re allowed to have our disagreements.” It goes all the way up to the loss of the AAA credit rating and all the way up to the \$4 billion operating deficit. The man who spent a lifetime critiquing that now says it is all okay.

Ms M.J. Davies interjected.

The SPEAKER: Minister, I call you for the first time.

Mr B.S. WYATT: Our revenue is not coming from a job-destroying policy of imposing a mining tax at the bottom of the cycle. What economic geniuses they are. What will the National Party do? It will hit the mining sector at the bottom of the cycle with a huge tax to destroy jobs. “That’s our plan”, says the National Party. The mob sitting in cabinet with the National Party says, “Oh, this is all okay because we can manage the balance sheet because we have two separate cabinets and it’s not madness.” That seems to be the response that they have got.

Let us reflect on the Minister for Transport’s public transport plan. It lasted about half an hour before the Minister for Transport, looking for the votes, said, “Well, we might actually do a station here or a station there.” Then the Treasurer, still smarting from the Violet Grove disagreement—we all remember that, Treasurer—said, “It may not be there; it may be somewhere else.” Then my friend the Leader of the House got up to try to do the Colin Barnett critique of “who is captured by business the most?” I am a bit uncertain whether I am captured by business or the unions at the end of that, but we will work that through, will we not, John? I know we will get there.

I find it interesting that we get this from the government that from the very start contracted itself out to the business sector. Nowhere was that more apparent than last year when it said, “Do you know what, 500 Club; come on into the Premier’s office. Come on into the cabinet room and have your drinks. Come on in. You’re more than welcome to have your Christmas drinks up here because—let’s face the fact—you own a share of it.” That is what happened. We all remember that. I remember the government’s good friend Gerry Hanssen. I will remind members of Gerry Hanssen. Let me quote Mr Hanssen from 2012. Remember the leaders forum and a lazy \$25 000 for access? This is what Gerry Hanssen said it is all about —

“To influence the politicians, the best way is for key CEOs to sit down in front of them and read the riot act to them,” ...

Mr Hanssen said anyone who joined believing it was about lobbying would be “greatly mistaken” but agreed that policy could be shaped by the forum.

“It’s really to teach ministers how to conduct their affairs,” ...

The government that contracted itself out to the private sector years ago is now stunned that the private sector wants to knock off the leader. Are they surprised, because the private sector has a huge shareholding? Now the Minister for Transport seems to be conducting a hostile takeover of the Liberal Party party room. Mr Nalder is unable to compete. We have Mike Nahan, the deputy leader and Joe Francis all trying to bustle in the post-Barnett world. Who is going to get the numbers? Dean clearly cannot get them so he has gone to the National Party of all people! Honestly! If he brings these clowns in, he is in strife. He went to the National Party, saying, “Brendon Grylls will deliver it to me. He’ll get me there.” He was still uncertain, so he got a poll done. That is unbelievable. We all look at polls. We all know that. They come and they go but very rarely do we see a hostile takeover of the leadership of the Liberal Party by a particular minister supported by the private sector to which the government ceded control years ago. He comes in here with some WA Inc argument, saying, “We’re not subject to that, not like the Labor Party—owned by business, owned by the unions.” I do not know who owns us, John; I really do not. I am confused. The reality is, John, that at some point control will have to be taken. The Treasurer walked away from a lifetime of strong advocacy around tight spending commitments, the evils of an operating deficit and the evils of debt. We have a Treasurer who abandoned everything he once stood for and is now willing to spend whatever it takes to increase his own position.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Treasurer and member for Girrawheen, just relax. I appreciate your bonhomie, member for Victoria Park, calling the member for Kalamunda by his name, John, but I direct you to refer to him by his electorate.

Mr B.S. WYATT: I apologise, member for Kalamunda; I did not mean to disrespect you in any way by calling you by your first name.

I want to conclude with a couple of points. The Minister for Regional Development is a man whom I like. I think he was very accurate when he said, “The Premier is captured by big interests like Chevron.” That is what the Minister for Regional Development said when he was the Leader of the National Party. I remember that one of the very first acts the Treasurer did when he came into cabinet was run off and sign a public sector guarantee for private sector debt for Muja. We all remember that. I do not want to see any of the mob opposite coming in here saying, “We’re not captured by the private sector.” The private sector has owned them for four years.” Even its own mob in government knows that. Now they come in here and say, “We don’t need a plan because we’ve got the National Party out there selling one plan. We’ll just let them do it and pretend that all our commitments are going to be fully funded and fully costed.” The reality is, Treasurer, that the government has not had a coherent cabinet for years. Government members seem to think it is a joke and it is a credible way to run government. That is why the government lost the AAA credit rating. That is why the Treasurer is the seventh incarnation in that role. That is why spending is out of control. That is why the government is presiding over the biggest operating deficit in the history of Western Australia. That is why net debt is heading to \$40 billion. I want to hear the would-be Premier explain to me why it is okay to compare gross assets with net debt. Up you get!

The SPEAKER: Treasurer, you never stopped talking during that interlude. I call you to order for the first time.

Point of Order

Mr J.M. FRANCIS: Only my mother gets to call me Joey.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Butler, I call you to order for the first time.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: I am on my feet. If somebody wants to have a rest, carry on.

Ms M.M. Quirk interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Girrawheen, I call you to order for the third time. Minister for Emergency Services, I gave you the call if you want to speak.

Mr J.M. FRANCIS: My point is that I think it is about time the opposition woke up and stopped calling members of this place by their first name. As I said, only my mum gets to call me by my first name.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: I gave you the call. That is your contribution. That is a point of order and that is finished now.

Debate Resumed

The SPEAKER: The question is that the motion be agreed to.

MRS L.M. HARVEY (Scarborough — Deputy Premier) [11.41 am]: This is typical of an opportunistic bunch of cowards who cannot even get up and make their case. Naturally, we are going to oppose this ridiculous interruption to the parliamentary process. What has happened here? We read in the Loan Bill, which everyone will get to debate the next time Parliaments sits. What did we interrupt for this motion? We interrupted the debate on legislation that will shut down the opportunity for drug traffickers to peddle methamphetamine across the state. That is what members opposite did so that they could make a cheap political point, which they failed to prosecute.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Mandurah, I call you for the third time; member for Swan Hills, I think it is the first time; and member for Cockburn, for the first time.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Let us look at what we have achieved as an apparently dysfunctional government, according to these people. This is a government led by a Premier who refused to give up on the projects which the community of Western Australia had been led to believe would be delivered and about which expectations had been raised of the delivery of. The Premier has delivered them. The stadium is coming out of the ground. We have rebuilt Perth city, with Elizabeth Quay, the Northbridge Link and the Perth underground bus station. We have the train going to Butler. We have extended Mitchell Freeway to Hester Avenue. We are building Roe 8 and the Forrestfield–Airport Link. We have rebuilt schools.

Mr J.R. Quigley interjected.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Butler. I call you to order for the second time.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: We have borrowed money to cope with unprecedented population growth in this state—growth that has been borne out of the economic management of this government ensuring that our businesses and industries can grow. People migrated here because they could get employment and they could see a future in Western Australia. We have grown our asset base by 55 per cent, or \$70 billion. It now sits at \$190 billion. We have rebuilt the education system and the health system. We have done that for those 450 000 people who say that Western Australia is the best place to live. This Liberal–National partnership has delivered the quality of life that people in Australia envy. That is what we have done. That is why we have borrowed money. In a couple of years when our GST fortunes reverse, there will not be a deficit. Why will our GST fortunes return? It will be because the Premier, Colin Barnett, has fought for a fair share of GST for this state.

Mr P.B. Watson interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Albany!

Ms M.M. Quirk interjected.

The SPEAKER: That was equally matched, so we will not talk about it.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The Premier has fought for eight years to get a fair deal for Western Australians from the GST and now the Prime Minister is saying, “I’m going to deliver that.” That is Colin Barnett’s achievement. Burswood stadium is Colin Barnett’s achievement, as are the Perth Children’s Hospital, Fiona Stanley Hospital, Roe 8 and the Forrestfield–Airport Link. We have also delivered an 84 per cent increase in funding to mental health services in this state. We have delivered a 117 per cent increase in disability services funding to those

families in need looking after family members with disabilities in this state. That is what we have delivered and we are proud of it. We said that we would deliver 20 000 affordable homes by 2020. We did that by 2015, so we lifted the target.

Mr P.B. Watson interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Albany, I call you to order for, I think, the first time.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: We are now going to deliver 30 000 affordable homes by 2020, and we can do that because the Premier drives it and our ministers deliver it. We are proud of our record. We are proud of the fact that by the middle of 2017, we will have an additional 1 050 police and police auxiliary officers on the front line looking after the community of Western Australia and preserving community safety.

Every single individual on this side of the house knows that we have a cohesive government. We have ministers who get things done and we have a Premier with the drive and energy to keep pushing for improvements in Western Australia. Our partners, the National Party, stood by our side through minority government for those first four years. We have delivered significant reform. Our work is not done. In March 2017, the community will have a choice to recognise our work and our achievements or take a risk with the union puppeteers. The choice is clear.

MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan) [11.47 am]: I am glad the Liberal and National Parties are congratulating themselves on their performance, because I can tell them that the community is not congratulating them. This motion is about an economic and financial plan for the state, but we got a list of dot points —

Mr F.A. Alban interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Swan Hills, you are becoming tiresome now. I call you to order for the second time.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We got a dot point list written by the government media office and texted to the Deputy Premier before she got to her feet. That is all we got—a dot point list. Where is the economic and financial plan? You guys are a rabble.

Mr V.A. Catania interjected.

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

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The Deputy Leader of the National Party is proud of the new mining tax that a cabinet colleague yesterday said would kill jobs in the state. They are in the same cabinet room and they have no coherent plan. They have led the state to the worst finances in the state's history.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Deputy Premier!

Mrs L.M. Harvey: It wasn't me.

The SPEAKER: Who was shouting out?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes, she did.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Belmont, you are in the wrong seat.

A government member interjected.

The SPEAKER: I do not want to hear from anyone.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The government has led the state to the worst debt and the worst deficit in the state's history. It has no plan for jobs. Let us look at the main contenders. When asked about the 25 per cent unemployment in Mirrabooka–Balg, the Minister for Training and Workforce Development showed that she does not care. She does not even know the figures. She is using her role in government to get soft media opportunities such as meeting with unsuspecting poor little apprentices around the state.

Mrs L.M. Harvey interjected.

The SPEAKER: This time I have got you, Deputy Premier! I call you to order for the first time.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The Minister for Transport uses his transport plan not as a fully funded, fully costed coherent plan for the state but to buy favours in the leadership contest. That is what it is about—trying to buy the votes of the member for Morley and the member for Perth. That is what it is all about.

Mr S.K. L'Estrange interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Churchlands!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Then we have the Minister for Corrective Services.

Ms E. Evangel interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Perth, I call you to order for the first time. We have two minutes left.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The Minister for Corrective Services, who is purer than snow out there, takes directions from members of the business community on a weekly basis. Let us face it: the Treasurer is selling out all members opposite to fund his Roe 8. He does not care if he cannot fund projects in their electorates because it is all about him.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Treasurer, I call you to order for the second time and member for Churchlands for, I think, the second time.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The Treasurer will sell out all members opposite because he cares only about his own seat. That is what happens in their cabinet. There is a complete breakdown of cabinet.

Mr J. Norberger interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Joondalup, I call you to order for the first time.

Mr D.J. Kelly interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Bassendean, for the second time!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: There is a complete breakdown. The Minister for Transport has been buying votes with his transport plan and the Treasurer does not care about his colleagues; he cares only about his own seat. He will junk the state's finances and jeopardise the funding of any other project to get his project up. That is all he has ever cared about. The Minister for Health is handing out \$500 000 a month for an empty car park that taxpayers bought. Talk about relationships with business!

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for North West Central!

Mr J.H.D. Day interjected.

The SPEAKER: Leader of the House, I call you to order for the first time.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Members opposite have handed millions of dollars of taxpayers' money to companies for empty stadiums, empty hospitals and empty car parks. They should not lecture us about relationships with business. You guys have given millions of dollars to business. This is a dysfunctional, chaotic government that does not deserve to be here.

Mr P.T. Miles interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Wanneroo, I call you to order for the second time.

Division

Question put and a division taken with the following result —

Ayes (18)

Ms L.L. Baker
Mr R.H. Cook
Ms J.M. Freeman
Mr R.F. Johnson
Mr W.J. Johnston

Mr D.J. Kelly
Mr F.M. Logan
Mr M. McGowan
Ms S.F. McGurk
Mr M.P. Murray

Mr P. Papalia
Ms M.M. Quirk
Mrs M.H. Roberts
Ms R. Saffioti
Mr P.C. Tinley

Mr P.B. Watson
Mr B.S. Wyatt
Mr D.A. Templeman (*Teller*)

Noes (30)

Mr F.A. Alban
Mr I.C. Blayney
Mr I.M. Britza
Mr G.M. Castrilli
Mr V.A. Catania
Mr M.J. Cowper
Ms M.J. Davies
Mr J.H.D. Day

Ms E. Evangel
Mr J.M. Francis
Mrs G.J. Godfrey
Dr K.D. Hames
Mrs L.M. Harvey
Mr C.D. Hatton
Mr A.P. Jacob
Mr S.K. L'Estrange

Mr W.R. Marmion
Mr J.E. McGrath
Ms L. Mettam
Mr P.T. Miles
Ms A.R. Mitchell
Mr N.W. Morton
Dr M.D. Nahan
Mr D.C. Nalder

Mr J. Norberger
Mr D.T. Redman
Mr A.J. Simpson
Mr M.H. Taylor
Mr T.K. Waldron
Mr A. Krsticevic (*Teller*)

Pairs

Dr A.D. Buti
Ms J. Farrer
Mr J.R. Quigley
Mr C.J. Tallentire

Ms W.M. Duncan
Mr C.J. Barnett
Dr G.G. Jacobs
Mr P. Abetz

Question thus negated.

MISUSE OF DRUGS AMENDMENT (SEARCH POWERS) BILL 2016*Second Reading*

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

MR P.C. TINLEY (Willagee) [11.57 am]: I rise to make a contribution to the Misuse of Drugs Amendment (Search Powers) Bill 2016. In doing so, I should inform the house that I am not the lead speaker on this bill.

I want to contribute, not necessarily on the detail related to the actual amendment of search powers, although I will comment in due course on a couple of issues about that. I want to start with the broad sweeping issues. Nothing highlights the problem of drugs more than the minister's second reading speech in which she outlines some pretty difficult numbers for this community to understand or take in. The numbers themselves bear repeating now in my contribution. She said —

The amount of methylamphetamine seized in Western Australia is increasing significantly, year by year. In the 2013–14 financial year, 122.7 kilograms of methylamphetamine was seized. In the 2014–15 financial year, this increased to 276.2 kilograms and in the half-year to December 2015, 418 kilograms of methylamphetamine was seized.

Those numbers are a cause for great concern. The location or orientation of the supply chain is more important, though, for the various local members who have a greater than normal representation of clandestine meth labs. According to the minister's own speech, they were misplaced in their thinking. She cited the Australian Federal Police seizures of 193 kilograms of methylamphetamine that were destined for the Western Australian market. The dominant percentage of the total kilograms seized was not domestically produced. According to the Australian Crime Commission, the supply chain for methamphetamine originates from overseas. It is clear why that is the case. As the member for Cannington highlighted in his contribution, when we talk about the value of the trade as being some \$3 billion, that would catch the attention of any organised crime groups that were looking to find new opportunities for their dealings in drugs. In the domestic supply chain, we also tend to look at and focus on bikie gangs as being the cause of any organised production and distribution of this illicit drug and other drugs. However, in fact—although I am sure they are not outside the supply chain of this and other drugs—according to the statistics we have and the research that has been done, they are absolutely immaterial to the avalanche of ice that is hitting our community.

As evidence of the wider Australian meth market, I refer to the “National Drug Strategy Household Survey” from 2013. They are the latest figures I could find; I think there may be a more recent survey, but it does not matter for the purpose of the debate here today. It is instructive. According to the survey, seven per cent of Australians aged 14 years old and above report using methamphetamine or methylamphetamine at least once in their lifetime and 2.1 per cent reported recent use. This remained consistent from the 2010 figures. If we call it one-time use, the trend appears to be unchanged. However, we need to acknowledge what has changed—the type of ice that Australians are using. Crystal methamphetamine, which produces more powerful physical and psychological reactions than the powdered form, is increasing in its prevalence. Numbers of users of the powdered form have decreased from 51 per cent to 29 per cent, while ice use—the crystal component—more than doubled from 22 per cent to 50 per cent. Between 2010 and 2013, there was an increase in powder and a decrease in crystal use because of its potency. Although I cannot quote the figures of subsequent surveys and subsequent research from the ACC, it reliably confirms the trend and a deepening use of ice, as opposed to the powdered form, through into at least 2015.

Findings from the National Drug and Alcohol Research Centre in 2014 support the conclusions that I have outlined. The increased levels of addiction, dependence, potency and potential for ice as the purest form of the drug are also evident. A great proportion—25 per cent—of regular ice users use it at least weekly. This is a much higher rate than the 2.2 per cent of regular powder users. Use is spreading and it is deepening. Increased demand for the higher purity of ice results in Australia's users, in particular, being prepared to pay a premium price for the more potent form of the drug.

I turn to concerns regarding the Australian price per kilo. Unfortunately, we talk about this as though it is a commodity, and I would not ever want to make light of it at all. I do not want to in any way diminish the evil that is resident in this particular drug, ice, over all other drugs—illicit or even prescribed drugs. However, unfortunately, we have come to treat drug enforcement as either a war on the drug or some sort of market that needs market intervention by a government; we keep talking about supply chains—me included—framed markets, and market operators. By our language, we are starting to legitimise the evil that is pervading our community. I understand it because I use the same language. It allows us, in some way, to get our heads around the nature of this on a supply or demand side. The argument for the war on drugs, in particular, keeps mentioning the interruption or disruption of supply or reduction in demand. Often, the remedies that are cited are clunky at best, imprecise, and unsustainable over a long period. The war on drugs in the United States has raged since it was declared by Ronald Reagan in his first presidential term, and it has not changed drug use in the United States one iota. We need to be very cautious when we look for remedies to the supply and demand sides or in framing

this drug market in those simplistic, binary terms. It is a much more complex and socially perverse situation that leaves not many families untouched. I think that each and every member in this chamber would have either a firsthand or, at best, second-hand connection to somebody with a drug problem or who has been touched by a drug problem. For anybody who has children in their teen years or higher, the idea of them coming in contact with drug culture or drugs themselves is very present in the front of their mind every time we talk about parenting and children's social engagements and their circles of friends.

Many parents turn a blind eye and say that their child is a good child and therefore, by extension, they would not get involved in drugs. I can tell members from personal experience that that is just not true. Like I said, many members in this chamber would have had some sort of experience with close family members who have been involved, in some form or another, with illicit drugs. Therein lies the best opportunity for us to understand what remedies would create a better culture—a safer culture—for our kids or people who will graduate into very hard drug users and all the multipliers of antisocial behaviour around petty crime and/or serious crime that eventually evolve. We often talk about gateway drugs and the idea that if a person is a cannabis user, they will graduate to become an ice user; that is just not true. The gateway component is the gateway culture. If people get involved in drugs at any level, they will associate with people who are criminals at some point in the supply chain. That will start to normalise their own behaviour and create the sense of a legitimate course of action that says it is okay—in this normalised environment—to undertake, initially, some sort of petty criminal activity to feed their habit. The ideas of drugs being a gateway are false. The culture creates the gateway and that is what we need to attend to.

We all know from the experience of our constituents or our own personal lives that when we come in contact with people who have had a drug abuse issue in their family, the person with the issue has come from a broad cross-section of the community. There are just as many kids from Scotch College and other private schools in Western Australia participating in illegal drug use as there are in any other school, public or private. It is a common feature among kids. As a parent, I was told by a good friend who is a drug and alcohol counsellor to get over the idea that my child would somehow not be exposed to and tempted by drugs. Not one parenting style, type of behaviour or way to raise a child will in any way inoculate a child from drugs exposure.

When I was growing up it was a case of if—now it is a case of when. When I was a teenager, cannabis was prevalent. There was the odd bit around, but for a suburban boy from the outer suburbs of Fremantle, the best thing I could get was a king brown from the drive-through at the Leopold Hotel, which was a cheap thrill. Indeed, a bottle of Stone's green ginger wine down under the cranes at the wharf with a packet of cigarettes was a big Saturday night. I do not say that to make light of a very serious issue. We as a community have come a long way. Many members of the chamber can associate with that anecdote. Cannabis was about, but it was not pervasive in everybody's network. It has certainly come to the point that because of the way we have brought up our children—I think it is a better world, do not get me wrong—and the advent of social media, they have a circle of friends that is geographically breathtaking. I have four children. My two older boys have gone to New Year's Eve parties in the far northern suburbs with friends they have known for a long time. From their association with those particular friends, they were exposed to a significant number of other people. We have exponentially opened up our children's network of people, which is fantastic on face value; in fact, I would not change that, because it has the potential to make for a better connected community. There have been a number of occasions on which members from this chamber, who I had not met before coming to Parliament, have come to me and said that my son and their son or daughter know each other from some vicarious connection from a long way away. It has happened. The member for Perth is nodding, because one of her children knows one of my children and we did not even know it. It is that wide social network that becomes a rich fertile ground for the introduction and expansion of drugs.

Yes, methamphetamine, or ice, is the very worst drug. There is plenty of evidence that refers to the addictive nature of ice and to the chemical reaction and changes in the brain that occur as a result of using ice over and above any other drug. It is a perverse issue among our children. My sons and I have had very open conversations about experimenting and a range of other things. Parents are mad if they do not do that; if they think they can keep a closed shop on this stuff and parent like we were parented, forget it. If we do not tell them as parents, they will find out a lot faster and a lot harder than anything we ever experienced. Again, I do not speak light of it, but when at any time I have talked to my children in this open way, and other kids in my constituency, no question, issue or subject about this stuff has been off limits.

[Member's time extended.]

Mr P.C. TINLEY: The point I want to make is that a public health campaign in this country that has been running for 40 years has created in the minds of our children the idea that tobacco smoking is the most evil thing that they can do. That is great; it is fantastic. We have used the stick-and-carrot approach with the stick in pricing and advertising legislation and the carrot of a healthier life. We all remember the ads. That campaign has been the single biggest improvement in public health and the best public health campaign in Australia and has been lauded internationally. Is it not interesting that our kids think smoking tobacco is abhorrent, yet they are willing

to put a tablet containing chemicals down their throat at a party and then throw back a Red Bull? It is a really interesting thing, but it is also instructive, because it tells us that when we want to describe the issue of illegal drug use in this community as a supply side–demand side war on drugs, we are wrong. We have tackled other public health issues, such as tobacco, and communicable diseases, such as sexually transmitted diseases and AIDS.

Ms S.F. McGurk interjected.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: Yes, and the seatbelt campaign. There were eight kids in my family and we grew up travelling in a Ford XW up the Kwinana Freeway, which only went from Canning Bridge to the city, and there was not a seatbelt in sight. Anyone who is over 50 would remember that. That is another example that if we want to change a behaviour, there are ways to do it.

The key in this debate is how do we want to approach drugs in our community? Do we see drugs exclusively as a criminal activity or do we see it as a public health problem? If we keep having this simplistic discussion about the stick-only approach—legislation, criminalisation and demonisation followed by normalising and legitimising it through the language that we use about the supply side and demand side, market framing and those sorts of things—we will get nothing but a superficial response until eventually the fad of ice, if we can call it that, fades away. It is almost like an epidemic. It curves up and is very popular. Again, I do not make light of this issue, but I point to the fashion trend that tattoos have become. That trend will come and go. In the nursing homes of the future, there will be some very saggy elbows, cobwebs and hinges on elbows, when the triple chins come in, and I am sure that some people will regret getting those tattoos. But it is a trend—it comes and goes. I am not so sure that that is necessarily a relevant feature of ice per se, but it may well be. We have had a history of these sorts of experimentations becoming fads with an increased use of something followed by a decline. I do not think we should wait for the trend to find out whether ice is a fad. We cannot afford to, because too many young Western Australians are ruining their lives and the lives of those around them as a result of meth.

With the tenor of my contribution, I am not suggesting for a second that the Misuse of Drugs Amendment (Search Powers) Bill 2016 is not part of that. But I make the point that it is a reaction; it is simply a reaction to allow us to continue this war on drugs. I do not have a problem with the bill. There has to be consequences for actions and society is entitled to a safe and secure environment. If this bill allows the community to feel a bit safer and, more importantly, allows law enforcement agencies to better undertake their tasks, I do not have a problem with the bill and I do not have a problem supporting it.

I might want to know more about the operational aspects of it, and maybe we will come to that during the consideration in detail stage. The point I make is that if our only response to illicit drug use in this state is to grab for a legislative remedy, we are mad. If we want to consider this as a public health issue, yes, we would do something such as what is proposed in this bill to amend the act. But we cannot look at it in isolation. One of the responsibilities of the opposition is to ensure that we try as best as possible through the process to identify the unintended consequences or missed opportunities in legislation. That is what we are meant to do. We will come to that when we discuss some of the detail of how this legislation will operate, but the other aspect we need to look at is how this legislation, this adjustment to the laws, attends to the wider issue of policy. What is the government's policy, and by extension the people of Western Australia's endorsed policy, for attending to this scourge in our society? It is a societal problem. What are we doing about it? Within the limits of the minister's portfolio, but certainly not without the limits of her experiences as a mother and a now experienced legislator, it would be good if the minister could at least make reference to the wider role of the government in creating a proper response to this problem through a health campaign.

That statement raises a range of issues that are politically difficult. In the discussion around what we might do more broadly—rather than reactively like with legislation such as this—to assist in the reduction of drug use in our community, we have to start talking about harm reduction and safe places. We have to talk about the consequential mental health issues, family support issues, public housing issues and education issues. When we look at this, we realise that no shortage of consequential consideration needs to be given when we talk about the broader issue of illegal drug use in our community. We need to touch on every part of our community across every demographic and every socioeconomic group, because it pervades all of society, from the multimillion-dollar mansions of the western suburbs and the coastal suburbs right through to the hills and the regional areas. The regional centres themselves at times have been even more fiercely attacked by this drug than areas in the metropolitan have been.

We need to talk about how we can assist those families who are caught up in issues with drug use. A good example is in my community in the state seat of Willagee as I have assisted citizens in the electorate any number of times to deal with a house that has been a clandestine meth lab or part of a drug distribution chain. We know and see how it happens. It takes a lot of work to get the community to participate and support the law enforcement agencies in their intelligence collection. Tolerance is needed to endure what is always too long, as far as the local community is concerned, to take action against a known drug house. Understandably, when we dig into it, we see that the controls and responsibilities of the police service in prosecuting a watertight case

requires that time. I have supported the police by getting neighbours of known drug houses to allow covert cameras to be put into their houses to assist in evidence collection for the purposes of the prosecution. The state has a vertical connection to public housing; it has a direct connection to, and influence over, public housing. People who occupy social housing are quite often the most vulnerable for a range of reasons, not least of which is the intergenerational transfer of dysfunction, poverty and unemployment. Public housing tenants are overexposed to the threats posed by drugs. What do we do? Many times I have received a request for support from the Department of Housing for a drug house where there is significant dysfunction among the tenants in that house. The first thing that we do is give them a strike, then a second strike and a third strike; it is all on a pathway to destruction. They will be evicted from the house, rejected by society and not helped.

What about if when we give the first strike, the Department for Communities takes over the tenancy? What about other agencies having a portfolio approach to managing and assisting the family in that house to overcome the problem? Dare I use the now clichéd term in public housing policy, but we need the joined-up taskforce approach to assist in turning around those most vulnerable people in the community who occupy public housing. The Department for Communities had a very good program for many years, but it has, unfortunately, slashed and cut StrongFamilies. The StrongFamilies program, which has since been renamed, was a multidisciplinary approach to assisting families, first, to function better and, second, to overcome the particular hurdles common to each and every one of them, not least of which is education and employment. We cannot continue to talk about drugs in our community and rely solely on the reactive nature of laws. Let us face it: when a uniform turns up at someone's house or searches their vehicle, as this bill refers to, and the uniform is carrying a gun and a warrant and a reasonable suspicion, it is game over. They are on a very short road to the end because they will simply end up going down a reactive path. It is not a criticism of the police force or any of the other law enforcement agencies involved. They are society's gatekeepers. We need to support them.

MR J.R. QUIGLEY (Butler) [12.27 pm]: I had the opportunity to attend a briefing on this matter and speak with the superintendent from the organised crime squad who came over to brief us on the purpose of this legislation, the Misuse of Drugs Amendment (Search Powers) Bill 2016, and what is driving it. That superintendent runs the various methamphetamine teams to try to suppress the distribution of the drug. In short, the superintendent explained to us how there are several transit routes into the metropolitan area for this drug and that the purpose of the legislation is to try to make it easier to detect the drug in transit, and we unequivocally support that.

But we are in a crisis and the government recognises that. The community recognises that we are in a crisis with this drug. I have known the officer who came to brief us for over 25 years. In my legal practice I was quite close to Superintendent Pryce Scanlan for a number of years and got to know him well and I repose the highest level of trust in him. I had a very frank conversation with him during the briefing.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: He is a very good man.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: Yes. I had a hand in saving his reputation because drug syndicates then levelled all these insidious accusations that we were able to expose for what they were.

Leaving that aside and returning to the subject at hand, as we all know and as Superintendent Scanlan said, this drug is quite unlike any other illicit drug on the market, certainly unlike cannabis, even unlike heroin, in the speed with which it can heavily addict a user. Why is that? I saw a wonderful show on television; it had nothing to do with drugs, it was to do with poker machines. It was called *Ka-Ching! Pokie Nation*, and it dealt with Aristocrat, an Australian company that produces most poker machines. They had done psychological experiments on how to induce dopamine release from the pleasure centre of the brain. Psychologists had worked out that keeping a subject in a state of some mild anxiety and then rewarding them with pleasure on an unexpected basis, keeping them in a state of anxiety with an occasional reward, flooded the brain with dopamine. They designed the wheels of the poker machines so that that effect would be induced; that is, to keep them in a state of anxiety with an occasional reward. These poor people who were feeding these beasts were not trying to win money. Looking at their own life, they knew they were losing a heap of money. Many of them were women, a lot of them men. I am talking about people who gamble at 10 o'clock in the morning. As soon as these isolated people got in front of the machine, scientists could prove there was a dopamine release and the warm pleasure of satisfaction they got, despite the fact that their purse was being drained. It went beyond logic. The other area in which this happens with regularity is with methamphetamine, because methamphetamine immediately releases a flood of pleasure hormone into the brain and it is so terrific that the subject wants go back and do it again. What follows after that, of course, is the downer, because the brain is then screaming for more of it and the only way to satisfy it is to give it more dopamine; give it more methamphetamine.

This was different from heroin, of course. With heroin, they took the opioid and all of their anxieties were calmed, but they went to sleep. After the early rush, they got what we used to call in court "the nods", because people were just nodding off on an opiate. After mass one day at Our Lady of Grace, I saw former Chief Judge of the District Court, Antoinette Kennedy. I asked her, "How are you going, Antoinette? How are the courts?"

She said, “It has all changed since you were in court, John.” I asked her why, and she said, “We now have got amphetamine.” I came into this place in 2001, and as Superintendent Pryce Scanlan says, in the last 10 years this has exploded. She said, “You remember when you used to come to court with all those heroin traffickers—they would be in the dock and we would have a hard time keeping them awake? They would be nodding off and I would be turning to the accused in the dock and asking if he is understanding what I am saying.” Their supporters in the gallery would all be nodding off, too. Bearing in mind she has been retired for five years, she said, “They come in here on amphetamines, frothing at the mouth, with security guards required to keep them calm in the dock and security guards at the back of the court having to keep an eye on all the wound-up supporters.”

It is just a dreadful drug in that regard. But it is because of this huge injection, this huge release of dopamine that these subjects find themselves so attracted to the drug and so quickly addicted. Look at the tragic situation of Phil Walsh, the coach of the Adelaide Crows whose son was addicted to methamphetamine. Phil Walsh apparently did things to try to control his son, who is now standing trial for the murder of his father during a methamphetamine-induced psychosis. I note in the media that the Director of Public Prosecutions in South Australia accepted that at the time of Phillip Walsh’s murder, his son, Cy, was not mentally capable of distinguishing right or wrong because of the methamphetamine he had ingested and they will accept a plea of not guilty on the grounds of mental incapacity.

The devastation this drug is wreaking on our community is huge. It has been coming for a long while—as Superintendent Scanlan said, for over 10 years. The other thing Superintendent Scanlan said is that they are getting fewer clandestine laboratories in Western Australia now. There is a fall-off in the clandestine laboratories. In the paper we used to regularly see that houses had blown up. Mr Acting Speaker (Mr I.M. Britza), you may have noticed over the last couple of years that there are fewer houses with chemicals in them blowing their top, but there is more methamphetamine in the community. Superintendent Scanlan said that because the cost of production in Asia is so cheap, it is much more profitable for the distributors to buy their product from overseas. On page 40 of the Australian Crime Commission’s 2015 report—remember, that is headed by the very able Commissioner Chris Dawson, the former Deputy Commissioner of Police in Western Australia—it states —

This increase in border detections does not appear to have coincided with a decrease in domestic production, as there are still significant precursor chemical and clandestine laboratory detections occurring. For example, 10 people were arrested and 1.9 tonnes of a mixture of vanilla powder and the methylamphetamine precursor pseudoephedrine were seized during an 18-month joint agency investigation that concluded in October 2013.

That is 1.9 tonnes, and the remarkable thing, as the report shows, is that the wholesale price of methamphetamine appeared to drop from about \$310 000 per kilo down to somewhere around \$200 000 a kilo; there had been a 30 per cent reduction in price. What does this tell us? It tells us that despite the enormous efforts at interdiction, which this bill will enhance, the wholesale price of the drug is falling. On television we see Border Protection cracking open some container that has vases in it. They crack open a vase and show us how much methamphetamine each vase contains and we look at the 40-foot container and think, “Wow”. They explain to us that there is half a tonne of methamphetamine in this container alone—and still the price falls. This tells us that there is more and more coming in. It is an economy—a supply and demand economy. With these interdictions, if the price is falling, it means they are only getting a relatively minor amount. If it is not a minor amount, not the bulk of it, there is way more than they are seizing coming through, because the wholesale price is falling. What evidence do we see to corroborate that? More and more people in our community are getting addicted to it. Both of those things evidence the fact that interdiction alone is insufficient. The real economic effort against this drug has all been aimed at interdiction. I do not stand here to advocate a tailing-off of that interdiction. I do not stand here to advocate that we should reduce that effort in any way. When we are dealing with a supply and demand economy worth billions of dollars, which the trade in methamphetamine is, all our effort is going into stemming supply, not reducing demand. We are spending billions on interdiction. The Americans spend even more billions on interdiction; they are trying to stop it coming across the border from Mexico or in submarines and ships up the east coast. That has not reduced the demand for the drug. Having said that, the methamphetamine problem is not the same in the United States as it is here. I have been following this closely on *The New York Times* crime reporting pages. Over there, the biggest demand is for heroin because of the cheap production of heroin in Mexico and it having the poorest border protection. It costs \$5 for a hit of heroin. There appears to be a huge demand for heroin, which we do not have with the advent of methamphetamine. For the first time in history in the United States, the death rate for middle-aged whites aged between 35 and 50 years is climbing. The death rate for black Americans is falling because white middle-class Americans are so far into addictive substances. *The New York Times* reports that the steep rise in middle-class whites dying whilst the black African death rate is falling is attributable to drugs. At a time when medical science is such that we all expect a bit of a longer life to look after illness, the drug overdoses in America are starting to fell a generation of people. It is the first time in America’s history that that has happened.

Returning to our own problem, I only cited the American example as their interdictions also failed to be the sole response, if we like, to illicit drug use. We know that in her current campaign, former Secretary of State Clinton is saying that there will have to be massive reform of the criminal justice system. If someone in America has two or three strikes, they are in for life. We know that their prison system is just groaning. I read a paper—I do not have it with me at the moment—to this chamber before in which the Speaker of the Congress, Paul Ryan, the Republican Speaker and Trump supporter, so not a left-winger, said in March 2016 during this presidential campaign, during the primary season, “I’m now a late convert to the proposition that mass incarceration has to be abandoned. It’s not working. It’s working to get rid of our crime rates. We’re locking up all these drug people for life and there are more of them coming and we can’t sustain it as a society.” Of all the places in the world—actually, I do not know; it could be a dead heat with Florida—they execute more people in the western world in Texas than anywhere, and they are closing prisons. They have closed five big prisons in Texas because they realise that pouring that money into that part of the anti-crime effort is not having the response or the effect on the street that they wanted. They just built another prison. I know that you have been over there, Mr Acting Speaker (Mr I.M. Britza), and you could bear witness to this.

In Western Australia, we are increasing the effort of interdiction by this bill that is now before the chamber. It will allow the Commissioner of Police to declare certain transit routes and conduct searches of vehicles. We support that. It was explained to us by Superintendent Pryce Scanlan. For example, he has had situations in which vehicle trailers have been cut apart, a false floor has been built into them, they are packed with ice or methamphetamine and then carefully welded back together and resprayed so that the average police officer, who made a traffic stop outside of Hedland or wherever and looked at that trailer, would be none the wiser to the fact that he is looking at a trailer smuggling tens of thousands of dollars’ worth of methamphetamine. We support this legislation, at the same time noticing that it is just another method of interdiction.

What other things could happen? On the interdiction side, during the briefing, I asked Superintendent Pryce Scanlan about the bikies. He said that as far as he can tell, the outlaw motorcycle gangs have gone out of methamphetamine production a bit and become the customers of the Chinese because it is easier to buy the drug that is being imported into Australia than to manufacture it here. In his view, the bikies are now very big distributors of methamphetamine. They have moved from the production side of it, which is a bit messy and carries more risk, to wholesale distributors and very big clients of the Chinese. They are not the only clients, however, because there are other criminal gangs.

[Member’s time extended.]

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: I notice that when that Calabrian lawyer in Victoria was executed outside his ice-creamery, they did a bit of a profile on him. He acted for a lot of Calabrians. They said, “If you want to go and look at the biggest amphetamine distributors in Australia, you cannot go past Ndrangheta—the Calabrian underworld.” People talk about the mafia, but it is the Ndrangheta. I have a bit of experience with Ndrangheta because I was briefed by the WA Police Union to represent the family of the late Detective Sergeant Geoffrey Bowen who had been assassinated by Ndrangheta at the National Crime Authority building in Adelaide some years ago. Members might recall that. They sent him a parcel bomb and cut him in half. I never knew about Ndrangheta before that. They are insidious and right through all parts of the Australian community. We hardly hear their name spoken. We would not know who is in it because they are very, very subterranean. While the media talks about the mafia, it is the Calabrians. I saw a show that was saying how the Ndrangheta are huge purveyors of this particular drug because of their very tight criminal network.

Where is this all going in my speech? It is going to what I believe is a failure of the government on the interdiction side. I will come to a supply side in a moment. The government failed on the interdiction back in 2010 when a previous Attorney General, Christian Porter, said that he was going to introduce anti-association laws that would not just target bikies but any serious criminal organisation and would break them up. He would have them declared serious criminal organisations and then get control orders against members. He challenged Labor and he challenged me as the shadow Attorney General, in particular, because I had been a defence lawyer. The Acting Speaker would remember this. Mr Porter said, “Where do you stand on this? Are you going to vote for these anti-association laws so we can break up these gangs or not?” We said that because of the extraordinary circumstances that this community found itself in we would support the then Attorney General—and we did support the government. We voted for those laws. It took just a little while to pass through Parliament because they were very complex laws and needed careful scrutiny to ensure that all the checks and balances were in place, but we voted for them in 2011.

Debate interrupted, pursuant to standing orders.

[Continued on page 5355.]

RADIO ACTIVE — ALBANY ENTERTAINMENT CENTRE

Statement by Member for Albany

MR P.B. WATSON (Albany) [12.50 pm]: I had the great opportunity last Friday night to see *Radio Active*. It was a concert celebrating the ongoing collaboration between staff and students from the Western Australian

Academy of Performing Arts, Albany Senior High School and Great Southern Grammar. A group from WAAPA has been travelling to Albany for a few years now. They bring their own musicians and touring crew and mix in with the people from the Albany Entertainment Centre. The talent I saw on Friday was absolutely fantastic. Students from not only WAAPA but also Albany Senior High School and Great Southern Grammar were singing and dancing. I thank in particular Steve Dougherty and Roger Arnold from Albany Senior High School and Geoff Waldeck, Joe Fowler and Emma Luxton from Great Southern Grammar. There is much talent in our regions, and not only musicians, singers and dancers. Some of those young people were putting down one instrument from one series of acts and picking up another, and then they would be singing. I would like to thank Garry Snowden from the Albany Entertainment Centre and his staff for making this such a great occasion. I would like to read out all the names, but about 100 people performed. It was a great performance by a great group of young people.

FRINGE WORLD FESTIVAL

Statement by Member for Perth

MS E. EVANGEL (Perth) [12.52 pm]: I was pleased to see an article by Stephen Bevis in *The West Australian* on 8 July entitled “Fringe World brings millions of dollars to the WA Economy”. Of course, the article refers to the success of the Fringe World Festival, which in its five years of operation has experienced rapid growth in its ability to deliver sensational cultural experiences and events while providing and driving economic opportunities for the Western Australian economy. This state government’s investment of \$1.24 million in the 2016 Fringe Festival attracted 990 000 people this year, achieved a turnover of \$20 million, earned \$8.3 million for artists and had a flow-on economic impact of \$98 million for this state. In simple terms, every dollar that this government invested returned a flow-on economic impact and benefited WA to the value of \$74.50, and in my eyes that is a tremendous return by any means.

Additional to the economic benefits is the performance opportunities provided to artists. We all know how difficult it is to find opportunities in the performing arts and entertainment industries. The opportunities that festivals such as Fringe provide to up-and-coming and established artists is priceless. As Mr Bevis states in his article, most surveyed artists listed the chance to expose their shows to new audiences as their main reason for taking part.

I take this opportunity to applaud Fringe World Festival chief executive, Mr Marcus Canning, for his hard work and dedication over the years. I would also like to acknowledge the hard work of Ms Amber Hasler, artistic director, and of course the whole Fringe Festival team. I look forward to next year’s Fringe Festival, which I am sure will be an extraordinary success.

BOOK WEEK — JOHN SEPTIMUS ROE ANGLICAN COMMUNITY SCHOOL

Statement by Member for Mirrabooka

MS J.M. FREEMAN (Mirrabooka) [12.53 pm]: Mirrabooka electorate schools are indulging their passion for all things imaginative and creative in Book Week. This morning book characters galore were on display at the John Septimus Roe Anglican Community School. “Miss Smiley”, Sharon Murphy, the energetic library teacher, led the enthusiastic staff in a story based on the Book Week theme “Australia: Story Country” that was written by classes at the school. Students dressed in costume and delighted in teachers’ character outfits. Particularly amusing was the Viking “cutting up the floor” in the celebration dance. Students squealed with joy at lolly grubs being tossed out by Henny Penny’s helpers and were amused at “game over” when the Mario Brothers arrived. I was delighted to speak to the students and they all agreed with my love of books, which take us on a journey of imagination into the past and the future. Book Week celebrated 71 years this year and the Children’s Book Council of Australia is to be congratulated for its work in promoting Australian children’s literature. The students of John Septimus Roe Anglican Community School cheered when their favourite book was announced as the winner of the different award categories. Books such as *Soon* by Morris Gleitzman illustrate the importance of compassion and humanity in the face of prejudice.

The passion for a good story and Book Week will be on display throughout schools in the Mirrabooka electorate. I look forward to participating at St Gerard’s Catholic Primary School, St Andrew’s Grammar School and North Balga Primary School through reading to students and donating a book to the libraries at the schools. Thanks to all the school librarians and staff for their efforts to bring books alive, because, as J.K. Rowling says, “Something very magical can happen when you read a book.”

KALAMUNDA MUSIC ACADEMY

Statement by Member for Forrestfield

MR N.W. MORTON (Forrestfield) [12.55 pm]: In June 2016, I attended and opened the Kalamunda Music Academy’s end-of-semester concert. Having toured the academy last year, I was excited to hear the students perform in concert, and I have to say that I was not let down; in fact, I was blown away. The skill on display

from the students was quite amazing and they, as well as their families, should take pride in their achievements. There are certainly a few potential career musicians in the group. All the students will walk away with a lifelong appreciation, understanding and love of music—something I am sure they will learn to treasure.

Kalamunda Music Academy is a specialist music school located in Forrestfield and hosted by Forrestfield Primary School. As the only music school in the Kalamunda region, its focus is on providing holistic music education to children and adults of all ages. I also note that it has now included a music enrichment program for students with special needs, which is a great initiative and proves that music is for everyone. Apart from being a locally run music school servicing the Kalamunda region, all the academy's teachers hold tertiary qualifications in music, education or related fields. Collectively, they have immense experience teaching and performing in a range of mediums, delivering programs with the highest professionalism, and supporting students' learning with proven effective educational processes. Kalamunda Music Academy is not just a place of learning; it is a community of like-minded young people, and older people, developing musicians. Daryl Eagle and his team should be commended for giving people in our community a chance to learn to play music through their extensive experience as educators and performers. I wish them every success for the rest of the year, especially their holiday programs, which are always very popular.

FREMANTLE CITIZENS ADVICE BUREAU

Statement by Member for Fremantle

MS S.F. McGURK (Fremantle) [12.56 pm]: Last week I was honoured to attend the fiftieth anniversary of the Fremantle office of the Citizens Advice Bureau of WA. For four decades, volunteers at that office have provided information and referral, a low-cost legal advice service on a wide range of issues and a mediation service. In the current climate of risk management, there is no doubt that there are challenges to ensure that authoritative advice is given. I commend those in the organisation who are working to balance that risk with ensuring that people who need advice still get it.

The Fremantle CAB harnesses the enormous resources of volunteers—largely retired people in my electorate who commit to a regular stint, train themselves and challenge themselves, and are motivated by helping people who just need a hand that those volunteering can give. Despite the array of resources now available online, many people do not have access to basic advice and need assistance. Illiteracy, people who are not literate in English, low numbers of justices of the peace and stretched community legal centres are all factors that contribute to the continuing high demand for services such as the Citizens Advice Bureau. Currently, the Fremantle CAB is trying to manage its latest challenge and source stable and suitable accommodation, exacerbated by the uncertainty around the Kings Square development. I hope that issue can be resolved and I can assist it in securing something appropriate, because it provides a vital service and I can only see demand for these services increasing. If it can secure visible and accessible accommodation, I have no doubt that the Fremantle Citizens Advice Bureau will be celebrating its next 50-year anniversary in due time.

Sitting suspended from 12.58 to 2.00 pm

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY CHAMBER — PHOTOGRAPHER ACCESS

Statement by Speaker

THE SPEAKER (Mr M.W. Sutherland): I wish to advise members that I have approved the presence of a photographer in the press and public gallery for the first 10 minutes of question time today.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

LOAN BILL 2016

573. Mr M. McGOWAN to the Treasurer:

I refer to the additional \$1.7 billion in the Loan Bill 2016 introduced today, on top of the \$8 billion Loan Bill last year.

- (1) Why did the Treasurer assure the house in debate on the last Loan Bill last year that there would not be a need for another, given that as part of that bill he had built in a margin of over \$1.5 billion?
- (2) Is it not completely incompetent to be introducing this bill in late August, when the Treasurer will not be able to pay teachers, nurses and police on 31 October without it?

Dr M.D. NAHAN replied:

- (1)–(2) If the Leader of the Opposition had been in the house for the second reading speech, he would have had the questions answered. We brought down the Loan Bill 2015 for \$8 billion. Based on the information enclosed in the budget at the time, that had sufficient capacity, with a buffer, to get us through to 1 July 2017. As the Leader of the Opposition might know—I am not sure he has been listening—since that time we have had an unprecedented drop in our revenue, a \$9.3 billion reduction in our revenue

relative to forecasts. We have adjusted some. In the midyear review, we made additional savings of \$1.3 billion and in the budget released last May, there was an additional \$1.3 billion. That is a \$2.6 billion response, but still leaves a gap that is more than the surplus provided for in the Loan Bill 2015.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I know the opposition is in denial about the decline in revenue, but it is a reality. What counts —

Several members interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: When Labor was in government, it was awash with revenue. Decisions needed to be made.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Cannington!

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The quality of management is determined by what we do in difficult times, and this is the most difficult time this state has ever faced—at least since the Great Depression. We are steering the economy and the state through the most difficult time ever, and we have undertaken unprecedented efficiency standards, which the opposition has resisted every inch of the way.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The opposition would also have done this. We made a decision, given that we made large efficiencies of \$2.6 billion, but the \$9.3 billion in the collapse of revenue was significant. We decided that we were going to maintain our capital spend to maintain job creation. I know members opposite are against that. They are against every major capital program we have done. We have continued it. It has created 90 000 jobs. That is a job plan, not a piece of paper that members opposite flip around. That is a job plan. We have maintained government services without forced redundancies at all.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for West Swan!

Dr M.D. NAHAN: We decided to maintain our capital spend, drive efficiencies like never before, but also maintain the highest quality service delivery in the country. I might add that this Loan Bill will not increase our debt levels additional to or beyond that which is already forecast in the budget. In other words, the increase in debt associated with this budget is fully forecast in the budget.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: I remind members that we do not start counting calls to order from question time; we started this morning. There are a number of people on three calls. I do not want anybody to go home early. I want you to be here with me all the time.

LOAN BILL 2016

574. Mr M. McGOWAN to the Treasurer:

I have a supplementary question. Is this financial catastrophe the result of the Treasurer's failure to build in significant surpluses during the many years of revenue boom times the government has had; and, again, why is the Treasurer introducing this bill so late?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Wanneroo, I call you for the second time. Member for Joondalup, I think you are for the second time.

Mr M. McGOWAN: I again ask this supplementary question: is this financial catastrophe the result of the Treasurer's failure to build in significant surpluses during the many years of revenue boom times; and, why is the Treasurer introducing this bill now, six weeks before the money runs out?

Dr M.D. NAHAN replied:

No, it is not. The origin of this additional Loan Bill, as I just said, is that since the 2015–16 budget, we have seen an unprecedented \$9.3 billion reduction in our revenue. It is \$9.3 billion! I know the opposition is in denial, but it is a reality. Members opposite can go and deal with stupid issues all the time, but it is a reality. As Treasurer, I have to deal with that reality.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Victoria Park!

Dr M.D. NAHAN: That is the cause of it. It is an unprecedented drop in revenue.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Cannington, I am going to call you now to order, I think it is for the first time. I can see somebody having a rest.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The increase in debt that it relates to is fully forecast in the budget. If members opposite had read the second reading speech, they would have seen that we have in Western Australia a unique responsibility. We have a requirement for a Loan Bill for the consolidated fund. We made a new Loan Bill in 2015, with a maximum of about \$21 billion in debt levels. We need to increase our borrowings to about \$23 billion, so \$1.7 billion is needed to meet our requirements going forward. That is fully consistent with the forecasted borrowings in the 2016–17 budget.

CINÉFESTOZ

575. Ms L. METTAM to the Minister for Culture and the Arts:

Before I ask my question, on behalf of the member for Joondalup, I acknowledge the student counsellors and principals—I understand there are two—from Beldon Primary School.

I understand the minister visited my electorate last night for the opening of CinéfestOZ. Can the minister update the house on this festival and how the Liberal–National government is supporting the screen industry in Western Australia?

Mr J.H.D. DAY replied:

I thank the member for the question. I was very pleased to visit the electorate of Vasse last evening for the opening of CinéfestOZ 2016 and for the first showing of the Western Australian-shot movie *Jasper Jones*. I was very keen to go to show my support and the government's support for the further development of the screen industry in Western Australia, which has been going from strength to strength in recent years, in large part because of the additional support the government has been giving, including through the \$16 million regional film investment fund from the royalties for regions program, which has taken effect from 1 July this year and in which there is a substantial degree of interest from within Western Australia and outside Western Australia and internationally as well. The purpose of that fund is to take advantage of the stunning regional locations we have right around Western Australia for movie production.

I am very pleased to say that in just the last 12 months, seven feature films have been filmed in Western Australia. They will come out onto cinema screens and elsewhere over the next 12 months or so. The films include *Jasper Jones*, which was filmed in Pemberton. It is based on the bestselling Western Australian story by a Western Australian author, Craig Silvey. It was published in 2009. It is an excellent book. It was adapted into a stage production by the Barking Gecko Theatre Company about three years ago and there is now a screen production. It tells very important stories about race relations in the 1960s in Western Australia. It is a coming-of-age story, which I recommend that all members and the wider community of Western Australia see when it is on screens in the early part of next year. Over the last 12 months or so, the film of Tim Winton's novel *Breath* was also filmed largely in Denmark on the south coast. *Blue Dog* has also been filmed in the Pilbara. I understand it is not exactly the sequel—in fact, I think it might be the prequel to *Red Dog*, which was outstandingly successful. These movies, which were all filmed in the last 12 months or so, build on other fantastic movies such as *Bran Nue Dae* and *Red Dog*, which were filmed in Western Australia in recent years.

As far as CinéfestOZ is concerned, it is on this week up until the weekend. That has also been going from strength to strength. It is in its ninth year and it is certainly a credit to all those who have had the vision to establish a substantial regional film festival in Western Australia. It is strongly supported by the government through Tourism Western Australia and through regional development from the government's royalties for regions fund, and also by ScreenWest, of course. For the filming of *Jasper Jones*, I also acknowledge the South West Development Commission's contribution. Congratulations to all those who were involved. We are very keen to continue to support the arts more widely in Western Australia, and the screen industry in particular.

REACHTEL POLL

576. Mr B.S. WYATT to the Minister for Transport:

I refer to the polling conducted on behalf of some business people that the minister has been linked to.

- (1) When did the minister first learn of this polling and when did he get a copy?
- (2) Can the minister guarantee that none of the associated people have any business dealings within the transport and agriculture portfolios?
- (3) When did the minister last meet with any of those associated business people?

Mr D.C. NALDER replied:

(1)–(3) I think the first part of that question has very little to do with my portfolio as Minister for Transport. As I have said publicly, I had nothing to do with the commissioning of that poll.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mr D.C. NALDER: I had nothing to do with it.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mr D.C. NALDER: Have I been advised of the results of the poll? Yes, I have. Over the last few days, I have discovered that a number of other people in the party room have also been advised of the results of that poll.

Several members interjected.

Mr D.C. NALDER: I am not involved. I have made this very clear; I know a lot of people want to link me to this. They can give it their best shot because, yes —

Mr M. McGowan: The CCC is investigating.

Mr D.C. NALDER: I am more than happy for anybody to investigate anything I have said or done.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members.

Mr D.C. NALDER: Mr Speaker, I do not know what that has to do with the transport portfolio. Apart from having a conversation with John Poynton, which I have acknowledged—I do not believe he has any interest whatsoever within the transport portfolio, that I am aware of—therefore I have nothing further —

Mr B.S. Wyatt: Agriculture.

Mr D.C. NALDER: — or agriculture. I have nothing further to comment.

REACHTEL POLL

577. Mr B.S. WYATT to the Minister for Transport:

I have a supplementary question. Now that the Premier has said that he is particularly concerned about the conduct of individuals who might end up referred to the CCC, when did the minister obtain a copy of the polling?

Mr D.C. NALDER replied:

I also saw the Premier's comments. He said that he was talking to the Public Sector Commission about having a look at this matter. He was not making any judgement on me and he determined that he needed to have a conversation with me first so we can both talk through the events that have occurred.

MELALEUCA REMAND AND REINTEGRATION FACILITY — SODEXO

578. Mrs G.J. GODFREY to the Minister for Corrective Services:

On behalf of the member for Forrestfield, I acknowledge the student leaders and staff from Maida Vale Primary School in the public gallery.

I note that the minister recently tabled the operator contract for the Melaleuca women's remand and reintegration prison. Can the minister please update the house on the benefits of engaging a private service provider for this facility?

Mr J.M. FRANCIS replied:

I thank the member for Belmont for her question on a very, very important issue for the state of Western Australia.

Mr P.B. Watson interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Albany.

Mr J.M. FRANCIS: Of course, as I have announced previously, some \$24.3 million was spent on a new women's remand and reintegration facility to change the previous facility into a new one out at the old Hakea Prison site. As I have conceded previously, the part of the prison estate with the most population pressures on it is obviously the women's estate. It is important that we get these things right. It is important that we do everything we can to try to rehabilitate our vulnerable prisoners, particularly in this circumstance, female prisoners, who have been both remanded and are being prepared for reintegration into society. Following a very, very detailed and exhaustive tender process that involved putting together an internal cost model, I would like to acknowledge the Western Australian Prison Officers' Union's contribution in being part of that process. The

government has decided to provide that contract to Sodexo. Interestingly, the cost per prisoner per day will come in at \$206. That is 42 per cent cheaper per prisoner per day than we are currently experiencing in running Bandyup Women's Prison—42 per cent cheaper per prisoner per day.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Warnbro, I call you to order for the third time. Minister, continue.

Mr J.M. FRANCIS: I know that the Labor Party does not like the idea of us doing things that will save taxpayers' dollars—get better value for money for Western Australian taxpayers—but it is not just about the cost.

Several members interjected.

Mr J.M. FRANCIS: Mr Speaker, it is not just —

Mr J.R. Quigley interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Butler, I call you to order for the third time.

Mr J.M. FRANCIS: It is not just about the cost. It is also about the services it will provide. It means that we will get better services for drug and alcohol rehabilitation for female prisoners.

Several members interjected.

Mr J.M. FRANCIS: It means that we will get better services when it comes to providing bail options. It means that we will get better services out of this contract for accommodation support once prisoners have been released. It means that we will get better services to provide post-release support so those prisoners who may be more likely to reoffend will be able to be kept on the straight and narrow and we will see a reduction in the recidivism rate of female prisoners. These are all very noble things to achieve, which could not be done if it was kept within the private sector, regardless of the cost. This is in line with the recommendations of the Economic Regulation Authority and we are getting on and doing the job that needs to be done, regardless of the politics. I know that the Labor Party hates it.

Several members interjected.

Mr J.M. FRANCIS: I know that I do not have to go too far into the WA Labor Party's platform to realise that if it ever made it to this side of the house, it would rip up these contracts. WA Labor will ensure that public services such as prisons, juvenile detention centres, prisoner transport and community justice are not further privatised. Where they have been, they will be brought back into the government's control and operation. The bottom line of that —

Opposition members: Hear, hear!

Mr J.M. FRANCIS: Members opposite all go "Hear, hear!" but they cannot stand in here and say that they have a plan to address issues in the economy and government spending when they would rip up these contracts and cost the taxpayers of this state hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars—tens of millions of dollars alone within just the Department of Corrective Services. It is a disgrace. If members opposite ever did that, they would jeopardise the rehabilitation of vulnerable prisoners. They would cost the taxpayers so much more money! The greatest risk to the taxpayers of Western Australia is the Labor Party in this house.

ROE HIGHWAY STAGE 8 — MEETING WITH PREMIER

579. Ms R. SAFFIOTI to the Minister for Transport:

I refer to reports that the minister has been unable, for weeks, to obtain a meeting with the Premier to discuss Roe 8, despite repeated attempts.

- (1) When did the minister first make a request to the Premier or his office for meetings regarding Roe 8?
- (2) How many attempts have been made?
- (3) What reasons was the minister given for not obtaining a meeting with the Premier?

Mr D.C. NALDER replied:

- (1)–(3) It is worth clarifying the comments I made this morning. I have not been able to obtain a meeting with the Premier because he has been away and he has been busy. This is not an issue of extreme urgency. I managed to catch him on one issue behind the chamber the other night, because we were here till 12.30 am, to let him know —

Mr F.M. Logan: Did you do a Nigel Hallett?

Mr D.C. NALDER: I beg your pardon.

The SPEAKER: Carry on.

Mr D.C. NALDER: There have been a couple of things, and I need to have discussions with him on a couple of broader issues, and I am just waiting for a time—and that has been just over two weeks.

ROE HIGHWAY STAGE 8 — MEETING WITH PREMIER

580. Ms R. SAFFIOTI to the Minister for Transport:

I have a supplementary question. How is the minister supposed to do his job if he cannot meet with the Premier on important topics related to infrastructure in his portfolio?

Mr D.C. NALDER replied:

We have a cabinet meeting and a cabinet process in which issues are raised and brought in.

Mr D.A. Templeman interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Mandurah, you are on three calls.

Mr D.C. NALDER: I know that members opposite have spent a long time over that side, and they might not understand the work that goes on, particularly for the Premier, and the level of time. I am waiting for a time to get in and have a broader chat on a number of issues.

STUDENT ACCOMMODATION FACILITY — ALBANY

581. Mr T.K. WALDRON to the Minister for Regional Development:

Can the minister explain how the recently announced student accommodation facility in Albany will make it easier for young people from the electorate I represent to access tertiary education?

Mr D.T. REDMAN replied:

I thank the member for Wagin. Wagin is a vast electorate, and the member knows well the importance of education for regional people, and the importance of access to higher education in particular. When we look at what happens with education as it applies to regional students, we are well aware that students born in regional Western Australia who continue their education in regional WA are much less likely to access tertiary education than students in metropolitan Perth. We also know that students who are able to pursue tertiary or higher education in the regions are much more likely to stay in regional Western Australia. It is very important that, as a government, we lay a foundation for opportunities for students in regional Western Australia to be able to choose and achieve, at both TAFE and tertiary education, and then go on to have fulfilling careers and participate in our economy.

There are significant costs attached to travelling away to tertiary education and TAFE in Perth. The blueprint process that all the development commissions have been pursuing has highlighted, in the great southern region in particular, the importance of an educational pathway. One of its pillars is knowledge and innovation—so the theme is very strong. In Albany, we have a University of Western Australia campus, and Curtin University also has some courses on offer, and there is also the Great Southern Institute as part of the southern regional TAFE. Providing opportunities for students to participate in higher education in Albany is significant to not just Albany, but also the broader regional area.

That framework highlights that by 2040, the tertiary education sector in Albany could host over 3 000 full-time equivalent tertiary students, of whom up to 30 per cent could be from overseas. Predicted demand is significant, and that is why we have announced an allocation of \$11 million to support affordable accommodation in Albany, on top of the Norman House project that was previously funded for \$1.7 million by royalties for regions for 20 units right across the road from the university centre. Now, at the old Albany Primary School site in Serpentine Road, another 40 units are to be constructed for a total project cost of about \$16 million—\$11 million from the Growing our South royalties for regions initiative, \$1 million from the Great Southern Community Housing Association, and an in-kind contribution of \$4 million from the Department of Education.

Having affordable accommodation in Albany allows students to access tertiary education opportunities and TAFE, and allows them to stay living in regional Western Australia, because we know that if they study and live in regional Western Australia in pursuit of those objectives, they are more likely to stay in regional Western Australia. That is what we want, and that is what this Liberal–National government is driven to achieve.

BAIL ACT — COMMISSIONER OF POLICE'S COMMENTS

582. Mrs M.H. ROBERTS to the Minister for Police:

Back in February, in an article in *The West Australian*, the Commissioner of Police called for changes to the Bail Act 1982 to help reduce crime rates.

- (1) Has the minister discussed the changes to the Bail Act the commissioner would like to see put in place to drive crime down?
- (2) If so, what changes was he calling for?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY replied:

- (1)–(2) A review of the Bail Act was conducted some time ago. Legislation should be shortly read into the Legislative Council with changes to the Bail Act. We have recently announced that we will be looking to implement changes to the Bail Act specifically with respect to offenders against children. We think we need to revisit the bail conditions for people who offend sexually against children, and we were talking about that last week.

Point of Order

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I am well aware of the proposals that are before the house with respect to the Bail Act. I am specifically asking the minister about those changes, not included in Hon Michael Mischin's bills, that the commissioner was asking for in February, and that the minister said were not a priority for the government. What are those changes, and how did he think they were going to drive down crime?

Questions without Notice Resumed

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: As I was saying, we are implementing some changes to the Bail Act, and the Attorney General is progressing those changes to do with those offenders who offend sexually against children. I am not sure which specific comments the member is referring to, but some of the discussions I have had with the commissioner and police officers about the Bail Act and bail conditions indicate that they would like to see more serious consequences for offenders who are bailed into the community and breach bail—in areas such as curfews. With respect to the specifics the member is talking about, there has been some discussions with my cabinet colleagues —

Mrs M.H. Roberts: You do not know what changes the commissioner wants to the Bail Act.

The SPEAKER: Member!

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The commissioner has flagged with me a range of changes to the Bail Act, and there has been further consultation with Western Australia Police. When I am ready to announce those changes to the Bail Act, I will bring the legislation to Parliament. The opposition will be fully informed, and we will offer a full briefing to members opposite, and I hope they avail themselves of the opportunity to understand what we believe is necessary.

BAIL ACT — COMMISSIONER OF POLICE'S COMMENTS

583. Mrs M.H. ROBERTS to the Minister for Police:

I have a supplementary question. In February, for the minister's information, Karl O'Callaghan said in the newspaper that he had made a call for an overhaul of Western Australia's bail laws, claiming officers wasted far too much time chasing repeat offenders only to see them back in court again. What are the changes the commissioner has asked the minister for? If she knows what they are, why will she not tell the house? Why is she hiding behind some gobbledygook answer?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY replied:

I think I articulated quite succinctly that a number of changes to the Bail Act are either before Parliament or are being proposed to Parliament.

Mrs M.H. Roberts interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Midland, I call you to order for the first time. Has the minister anything further to say?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: To go back to what I said, and perhaps the member would like to listen, I said that the commissioner told me he wanted to tighten up bail conditions and ensure that there were more serious consequences for offenders who breach bail. Police find that when they are dealing with recidivist offenders, the court will often impose conditions such as a curfew or a geographical restriction on where they can go.

Mrs M.H. Roberts interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Midland, I call you to order for the second time. A quick answer, thank you.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The offender might be required to not reoffend or be subject to a range of initiatives. As I said earlier, and I will say again, when I am ready to bring those changes to this place, I will do so. At the moment, where has our priority been? Our priority was interrupted today by a stupid political stunt while we were dealing with legislation to deal with methamphetamine transportation around the state. That is where the opposition's priorities are. Our priorities are road traffic legislation and methamphetamine transit route legislation.

Mrs M.H. Roberts interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Midland, I call you to order for the third time. Minister, you have 10 seconds.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will bring the legislation to this place in due course, and I expect the support of the opposition when I do so.

ROADSIDE LITTER PREVENTION PROJECT

584. Mr F.A. ALBAN to the Minister for Environment:

The minister announced a regional roadside litter prevention project yesterday. Can he please explain how this project will address the issue of littering on our roadsides?

Mr A.P. JACOB replied:

I thank the member for Swan Hills for this question. The Liberal–National government is committed to tackling the problem of litter in our community. We are doing this through a range of initiatives, some of which we have had the opportunity to talk about in this house in recent days. However, the latest round of the National Litter Index has come out. Although it shows that for five of the eight categories, Western Australia is now showing an improvement in litter rates, for the other three categories we are still, unfortunately, tracking downwards. The worst of those is roadside litter, which is why we are targeting it.

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for West Swan, I call you to order for the third time!

Mr A.P. JACOB: I had the opportunity yesterday to launch a new program, which fits in very well with the other range of programs we are running at the well-known Gingers Roadhouse and cafe, in the electorate of the member for Swan Hills, and I thank him for being there for yesterday's announcement. The program is a regional roadside litter prevention project centred on the theme of "WA naturally thanks you". It is a branded program that will run across three key arterial roads: the Brand Highway going to the north, the Great Eastern Highway going to the east, and the Forrest Highway going south. It is targeted at those three roads so that we can see whether such a campaign—we have done them in the past—can make a marked difference to littering along those three roads. We will be auditing this program over the coming four months to compare it with similar roads to see whether we make a difference. This program is funded by the state government in partnership with Main Roads Western Australia, the Keep Australia Beautiful council and also the Australian Packaging Covenant. Funding to the amount of \$185 000 will go into this program. It will include informational signage along all those roads branded along the lines of the "WA naturally thanks you" theme. It will also include signage on bins along those highways. Importantly, this program is being done in partnership with private sector stakeholders. Some 20 service stations along those roads will partner with us on this project, 16 of which have already signed up, and more are interested. These service stations will also include signage and branding.

Mr D.J. Kelly interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Bassendean, I call you to order for the third time!

Mr A.P. JACOB: If the member was here yesterday, I do not think he would have made that interjection. I would love to take an interjection if he wants to ask a question.

The most important part of this project is a small thing but it harks back to the container deposit scheme legislation. Many members will remember that for many years we used to be able to get a free Keep Australia Beautiful litter bag for the vehicle at service stations. We are bringing that back as well. Not only are we facilitating drivers to collect their litter, it is also a great way to communicate our message. The bags will have QR codes on the back, which will lead people to other initiatives.

Mr D.J. Kelly interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Bassendean, I have called you to order three times! If you shout out again, you are going out.

Mr A.P. JACOB: We will use technology on the bags as well. Three individual QR codes will point users to the Keep Australia Beautiful website and other programs such as the Adopt-a-Spot program and the program that enables a person to become a litter reporter. We have nearly 10 000 litter reporters in this state, which makes it a fantastic program. This new roadside litter prevention project fits in very well with the container deposit scheme set up by the Liberal–National government—the first government to bring it into place in this state. It is good to see that members opposite are catching up and I welcome their support. It is a government decision —

Mr R.H. Cook interjected.

Mr A.P. JACOB: The member is not listening. The second way —
Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members! You have 30 seconds, minister.

Mr A.P. JACOB: I really want to focus on this program, which obviously fits in with the container deposit scheme, our illegal dumping task force that specifically targets higher level dumping with significant penalties under the Environmental Protection Act, and also other initiatives such as a waste levy increase, which drives recycling, and our Better Bins program around our construction and demolition recycling program. It all fits together like a big puzzle. It is all coming together to drive recycling in Western Australia and to drive down litter rates.

POLICE — CRIME RATES — INCREASE

585. Mr R.F. JOHNSON to the Minister for Police:

Last weekend we saw the tragic stabbing of a 75-year-old grandfather in the Sorrento marina carpark, followed by an innocent tradesperson being viciously attacked outside his Sorrento home and having his head stamped on. On Tuesday, there was the attempted abduction of three young boys by a predator in Hillarys. With recent figures showing crime spiralling out of control in the suburbs, including an unacceptable increase of 37 per cent in the suburb of Kallaroo alone, why has the government neglected the electorate of Hillarys; and will the minister ensure there are adequate police officers to deal with this increase in crime and the safety of visitors to such a vital tourist facility?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY replied:

I think the member is working for our side. This sounds like a Dorothy Dix to me.

The member for Hillarys has raised some very serious issues with respect to a number of incidents that appear to be linked, but those matters are currently before the court. Some of them are still being investigated by police so I will not go into specific issues. We have a very interesting story to tell about crime because I have recently to hand the 10-year trends for crime statistics, including the 2015–16 crime statistics corrected for population. Obviously, as the population increases, certain areas of crime increase, but the proportionate —

Mr P.B. Watson interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Albany, I call you to order for the second time.

Point of Order

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: My question was very specific. It was about crime spiralling out of control in my electorate, and in particular the 37 per cent increase in Kallaroo. I would like the minister to address that and not to talk a lot of baloney about the last 10 years.

Questions without Notice Resumed

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: When we look at some of the crime figures over the last 10 years, we see that in 2005–06 there were 103 dwelling burglary offences per 100 000 of population. Last year, 1 094 offences were committed. Home burglary offences across the state are down by 16 per cent over 10 years.

Several members interjected.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I know that members opposite do not like it. They do not want to hear about it, but we have been in government for eight of the last 10 years and we have seen a 16 per cent decrease—when we correct for population—in home-dwelling burglaries.

Mr P. Papalia interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Warnbro! I have some good news and some bad news for you. The good news is that I said you were on three calls; you are only on two. Now you are on three. If you shout out again, you are having a rest.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: A non-dwelling burglary is a break-in of a place other than where people reside. That figure is down 40 per cent on the 10-year average. Property damage offences are down by 27 per cent.

Point of Order

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Mr Speaker, the minister is not taking any direction from you. The question was specifically about the increase by 37 per cent of crime in Kallaroo and the electorate of Hillarys. It has nothing to do with the hyperbole she is coming out with now.

The SPEAKER: Minister, you are talking about general crime trends. If you cannot address this Kallaroo question, you might want to take it on notice, but I do not know how else you can address it.

Questions without Notice Resumed

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I was coming to that. I am actually quite flattered that the member for Hillarys would think I know precisely the increases in every aspect of crime, every area of reported verifiable crime, for every suburb in the state. That is a great compliment to me from the member for Hillarys, but if he wants to know the specifics about Kallaroo, can he please put the question on notice and I will provide him with the information.

Point of Order

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: In that answer the minister just gave, she said she had some interesting figures to hand and she held an official document in her hand and quoted from it. I call upon her to table that document.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: That is my document. Is that official?

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for West Swan! I call you now to order for the fourth time! If you want to have a rest —

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: That is the only document, the minister's handwritten notes. That is not an official document. Member for West Swan, please relax.

POLICE — CRIME RATES — INCREASE

586. Mr R.F. JOHNSON to the Minister for Police:

I have a supplementary question. Will the minister now accept that she is not capable of handling this important portfolio and resign and hand it to somebody who is; and, if not, why not?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: We are running out of time. The question has now been asked.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY replied:

No, I am not going to resign.

Point of Order

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I have a point of order.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Let us hear your point of order.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: That supplementary question was very specific. It was not a long drawn-out one. It was simply: "... resign and hand it to somebody who is; and, if not, why not?"

The SPEAKER: The minister said she is not resigning and she does not have to expand on the answer.

MINING TAX — NATIONAL PARTY PROPOSAL

587. Mr F.M. LOGAN to the Deputy Premier:

I refer to the proposal by the Deputy Premier's partner in government, the Leader of the National Party, to impose a \$5-a-tonne tax on iron ore produced by Rio Tinto and BHP Billiton —

Mr V.A. Catania interjected.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: You put the proposal up.

The SPEAKER: Member for North West, I think you are starting to get right up there to the third strike. Do not tempt fate.

Mr P.B. Watson interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Albany, I call you to order for the first time.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: I ask —

- (1) What effect would this tax have on employment in the mining industry?
- (2) Would this tax result in more or fewer apprentices being hired by mining companies or on mine construction projects?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY replied:

(1)–(2) I am not going to comment on a policy position of the National Party.

Several members interjected.

Point of Order

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Mr Speaker, you heard the question, as everyone else in the chamber did. I did not ask the Deputy Premier to comment on the policy of the National Party. I asked her to talk about the effect of that policy on something in her own portfolio. I would like her to answer it, if she knows.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I heard that as the member requesting me to place an opinion on the record about a National Party policy and I am not required to do it and I am not doing it.

MINING TAX — NATIONAL PARTY PROPOSAL

588. Mr F.M. LOGAN to the Deputy Premier:

I have a supplementary question. If the Deputy Premier simply will not answer or cannot answer the question, can she confirm that under no circumstances will the Liberal Party support the National Party's policy?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY replied:

I am not entitled to respond on behalf of the party. I am not the leader of the Liberal Party. I am not the leader of the government. The question is out of order.

CONSUMER PRICE INDEX — TREASURY FORECAST

589. Mr C.D. HATTON to the Treasurer:

Can the Treasurer please update the house on its latest advice from Treasury on its forecast for the Perth consumer price index?

Dr M.D. NAHAN replied:

I thank the member for the question. As the member knows, since 2013–14 our wages policy has been tied to the consumer price index. Members opposite criticised it and said we would never do it and could not do it. All agreements that we have achieved during that period are tied to the CPI. It is very important because the key to restraining expenditure growth is wages, not only directly with employees in the public service. Public service wages are also tied to the non-profits to which we contract services. It is about 60 per cent of the cost, so it is very important. That is a crucial factor. Those turned out to be generous. We systematically overestimated CPI, so the fireys and the police got a four per cent real increase over the past three years to 2015–16. Members will remember that in February this year—then locked in the budget—we revised our policy to 1.5 per cent increases. We did that for a number of reasons. We needed to tighten up expenditure growth. We also saw that around the world treasuries were overestimating CPI. We are going through a period of deflation, not only here but around the world. We thought that would be a fair one. Treasury's forecast for inflation—Treasury makes those forecasts—of 1.75 per cent appeared to everyone, and we heard screams on the other side of the house, that we were giving the public servants with 1.5 per cent a real reduction in wages. Since then, data has come out on both CPI, two quarters, and also some commonwealth data, to show that, as suspected, CPI is going down. For 2015–16 it averaged one per cent. Treasury now forecasts inflation for this year, 2016–17, to be 1.25 per cent. Our policies were very appropriate both in restraining expenditure growth and predicting the future. Our 1.5 per cent targets are a real increase in wages. I am really pleased to state that we are in a number of negotiations, including with the Health Services Union, which has agreed to a 1.5 per cent wage increase. We are having positive outcomes in other negotiations. People opposite have been screaming about fiscal management. That is a measure of good fiscal management—controlling wages. When we came to government, the salary bill was growing at 12 per cent a year.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Cockburn!

Dr M.D. NAHAN: We have now put in place and have been operating for a number of years restraints on wages and expenditure growth. We are predicting the price, and that is good fiscal management. Can members imagine what Labor would do? No, the union people who put them in power —

Point of Order

Mr B.S. WYATT: I wonder whether the Treasurer could reflect on the success of the government's wages policy in the first term of the Barnett government for us.

The SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. That is some kind of surreptitious question. I would like you to wind this up in one minute, because we have run out of time.

Questions without Notice Resumed

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Relative to their mess at 12 per cent a year —

Point of Order

Mr B.S. WYATT: I have a point of order.

The SPEAKER: Sit down. I want you to answer the member for Balcatta's question. I want to move on.

Questions without Notice Resumed

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Back to the question. Imagine —

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Cannington, I call you to order for the second time.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Imagine that Labor was in government—I know it sends quivers down you—and trying to control wages —

Several members interjected.

Point of Order

Mr B.S. WYATT: I wonder whether the Treasurer could confirm that in the first term of the Barnett government, it increased its wages policy by more than 50 per cent.

The SPEAKER: I call you to order for the first time, member for Victoria Park, for bringing spurious points of order. Treasurer, you have 30 seconds to wind this up.

Questions without Notice Resumed

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Imagine Labor was in government, a party owned by the union —

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Cannington!

Mr B.S. WYATT: I have a point of order, Mr Speaker.

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Cannington, I call you to order for the third time. I want to warn you that if you rise with a spurious point of order, I am going to call you to order. That concludes question time.

MISUSE OF DRUGS AMENDMENT (SEARCH POWERS) BILL 2016

Second Reading

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

MR J.R. QUIGLEY (Butler) [2.49 pm]: As I said, the government failed in the fight against distributions when in 2011 it pressed the opposition and others to accept anti-association laws and said that they were critical to disrupting serious crime organisations in their business of distributing and manufacturing amphetamines. We went along with that measure on the government's assurance that it would bust and dismantle these gangs, in the former Attorney General's words.

Since then the government has come up with a litany of excuses for why it has done nothing. This Parliament's time was taken for days and days on that complex and lengthy legislation, and since then, not one application has been brought under that legislation to have any organised crime gang declared—not one. When I questioned this, we were told by the Deputy Premier that no application had been brought because they were awaiting the outcome of a High Court case. There was no High Court case pending at the time of that given answer. That was two years ago. We have heard in estimates hearings for two years running that Western Australia Police had a team working on the application. It had its target; it had a team working on the application. We always expressed disbelief with this legislation and its effectiveness because it involved taking a Supreme Court judge out of the list for perhaps months at a time to declare an organisation.

Mr P.C. Tinley interjected.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: None, member.

Five years after the legislation was introduced to this Parliament and four years after it was operative, not one application has been brought under this legislation to declare any of these organisations involved in the distribution of this insidious drug, methamphetamine—not one application. Yet during the briefing, I asked Superintendent Scanlan what was the role of outlaw motorcycle gangs. He said that they do not manufacture anymore; they are clients of the importers and major distributors of the drug in our community. With the way the opposition cooperated with the government in the passage of this legislation, one would think at least one application had been brought, but nothing! I recall an article published in *The West Australian* 18 months ago when there was a joint appearance at a press conference by the Deputy Premier and the Attorney General to announce further mandatory sentencing laws. The media asked the Attorney General when he will do something under his anti-association laws. His response was that it is the Attorney General's responsibility to shepherd these laws through the Parliament and he had done that, he had no further responsibility, and it was the responsibility of the Minister for Police. That is a failure; a very big failure.

Although we support this legislation, which will help with the interdiction of the drug and the distribution of the drug, it falls a long, long way short of what the government promised this community. I asked the superintendent how many of these outlaw motorcycle gangs are operating—I note the superintendent is in the Speaker's gallery. I asked the superintendent how many of these organisations operate in Western Australia and he said, "You have

got the big six, such as the Coffin Cheaters and the Rebels. You have got the big six and then you have got another half a dozen below them.” There are at least as many of these organisations as there were when the government promised to start dismantling them, and more members today of these organisations than there were back then. There are more distributors of this drug now than we had back then when the government promised legislation that was going to see them dismantled. We hear nothing about this anymore—not a word. Three estimates ago the Commissioner of Police sat in this chamber and the commissioner’s representative sitting with the minister said, “Member, we have a team working on it now, we have the first target, we are on the cusp of the first application”—then nothing; nothing at all. Moreover, Hon Nick Goiran and his team of members on the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission recommended an amendment to the Corruption and Crime Commission legislation to unblock it and to enliven that legislation so police could use it and their special powers of investigation against organised crime from time to time, but the government failed to do that. It rejected that and has done nothing in that area. We support this legislation as one step. We trust that this legislation will actually have an effect because it is in the hands of the police and not the government.

Debate adjourned, on motion by **Mr J.H.D. Day (Leader of the House)**.

ROAD TRAFFIC LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL (NO. 2) 2015

Third Reading

MRS L.M. HARVEY (Scarborough — Minister for Road Safety) [2.57 pm]: I move —

That the bill be now read a third time.

MRS M.H. ROBERTS (Midland) [2.57 pm]: The Road Traffic Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2015 has a lot of clauses and it makes quite a number of changes to four other pieces of legislation; namely, the Road Traffic Act 1974, the Road Traffic (Administration) Act 2008, the Road Traffic (Authorisation to Drive) Act 2008 and the Young Offenders Act 1994. It is a significant piece of legislation.

We learnt a number of things during the committee stage of the debate. We knew well beforehand that this is something the government had been tardy on. It is a 2015 bill and the government chose, despite an alleged priority, to only bring it on for debate in this house this week. The whole autumn session lapsed before the bill was brought forward by the government and brought on for debate this week. That is the first point I make. There has been no particular rush here. We have been calling for many elements of this legislation for years and had been promised for years. Some elements that will finally become law, once this legislation has passed both houses and receives assent, have been called for by road safety authorities for over a decade—ever since the Road Safety Council wanted some of these measures put in place.

It has been a long wait. However, as we went through the legislation, there were some elements of concern, and I will get to those. There were also amendments that I believe should have been contemplated given that this is a wide-ranging amendment bill. As I stated, this bill amends various parts of a number of acts. Had some other simple good amendments been included in the bill, they would have enhanced road safety and reduced trauma on our roads. There are gaps and omissions that I am disappointed in, and I am disappointed that the government did not manage to include those amendments in the bill.

Having said that, copious amendments were put on the notice paper—effectively it was a whole new part. It occurs to me that the government made a choice about whether to add those amendments to the Road Traffic Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2015 at the end—to pop them on the notice paper—or to put them in a standalone bill. Most of the minister’s amendments on the notice paper related to clauses that became necessary, as the minister put it, to have the trial of point-to-point cameras. Members may be aware that, as usual, this minister put the cart before the horse when she made some announcements on 21 February this year, some five months ago. She said that her five-year plan to focus on safety, community engagement and accountability; and to increase the number of red-light cameras from 30 to 90 and fixed cameras from five to 30; to use mobile cameras for 600 more hours per year at crash hot spots. Her fourth bullet point was the trial of point-to-point cameras to measure average speed over distance. There was also talk of that trial taking place on Forrest Highway. At the time, we asked how the equipment would be trialled when it required legislative change. We were told, “Maybe, maybe not. Whatever. We’ll get around to it.” There was a bit of the usual pre-emption. Basically, the government announced something before legislation was in place for the trial, let alone the proper rollout of point-to-point cameras, as has occurred already in every other state. The minister had to very quickly come up with a plan to deliver what she had announced—how to give the capacity for the point-to-point cameras to be properly trialled. The government was considering a trial—that is, it would have the equipment and personnel and out in the field and it would spend the money—but it could not actually infringe anyone because there was no legislative backup to infringe anyone.

Contained in the amendments on the notice paper were some quite complicated formulas to do with calculating average speed over distance. I think it was a distance-over-time formula to give an average speed. That is of course necessary. The minister advised us that those formulas and calculations are based on legislation already in place in other places. I think reference was made to South Australia.

We also found out last evening that there was no explanatory memorandum to go with those changes. I regard the new point-to-point camera clauses added to the bill as effectively a separate small bill. It is a separate small bill added to the end of the bill, and it came without an explanatory memorandum. It was only at 11.30 last night that the members for Cannington and Butler and I were able to at last see a copy of the explanatory memorandum for what is very new legislation and a new way of doing things in this state. That was disappointing. Adding that stuff to the bill may well be the real reason the entire Road Traffic Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2015 was delayed. I think the minister alluded to the fact that the government was waiting on those amendments to be ready and using the opportunity to incorporate those point-to-point camera provisions. The alternative was that the Road Traffic Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2015 could have been dealt with in 2015. It could have been dealt in February or March this year, and we could have just been debating the point-to-point camera provisions, which we got by way of amendment, at this stage.

Again, the minister talked tough, talked up priorities and went out and announced things. Half the time she does not know whether she needs new legislation to back up what she states. Most people on this side have a much better idea of that. All of us knew well in advance that it required legislation. Legislation was put in place in other states. The members for Butler and Girrawheen and I were wondering when there would be that legislative backup and what teeth the so-called trial of point-to-point cameras would have. Effectively, it will cause further delay because it will not be until this bill has gone through the other house and has received royal assent that the trial will be able to take place. Perhaps the minister can enlighten us in this third reading debate about how long the trial will take place. I guess that the trial will be at least three months, but maybe it will be a six-month trial. Maybe we will not know the results of the trial until after the election. But it built in yet a further delay for rolling out point-to-point cameras in this state—something that has been recommended to this minister for the four years she has been Minister for Police.

I am rather confident that the member for Hillarys, in his third reading contribution, will remind people that point-to-point cameras was something he was very keen to roll out when he was Minister for Road Safety. Many people, including him, have alluded in this house to the fact that it was the Premier who blocked him from seeking cabinet approval to implement the point-to-point cameras. This government has had to be embarrassed into it. This is new technology; it is the way of the future. We are not interested in protecting people who flout the law, who speed and who put other road users' lives in danger. It is only after every other state in Australia has implemented it some considerable time ago that Western Australia is finally getting to put the legislation through to have the trial before we can implement these cameras in Western Australia.

Another area that considerable time was spent on in the consideration stage was blood samples. Again, we commended the minister for bringing forward provisions to give the police power to require compulsory blood testing of suspected drivers involved in a traffic crash that results in death or serious injury. Most people in Western Australia are not involved in these kinds of crashes—thank goodness. When I say that most people are not involved, I mean that either they or their family members are not involved directly in the accident and, as a result, they do not necessarily find out what goes on, what the penalties are and what happens to those people who are found to be responsible until they find themselves in that situation. I am sure that Martin Roberts' two daughters would have had no idea of the provisions and what was likely to occur in a crash such as the one involving their father until they found themselves in the thick of it. I think that most people would be in that position. Most people I have spoken to over recent months about taking blood from people involved in road crashes that result in a fatality or a serious injury have said that they assumed that police had that power. They assumed that the fact that the person was involved, whether or not they were the driver, meant that the police would have the power to take a blood sample or an appropriate sample, be that saliva or urine or whatever in the circumstances, to ascertain whether the person was under the influence of alcohol. I think people also make a bit of an assumption that, given that drugs have been prevalent in the community for quite a number of decades now, people would be tested to determine what drugs they had in their system and to make some calculation of the quantity. If someone's loved one is killed or seriously disabled in a road crash, they would expect that if the driver was seen to be at fault, they would be tested promptly so that information on whether the person was driving impaired from the use of alcohol or illicit or licit drugs would be known to the courts and others.

Fortunately, we have finally got this legislation before Parliament. I think it will provide a lot of comfort to a lot of people. It is not that this legislation can or should be retrospective. It will not sort out some issues for a lot of people whose loved ones have been involved in crashes in the past, but it will be of real benefit to lots of people in the future. People will be able to get some answers that they might not otherwise have got because the police will be given the power to take bodily samples from those people involved in a crash that results in death or serious injury. That is a very good thing. However, the issue that I raise is one that I asked some questions about last night to get some clarification. Even after this legislation is passed, it will not be compulsory for a driver involved in a serious crash that results in death or serious injury to give a blood sample or the like. What this legislation will do, as is correctly explained in the memorandum, is give the police the power to require one. I would hope that, as a police practice, in virtually every circumstance they would use this power to check the level of impairment and to check for the presence of alcohol or drugs in a driver involved in a crash that results

in death or serious injury. In some circumstances, that will be a protection for the driver involved, because they will be able to clear their name. At the moment, people may contemplate whether the person involved in the crash with their mother, sister, cousin or best friend was under the influence of drugs or alcohol, and then they would question why the police did not test the driver. The answer that they would get at the moment is that the police did not test the driver because they did not have the power to test the driver. There are some circumstances—I will not go into them at the third reading—in which samples are taken because people are on the scene and so forth. No-one currently has the right to refuse to be tested if it is obvious that they were driving and police are on the scene. This will give a power to locate the person and test them for up to, I think, 12 hours after the crash, which is certainly a big advance. My inclination would be to go a step further and require drivers who have been involved in accidents that result in death or serious injury to have a sample taken so that whether they were driving impaired can be ascertained.

The minister advised last evening during the consideration in detail stage that in some circumstances—I believe rare—this could endanger the life of someone; their life could be in such a precarious position that taking a bodily sample could be injurious to their health and wellbeing. I accept that. I presume that those circumstances would be relatively rare, but I certainly would not want to put anyone's life at further risk or do something that would be injurious to their health. I believe we could easily get around that in the legislation. All that would need to be placed in the legislation would be a qualifying statement—an exception, basically—with words to the effect of “except when taking such a sample would be injurious to someone's health”, or whatever appropriate words parliamentary counsel would like to recommend. That would be beneficial on a range of fronts, because sometimes police, perhaps through further inquiries, become aware sometime later that they did not exercise their power to take a sample when perhaps they should have. Ideally, it would be good if samples were taken from all drivers involved in that level of car crash. Perhaps on further inquiry after talking to people, it might become clear that the driver was part of a group of people who had been drinking at a party or had been at someone's house, or it might come to light that they were a known drug user or they have a long history of drug abuse, and that might not come to light within the first 12 hours or so. Taking a sample beyond that 12-hour mark is pretty much redundant. Given that the minister has said that she believes that once that power is given to police, samples will be taken in the vast majority of cases, I think it would be better if it was a catch-all, with the exception of when it is injurious to someone's health.

I say that also because it would be highly beneficial to researchers and people who want to know the information. I think most of us in the community would benefit from researchers knowing, for example, what percentage of drivers involved in fatal crashes or crashes that result in serious injury were under the effects of alcohol or the influence of drugs, and which drugs, which will be able to be determined through this testing regime. What percentage of people involved in that level of crash has been using methamphetamine, a combination of methamphetamine and alcohol, or a combination of methamphetamine, prescription drugs and alcohol? Once we have that information we will know the size of the problem in the community and it will give the government some direction in targeting the road safety resource. When the government is looking at expending money out of the road trauma trust account and it knows there is a huge level of methamphetamine use by those people who have been involved in a crash involving death or serious injury, it can target that as a concern and can warrant spending extra resources.

I am well aware that the regime proposed in the legislation is a significant step forward and that through this a lot of information should be collected and that we will have a much better idea of not only how many people are driving under the influence of drugs and alcohol and who end up involved in a serious or fatal crash but also which drugs are more prevalent and whether alcohol still remains one of the main causes of impairment in fatal crashes, or whether a mixture of legal or illegal drugs is taking over.

Over the last couple of evenings we looked at some other issues, which I expect a couple of my colleagues will make more comment on than I will, so I will largely leave that to them. I now refer to the introduction of a new offence of careless driving about which some concerns were raised as to what constitutes careless driving and the penalties that will potentially apply. I appreciate the commentary from the coroner, who has recommended that in some circumstances there may be the possibility of an alternative finding, but this offence will be new and it is an area that we will need to watch closely as people are potentially brought before the courts. Some careful analysis will need to take place on whether the penalties meted out under this new category of careless driving are appropriate and in line with community expectations.

Another long overdue provision that is contained in the bill is to require the sobriety of people instructing learner drivers. This is another measure that is long overdue and that was recommended to government about 10 years ago. It was based on research done by Monash University and then recommended to government through the Road Safety Council. Again, this government has sat on this for the last eight years. I know that with a couple of measures in this bill, and this is one of them, the minister says it was about 10 years ago that the recommendation was received by government. Yes, it was, and it was new at that time. I firmly believe that had Labor been re-elected in 2008, it would have happened within a year or at the outside within two years. The

minister and the government need to recognise that they have been in government for the last eight years. For that whole eight years the government has been asked to do something that is really sensible and totally in line with community expectations, such as requiring sobriety of a driving instructor. For the benefit of members present, a driving instructor is not necessarily someone from a driving school, and can be mum, dad, aunt, uncle, friend, relative or whoever is supervising the learner driver. It is very sensible to require them to be sober. Other anomalies have been picked up, including with people driving a 22.5 tonne truck.

Finally, some of the penalties in this bill have had strong increases. Along with those increased penalties, I was expecting to see another penalty increase, which probably should have been done at some time in recent years, and that is to increase the penalty for people who obscure their numberplates in some way. We will have point-to-point cameras in place, initially on Forrest Highway and ultimately on a range of other highways and roads, and significant penalties will apply and have been upped in this legislation. I note that I inquired of the minister last night the penalty for obscuring a numberplate. I believe the minister answered that it was a \$1 000 fine. There is no demerit point penalty for that. If someone drives significantly over the speed limit, they can accrue six or eight demerit points. If they do that on a double-demerit weekend, it is double six, which is 12, and a person will lose their licence, yet if a person obscures their numberplate, it is just a fine. For a lot of my constituents and a lot of people I know, that would be a colossal fine and they would not be interested in it. Sadly, some people would much rather pay the thousand dollar fine than lose their licence. For some people, a thousand dollars is not sufficient deterrent. If the government really wants to deter everyone in the community—people with a diverse range of wealth and financial backgrounds—demerit points are important. It is not right that that offence does not accrue demerit points. Since the government has significantly upped other penalties, it has been an oversight of government not to up the penalty for obscuring a numberplate.

MS M.M. QUIRK (Girrawheen) [3.27 pm]: Madam Acting Speaker?

The ACTING SPEAKER: (Ms L.L. Baker): Member for Girrawheen, I am so sorry.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: It was a late night last night, so I completely understand.

I want to comment on a few of the remarks made by the minister last night. She was somewhat defensive about the road toll and although it is trending down, it is by no means trending down as quickly as it is in other states. That is a matter of concern, because one fatality on our roads is one fatality too many.

Road trauma imposes a significant cost on our community both socially and financially. We tend to focus on road fatalities, but for every death it is estimated that around 11 people are permanently injured and another 50 spend a long time in hospital. This year, although the government has purportedly focused on regional Western Australia, the country road toll is extremely sobering. This year to date we have had 43 fatalities in the metropolitan area and a staggering 77 in the country. This time last year, there had been 55 fatalities in the country. We have a huge problem there. It is great that the bill contains reforms such as point-to-point cameras; however, that suggestion has been around for a significant length of time and I am certainly saddened that the government has not been a bit more assiduous in introducing that strategy, which has worked well in other jurisdictions and which, I think, would work particularly well in the country. Secondly, I am concerned that we are relying much more on cameras—both speed and red-light cameras—at intersections and less on police personnel. The Community Development and Justice Standing Committee recently completed a report on the police's performance in road safety. The evidence is certainly clear. In excess of 30 police officers have been removed from traffic duties. Other officers who are still notionally in traffic are pulled away to other duties and are therefore not 100 per cent on board for traffic duties. The public generally believe police have a deterrent effect and I certainly believe that is the case. The reduction in the number of traffic police has resulted in a significant reduction of almost 50 per cent in the number of infringements. Infringements or on-the-spot fines are those when a person is pulled up by a police officer. The reduction in numbers of police on traffic duty has had a concrete adverse impact on the police presence on roads. The inevitable outcome is that fewer people are being picked up and infringed. That is a bit of a no-brainer. With the funds available from the road trauma trust account, which I will talk about shortly, there is absolutely no reason for that to happen. During my contribution to the second reading debate, I spoke on the fewer drug tests that are performed in Western Australia compared with other states. Evidence to the Community Development and Justice Standing Committee found that police applied to the road trauma trust account for almost \$12 million to fund a project to increase breath-testing and drug testing in 2014–15. The Road Safety Council recommended that that amount be granted. However, only \$4.6 million was approved and \$4.7 million was approved in the subsequent year. If we really think that drunk-driving has an impact on the road toll and the money is available in the road trauma trust account, it beggars belief why that money would not be available. Max Cameron, a road safety expert from Monash University, certainly believes that we should be testing at a rate of 90 000 people per year. We fall much short of that.

Police like to talk about evidence-based policing. Over the past few days, we have all spoken and speculated in this house about various aspects of road safety. However, there is very little objective evidence, other than the road toll figures, to talk about what works and what does not. The Road Traffic Legislation Amendment

Bill (No. 2) 2015 will bring in blood and drug testing for people involved in fatal accidents. That will give us the first opportunity, instead of just speculating, to find out how many people involved in fatal crashes are affected by drugs or alcohol. This will really be the first occasion in which we can have good, objective figures to make a proper assessment about where we need to target our road safety efforts.

The Community Development and Justice Standing Committee also found that the community attitude surveys, which were abolished a few years ago, should be reinstated. Those surveys were particularly good for policymakers to see what effective deterrents are to bad driving in the community—what worked and what did not. They show how many people would be prepared to admit that they comply with road safety laws and how many people said they regularly breach them by driving whilst under the influence or regularly engage in speeding. They were really good to inform people whether efforts were targeted in the right direction. Although the government has said it will replace those surveys with something else, nothing has occurred. We are really in the dark and in a bit of a vacuum in assessing what measures work and what do not. All we know is that in the country, for example, there is a major issue. Sitting around in the wheatbelt and discussing whether there should be a T-junction or a sign at a particular favourite road of one individual or another will not cut it. We need some really strategic thought about road safety, particularly in the country.

There was also some discussion about the Road Safety Commissioner being independent. I think this is part of the area I am concerned about—the lack of objectivity and lack of data. In that regard, interest groups such as the RAC are finding it increasingly difficult to get objective, comprehensive information from police. Again, they have a legitimate interest. The RAC has 700 000 members in Western Australia and it wants to make recommendations to the government. It wants to fund community safety programs. It is finding it harder and harder to get access to good, objective information about where there are areas of need and gaps in enforcement. In addition, I have met the Road Safety Commissioner on a number of occasions and I have the greatest respect for him, but I do not have respect for the manner in which he has been appointed and the fact that he is not independent of government. I think that lack of independence hurts his credibility. The road safety message would be much less sceptically received if it came from someone who had a truly independent status. I think that has been a major policy flaw and it is an issue.

The final thing I want to talk about is kind of related to road safety; I have not had the opportunity to deal with this in another matter today. We have a new campaign about “Zero Heroes”. It suggests to people that they should try to proselytise errant drivers by bragging about the fact that they have behaved well on the roads and people should follow their example. That is a laudable endeavour. I hope it is properly evaluated. I have the impression that Australians do not tend to be braggers. They like to hide their light under the bushel, so encouraging people to boast and brag might, frankly, be met with a bit of scepticism and a bit of razzing. I am not quite sure how effective that campaign will be. Frankly, if I were a family member or the parent of one of the 77 people who were killed in the country year to date, I do not know that I would be particularly enamoured with the legislation. However, that leads me to a segue; from “Zero Heroes” to hero.

This week marks the last game for Matthew Pavlich, who has been an exceptional leader in Fremantle Football Club for many years. He is a great model for young Western Australians. Around this place, we do not see very good examples of leadership at the moment. Some might say that leaders are thin on the ground, but that is not something I can say about Matthew Pavlich. He is an extraordinary individual and a great Western Australian. I know that he will continue to contribute to the community in endeavours outside of football.

[Quorum formed.]

MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah) [3.41 pm]: I would like to make some brief comments on the Road Traffic Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2015. As members will be aware, this bill has been comprehensively debated over the last two evenings in this house. The process of interrogation of this legislation and the points made on this bill were quite important. I note that during the consideration in detail process a number of issues were pursued by the members for Midland, Butler, Cannington and Girraween. It is always of interest to a member who is not from the legal fraternity, which I am not, to watch and listen to the quality of interrogation from some of my colleagues on this side. It is important that any legislation that passes through this place be interrogated so that we achieve the best possible legislation for the Western Australian community.

A number of issues were raised about this bill during the consideration in detail stage. It was quite an enduring process. I do not think we have sat past midnight for two nights in a row for some time. That reflects on the unfortunate handling of legislation in this place by this government. We find ourselves in this situation because legislation has not been handled or planned well by the government. That said, it is incumbent on any good opposition to make sure that we have our say and that appropriate interrogation is conducted. I believe that has been the case in this debate, although I was disappointed when the member for Hillarys genuinely attempted to incorporate some amendments into this bill. Irrespective of what members opposite think of the member for Hillarys, he has as much right as anybody else in this place to put his case for amendments and explain the reasons behind his amendments. We all have that absolute right, having won the opportunity to represent our communities in this place.

I thought it was very sad that at one stage during consideration in detail we saw an attempt by the Leader of the House representing the government to shut down the debate on the amendment moved by the member for Hillarys. Let us recount what happened. The member for Hillarys moved his amendment, and spoke to it. There was no opportunity for any other member to debate the amendment. The Leader of the House at that stage moved to gag the debate without any member in this place having an opportunity to respond. That is what happened.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: We did debate it the week before.

Mr D.A. Templeman: That does not matter, minister. This is in the context of the bill that is before the house.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: We did debate it last week.

Mr D.A. Templeman: It does not matter, minister. The fact of the matter is that an amendment was put forward, as per the procedures of this place, and there is a convention that that amendment is at least able to be debated. The member for Hillarys, in speaking to his amendment, presented the case, and then the government attempted to close down the debate without the opposition having any opportunity to further discuss the intention of the amendment. Luckily, the Speaker, in the chair at the time, conveniently misheard the Leader of the House's move to gag the debate. We all know what really happened, but that was a sound decision by the Speaker in the chair to selectively mishear the intentions of the Leader of the House and ensure that debate did in fact take place, as is proper and due process, on the amendment of the member for Hillarys. That was debated, and subsequently lost, but the opportunity for the opposition and any other member in this place to have their say was affirmed. It is on the record, and was witnessed by those of us who endured the debate for many hours, into the wee hours of the morning. We will bear witness to the attempt by the government to do that.

That said, I note that the member for Hillarys is entering the house in his usual grandiose way. I was just talking about the appalling attempt to close down the member's amendment to this bill the other evening, and commenting that thanks to some sense being seen by the Speaker—his selective hearing loss at the time—we at least were allowed to have a say on the member's very important and appropriate amendment to the bill, although it was subsequently defeated. I hope that the government does not decide that that will be a technique used in the last seven weeks of Parliament and that this is not the kind of behaviour we will see. If it is, it will add to the enormous barrow load of evidence that this government is not only in disarray, but also disintegrating before our eyes, in all capacities. There is fighting within the cabinet and distrust and fighting between the so-called alliance partners in the government.

Point of Order

Mrs L.M. Harvey: The third reading debate is generally confined to the content of the consideration in detail debate, and generally is not a wideranging discussion on extraneous issues.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms L.L. Baker): Quite right, member. Member for Mandurah, I remind you that the third reading debate is about issues raised in the second reading debate. You cannot introduce anything new, and it is meant to be about the bill.

Mr D.A. Templeman: It is about the preceding debates.

The ACTING SPEAKER: That is correct.

Mr D.A. Templeman: Yes, and I was recounting the experience of the consideration in detail process.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member, it is not a general debate.

Debate Resumed

Mr D.A. Templeman: As you know, Madam Acting Speaker, it has been very tiring, particularly for someone from the regions who, of course, wishes to get back to his family this afternoon, because I have not seen them for nearly 100 hours.

Mr R.F. Johnson: It is too long.

Mr D.A. Templeman: Absolutely, so I am going to conclude my comments. I know that the members for Butler and Cannington, and I also understand —

Mr R.F. Johnson: I am, too.

Mr D.A. Templeman: There we are. I am sure that the member for Hillarys will get the call after me.

Mr A. Krsticevic (Carine) [3.50 pm]: I would like to make a couple of quick comments. I will not take too long on this because the Road Traffic Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2015 is a very important piece of legislation. As stated by other members, it covers a range of areas. We all spend a significant portion of our lives on the roads, and, if it is not us, it is our loved ones. Safety on our roads is a serious part of our life so we need to ensure that everything is working as well as possible on our roads.

When I looked through this bill, one of the first things that amazed me was that people as instructors who teach others to drive currently can have alcohol in their system. I was shocked by that. To think that anybody would consider teaching their son or daughter, or nephew or niece, to drive on a learner's permit while under the influence of alcohol just amazes me. One thing that I often reflect on is the lack of personal responsibility by many people out there who do the wrong thing and do not take their role seriously. This Parliament can put legislation in place, but what is happening in our court system and the stories on the news every night still make us shake our head in amazement at how some people have no level of personal responsibility and take everything for granted. The roads are a dangerous place. I have taught my son to drive and I am teaching one of my daughters at the moment. I cannot imagine even for one second that I would do it under the influence of alcohol. Just the idea of them knowing that that is happening, and knowing that I would be setting such a bad example for them at an early stage, is abhorrent to me. I am glad that that will now be an offence, but, at the same time, I am shocked that it even needs to be in the legislation and that people would consider doing that in the first place. Although we have laws in this country, people still do not necessarily adhere to them. I hope that people do not do that. There is always a percentage of the population who, no matter what we introduce and whatever the penalties are, still break the law, which is very disappointing.

The first phase of education is in our schools with the driving for life certificate. It is important to make sure that that education happens through not only the education system, but also parents. As the member for Willagee said, parents need to talk to their children about all aspects of life, including not only driving on the roads and coming into contact with alcohol and drugs, but also being distracted as a driver by things such as mobile phones. I know that technology, for our younger generation, is a disease. It is very difficult for them to keep their hands away from their mobile devices, which seem to be all-consuming in their lives. That is something that needs to be discussed at length with them. It will not sink into their heads straightaway, but it will happen over a prolonged period.

At the same time, when we see people doing the wrong thing, each of us, as members of the community, should say that something is not being done properly. We should be able to raise it with people without being scared of reprisals or getting them upset or angry. We should be able to say to them that something is unacceptable in our society because it is dangerous and puts lives at risk—not just their life but the lives of others. We need to do better on that front. As a community, we have probably let that slip a little bit, and have given that responsibility to others. Of course, nobody knows who these others are. It is very difficult then to get things happening from that perspective.

In debate on this bill, members talked about road design; I am always looking at road design in my electorate of Carine. The 40-kilometre-an-hour flashing signs in schools zones have been rolled out. I pushed hard for that to happen in my electorate. All my schools have them now, and it has made a huge difference to road safety. People who are not familiar with an area do not necessarily know that they are going past a school zone without these signs. Great work has been done in that respect, and it puts our children in a much safer place.

The alcohol interlocks program is another great thing that will come online. The thing I want to talk about quickly with road design is that people get frustrated on our roads. Everyone seems to be in a hurry to get somewhere. When I talk to my kids, I say, "If you speed and rush, you will be the first person to get to the next set of traffic lights. That is pretty much as far as you will get. Depending on where they are going, they will not get there much faster—a couple of minutes earlier perhaps." Speeding will not make a big difference from that point of view. However, road design can also create problems whether by putting in traffic lights or increasing the number of turning lanes. Sometimes people find it difficult to turn left or right and the traffic banks up behind them, so people get frustrated, upset and nervous, which creates more problems.

Increasing the penalty for careless driving causing death or grievous bodily harm from a \$600 fine to up to three years in jail and \$36 000 is a step in the right direction. People need to take responsibility for their actions. We see people who frequently drive carelessly on the roads, which can lead to road rage. They do not necessarily cause death or grievous bodily harm, but at the same time there must be serious consequences for that behaviour—likewise for drivers under the influence of drugs and alcohol. The testing regime for that is very important and people need to be accountable for their actions.

This bill covers a range of areas. I am proud of the fact that the government is introducing this legislation and hopefully it will get through the upper house as quickly as possible and we can have it enacted. I am grateful to the minister for the work that has been put into this legislation. I know that it is not the end of road. There is always room for improvement and changes. We will never get it 100 per cent right, but every little bit helps and we are heading in the right direction. Hopefully, members will at least acknowledge the good work in the bill, even though things can always be improved in the future.

MR R.F. JOHNSON (Hillarys) [3.57 pm]: The previous speaker brought up issues that were debated in the consideration in detail stage of the Road Traffic Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2015, and that is fair enough, but I just want to take issue with a couple of comments that he made—or at least clarify my position on them. As I mentioned during consideration in detail, I have concerns about the massive \$36 000 fine and

three-year imprisonment of somebody who is alleged to have not driven carefully and was distracted. As it was said many times during consideration in detail, there are varying degrees of distraction. If a person uses their mobile phone while driving, which is completely against the Road Traffic Act, and they kill somebody, they should get a prison sentence, because it is an action taken purposefully, deliberately and intentionally. However, if some poor devil is purely and unintentionally distracted, and then perhaps has the lifetime misfortune and horrific memories of injuring or killing somebody, that is a bit too tough. I am not weak on crime or sentencing. I would hang people if I had had my way for certain crimes—when it is a crime against children I would certainly do that. But I am concerned that when good people who are distracted just for a moment by kids screaming in the back seat or a dog running along the footpath, something that takes their eyes off the road for a moment, other than using their mobile phone, it seems to me to be a bit too harsh. I would be very surprised if any court imposes the sentence that the minister has put into this legislation. I do not believe that any court would do that under those circumstances. I think it could have been made a lot clearer. I hope that when this legislation reaches the other place, some learned people there will have some commonsense and legal expertise and ensure that that is clarified in a much better way. I do not want to see good and innocent people who have been genuinely distracted for just a moment being sent to prison for three years—not that they would. I do not think they would. But if the courts are not going to do that, why put it in the legislation? It is just to try to sound tough.

This bill has been a long, long time coming. It was brought into this house last November, I think it was, and now we have only 21 days left of this house sitting, unless the Premier decides that we will sit another week or two weeks, which I think we should do. There is so much legislation still to debate and I believe that is what should happen. We have a responsibility to debate legislation and to ensure that nothing is left on the notice paper and falls away when Parliament prorogues. It will be prorogued as soon as both houses rise, because the Premier will not want any committees sitting because they might come up with some findings that are not favourable to the government.

This legislation has been a long time coming and I certainly criticised this at the consideration in detail stage. I have very serious concerns that the minister has simply pooh-poohed the idea of doing anything about drunk and drug-drivers who kill somebody. She is not prepared to listen to what I think was a reasonable argument that every member on this side of the house supported.

Mrs L.M. Harvey interjected.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: She said she would bring in something with minimum mandatory sentences. In her response, can the minister tell me what sort of minimum mandatory sentence? Would she support five years? Would she support 10 years?

Mrs L.M. Harvey: I will bring that to Parliament when I have crafted it, member.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The minister will not have time. Let me tell the minister what I will do. It will follow on from what happened at the consideration in detail stage. I will introduce another bill —

Mrs L.M. Harvey: Another bill!

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Yes, another bill.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: Clever boy!

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: It will put the minister on the spot—it really will. It will show what a weak minister she is and how long it has taken her to bring in this legislation. The government has been talking about authorised drivers supervising their children or whoever is a learner for five years. It was going to happen just towards the end of my time. The minister is debating it only now. What has the minister been doing for the last four years? She has been taking a minister's salary and she has been doing stuff all, quite frankly.

Mrs L.M. Harvey interjected.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I will look at what has been said at the consideration in detail stage and take great note of it, and I will bring another bill to this house and I will cover in that bill the areas that this minister said —

Mrs L.M. Harvey interjected.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Do not keep interrupting, please. It is very rude, you know. You took your time getting up to speak and you were so nervous. You were getting your dot points from Dixie and Narelle —

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms J.M. Freeman): Member, it is the third reading. Stay on the third reading, please.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Can you protect me from this bully, please?

The ACTING SPEAKER: I can protect anyone in the house, member. You need to understand that you need to keep it to the third reading.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I am doing that, but I just do not like the interjections from the minister.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Do not introduce new information.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I am not. I am saying that a new bill will have to result from that.

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Cannington. I am perfectly capable.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I will cover those areas that were debated at the consideration in detail stage. I will introduce a bill that has a mandatory minimum sentence for drunk drivers and drug-drivers causing death. I will make sure that when those drivers get out of jail, they will not be able to apply after 10 years for another licence. I will cover those areas. I wonder what excuses the minister will bring in then to try to knock that on the head.

I have to tell the minister that the alcohol interlock systems that we have talked about have been in the pipeline for a long time. I have never been greatly supportive of that system. I did it because the Road Safety Council suggested it in its recommendations. I listen to the Road Safety Council and its independent chairman. In the third reading debate we are talking about alcohol interlock systems. Will Madam Acting Speaker give me a bit of leeway to talk about that? That was a recommendation. I was not over the moon about it. Since then I have had people who have been watching the debate contact me, and somebody told me that a person can very simply blow into a balloon before they get drunk, tie it up and keep it in the back of their car, and after they get in their car after having had a few drinks, they let some of that air into the device that registers whether there is alcohol present. There are ways around it. The minister will be laughing on the other side of her face when that comes to light, and it will come to light. I went along with it because the Road Safety Council said that it was a good idea and a good recommendation. I listened to the Road Safety Council. I did not dream up things of my own—well, one or two things I did, such as crushing cars and confiscating cars from hoon drivers, but not things such as this.

The alcohol interlock system is supposed to be put in place in October. That is what we were told at the consideration in detail stage; I will not hold my breath and see whether that happens because I have heard promises before from this minister that have come to nothing. I do not want to keep the house any longer because I think there has been so much debate on this bill, which has been so long in coming. I will do my bit and I will act on behalf of the families of victims who have been killed by drunk drivers and I will never let up. I will bring that bill back to this house and we will see how much substance this minister might show.

MR J.R. QUIGLEY (Butler) [4.07 pm]: I preface my comments on the third reading of the Road Traffic Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2015 by noting the following: none of the provisions in this bill is aimed at reducing the number of fender dents. They are aimed at something much more serious—that is, reducing the number of serious injuries and deaths on our roads. I am always left gobsmacked by the attitude to deaths on our roads by our community. I am looking here at the published figures for deaths on our roads since 1999, when it was 217. It fell a little bit and went back up to 200. Last year it was down to 161, which is the lowest. It was 164 back in 2005. Let us say that 160 is the lowest it has been in the past 10 years. We could add up any of these figures in three-year batches and find that in any three-year period there are nigh on 500 deaths on our roads. I am of the generation that was there when the Vietnam War was on and Sir Robert Menzies announced conscription. I remember that year—the death of my mother—1965. It was introduced in, I believe, 1966.

Mr W.J. Johnston: Don Chipp's death raffle.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: Don Chipp's death raffle—that is it. We remained in Vietnam until 1972. There was a reduction of troops from about 1971 onwards. All in all, from my recollection, there were 501 Aussie deaths in Vietnam, but I read somewhere the other day that there were 521, so I do not know which figure is the reliable one.

Mr J.M. Francis: It is 521.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: The minister is telling me 521, so I will run with that. In any three-year period, in our best performance on the roads, there have been as many people, if not more people, dying on our roads than there were soldiers who died in Vietnam over a seven-year period. I can remember the community's reaction as those Australian troops came home. Mothers of the fallen were in the streets. The community became one against those deaths and against sending further young Australians overseas to their deaths. Yet it is almost with ambivalence that the community regards the shocking road toll in any three-year period, which per year is more than double the rate—nearly treble the rate—of combat soldiers who died facing machine guns in the jungles of Vietnam. The community reacted loudly and enduringly against that wicked waste of life, yet here we face more deaths per year than this community ever faced at war—I am talking about all Australian soldiers. Western Australia has more road deaths in a three-year period than the whole of the Australian Defence Force had in the seven years of a vicious war.

I note that three-quarters of the Western Australian population lives in the metropolitan area, yet consistently the 25 per cent of the population that lives in the regions suffers more road deaths than the population in the metropolitan area. Last year, that figure was 87 deaths in the regions versus 74, and in 2014 there were 108 deaths in the regions and 74 in the metropolitan area.

This legislation is chipping away at the problem. It extends to 12 hours the period of time for taking samples for analysis when more than four hours have elapsed between the time of the fatality and the time of testing, and it increases the scope of people who can conduct the testing. That is important. I remember appearing for a police officer who had been drinking at dinner in Marble Bar and who while driving home from the roadhouse across the little bridge in Marble Bar had struck an Indigenous woman dressed in black. Marble Bar did not have an operative sampling machine, an Alcotest, so the nearest police station, Nullagine, was called and there was a 200 or 300-kilometre race against the clock. With minutes to spare, officers got to Marble Bar to administer the test, but it was done under so much pressure that they did not comply with some of the technicalities. It became a controversy in the paper because people thought that the situation had been set up, that the police had come slowly with the alcohol testing machine to preserve their brother in Marble Bar. In those days the road between Marble Bar and Nullagine was unsealed, and when the journey was timed it was found that the constables had to put the station car under the hammer to get to Marble Bar. They were under so much pressure that in the precious few minutes they had left to administer the test—I think it was only two minutes—they mucked it up, so there was no admissible breath test. I think that if the legislation at that time was per this bill, that case would have had a different outcome.

Mr W.J. Johnston: Potentially, because you do not know what the proper conducted test would show.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: My colleague says “potentially”, because I do not know what the test would have been, and of course legal professional privilege would bind me from giving an opinion. Anyway, this is an important step forward in a state as diverse as Western Australia and when we have so many deaths in the regions.

Perhaps, controversially, I would go further. Given that, as I have said, every three years we have more road deaths in Western Australia than we had in the Vietnam War within the entire Australian Defence Force—I would be unpopular—I would have every licensed car equipped with an alcometer.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: That would save only a quarter of them. There are still other issues that lead to road traffic deaths.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: That would reduce it by about 50 deaths.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: Hopefully, alcohol interlocks will reduce some of that.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: Yes, but they are only for recidivists. First of all a person has to be convicted. I think, for example, of the mother in my electorate who did not have a record and who transported her daughter unsecured by a seatbelt in the rear of, I think, a LandCruiser—it was a four-wheel drive vehicle without a third row of seats. She was snaking up Marmion Avenue and swerving from side to side, because at the party where her girls had been she had had a few drinks with another mother. She lost control of the LandCruiser in the sandy median strip in Quinns Rock, rolled it, and her daughter died. That woman has to live with that for the rest of her life. Whilst it would save only a quarter of the lives lost, on the figures that is 50 Western Australians per annum. That is more than two football teams per annum. That is my opinion.

I remember the controversy in the 1950s when seatbelts were first introduced. I still remember seeing my first seatbelt in a car as a child and saying, “Who would hop in and muck around trying to get this on?” In those days we used to stand up behind dad’s seat in the Austin A40.

Mr W.J. Johnston: My mum had a Standard Vanguard and I used to stand up behind her.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: The Austin A40 had a drive shaft that came in from down the back. I would stand on that. Talk about the danger. I could have been catapulted through the windscreen.

I think I could go further. I would be happy to see every car with an alcohol interlock, especially in the regions. The social life is such in the regions that people have to travel long distances. The sort of social events people in the regions go to generally involve alcohol. It is the footy club show or driving to another town to a bowling carnival or a cricket match, travelling distances that people in the metropolitan area do not contemplate. It is nothing to travel 120 kilometres to go and play the other football team, and then have a few beers after football and drive back to the farm. It is very dangerous.

I support and have supported, as the minister knows, all the provisions of the bill. However, I wanted to rise to address my continuing concerns, which are twofold. The first is cumulative or concurrent penalties, which the minister has undertaken in this chamber to address.

This is a vexed question. Cumulative or concurrent licence suspensions is a vexed question because there are a number of offences that a person can be charged with in a traffic crash. One might be dangerous driving, which I think carries nine demerit points, and another might be driving under the influence. If the person has three demerit points already, they will lose nine demerit points for the dangerous driving and will therefore be suspended, and for driving under the influence they will get a nine-month suspension. Both those suspensions will run concurrently. The magistrate has the ability to up that because the nine months for driving under the influence is not a statutory minimum. It could be more; it is up to the magistrate. However, the offence of failing

to report is a separate offence away from the accident. The person has done what they have done at the scene—drunken driving, reckless driving or whatever—but then they have decamped the scene and subsequently put their mind to committing a further offence—that they will not tell the police about it. That is the situation in which it should be cumulative for a subsequent offence. The minister has said there are other consequential amendments. I would be a little worried if those consequential amendments—we have not seen them yet—go to every offence in the road traffic calendar, because as I said before, some of those could happen concurrently at the crash. It should be up to the discretion of the court to weigh how much penalty the driver gets for that action on that intersection and the manner in which they drove there and then. But when the person leaves there and then makes a further decision down the track to try to secrete the whole thing, that should become an extra cumulative penalty and not be wound up in the penalty there. That is my one concern. The minister has undertaken to do something about that and introduce something in the other place.

I have seen reports coming out of New South Wales on the drug testing area. The actual wording of the Road Traffic Act at section 64AB(1) is, in part —

A person who drives ... a motor vehicle while impaired by drugs commits an offence, ...

New South Wales has a very prevalent drug testing regime. I have read the cases, because I subscribe to *The Sydney Morning Herald* and *The New York Times* to find out what happens beyond our little borough, and following *The Sydney Morning Herald* I saw cases in which people had driven a car two days after they had consumed cannabis, it was detected positive in their body, and they then suffered a term of suspension of their licence. Some of those people are tradesmen. These are not the people we are trying to pick up. We are trying to pick up people who are in control of the vehicle in such a condition as not to be 100 per cent on top of their game by reason of impairment. The minister says that she agrees it is impairment. However, often something is just detected. It is said that that is not the case with alcohol, but it happened to be. I have had the experience of consuming alcohol—one measure of Campari with my orange juice and soda, as I am wont to do some mornings—and then got one of those early morning breath tests and have blown 0.00. A person knows they are right and they have had only the minimum. But what is the deterrence for people? Increasing penalties? No. This is proven time and again. It is the risk of being caught and exposed to any penalty.

The advent of the so-called booze bus went a long way to deterring so many in our community from any risky behaviour. It was the advent of the booze bus and its big prominence, and then, of course, the other random testing stations. I can remember when random breath testing was first introduced. There was an outcry in the community that it was picking on the innocent, and that it was almost unconstitutional. But it is that risk of being caught. I understand that our state is so large and widespread, but we look at all these provisions in these acts, and we understand them, but 99.9 per cent of people out there driving cars will never read this legislation and the only thing that will ameliorate or change their behaviour is the risk of being caught.

If we are going to attack the number of road deaths, even the member for Hillarys' amendment sort of deals with the matter ex post facto. We have to deter them before they get behind a wheel if we are going to save a life. If we want to save lives, we have really got to attack this area of country road deaths and the consumption of alcohol in the country. I understand their problem, because there are long distances to social events and such, but we have to get more deterrents out on the roads in the country. It is becoming killing fields out there. Twenty-five per cent of our population are producing over 50 per cent of our deaths. It is just a tragedy and I have tried to give it the context of the number of people we lost in the Vietnam War over a seven-year period. In Western Australia we are ticking that up every three years.

I support the measures in this bill. I am worried about the unintended consequences of some of the drug testing, unless it is shot back to impairment, which I totally support, and the other measures of extending the time and the manner of testing are all good. That is my contribution to the third reading debate.

MRS L.M. HARVEY (Scarborough — Minister for Road Safety) [4.27 pm] — in reply: It is my pleasure to rise and close debate on the third reading of the Road Traffic Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2015. I appreciate contributions from all members and also their understanding in moving through the legislation in what involved a long series of amendments on the notice paper. I note members' comments about that. With the benefit of hindsight it might have been easier and perhaps a bit tidier if we had pulled together some of those amendments on the notice paper into a separate bill for the sake of easing the confusion and making it easier to follow for those people in Parliament who did not have the opportunity to avail themselves of a briefing to understand what was happening with the legislation. That is a lesson learned for me, and one that I would certainly take into consideration should there be another suite of amendments of that nature proposed for me to place on the notice paper again.

The point-to-point system that we have now legislated for will go to the Council for its approval. Just to be clear with members, we have a trial in place. However, that will go for six months from October 2016 through to April 2017. There will be an assessment of the systems as we move through that six month period. We have

that trial period to ensure that the system performs well and that it integrates appropriately with police systems so that we can ensure that we do not have to return to infringements, as has happened elsewhere, I am advised. The cameras, the gantries and all the equipment in the trial will remain in place permanently. Once this legislation has passed through both houses of Parliament and is gazetted, we will be able to infringe people under that point-to-point trial, which is the first of its kind in Western Australia.

Many members have talked of the road toll. It is moving in the right direction, albeit we regret every death on our roads. We have the Towards Zero strategy in place to try to correct the road toll. For members' information, in 2000 the road toll was 212 individuals in Western Australia who lost their lives, which equates to 11.31 deaths per 100 000 people.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Over the years, that has come down. In 2007, there were 235 deaths, which is 11.16 deaths per 100 000 people, and in 2014, there were 182 deaths, which is 7.07 deaths per 100 000 people, and there are some variations in between those years. Although we are moving in the right direction, obviously, as Minister for Road Safety and Minister for Police, I want to reduce that number as low as it can go.

Members spoke of the delay in bringing this legislation to Parliament and whether it was prioritised appropriately. In my tenure as minister, I have brought about 12 pieces of legislation to this place, including the three-strikes laws, the violent home invader laws, the Graffiti Vandalism Bill, the Terrorism (Extraordinary Powers) Amendment Bill, the Misuse of Drugs Amendment (Psychoactive Substances) Bill, the Road Traffic Amendment (Alcohol Interlocks and Other Matters) Bill, the Mandatory Testing (Infectious Diseases) Bill, the Criminal Investigation (Identifying People) Amendment Bill and a range of others that I will not go through, including a suite of Road Traffic Act amendments, which I think it is important to highlight, that introduced a significant increase in penalties for speeding, distraction, drink-driving, concealing numberplates and a range of other offences. I am pleased that, with the cooperation of other members in this place, we have been able to pass that amending bill as well to allow us to have penalties that are consistent with those in other states for these sorts of infringements of our system.

I appreciate the member for Butler's contribution to the debate. We had a discussion about the amendment he moved during the consideration in detail stage of the bill to allow the periods of licence disqualification to be cumulative for certain offences. I appreciate his understanding in withdrawing that amendment so that we could do some more work on it. Should that amendment be agreed to, it will allow for a cumulative disqualification period for offences under certain parts of the Road Traffic Act, including leaving the scene of a crash and failing to report a crash. It would seem sensible to apply that cumulative requirement for the disqualification offences to some other sections of the act for consistency. Obviously, I will discuss those with the member for Butler before we place that amendment on the notice paper for debate in the other place.

On the idea of an alcometer in every vehicle, members might be interested to know that any person can purchase an alcohol interlock and install it in their vehicle. They are available and they can be used. Indeed, as the mother of two children, one of whom will be learning to drive shortly, it is one of those things that I have considered at length. However, I would like to think that the education and the conversations that my children have had in the home as a result of my experiences as Minister for Police; Road Safety may have them making far better choices than some others unfortunately do when they get behind the wheel of a vehicle.

With respect to the drug impairment offences and residual traces of drugs still yielding a positive result, my query with that and the reason I would not be seeking necessarily to change the way that we apply those tests for drug impairment is that although there can be traces of drugs in a person's system many days after they have consumed the drug, one has to wonder whether there are traces of the drug racing around the system and it is still having an effect on the nervous system and the brain and the ability for someone to react in those emergency circumstances on our roads. My view is that any residual trace of those drugs could potentially lead to impairment, so I would not be seeking to change the way that we currently calculate those drug offences and the way that the ChemCentre works out the traces of drugs that constitute the offence under the legislation.

The member made comments about penalties not being a deterrent. I believe that penalties are a deterrent to some people; indeed, the research shows that. Some people need to get caught once before they change their behaviour; others need further interventions. For some people, the deterrent is the risk of getting caught, rather than receiving the penalty in the first place. That is why we have a road safety strategy that works on education programs, deterrents with penalties, alcohol interlock devices that prevent people from driving after they have imbibed alcohol and blow over a certain level, and having people take personal responsibility for their actions when they are behind the wheel of a vehicle. Ultimately, every motorist and every person granted a driver's licence in Western Australia needs to understand that that licence is a privilege and it comes with a suite of responsibilities to behave appropriately on the road for the safety of all users of that road—not only motorists, but also cyclists, pedestrians and any other person who might be on that road. That is the challenge we have. It is a cultural challenge, and most of those cultural challenges need a firm commitment to education campaigns, which is where a significant amount of our funding from the road trauma trust account has gone this year.

I thank members for their contributions to the debate. Once again, I take on board the criticism about the many amendments that were placed on the notice paper. As I said, with the benefit of hindsight, I might take a different tack next time if that many amendments are presented to an amending bill. However, I would also like to say that in good faith we offered a comprehensive briefing a number of times through the Leader of the Opposition's office and had two appointments for briefings cancelled. Had members availed themselves of that opportunity for a comprehensive briefing on what was a very technical and complex piece of legislation, I think that it may have been a much easier interrogation and perhaps we may have had a couple of earlier nights. For my part, the effort that everyone has put into the debate on this amending legislation is very much appreciated, and I hope that it receives a smoother passage through the Legislative Council.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILLS

Returned

1. Appropriation (Recurrent 2016–17) Bill 2016.
2. Appropriation (Capital 2016–17) Bill 2016.

Bills returned from the Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

Special

On motion without notice by **Mr J.H.D. Day (Leader of the House)**, resolved —

That the house at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, 6 September 2016, at 2.00 pm.

House adjourned at 4.39 pm
