

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.

Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr David Templeman; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr John Quigley

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

Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr David Templeman; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr John Quigley

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.

Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr David Templeman; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr John Quigley

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.

Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr David Templeman; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr John Quigley

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.

Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr David Templeman; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr John Quigley

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

Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr David Templeman; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr John Quigley

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.

Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr David Templeman; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr John Quigley

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 —

Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr David Templeman; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr John Quigley

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

Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr David Templeman; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr John Quigley

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.

Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr David Templeman; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr John Quigley

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 Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr David Templeman; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr John Quigley

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

Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr David Templeman; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr John Quigley

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.