

Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Arthur Marshall; Mr Dan Barron-Sullivan; Mr Martin Whitely; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Chairman; Mr David Templeman

---

**Division 53: Transport, \$20 756 000 -**

Ms Guise, Chairman.

Mrs Roberts, Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure.

Mr G.E. Hodge, Acting Director General of Transport.

Ms R. Barrow, Director, Director General Support.

Mr W.T. Halliday, Executive Director, Licensing Services.

Mr I. Cameron, Executive Director, Office of Road Safety.

Mr P.M. Crew, Senior Project Officer, Office of Director General.

Mr R.E. Carleton, Chief Financial Officer, Corporate Services.

Mrs HODSON-THOMAS: My question relates to the second dot point of significant issues and trends on page 894 of the *Budget Statements*, which states -

Programs to inform and motivate the community on the safe use of the transport system are becoming increasingly important to cater for a growing, ageing and steadily more urbanised population.

Will the minister expand on the commitments to cut advertising? The cutting of advertising in the area of road safety would be seen as detrimental. I would support that amount being maintained rather than cut. Will the minister expand on that?

Mrs ROBERTS: I am pleased to report that, far from expecting a cut in the area of road safety and road safety advertising, our overall community awareness package will indicate an increased amount. That will be brought about for a couple of reasons: first, no cut is being made to the road trauma trust fund. As members will be aware, one-third of all the money from speed camera and red light camera revenue goes to the road trauma trust fund. Within that is a significant component for community education, which includes advertising, and there is no government measure to decrease the budget of the road trauma trust fund. Those moneys will be allocated in the normal fashion. In addition, we are allocating the other two-thirds - the remainder of that revenue - to road safety initiatives. While the full details of that two-thirds have not yet been presented to the Parliament, they will be in due course, and will no doubt involve a community education component. A number of advertising campaigns are progressing at the moment. I will ask Mr Cameron to outline some of those community education campaigns and our expanded efforts in that area.

Mr CAMERON: Those campaigns continue to target the four priority factors known to be causing, or adding to the severity of, road trauma - speeding, drink driving, fatigue and the non-use of seatbelts. The road safety recommended campaigns tend to emphasise and focus on those priority areas. Some examples in the coming year are an amount of approximately \$1 million allocated to speeding campaigns, reinforcing messages such as "10 kilometres over the limit makes a big difference" and "Slow down. Save lives." In addition, anticipating at the end of this year a move to introduce 50 kilometres an hour speed limits on local streets, a further \$750 000 has been allocated for an extensive community education campaign to ensure that, once an implementation date is confirmed, all drivers are well informed about those proposed changes. A sum of \$1 million has also been allocated to warn against the risk of drink driving in those other priority areas, and \$400 000 will go to educate drivers about the dangers of fatigue. An amount of \$545 000 is allocated for a restraints campaign for adults and children in regional areas. We will continue to promote key messages such as the Belt Up program through our sports sponsorships, particularly in regional areas. The campaign focus at community level is enhanced and enforced by local activities in local communities. An amount of \$1.2 million is allocated to the RoadWise local government road safety initiative. Local road safety projects that support the mass media campaign are conducted through the program.

[2.10 pm]

Mr MARSHALL: I have a supplementary question. What is the position of the antidrink-driving advertisement that shows two men drinking at a bar and light-heartedly discussing the consequences of drinking and driving? It is currently on hold. Will the advertisement be reintroduced or has it been shelved forever?

Mrs ROBERTS: There is no permanent shelving of the advertisement. The Office of Road Safety is considering its Christmas campaign. The drink-driving campaign is one that normally features at Christmas, for understandable reasons. It is currently evaluating the advertisement campaign. In the near future I expect to receive a report from the Office of Road Safety about the proposed Christmas campaign. The advertisement the member is referring to is still under consideration and has not been shelved permanently. I am interested in the member's feedback on whether he supports the advertisement.

Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Arthur Marshall; Mr Dan Barron-Sullivan; Mr Martin Whitely; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Chairman; Mr David Templeman

---

Mr MARSHALL: Everyone I have spoken to has supported it. It is established that the television campaigns are very successful. Speed, drink-driving and fatigue are the major causes of accidents. As causes, how do they average out? Are all the causes equal? Has it been established how important fatigue is as a factor? By how much have accidents attributed to fatigue dropped? Is it 50 per cent or 80 per cent? I am interested in the figures.

Mrs ROBERTS: It is very difficult to assess the impact of any specific advertisement or campaign on driver behaviour. Some things are easily assessed. People's recall of particular advertisements can be measured. The impact of a specific advertisement on drivers' behaviour is less quantifiable. Driving attitudes are monitored over time. If a strong campaign is run, a survey can be conducted of drivers' attitudes before and after the campaign. I recently launched a campaign about people speeding more than 10 kilometres an hour over the limit. Speeding by more than that amount has an impact. Qualitative research was conducted in advance that indicated there were two main factors that would make people drive more slowly. One factor was if people believed that by travelling more than 10 kilometres an hour over the limit they could do serious harm or cause the death of another person. Nobody likes the idea of being responsible for that. That message was taken on board. We need to convince people that by driving more than 10 kilometres an hour over the limit they are much more likely to maim or kill someone. The second factor is people's risk of being penalised by way of a fine or infringement. Preliminary analysis indicates that those are the two factors that have to be homed in on. Advertising campaigns are based on those two factors. Monitoring and evaluation of drivers' attitudes are conducted at the end of a campaign. None of it is simple. It is difficult when a number of factors are at play. After the attack on the World Trade Centre on 11 September, a lot of people were driving like zombies. The movements and behaviour of people seemed to slow down. Many more people were driving more slowly. An advertising campaign could have been run at the same time and it could have been assumed that that was the reason fewer people were picked up for speeding. It is hard to work out cause and effect.

Mr MARSHALL: What is the cost of producing an advertisement?

Mr CAMERON: Costs vary quite widely. It depends on the advertisement. Costs can range between \$150 000 and \$450 000.

Mr MARSHALL: What was the budget for the drink-driving advertisement that has since been shelved?

Mrs ROBERTS: That campaign was run on a couple of occasions. Campaigns are often developed and run, and then shelved. Some are brought out of mothballs and some are not. The Office of Road Safety determines what it targets. It could be speed, fatigue, drink-driving or seatbelts. It looks at what it has on the shelf as well as its budget. Sometimes it will go with a new campaign and at other times it will go with a mix of previously used advertisements. New research is coming out all the time. Recent research indicates that too much regular advertising can have the reverse effect on people; people start tuning out. It is necessary for the Office of Road Safety to make assessments. There is no point in spending money if it is counterproductive.

Mrs HODSON-THOMAS: I hold a view contrary to that of the member for Dawesville. I think it was a wise decision to pull the advertisement. People end up switching off. Upon seeing the advertisement for the first time, my immediate reaction was to turn off the television. Such action does not target the motorist. If my reaction is the normal reaction to an advertisement, I think we are missing the point. It is a shame my view is contrary to the member's.

Mr MARSHALL: I did not give a view. I gave the views of those people who had spoken to me. I was smart.

Mrs ROBERTS: All advertisements will create mixed views. Some people think that the advertisement showing children on tricycles is fantastic and very effective. When the advertisement comes on my television I have to reach for the remote control. It has catchy music; it is like Sesame Street. I have a two-year-old who wants to tune into the advertisement. She then asks what happened and starts crying about the child hit by the car. I can see no point in inflicting that on a two-year-old. Other people must make the assessment. With such an advertisement, it is very important to take the community along. The community must be in line with the laws introduced and the changes made. If people do not think laws are sensible, they will not obey them.

Accords have been developed with the liquor industry, especially on drink-driving. A number of campaigns have been run in conjunction with the liquor industry. Many outlets hand out drink coasters that have safe drinking messages on them. It is important to maintain reasonable links with people in the liquor industry so they will continue to promote safe drinking through their venues. There has been some underplaying of the need for a relationship with members of the Australian Hotels Association. The businesses are legal and are visited by many members of the community. They are good venues for promoting safety messages. A campaign was run recently in Kalgoorlie in conjunction with the local liquor industry. People who had a blood alcohol level of 0.00 when picked up by the police went into a draw to win a dinner for two at one of the liquor accord hotels.

Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Arthur Marshall; Mr Dan Barron-Sullivan; Mr Martin Whitely; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Chairman; Mr David Templeman

---

There are ways to change community opinion and develop appropriate relationships that help change attitudes about sensible drinking and "grabbing a skipper".

[2.20 pm]

Mr BARRON-SULLIVAN: I draw the minister's attention to page 895, the section on the decisions taken since the state election, and particularly the priority and assurance dividend. Will the minister indicate how the priority and assurance dividend of \$5.459 million was determined and what programs will be omitted? What cuts will be made to make up that amount of money? I am also intrigued to know whether that includes the amount for the transfer of funds from the Department of Transport to pay for the 50 transit police who were mentioned in another session, or will that be funded differently?

Mrs ROBERTS: I can explain what comprises the priority and assurance dividend of \$5.459 million. It is a saving from the abolition of motor vehicle immobiliser subsidies. The removal of that subsidy will result in a saving of \$5 million a year. The other cost cuts in the order of \$500 000 presumably relate to travel, advertising and consultancy savings.

Mr BARRON-SULLIVAN: That is a separate amount underneath the figure of \$5.459 million; that makes \$6 million all up.

Mr CARLETON: The other \$459 000 is a cut across the whole division's expenditure so it could come in consumables and other items like that. It has not been specifically identified, but it is a cut across the department's budget.

Mrs ROBERTS: We are looking at management and administration areas.

Mr BARRON-SULLIVAN: Therefore, the department has been told to tighten its belt by that amount?

Mrs ROBERTS: That is right. One of the areas in which it can do that is by further cutting its travel, consultancy and advertising costs.

Mr BARRON-SULLIVAN: Where does the transfer of funds from the department for the transit police appear, if that is not in there? In other words, what went by the bye to fund that, because that is not new money?

Mrs ROBERTS: The member for Mitchell is asking a question under a different division. That question should have been put to the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure yesterday.

Mr WHITELY: The Government has withdrawn its subsidy for the purchase and fitting of vehicle immobilisers. However, vehicles still cannot be registered or transferred without immobilisers. What impact will this have on motor vehicle owners?

Mrs ROBERTS: The original subsidy of \$30 was introduced as an incentive. It was designed to increase the number of cars in Western Australia that had immobilisers, thus reducing motor vehicle theft. During the time that the fitting of immobilisers was not compulsory, despite the fact that the Government had allocated about \$20 million over four years, the incentive was not being taken up in the numbers that were anticipated. As a result, the then Government moved to make immobilisers compulsory, and to increase the subsidy to \$40. It is estimated that over 375 000 subsidy payments were made to immobiliser installers over that period. The same rate of take-up will continue to occur even though the subsidy has been withdrawn, because we are not removing the compulsory nature of immobilisers. At the point of registration or transfer of a car, it will still be compulsory to fit an immobiliser. The market for the installation of immobilisers is very competitive and it is still possible to get a good deal.

Mr MARSHALL: I refer the minister to dot point five on page 898. When will the 50 kilometres an hour speed limit be introduced, and what funds have been allocated for its implementation, regulation and monitoring?

Mrs ROBERTS: One of the lessons learnt from other places that introduced the 50 kilometres an hour speed limit, such as Victoria, is that one must be well prepared before its introduction. We want the transition to the 50 kilometres an hour speed limit to be as smooth as possible, so that has involved a lot of consultation between local government authorities regarding roads in their areas and Main Roads Western Australia. I am sure that some members have noticed that 60 kilometres an hour signs have already gone up on some of our major roads, such as Beaufort and William Streets. We took the option of making 50 kilometres an hour the default speed limit, so as part of that process we must sign up the other roads for 60 kilometres an hour. That process is well under way. I expect that it will be completed in time for us to effectively introduce the 50 kilometres an hour speed limit on 1 December 2001, but we will make an announcement. As Mr Cameron pointed out, there is about \$750 000 in the budget for the advertising campaign. Money has obviously been expended putting up the 60 kilometres an hour signage and the like. However, we are very keen to have a smooth transition, so

Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Arthur Marshall; Mr Dan Barron-Sullivan; Mr Martin Whitely; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Chairman; Mr David Templeman

---

absolutely everything must be in place before we announce that commencement date. The best estimate at this point is 1 December.

Mr MARSHALL: Is it correct that the speed limit on major roads will be 60 kilometres an hour; on other roads it will be 90, 100 or 110 kilometres an hour; and on roads that are not marked it will be 50 kilometres an hour?

Mrs ROBERTS: There is no change for those roads that have existing speed limits of 70, 80, 100 or 110 kilometres an hour. They will remain the same. The only roads that need to be signposted are the major arterial roads, and they will be signposted up to 60 kilometres an hour. That means that everywhere else the speed limit will be 50 kilometres an hour.

Mr MARSHALL: Except around schools?

Mrs ROBERTS: Except around schools, where at certain times the speed limit will be 40 kilometres an hour. Hopefully it will not be too confusing for the member for Dawesville!

Mr MARSHALL: I am not worried about myself, because I am a very alert driver and I have been driving longer than most. I know there will be a huge educational program. However, when I was driving in the eastern States I noticed the speed limit was painted on many of the roads and was not just displayed on a sign. I have noticed that also on Safety Bay Road where the 100 kilometres an hour limit starts to drop off to 80 kilometres an hour. Is there a move to put the speed limit on the roads as well?

Mrs ROBERTS: We are looking closely at developments in that area. I took up the opportunity to put the speed limit on roads around schools, and we are currently running a trial around a numbers of schools where we have put the 40 kilometres per hour speed limit on the road. The member is right; there tends to be a proliferation of signs at different venues. I am told that one of the most common excuses people use - I do not know whether or not it is true - when they are caught doing 60 or 70 kilometres per hour in a school zone in the morning or afternoon, when they should be doing 40 kilometres per hour, is "I did not see the sign." However, monitoring and evaluation is continuing on the issue of placing speed limits on roads. We are considering options for that but will take into consideration whether the expense of doing that is justified by a greater alertness or awareness of people to the speed limits.

[2.30 pm]

Mr MARSHALL: I commend the program.

Mr O'GORMAN: On page 895 under appropriations provided to purchase outputs, in 2000-01 the licensing division of transport was allocated \$12.953 million and expended \$19.799 million. However, in 2001-02, it has been allocated only \$14.395 million. Is this an under-appropriation?

Mrs ROBERTS: The member for Joondalup is referring to a reduction in the order of \$5 million per annum. That is a result of ceasing the immobiliser subsidy payment, which explains the difference in the figures.

Mrs HODSON-THOMAS: My question relates to the key effectiveness indicator on page 896. The number of motor vehicle fails was 36 000 in last year's budget with the estimated figure being 33 689. This year's target is 34 000 fails. That seems to be decreasing and the passes are increasing. Are any strategies being taken to reduce the number of people applying to do their licence and failing, and has any thought been given to reducing the number of fails?

Mrs ROBERTS: A number of factors affect this outcome, but one of the things we have introduced is the new graduated drivers scheme and that has had an impact.

I have just been advised that the member's question is about drivers, but the information that she has referred to concerns the number of failing vehicles.

Mrs HODSON-THOMAS: Sorry, that is my fault.

Mr BARRON-SULLIVAN: Having highlighted that issue, it presents a number of supplementary questions. Of the vehicles tested, 40 per cent failed the test. I would be interested to know - this may have to be provided as supplementary information - what percentage of the 86 000 passes relate to new vehicles? I want to identify the extent of problems with vehicles travelling on our roads at the moment. Therefore, what percentage of the passes relate to new vehicles and what percentage of the failures relate to vehicles that would be seriously unsafe on our roads? In other words, how many death traps are travelling around out there? What proportion of the 34 000 fails does the Department of Transport consider to be seriously unsafe?

Mrs ROBERTS: Presumably, when vehicles fail, they are no longer on the road. However, I am happy to provide the details that the member requires as supplementary information.

Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Arthur Marshall; Mr Dan Barron-Sullivan; Mr Martin Whitely; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Chairman; Mr David Templeman

---

Mr BARRON-SULLIVAN: What percentage of the vehicles that are on the road are tested? Of the 86 000 passed and the 34 000 failed vehicles - not including the ones that are brand new obviously - what percentage of the total number of vehicles on the road does that constitute?

Mrs ROBERTS: We can probably give an indication of the total number of vehicles on the road and the number of vehicles that are tested. I expect that within that information will be the figure for the number of those that are new vehicles. That information will be provided as supplementary information.

Mr BARRON-SULLIVAN: In view of the fact that 40 per cent of vehicles are failing these tests, is the minister or her department examining the need for annual vehicle inspections?

Mrs ROBERTS: No, that is not something that is under active consideration. There are many factors in there that the member may or may not be aware of. Sometimes, one vehicle may go for a test three times and fail. Somebody may be told that the vehicle is failing on a number of points. That person takes it away, does some repairs and then brings it back, and it could very well fail again. Therefore, the member should take into account that when he gets the figures there could be some double counting because one vehicle may fail on more than one occasion.

The CHAIRMAN: There are a number of parts to that question. Could the member for Mitchell clarify what he seeks as supplementary information and accordingly, can the minister state what information she will supply?

Mr BARRON-SULLIVAN: The first piece of information I require is the percentage or number of new vehicles out of the 86 000 vehicles that pass. The second is the percentage of failed vehicles that were deemed to be seriously unsafe - I am not talking about replacing the rubber on a footrest or something like that. Also, I would like a rough estimate of what percentage of vehicles on the road today are tested each year.

Mrs ROBERTS: I anticipate that I will be able to provide most of that detail as supplementary information. I am not necessarily confident that we will be able to differentiate between the vehicles that have failed for a minor fault and those that have failed for a major fault, but we will do our best.

Mr TEMPLEMAN: Can we ascertain the ages of vehicles that are on the roads, and can we also have a breakdown of that information?

Mrs ROBERTS: Yes, that can be provided.

Mr TEMPLEMAN: My question relates to the transport electronic licensing information system project that is mentioned on page 898 of the *Budget Statements*. This initiative will be a staged implementation. What is the total cost of the TRELIS project? If supplementary information needs to be provided on that, that is fine.

Mrs ROBERTS: Dot point three on that page in the *Budget Statements* states -

Continue staged implementation of the Transport Electronic Licensing Information System (TRELIS) in order to provide more accurate data, efficient business processes and better customer service.

TRELIS is a database. Treasury and the Department of Transport, through the cap speed program, have allocated \$18 million to the project to date including \$6.3 million in 2001-02. Licensing estimates that approximately \$5 million is required for hardware and software system enhancements. The Department of Transport was negotiating with the Insurance Commission of Western Australia to advance commission payments in the order of two to three per cent to secure those funds. Unfortunately, those negotiations have fallen through and have not been acceptable to transport or Treasury. Therefore, we need to secure an estimated \$5 million-plus to complete the project. The problem, of course, was that the previous Government again committed to a project but did not provide enough funding for it in the out years. I have now found that to appropriately fund that project, and because there was insufficient funding in the forward estimates, we will need to seek that additional \$5 million from Treasury.

[2.40 pm]

Mr O'GORMAN: The transport electronic licensing information system shows that it does not require any appropriation after 2001-02. Does that mean the project will be completed by the end of that year?

Mrs ROBERTS: No, it does not. As I have already stated, licensing estimates that it requires an additional \$5 million in 2001-02. There will also be a requirement of \$1.5 million for lease costs in the out years. These requirements were not submitted for the capital budget for the out years; however, \$2.5 million was requested for operating funds in 2000-01. That was not funded and TRELIS will be completed within the 2001-02 financial year. However, out-year lease costs and maintenance are unfunded.

Mr MARSHALL: At page 898 of the *Budget Statements*, dot point four refers to regulatory consistency. I am interested in the interstate and international consistency of roundabouts and traffic lights. Recently, I drove in

Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Arthur Marshall; Mr Dan Barron-Sullivan; Mr Martin Whitely; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Chairman; Mr David Templeman

---

Scotland and the east coast. At the end of the freeway going up to Safety Bay Road, I have noticed that three or four roundabouts have been introduced on the strip. The flow of traffic there seems to be very good. I wonder whether, in the interests of road safety, a decision had been made in Western Australia to have more roundabouts and fewer traffic lights. Where do roundabouts fit in with the road safety initiatives of this State?

Mrs ROBERTS: Roundabouts are an excellent traffic management device. I understand that a decision on whether to have traffic lights or a roundabout is generally determined by the number of vehicles that use a particular intersection. Often the flow on the roads entering the intersection must be taken into account. As far as I am aware, the two biggest factors that determine whether a roundabout or traffic lights will be used at an intersection are the number of thousands of cars that utilise the intersection and whether one road has 10 times the flow of traffic as the intersecting road. I note that this matter falls under the Main Roads jurisdiction.

Mr MARSHALL: Last year when I was in Scotland, I noticed that the roundabouts were much larger than the roundabouts here. That could be because of the number of vehicles and the size of the population. However, it seems that the bigger the roundabout, the less chance there is for accidents to happen.

Mrs ROBERTS: I support the member. I think that roundabouts are generally excellent. If a roundabout suits an intersection, it is a better traffic management device than traffic lights. However, because of the sheer volumes of vehicles that enter some intersections, they require traffic lights. A couple of factors would be taken into account. I am sure that Main Roads has a formula in place for the number of vehicles that enter an intersection when it makes a decision about whether to use a roundabout or a set of traffic lights. Local governments are also involved intrinsically in those decisions.

Mr MARSHALL: Under the term of regulatory consistency, I have to ask this question for the sake of my constituents. Motorists who travel on the new Dawesville deviation reduce their speed from 110 kilometres an hour to 100 kilometres an hour on a deviation that is smooth as silk; it is a beautiful piece of highway with very little population around it. The motorists have complained about a lack of consistency. Some 13 000 vehicles a day use that strip to go from Mandurah to the south west. There is an interesting question about who is right: the drivers or whoever sets the speed limits.

Similarly, a motorist who leaves here to go Manjimup on the new freeway and comes off Safety Bay Road, having travelled at 100 kilometres an hour all the way, must travel between Safety Bay Road and Mandurah at 110 kilometres an hour. Very few, if any, accidents occur on the strip of road that has a speed limit of 110 kilometres an hour compared with the strip where the speed limit is 100 kilometres an hour. Driver fatigue occurs along that strip because it is so long and boring to travel on it at only 100 kilometres an hour. That matter should be investigated. This regulatory inconsistency of our road system does not seem sound for road safety in the areas that I and my electors travel on.

Mrs ROBERTS: Again, the primary responsibility for speed limits on roads rests with the department of Main Roads, not my department.

Mr MARSHALL: Can the minister's department check through Main Roads?

Mrs ROBERTS: Wearing my road safety hat, I am far more inclined to approach Main Roads about reducing speed limits on roads rather than increasing them. I am advised by Mr Cameron that in Victoria moves were made along the lines of those suggested by the member for Dawesville, and they found exactly the opposite outcome to what the member thought it would be. The number of accidents increased on the stretches of roads where increased speed limits applied.

Mr MARSHALL: Accepted.

Mrs ROBERTS: Nice try though! I knew the member would not be asking for himself.

Mrs HODSON-THOMAS: My question relates to page 905 of the *Budget Statements*. In 2000-01, the estimated actual revenue raised from speed and red light fines was \$45 331 000, yet the budget estimate for this year is \$20 million. Will the minister outline why the estimate is only \$20 million? In 2000-01, the estimated actual final demand fees were \$883 000 as opposed to the 2001-02 budget estimate of \$2 496 000. Will the minister explain why the estimated figures are such?

Mrs ROBERTS: I am very pleased that the member asked those questions because they were the first questions I asked. I have been informed that the figure of \$20 million is a departmental error. That figure should read about \$45 million. That error has been pointed out to Treasury.

Ms BARROW: Final demand fees are fees incurred when motorists have not paid their road traffic infringement notices and they are penalised an extra \$10 for non-payment. It is hard to estimate what population will be in that group. Through increased warning notices, we encourage people not to incur a final demand fee. That is the reason for the variance. The figure of \$883 000 was the actual revenue collected against the budget of

Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Arthur Marshall; Mr Dan Barron-Sullivan; Mr Martin Whitely; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Chairman; Mr David Templeman

---

\$2.05 million. In the out years, it has remained constant. Next year when we come to the budget estimates again, this area should be reviewed.

Mr BARRON-SULLIVAN: Will the minister explain how that particular line item under the administered transaction revenue is accounted for? What happens to that money? In 1999-2000, the actual expenditure was well under \$1 million and in 2000-01, the estimated actual was well under \$1 million, yet for some reason, the department continues to estimate \$2.5 million. What happens to that money?

[2.50 pm]

Mrs ROBERTS: Is the member referring to the final demand fee money?

Mr BARRON-SULLIVAN: Does it feed into departmental revenue?

Ms BARROW: The funds go to consolidated revenue. None of the funds are departmental revenue. They are collected primarily by the Department of Transport. However, the Department of Justice, through the Fines Enforcement Registry, also collects late fees, which it transfers into the consolidated fund.

Mr BARRON-SULLIVAN: The figures for two years are under \$1 million. I do not have the figures for previous years in front of me. Have the estimates and actuals always been well over \$1 million out?

Mrs ROBERTS: We will take that question on notice and provide supplementary information.

The CHAIRMAN: The variance in the figures mentioned for the administrative transactions revenue in final demand fees will be provided as supplementary information.

Mrs ROBERTS: As requested by the member for Mitchell, we will provide the figures for the past three or four years.

Mr BARRON-SULLIVAN: Also on page 905, will the minister provide a potted history of the information pertaining to the exact circumstances concerning the revenue from speed and red light fines? Can we have a breakdown of the amounts received from Multanovas and radar gun fines, etc? The forward estimates show the amount as \$20 million. Why has that not been adjusted in any way for the consumer price index or whatever?

Mrs ROBERTS: I cannot provide a detailed background. However, the heading of fines referring to speed and red-light fines also includes on-the-spot fines. I have asked that in future years the budget papers include a breakdown of those fines. I suggested that it is not particularly helpful given that we have a commitment to giving all the speed and red-light fine money to road safety. I want that money accounted for separately and the on-the-spot fines to have a separate category next year. It has been printed in this way, but I am told that the on-the-spot fines are included in the one lump of money. In general terms, I am told that of the \$45 million - bearing in mind that this is an estimate of our fines revenue - roughly \$15 million is from on-the-spot fines and the other \$30 million is from speed and red-light fines. Roughly one-third - \$10 million - will go to the road trauma trust fund and roughly \$20 million will go to other road safety initiatives, which I will detail in Parliament.

Some commitments have been made for that two-thirds funding. Although final details are not available at this point, I have announced the increase of annual black-spot funding from \$13 million to \$15 million per annum, so an additional \$2 million will need to come out of that two-thirds - roughly \$20 million - for black-spot funding. I have also committed the Government to a four-year \$4 million comprehensive youth driver education program. One of the other election commitments was to recruit 80 additional crosswalk attendants to improve road safety for children going to and from school. I am told the cost will be in the order of \$480 000. Some smaller amounts may be allocated; for example, approximately \$250 000 to WorkSafe to monitor fatigue management in the transport industry. I have also been asked to increase funding for safe routes to school programs from \$30 000 to \$120 000. I expect to achieve improvements in those areas. I am considering considerable increases in funding for RoadWise programs.

Mr BARRON-SULLIVAN: The money from Multanova fines, radar guns, and so on is all to be allocated to road safety programs. How was it decided that those revenues should be allocated? The minister said that some were allocated to fund black spots and so on. Who decided how much money should go to each of those road safety areas?

Mrs ROBERTS: The member for Mitchell's question is based on a false premise. All the Multanova and the red light camera fines will go into road safety. As I said, revenue from that will be in the order of \$30 million. As I outlined, two-thirds - in the order of \$20 million - will be allocated for a number of items to which the Government is committed. Just as this was a political decision - an election commitment - to allocate an additional two-thirds of fine money to road safety, the ALP made a number of other commitments, such as to increase the number of crosswalk attendants. We also undertook during the election campaign to allocate additional money to black-spot funding. People were informed during the election campaign that that money

Ms Katie Hodson-Thomas; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Arthur Marshall; Mr Dan Barron-Sullivan; Mr Martin Whitely; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Chairman; Mr David Templeman

---

would be allocated from the additional two-thirds road safety moneys. We have also set up a Ministerial Council on Road Safety, chaired by me. I will certainly take my recommendations for the expenditure of that money to the Ministerial Council on Road Safety and to Cabinet, which will make the ultimate decision to sign off on that expenditure. It is in line with the election commitments we made to spend that money on road safety.

Mr BARRON-SULLIVAN: I am referring to the \$20 million of that money. I am not taking anything away from the black-spot program or the other programs; they are obviously commendable. I am trying to determine whether the allocation of that money was made on a political basis or whether an independent assessment was done by, for example, the Road Safety Council or someone like that. Has the minister thought very carefully and objectively about what the \$20 million should be spent on? Has someone else made a decision or was it purely political? Are we saving as many lives as possible with the \$20 million or are we talking politics?

Mrs ROBERTS: Our first obligation is to fulfil commitments we made during the election campaign. We gave an undertaking on black-spot funding and crosswalk attendants, both of which are initiatives that should attract bipartisan support. They are locked in. In addition, I am seeking the advice of the Office of Road Safety and the Road Safety Council so that we receive independent and objective advice on the expenditure of that money. Ultimately, as with all funding decisions, the minister and the Government must sign off on the expenditure in the same way as the Road Safety Council forwards to me its proposals for expenditure for the road trauma trust fund accounts.

[3.00 pm]

Mrs HODSON-THOMAS: I know that the minister will not determine where the extra 80 crosswalk attendants will be allocated, but will the process of applying for a crosswalk attendant remain the same as that which existed in the past?

Mrs ROBERTS: There must be some change to the formula. As the member is aware, the formula is determined by the Police Service. A number of pitfalls have been experienced with that formula, which have been pointed out by people on both sides of the House. Given that the money will be coming out of transport and road safety, I expect that the people from the road safety side will want a bigger say in where those crosswalk attendants are placed and will revisit that formula.