

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

Motion

Resumed from 18 April on the following motion moved by Mrs G.J. Godfrey —

That the following Address-in-Reply to His Excellency's speech be agreed to —

To His Excellency the Honourable Mr Malcolm James McCusker, Governor of the State of Western Australia.

May it please your Excellency —

We, the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of the State of Western Australia in Parliament assembled, beg to express our loyalty to our most Gracious Sovereign, and to thank your Excellency for the speech you have been pleased to address to Parliament.

MR J.E. McGRATH (South Perth — Parliamentary Secretary) [4.01 pm]: It gives me great delight to stand in this Parliament today as a member who has been re-elected for a third term. Firstly, I would like to congratulate you, Mr Speaker, on your elevation to such a lofty position in the house. I would also like to congratulate all the new members on both sides of the house.

I would like to talk about what happened in my electorate in South Perth on polling day 2013. I was particularly happy with the result because the member for South Perth recorded a primary vote of 66.97 per cent. I told some people in conversation that it might have been the highest primary vote in the state. There were some doubters. We went to the Western Australian Electoral Commission and checked the statistics. The member for South Perth's primary vote was, in fact, above the primary vote of the member for Ocean Reef, which was 65.2 per cent. I am sad to say that my percentage was also above that of the Premier, the member for Cottesloe, whose primary vote was 64.7 per cent. The member for Alfred Cove's primary vote was 64.41 per cent and the primary vote of the member for Hillarys was 64.28 per cent.

One of my colleagues also said to me, "We just beat you on two-party preferred." I said, "Don't worry about two-party preferred, because on two-party preferred you might end up getting the votes of some people who despise you and who voted for another party, a minor party or an Independent because the last thing they could do would be to vote for you." That is why I am a great believer—I am sure the Premier is too—in the primary vote. It was a good result for us and I think it was a great result for the Liberal Party across the board. I admit that going into the election I was fairly confident that the government would be re-elected but I had no idea that it would be such a strong result.

Mr M.P. Murray: Did you get a price on yourself?

Mr J.E. McGRATH: I was at unbackable odds. I was told a long time ago to never bet on anything that talks.

One of the main local issues in my electorate leading up to the election was the ferry service. I was able to convince the Minister for Transport that we should extend the Mends Street ferry service over the summer months, which the government did. The extension of the ferry service concluded at the end of April. I am led to believe by the minister that the extended summer service will resume again next year. It did not make sense to have the only commuter or passenger ferry operating in the metropolitan area when the last service on some nights was at 8.30 or nine o'clock, especially on Friday and Saturday nights. I think it has been a success. I asked for the ferry service to be extended on weekends only but Transperth wanted to try extending it during the week. The numbers were not as good during the week as they were on weekends. I guess that commuters coming home from work are well served by buses to South Perth, and I would not think they would travel home on a nine o'clock ferry.

As I have said before in this place, there is a huge opportunity for ferry services. When there was some public comment that the ferry terminal might not be located in Elizabeth Quay and there was speculation that it might be left at Barrack Square, I was happy to hear the Minister for Planning say that it would in fact be located in Elizabeth Quay. I think that is most important, because it links the ferry service to the William Street train station. The other reason that I was always supportive of bringing the water to the bottom of Sherwood Court and Howard Street is that I had visions of a mini Circular Quay, as we see in Sydney. I do not know that we will ever see that, because Sydney Harbour is a very deep harbour and the ferries and boats are a lot bigger. But I thought that if people could get off the ferry in that area, they would have a short walk to St Georges Terrace, whereas now they get off at Barrack Street and it is a longer walk.

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

The other issue that I was very happy to get some support from the government on was the situation with the river walls. The former Minister for Environment, the member for Nedlands, is sitting in front of me now. He put his reputation on the line to go into bat for the people of South Perth. He said during the election that if the government was re-elected, it would put \$1.35 million into rebuilding the river walls around Mends Street. I hope this money will be delivered this year, because the City of South Perth, which will also put a couple of million dollars into this project, would like the funding before the end of this year so that it can tear down the fences and rebuild the river walls. It is an area of Perth that gets a lot of visitors. A lot of tourists and a lot of locals walk along the South Perth foreshore. There are a lot of visitors. People from other suburbs drive there and park their cars, as they like to recreate in the South Perth area.

I note that the Minister for Transport is walking out the door of the chamber, but I have reminded him many times about the issue that I am about to raise. When people went to vote at the election, they said, “Tell John we’re going to vote for him, but we’re still disappointed that he hasn’t delivered the Manning Road on-ramp to the freeway south.” The minister just rushed out the door! This is something that I have been talking about for eight years, since I was elected. We understand that there are a lot of competing projects in transport infrastructure. There are a lot of much bigger projects than this project. It is about a \$30 million project. The people in that part of my electorate want an on-ramp from Manning Road south onto the Kwinana Freeway. Eventually, people will drive down the freeway to Fiona Stanley Hospital and Murdoch University and to Mandurah and the growing suburbs in the southern part of the metropolitan area.

Mr P.B. Watson: Are they going to name it after you?

Mr J.E. McGRATH: I do not think so! I hope it will be done. I will keep working with the Minister for Transport. Some work has been done by government, but it has to be moved up the list of priorities. If I were in a marginal seat like Albany, I would have a new hospital.

Mr P.B. Watson: It’s a safe seat now.

Mr J.E. McGRATH: I will never know how we saved the member for Albany. We built the hospital and he won the seat! There is something wrong there.

I will keep talking to the minister about Manning Road. As I said before, it is important to the people in my electorate.

Other things have been raised with me. The suburb of Como, where I live, has increasingly been the target for burglaries. I was very concerned at the statistics that were released recently by the police on burglaries in the electorate of South Perth. The statistics show that there were 287 burglaries in Como in the 12-month period between March 2012 and March 2013. I think one of the reasons for this is the fact that burglars are using Canning Bridge Station to come into and go out of the area. Some of the people in Como who live near Canning Bridge Station have been victims of these burglaries. Many of these burglaries are committed in daylight hours. People have come home during the afternoon to find that their house has been burgled. I think this is being done by people who have come into the district from outside. In fact, the officer in charge of Kensington Police Station has said something along those lines. He was quoted in the local paper recently as saying —

Any persons apprehended in Como are not usually linked to living in the area. They could commit a crime in Como at 11 am, get on a train and be somewhere else at 2 pm.

We understand that this happens around the world with train stations. Obviously it is the modus operandi for many, many thieves. But it is causing concern to my constituents. I have had discussions with the Minister for Police, as late as today, about the possibility of getting some more closed-circuit security cameras around that area.

Mr P.B. Watson: Was that not an election promise—more CCTV cameras?

Mr J.E. McGRATH: Not for Como. But there was an election promise about that, which the government will be rolling out, as the minister said today in question time. I will be talking to the minister about getting some of that funding for the City of South Perth so that we can have more CCTV cameras, because that is a terrific way of tracking people who commit crimes. Local residents are also asking whether it would be possible to put more police on the streets, maybe some mounted police patrols, because that is often a deterrent to people who want to come into the area and break into people’s houses.

I read over the weekend—in fact I was interstate and I picked it up on the internet—a disturbing article about prison admissions in 2011–12. I must admit that I was staggered at the numbers in that article. These numbers were based on local government areas. The authors of the article had worked out how many people in each local government area had been admitted to prison in 2011–12. South Perth, my electorate, was ninth on the list, with

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

135 admissions to prison. Subiaco had 16 admissions, East Fremantle had six, Claremont had eight, and Serpentine–Jarrahdale had 13.

Mr A.J. Simpson: It is according to postcode, member, so Manning could get caught up in that because it has the same postcode.

Mr J.E. McGRATH: No; it is the City of South Perth. Manning is in the City of South Perth.

Mr P.B. Watson: The postcode for South Perth is 6151. All the Australia Post people know the postcodes.

Mr J.E. McGRATH: So is the member saying that these people do not come from my electorate?

Mr A.J. Simpson: You can get caught a bit, because, for instance, the area that is represented by the member for Armadale and me goes all the way out to Roleystone and Karragullen.

Mr J.E. McGRATH: But those people would not come under the statistics for the City of Armadale.

Mr P.B. Watson: You have got two ex–Australia Post people here, if you want any help!

Mr J.E. McGRATH: Yes.

But it is of concern to me to have a figure like that for the electorate of South Perth, which some people would say is a reasonably affluent area. I have asked the Minister for Corrective Services for some more information. I would like to drill down and see whether there are people in my electorate who may need some better services. I as a local member—in fact any local member—would have to be concerned at that figure. But until I get some more information, I will not be able to do anything about it. So I am certainly going to seek more information to find out why that is happening.

On the same subject, I must admit that I was heartened by the some of the comments that the Minister for Corrective Services has been making about crime and admissions to prison. My view is that it is probably a bit late to start rehabilitating people once they get into prison. It has to start earlier than that, and I think the programs have to be set in place. I must admit that when I was first elected, I could not believe that we did not have more truant officers, because a long time ago when we went to school there were truant officers, and if young people did not go to school or did not turn up, the truant officer would chase them around. I understand that the world is a bit different now and that schools are a lot bigger, with much bigger school populations. One of my local schools, Como Secondary College, had 800 students. Eighty students a day would not turn up for school. Some of those absences would be legitimate, but there was 10 per cent truancy on any given day. I said, “Well, who chases them up?” The principal said, “The deputy principal. It’s his job, because we’ve got no-one else to do it.” That has been addressed, I believe, by our government, and now more people are involved in making sure that more young people attend school. I think that the biggest factor in producing a better society is education, and we have to make sure that our young people attend school, and do so regularly.

Other issues have been raised with me post the election. Obviously, from the figures from the election, my electorate is very supportive of our government. People in my electorate are asking for the underground power program to be continued. I think the underground power program has been one of the most successful of the programs that have been initiated in the Perth community. Recently I went to a small ceremony with the Mayor of the City of South Perth, where the latest phase of the underground power program in Manning and Salter Point was completed. We saw the last pole removed and we were all very happy about that. But some areas in South Perth still have not been undergrounded. A part of South Perth near to where the old Hurlingham Hotel used to be still has overhead powerlines. The lovely leafy suburb of Kensington, which has a lot of beautiful street trees, still has overhead powerlines, as do parts of Como. But I am sure—I have discussed this with the Premier and he has given me a commitment—that the underground power program will continue, and eventually we will get all these suburbs done, bearing in mind that for all new developments, underground power is a prerequisite for them being approved.

So, what am I going to do in the next four years, Premier? It will be four years of serving the people of South Perth, but also working as a parliamentary secretary to the Premier on this massive project to build a new stadium at Burswood.

[Member’s time extended.]

Mr J.E. McGRATH: Although the stadium has had its critics, I think that the election result was a glowing endorsement of our government’s decision to go to Burswood—to take a massive step to leave a ground that has been the home of football for over 100 years now and move to a greenfields site. My role for the Premier is that I attend all the meetings of the major stadium steering committee. All the departments involved in the building of the stadium, the transport and the funding have representatives on this steering committee. It is headed by Ron

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

Alexander, the director general of the Department of Sport and Recreation; and Richard Mann, the executive director of strategic projects for the government. They are two very capable people. When I was at my first meeting, I said that I would never build anything bigger than a house, so, for me, it has been an education to see how much work, planning and detail go into these huge government projects. Obviously, that is not the case for just a sports stadium; it would be similar for Fiona Stanley Hospital, the other new hospitals and any new developments. But the one thing about this stadium is that wherever I go, people want to talk about the stadium. The massive Fiona Stanley Hospital is being built, and it will be the most modern hospital in Australia. I have been there, and I have seen and been amazed at some of the things that will be available to patients who use that public hospital. People do not talk about the hospital much, but there is a fascination with the stadium. People want to know when it will be finished, how they will get there, how big it will be and whether there will be a roof. All those decisions have been made, and I support the Premier's vision for this public land. The Burswood peninsula is owned by the people of Western Australia and there is an opportunity to make it an area where the people of Perth and Western Australia can come at any time for recreation and enjoyment.

There will be other facilities there but I do not believe high-rise towers should cover the entire peninsula. There will be an opportunity to build high-rise accommodation near the new train station being built within 400 metres of the stadium, for which \$300 million has been budgeted. That train station will service any new high-rise developments along the train line and the people who will live there will be able to jump on the train and commute into the city. Those developments will be up against the rail line and not be in anyone's way. They will provide magnificent views across the river to the city of Perth and the peninsula will retain its present open grassed areas where people can relax.

During the campaign the Premier announced that Scitech would be moved. I recently visited Scitech and was very impressed with the work they do there. It carries out world-first work and the people who work there are inventing all the time. They are looking forward to relocating to the new site, but I do not know where the Premier is going to put it.

Mr C.J. Barnett: The first meetings have already been held with Scitech.

Mr J.E. McGRATH: Have they? Scitech has been in that location for 30 years now. In the 1980s it was moved to West Leederville, but I said to the people who work there that this will be an exciting move. The Burswood peninsula will be a hub on the edge of the city where many things will be happening.

I have mentioned before in this house the great Professor Stephenson, who formulated the Stephenson plan, under which many of Perth's major arterial roads, highways and freeways were planned 50 or 60 years ago. He said then that the Burswood peninsula would one day be a great location for an 80 000-seat stadium. What a great vision and a great statement to make in the 1950s when Burswood Island was a tip. There was no casino there, only a rail line that went to Armadale and the old Belmont Park racecourse. He identified it as a site that, as the city grew, would become a central location for a sport and recreational-type facility. We are fortunate to have had people of such vision as Professor Stephenson in Western Australia.

Earlier today Minister Waldron, with whom I have also enjoyed working, said that the pre-construction site works for the stadium will begin in a month or two, and once that commences the work of selecting the preferred tenderer for the stadium will take place. I think this is the most exciting phase, because three tenderers have been selected and given preferred status. They will now all go away and come back with a different design. They have been given the scoping. The government has told them what it wants put into the stadium—how big the seats will be, how big the area between the rows of seats will be, how many entertaining areas, how many private boxes, how many public areas and all that sort of stuff. That has all been set down for them. Rather than a design competition, which has often happened with stadiums in the past, these three proponents will come back with their own design. Premier, I do not know but I imagine we would not even have any conception of what they might come up with in their final design and what this stadium might look like.

Mr C.J. Barnett: The fence is already up on the site.

Mr J.E. McGRATH: The fence is up on the site and work has begun.

Mr P.B. Watson: Is that to keep the people in or out?

Mr J.E. McGRATH: No; work has begun on the site. It has often been raised that the stadium is being built on a tip site and that there would be old car bodies and who knows what underneath it. The way now, with modern construction and modern engineering, is that during the pre-construction site works the ground will be compacted so that there will be no subsidence. There are various ways of doing it. Even the playing field itself will be compacted. When the casino at Burswood was built, the pool was built on pylons but they did not

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

compact the ground around the pool. When the pavers were laid for the deck around the pool, someone went out one day and part of it had sunk about a metre. This will not happen here.

Mr P.B. Watson: It will be the Premier's legacy—60 000 people sinking into the Swan River!

Mr J.E. McGRATH: No, no. The member for Albany can go around the world and see that there have been some major construction projects built on wasteland. We visited the London Olympic site, which was built on wasteland. Look at what they have done at —

Mr W.J. Johnston: How much over budget was the Olympic site?

Mr J.E. McGRATH: The Olympic Stadium in London—I do not really care how much over budget it was. I know that ours is not over budget; we are on track.

Mr P.B. Watson: That is a quote we will retain from *Hansard*.

Mr J.E. McGRATH: We are on track. The figures announced were based on 2009 figures. They are the figures. There is no indication that —

Several members interjected.

Mr J.E. McGRATH: This is something that I believe will grow as the various phases of the stadium evolve. A fan group recently came in to meet the Premier and the minister. These fans had regular sessions with the Department of Sport and Recreation. This stadium is being built with public money. There is not a dollar of private money; it is a publicly backed state project. It is for the people of Western Australia. Any member of the public who wants to go to the footy will be able to go. That cannot happen now. If a person does not have an Eagles' member's ticket for a big game, they will not get into the ground. With the new stadium, there will be an allowance for walk-up tickets on the day. That is one of the things the Premier insisted on because this is the people's stadium. Premier, I think it is a very exciting project. The Premier has not decided, or the government has not decided, what the stadium might be called, but who knows?

Mr P. Papalia: "John McGrath Stadium"!

Mr J.E. McGRATH: No, no; it will not be. But who knows?

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

Mr J.E. McGRATH: It will be a very exciting project. The member for Cannington's constituents will love it. They will jump on the train down at Cannington station. They will get up there with their scarves and barrack for whomever they barrack for. Then they will jump back on the train and go home after a great day out. They will not have to be members of the Eagles or Dockers. There will be family tickets, and the aim is to make this as affordable as possible for families. A family can go to the Melbourne Cricket Ground and buy a family ticket for the day at a reasonable price because it is such a huge ground with so much capacity; we cannot do that in Perth because of the size restrictions of Subiaco. As this stadium has a capacity of 60 000, with capacity to go to 70 000 or even 80 000 later, there will never be restrictions on capacity. We want to make sure that football returns to being the game of the people, which it always has been, by not pricing the average Western Australian out of it. So, well done, Premier! Do not make me work too hard in the next four years, but I am right there with the stadium and I think it is —

Mr D.A. Templeman: Are you going to go round again in 2017?

Mr J.E. McGRATH: Why not?

Mr D.A. Templeman: I think you should; you should make minister by then!

Mr J.E. McGRATH: The stadium is a project that I am really going to put all my endeavours into. I think it is a fantastic project, and I am glad the Labor Party has now decided we should not go to Subiaco Oval and is on board with us, and we are going to have it at this great new site at Burswood.

MR P. PAPALIA (Warnbro) [4.31 pm]: At the outset, I take the opportunity to congratulate the Speaker, in his absence, and the Deputy Speaker for their election to those very important offices. I also extend my congratulations and welcome to all members of Parliament, regardless of party, who have entered this house for the first time. I came in in 2007 after a by-election, so I was a bit lonely insofar as a cohort—I did not have any classmates to call my own—so I am looking a little enviously at all new members, particularly the hordes of the conservative ranks who have joined us, and also the three on our side is not too bad a little group to have come in. I am sure new members will find the tasks on this pathway they have embarked upon challenging and rewarding, and I wish them all well.

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

I apologise in advance if I am at times a little confrontational in this place in the pursuit of holding the government to account, because that is our role. No doubt many new members will already be finding us quite obnoxious and thinking that if only the other side would be polite and respectful during question time, we might actually be able to convey a better face to the public of Western Australia and repair the somewhat damaged reputation of politicians. I understand that feeling; I held it for about 18 months when I was a backbencher in government, but I can assure members that the moment they end up on this side of the house, a few things occur. One in particular is that we learn about frustration, about how long ministers can rabbit on without actually saying anything and how frustrating that is, and we learn a little about there being more to life than our own self-importance or whatever. There are good things about being in opposition; we learn a lot about conducting research ourselves, because there is no-one else to do it; there are no great legions of government staffers to provide assistance and information. I warn backbench members opposite in government that come the day they are not, all that additional support disappears. Therefore, they should take the opportunity to force themselves to embark upon a self-education program, and not take the lazy route of expecting everything to be delivered to them on a plate.

Mr J.H.D. Day: Don't you use the Parliamentary Library?

Mr P. PAPALIA: Exactly. I am not suggesting that I now do that, minister; I am out there, as the minister knows, seeking out opportunities to hold the government to account and keep ministers honest, and there is a lot of opportunity to be had already—I can see that! It is going to be entertaining, if nothing else, in the coming years as we do the people's work. The people of Western Australia expect us to hold the government to account. They expect us to ensure that the government, which went to an election with a raft of promises and commitments, is held to those promises. It is not as though the government ended. I know that there is a concerted effort and a clear strategy on behalf of the —

Mr J.E. McGrath: What have we done?

Mr P. PAPALIA: Wait, wait! Hang on! Do not get me ahead of myself. There is a clear strategy on behalf of the Premier to ensure that people consider him to be a year-zero Premier. They have rolled the old wagon out the back and they are pushing it backwards in an effort to have the odometer go backwards so that in the second-hand car yard they can sell the government as a newer government than it is. I can tell members it is not.

The truth is that a whole lot of promises and a wide spectrum of commitments were made in the 2008 election. The people of Western Australia openly elected a government and expected those commitments to be kept, but they were not kept. The member for South Perth has very kindly asked me to segue into the promises that were broken in the first term of this government. I recently held the shadow education portfolio. I do not know about all the portfolios, but I will just throw at the member a little example that stands out in its boldness and the nature and extent of the broken promise. It relates to a commitment in 2008 at a time when much was made by the then opposition, the very short-lived Barnett opposition, of the breakdown of respect and responsibilities in schools and the breakdown of respect for authority by juveniles in this state. As a consequence, the Liberal Party promised the people of Western Australia that if it were elected to power on 6 September 2008, it would deliver a police officer to every high school in the state. That was a firm commitment. That was a clear promise, an undertaking, on behalf of the Liberal Party, the government-in-waiting, and the Barnett government broke it in about the first six months it was in power. It started off with a trial at Gilmore College—one police officer, one school. The trial went for about six months and then quietly drifted off into the ether. It was a broken promise, member for South Perth. It was undeniably a broken promise with consequences.

I spent some time researching on my own, in the absence of any staff other than my electorate staff—I acknowledge Linda, Monika and Trish. Having spent a little time conducting research into what does and does not work with interventions in juvenile offending, I can tell members that putting a copper in every school is just a stupid idea. That aside, it was a commitment the Liberal Party made. It was the Liberal Party's own stupid idea and it was its own stupid broken promise. That is undeniable.

Another small example leaps to mind as I look over towards the far reaches of the chamber and see the smiling cheerful face of the member for Swan Hills. It is undeniable that in the lead-up to the 2008 election the people of Ellenbrook were promised a railway line.

Mr J.E. McGrath: They still re-elected the member.

Mr P. PAPALIA: No matter how many times the emperor of Cottesloe —

Mr F.A. Alban: They re-elected me.

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

Mr P. PAPALIA: The member knows he lost those people. No matter how many times the emperor of Cottesloe says it ain't so, the member for South Perth knows it is. It is on film; that is the beauty of it. It is not just a recording, a transcript, a report in the newspaper or the letters that the candidate for Swan Hills sent to the thousands of Ellenbrook residents with his signature on them. We do not have to rely on those things. In the lead-up to this election we saw vision of the Premier promising it and then the Premier denying that he promised it and then denying again that he promised it and then denying once more that he promised it and then finally never conceding that he said it.

Mr J.E. McGrath: It had no impact on the election.

Mr P. PAPALIA: It is almost like not talking about the war when we are in Europe. We cannot assume it is okay. I take umbrage at the Premier on this fact. I do not believe that it is okay for him to go to an election, make a promise with his hand on his heart and ask the citizens of the state to elect him on an undertaking that he fully intends not to keep. That is just dishonest; it is not right. If we are trying to elevate the status in which the pursuit of politics is held by the people, members should consider that. Members should consider how that has undermined the credibility of every single member of this place, because whenever any member of this place, or any other Parliament for that matter, goes into the public domain and makes a commitment, people are inclined to recall their last experience. That undertaking was made in 2008, and I understand that government members are saying that was a long time ago. It was a long time ago but these were serious commitments that were made and then broken. However, the crime was further added to. It was made worse in the recent election, because a series of commitments were made by candidates, the Premier and the parties in the lead-up to this election in the full and undeniable knowledge that they had no intention of keeping those commitments. I will point very clearly to an obvious one. The National Party, which was part of the government and intended to be part of a future government, had its own enormous list of commitments worth \$500 million or \$800 million—I cannot remember.

Mr W.J. Johnston: Half a billion.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Half a billion dollars' worth of promises were made on behalf of candidates in the National Party to the people of Western Australia saying, "If you re-elect a Barnett government, we will deliver these commitments to you." It is undeniable that Liberal Party members knew this. I am looking at the member for South Perth. I am not picking on the member for South Perth; it is just that I like looking at his face and he gives me some feedback that is enjoyable. The rest of the members of the Liberal Party knew they were never going to deliver all those commitments made by the National Party. In fact, the Treasurer of the day confirmed that fact in the public domain by saying he was not going to sign up to them. He was therefore saying, "Vote for the Nationals so that we can form government but we're not going to commit to anything they're promising." Conversely, the Liberal Party candidates in those same electorates and in electorates around the state were making enormous and significant promises all over the place, using what has come to be known as the Swan Hills model, but they had no intention of delivering them.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: Mr Acting Speaker, I am very interested in the comments and I think others should be too. I draw your attention to the state of the house.

[Quorum formed.]

Mr P. PAPALIA: I say to the member for South Perth, to others in the Liberal Party and also to my friends in the National Party that mine is a very salient and valid point. There are not many friends in the National Party, but they are over there somewhere. My point is that when members go to an election, make serious commitments to the people of Western Australia, urge them to vote for them and seek their endorsement in the full knowledge they will never meet all those commitments, it is a lie. It is dishonest, it is inappropriate and it demeans the currency of commitments by political parties and by people who are in politics as a vocation, and it demeans —

Mr B.J. Grylls: Is that what the Prime Minister did?

Mr P. PAPALIA: Do not get me started on them!

It demeans the profession of public service, and that is wrong.

Dr K.D. Hames interjected.

Mr P. PAPALIA: The Deputy Premier missed the wonderful contribution I made earlier—if I do say so myself! For the benefit of *Hansard*, that was a joke and I do not want to get that delivered later on as evidence of my bigheadedness! Those commitments amounted to hundreds of millions of dollars—was it \$500 million or \$800 million that the National Party committed to in the lead-up to the election, Leader of the National Party?

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

Mr B.J. Grylls interjected.

Mr P. PAPALIA: That is \$800 million worth of promises that were unsupported by the Liberal Party. At the same time, there were significant promises, which were different in many respects, made to the same people in the electorates in which both parties had a candidate.

Dr K.D. Hames interjected.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I am making the point that both parties made commitments knowing this full well, which means that both sides were complicit in this unspoken agreement, or perhaps it was spoken, to lie to the electorate in order to gain office.

Dr K.D. Hames: It's just not true.

Mr P. PAPALIA: It must be true because each party has said that it has no control over the other party's commitments; therefore, if identical commitments are not being made, it must mean that some will not be met. Why is it important? Because the accusations that were thrown at the WA Labor Party in the course of the campaign were that we did not intend to keep some of our commitments. But we did; we always intended to, which is why we had costings and why we had to find offsets to ensure that we had funding. The Minister for Health knows full well that when the Liberal Party made a number of serious commitments, particularly in relation to public transport, it never had any intention of delivering on them to the people of Perth. It was clear, with only 48 hours to run before the election, when the Liberal Party finally 'fessed up and suggested that it would get a \$3 billion handout from the federal government for its commitments in this state without ever having spoken to the federal government. That strategy, the "don't speak to them" strategy, I suspect will hitherto be known as the "Joe Francis strategy",—"the member for Jandakot strategy"—"Don't talk to 'em; just do it—just assume. Avoid them. Don't talk to them at all costs, because it might be embarrassing". That was the strategy.

Dr K.D. Hames: One interjection, that's all I ask.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Okay.

Dr K.D. Hames: They promised a health package for Port Hedland, Newman and Paraburdoo. We will fulfil their promise.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Minister, will the government fulfil all \$800 million worth of National Party promises? I can tell the minister we have them written down. Will the government fulfil every one of those \$800 million worth of promises? What about the Liberal Party candidates' promises that were made in the same electorates, which were not the same? Will the government fulfil those or will it only fulfil those of the elected member?

Dr K.D. Hames: No; I am in the process of doing some of —

Mr P. PAPALIA: I understand. Say anything, whatever it takes, is that the strategy?

Dr K.D. Hames: I didn't say we won't do them.

Mr P. PAPALIA: So the government will not carry out the Liberal Party's promises? The Liberal Party was the government of the day and it went to an electorate competing against the Nationals saying, "Vote for the Liberal Party in this electorate and we will deliver a raft of promises that are Liberal Party promises." Concurrently, there is a National Party bloke or woman running around with a raft of National Party promises and only the person who wins and gets up gets to deliver on the promises regardless of the fact that it is a Liberal-National government. How duplicitous. That is dishonest and duplicitous.

Dr K.D. Hames: Only if it's true.

Mr P. PAPALIA: It is true.

[Member's time extended.]

Mr P. PAPALIA: Is the minister suggesting that whenever a candidate for the Liberal Party or the National Party makes a promise —

Dr K.D. Hames interjected.

Mr P. PAPALIA: The minister had his one interjection.

Dr K.D. Hames: Now you're asking me another question.

Mr P. PAPALIA: No I am not; it is a rhetorical question. It is an affectation of speech to entertain members. This is a serious question for the Premier to consider. Is the Liberal-National government suggesting that it is only compelled to deliver on promises in seats that it won? Is that what the government is suggesting? I can tell

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

the government that there were some significant promises made in my electorate by the candidate who was my opponent and there were people in my electorate, a minority I might add, who gave that individual their primary votes. It was not the majority of the primary vote, but the minority. Nevertheless, it was not an insignificant number and those voters were no doubt compelled —

Mr B.J. Grylls: What were the commitments?

Mr P. PAPALIA: I am about to deliver, minister. Wait! I have the minister on the edge of his seat, I know.

Dr K.D. Hames: They had to be endorsed.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Hang on! The suggestion now by way of interjection from the member for Dawesville is that a promise was valid only if it had been endorsed. If the Liberal Party had put up posters that contained promises or implied promises, or a statement was carried in a newspaper that referred to a promise by the candidate, is that not binding? Who did the candidate represent?

Dr K.D. Hames: He would not have been able to get it endorsed if it had not been before the Liberal head office.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Minister, can I interject on your interjection? Who do those candidates represent when they put on their Liberal Party T-shirts and their name tags and receive all their candidates' support? There were dozens of Liberal Party supporters at every one of my booths, but there was not one photo of the Premier displayed during the election campaign, I might add. At the time there was not one photo of the very unpopular leader of the Liberal Party.

Mr B.J. Grylls interjected.

Mr P. PAPALIA: We will see in due course. Members opposite knew, as the internal polling indicated. It said, "Alarm, alarm; don't put Colin's photo out there because he's unpopular. People don't like the grumpy individual".

Mr P.B. Watson interjected.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I stop myself. I have to talk about the electorate, sorry.

Dr K.D. Hames: We had his photos around the polling booths.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Hang on! Minister! The interjections are getting out of control. May I seek your protection just for a moment, please, Mr Acting Speaker, and I will get back onto my subject.

Is the government suggesting that none of its promises made in any of the seats it lost are legitimate promises and therefore not binding on the current government led by the Premier, the member for Cottesloe? Is that the suggestion?

Dr K.D. Hames interjected.

Mr P. PAPALIA: This is a rhetorical question, member for Dawesville.

Dr K.D. Hames: I am giving you a definitive answer.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Is that the extent of their dishonesty? We are talking about a long way. It is a big extent; it reaches out there. There should be a caveat on every Liberal Party political advertisement so that it says, "Anything we say will be completely ignored in the event we do not win your seat."

We heard today about the integrity of the former member for Kimberley Hon Ernie Bridge, AOM. We heard one of the things he said in his inaugural speech, which we have to admire because it is a fantastic model for all of us to emulate. He said that he would serve everyone in his electorate, not just those who voted for him. I believe that is the fundamental premise that underpins our democracy. We do not represent just the people who vote for us. We also have the job of representing those people in our electorates who did not vote for us. Regardless of their political views and their persuasions, we are duty bound to stand up for them and deliver. That goes for the entire state. Even if candidates do not hold the seat, their parties are duty bound to keep their promises in those electorates.

Why am I going on about this? I had personal experience of it during the election in the seat of Warnbro. What occurred during the election campaign? The endorsed Liberal Party candidate promised a station at Karnup to the people of the electorate of Warnbro—those people living in the southern suburbs of Warnbro, Port Kennedy, Secret Harbour, Golden Bay, Singleton, Baldivis and Karnup—who are stuck without public transport in the public transport vacuum between the stations built by the Labor Party at Warnbro and Mandurah, on the train line built by the Labor Party. He deliberately went to the people with a promise and misled them.

Dr K.D. Hames: Show us.

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

Mr P. PAPALIA: I will show members. Following the formal preselection of the Liberal Party candidate, Brian Oliver wrote an article in the local newspaper, the *Southern Telegraph*, of Friday, 23 November 2012, headed “Paganoni road station pledge”. What is the meaning of the word “pledge” minister?

Dr K.D. Hames: But it is a report by someone. I want you to show me evidence, not what someone said he said.

Mr P. PAPALIA: The minister is being duplicitous and I ask that he desist because this is important. I will not name him now because he is a private citizen and is no longer running as a candidate. He claims that —

... the electorate of Warnbro has been neglected by Labor for more than two decades ...

I digress slightly from the quote, but there is the small matter of the Labor Party having built the southern suburbs railway and put stations in Warnbro and Mandurah. I will go on. The Liberal candidate claimed —

... the electorate of Warnbro has been neglected by Labor for more than two decades and has committed to a train station at Paganoni Road in his quest to unseat Paul Papalia at the State election.

The candidate also said —

... a train station at Paganoni Road was needed to reduce travel time for commuters and ease the pressure on neighbouring stations at Rockingham, Kwinana and Wellard.

Mr B.J. Grylls interjected.

Mr P. PAPALIA: No, this is what the candidate said. I give the Leader of the National Party my commitment that every single thing I committed to in the electorate of Warnbro during the election campaign was a Labor Party commitment that was fully costed and funded. One of the things I committed to —

Several members interjected.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Mr Acting Speaker! During the election campaign, one of the things I committed to on behalf of the Western Australian Labor Party was to build a station at Karnup should we be elected. We made that commitment. Do members know how much it cost? It cost \$55 million. We costed it based on the government’s own costings by the transport minister’s department, which were made public after a freedom of information application by the opposition’s transport spokesperson. We gave a commitment to build 1 200 or 1 700 car parks at Karnup station. That was to deliver to the people in the electorate of Warnbro the much needed access to public transport between Warnbro and Mandurah stations. We made that commitment and there was a public announcement by my leader. I would not have done it otherwise. I would not have told the people of Warnbro that we would deliver that had my leader not approved it and our party not committed to it.

Dr K.D. Hames interjected.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I put out a lot of stuff saying that. On the election day, the Liberal Party’s candidate—this is where the member for Dawesville gets that tricky reputation he is known for—had signs all over the place with Liberal Party commitments. The Liberal Party refined its message in an effort to avoid responsibility. It is undeniable that a commitment was given by the candidate on behalf of the Liberal Party to build a station at Karnup. Undeniably, that is the message he was conveying to the people of the electorate. He said that on numerous occasions. What was worse, and what I found quite galling, was that he criticised my party for making a promise to the people of the electorate of Warnbro to actually build the station and commit to a delivery date. The Liberal Party candidate said that was not soon enough. He said we could not promise to put it in the 2016–17 budget and to build and open it by 2019, because that was not fast enough, according to the Liberal Party. Why do I know that? It is because whichever booth one went to on election day, there were signs strewn along the access way towards the booth where people voted containing the candidate’s picture and name and carrying the Liberal Party’s motto. The signs confirmed that the candidate was the Liberal Party candidate for Warnbro. The signs also carried the slogan “Making decisions. Getting things done.” For the benefit of *Hansard*, the signs had the Liberal Party logo at the bottom and the words —

WE NEED A TRAIN STATION AT PAGANONI ROAD NOW!

A VOICE IN THE LIBERAL GOVERNMENT WILL DELIVER IT SOONER

There was an undeniable criticism of the Labor Party for promising to deliver a station in Warnbro in six years because that was not considered fast enough.

Dr K.D. Hames: Does it say “authorised” down the bottom?

Mr P. PAPALIA: Are you saying that your candidate was a liar?

Dr K.D. Hames: I am asking if it says it was authorised.

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

Mr P. PAPALIA: Are you saying that your candidate intentionally deceived the people in the electorate of Warnbro? Are you saying that he went rogue?

Dr K.D. Hames: I cannot see!

Mr P. PAPALIA: Did he go rogue? I have not mentioned the man's name, because he is not a public figure and I do not want to embarrass him or to attack him in the way that the minister has. He was representing the Liberal Party in the electorate of Warnbro. He was its endorsed candidate and he made a commitment that was reported in the local media, which was re-emphasised on numerous occasions at numerous locations around my electorate and at every single booth, where a sign informed the people of Warnbro that the Labor Party was being slack and failing the people of Warnbro by promising to deliver a station in six years. He stated that opening a station in six years was not good enough and that the Liberal Party would do it sooner. I give notice here and now to the Minister for Transport and the Premier: they made that commitment! The people who gave the Liberal Party their primary votes expect that commitment to be delivered. The people who did not vote for them expect that. For the government to do anything else will be base dishonesty. It will be shameless. It will demean the integrity of every individual in this place who stands up and gives a commitment on any day, on behalf of not only themselves and their party but this calling of politics. It will demean the value of our word and it is dishonest. It is wrong and shameful that the Premier and his party appear to consider that is acceptable and that, sadly, so does the little mirror image party, the Nationals. They consider it is okay to lie!

MR P.C. TINLEY (Willagee) [5.01 pm]: It is with great pleasure that I rise this afternoon to add my contribution in the chamber, my first for this thirty-ninth Parliament. It should not be any great surprise to people that I will dwell on my electorate at the start of this Parliament. Hopefully, I will get to do it more often so that I can laud some of the great achievements that members will not read about in *The West Australian* or hear on the wireless—or rarely. People need to hear these stories and this is the only place where members get to tell stories from their electorates. I have sat in this place listening to many speeches, particularly inaugural speeches, of a lot of members who talk with great pride about their electorates and speak of the things they have discovered, whether they are new members or returning members. It has been particularly interesting to listen to the new members who have campaigned in their seats and have discovered so much about what goes on in the suburbs, streets, various community halls and schools, and all those places where people congregate and make up this place called Western Australia. It is very interesting.

My journey is probably no different from any other member. I come from a professional background, where I was foisted into a particular lane and have lived my life. However, when we step outside of ourselves, put our names on a ballot paper and step forward and commit ourselves, with a greater sense of the need to serve others above self, particularly in the community, that is when we discover so much more about what is good about this state, what is great about this state and why it is so compelling for us to keep moving forward, to continue to make the inroads we need to make to ensure we are describing and laying the foundations for a future economy and society that my children and my children's children will benefit from. That is a broad pallet, a very broad menu, from which to choose because so much happens in our communities that is a microcosm of the way we see ourselves as a state, our collective persona, if you like, of the character that makes up what it is to be Western Australian and not just a person from a suburb of Perth, from the south or north of the river, or from a regional town. What it means is: what is the collective componentry, if you like, of all those things that give us our unique character? When I consider Western Australia I am compelled to see it, as most do, as something that sits in isolation—in the sense of its character—from the rest of the country. Here we are, nearly 2.5 million people, sitting on the western rim of the country. We are very much an Indian Ocean country; we are very much an Asian-focused country on so many different levels, not least through the direct export of our resources to the north, and the level of engagement that we have with our near neighbours in Indonesia, Thailand, Vietnam—which is a growing destination—and, of course, China. In the future we hope that places such as Burma will also join that list, should it continue to open up and embrace the idea of a globalised world and global village.

This small business called Western Australia sits isolated from the rest of the country, and not just by distance, although Jakarta is 3 000 kilometres away and Sydney is further. We sit out here, unconnected from the rest of the country in so many different ways. We share a common rail line, although initially we could not even get that right, but we fixed it! We shared a telegraph cable, and that took a long time to get.

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: That is right; a previous Premier of this state got them on board. There was the promise of rail infrastructure—good lord! A conservative delivering rail infrastructure, that is unique; but it has some history.

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

We share these physical connections; we share a common coastline, but that is it. We do not share a power network or other utilities, such as happens on the east coast. Those sorts of devices are not available to us. We do not share those connections—those things that happen on a daily basis on the eastern seaboard that allow them to have a greater sense of their own Australia. Our Australia is quite different. Our Western Australia is extremely vast, and we have heard some great contributions by members from both sides—certainly from this side—from places as far afield as the Kimberley. We heard this afternoon many detailed speeches about Ernie Bridge, and they provided a particular insight for me in gaining a better understanding of the breadth of that character, because it extends from places like the Kimberley, embracing traditional ownership and greater connection to that land than perhaps other Indigenous communities have had the opportunity to maintain since European settlement. It all adds to the idea that we need to better inform ourselves about our history and our commitment to our future.

I think it was really important that the member for Kwinana made a somewhat controversial Address-in-Reply speech in saying that Western Australia was not formed out of a peaceful settlement; this place called Western Australia was indeed formed out of some bloodshed. Certainly, it was not on the scale of the War of American Independence or the American Civil War, but it did arise out of bloodshed, and we need to be completely open and honest about the concept that we actually dispossessed a whole race of people through ignorance, if nothing else, and through the crime of silence or through the crime of commission to actually hunt down and murder the Indigenous people of Western Australia. I think that is really important. For me, it does not detract from any sense of ownership that I have for this great, grand and graceful state; and it does not in any way diminish my contribution or invalidate my presence. In fact, knowledge of the traditional owners of Western Australia enhances my sense of place and my idea of what it is to be a Western Australian. We must embrace all of it if we are to contribute to its future in a full and holistic way.

One of the things that really struck me whilst listening to members opposite is that it was difficult to find the contrast between the philosophical basis by which they have called themselves conservatives and the philosophical base by which they call themselves left of centre progressives or, in our case, the Labor Party and why I am a Labor man. It was really interesting because in this day and age we cannot necessarily always break it down policy by policy. For example, a number of members on the other side of this chamber are pro-gay marriage. A number of people on this side of the chamber—the progressive side—are anti-gay marriage. I completely respect the fact that there is a divergent set of views. When I break away from those different policy positions, whether they relate to uranium, gay marriage or a range of other areas that might traditionally fall along party lines and no longer do, where is the separation? Where does one stop being a conservative and start to become a progressive Labor person? Apart from a slavish commitment to the leader in the form of the Premier and whatever he says is gospel no matter when it was heard or read, no matter what ministerial appointment one has, the other thing that struck me was this concept or notion that the Liberal Party, and maybe less so the National Party—it would be interesting to test that—on the conservative side of politics stands for the rights of individuals and their inalienable right to make their own way in the world, make their own way through life and do as they please within the freedoms of their personal liberties, which is a small “I” view of the world. The contrast with my own values and those that I know to be the centre and the core of the Labor Party or the progressive side of politics is that we do not believe that the Liberal idea of the individual is supreme. We do not subscribe to that idea; we subscribe to the idea of collectivism. Before members opposite say that this is just a socialist rant and we will be a communist state before we know it, I draw their attention —

Mr W.J. Johnston: If the Premier gets his way.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: Even when I talk to the Premier about how he wants to renationalise the production of electricity in this state, I find it is a topsy-turvy world. It is all upside down. There are all sorts of different things that I am yet to fathom when it comes to the conservatives.

For this side of politics, the progressive side, we do not get to claim the title of left of centre or progressive without the commitment to reform. If one is not a reformist, one is not left of centre; one is a conservative, a defender of the status quo. That is not a critique; it is not a slur at all. The conservative side of politics has a long, proud heritage of defending the status quo and keeping things the way they were. We can go back through the ages and look at the resistance to it. We on this side of Parliament believe that the group—the collective, the society, the community—actually forms the best basis by which we can build consensus and deliver a future that is for all and that talks about the idea of service for each other through collective work, with the team always outdoing the individual and always being stronger and more capable than any individual or the pursuit of any individual rights or freedoms within the bounds of our inalienable human rights. It is with that sort of view that we come to the thirty-ninth Parliament and we look for the legislative agenda, the grand vision or the idea that this government so handsomely won on. We look inside the policy direction of the last campaign to determine

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

what the conservative side of politics has in store for the next four years for this great state. What is it? I am yet to find out, because when I review the piecemeal promises and the piecemeal announcements of the last election, I am completely bereft of an understanding of the central theme or the ambition. All we had was a series of promises. I might add that one of the best promises that the Liberal–National Party made, and now the Liberal–National government will hopefully have to deliver on—although there is no guarantee that a promise, of itself, intones any idea that it might be delivered—was the airport rail link. I recall that in the previous Parliament, the thirty-eighth Parliament, many people got to their feet and said that an airport rail link was not needed.

Mr W.J. Johnston: Including the transport minister.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: Yes, not the least of whom was the Minister for Transport. They said that an airport link is a waste of taxpayers' money and is redundant. Yet during the campaign the government, which was trying to be returned, made promises that it did not believe in. How is it so? There are two things that would lead us to believe that a conservative government, trying to be returned, would back something it does not believe in. One possibility is that we spooked it with Metronet. We got out of the blocks early and created a very large idea about public transport and the values that we have for public transport, not the least of which is the value of being able to do heavy-lifting urban rail, and we cornered the Liberal Party into matching a promise it did not want to make. That is one possibility. The other possibility is that it will say and do anything it can to get elected. If we subscribe to the second option that it will say and do anything to get re-elected, this idea speaks to the fact that it is rudderless. The Liberal–National government is simply going through an in-tray, because it is just about decisions. The in-tray fills up with decisions to be made and it makes decisions. Well done! What does it mean? Where is it taking this state? Where are we going as an isolated, proud, confident small business, if you will, of 2.5 million people sitting on the Indian Ocean in the west? Where does it take us? Where is our future? Why have we not embraced it? Why was it not articulated by a government wanting to be returned, and which was so handsomely returned? It cannot, to my way of thinking, deliver a central theme or an idea about what it is about. It has a few “tough on law and order” issues. It was cornered into making a rail announcement and a bunch of other little localised things. It was more interested in what it could do at the local level to roll a sitting member or to carve the margin of a Labor member than in having the capacity and fortitude to present to the electorate a unifying guiding theme that would deliver a future that people can believe in. This government presented nothing to the electorate at the last election that said that it would present a future the electorate can believe in.

[Member's time extended.]

Mr P.C. TINLEY: The guiding theme of this returned government is just the election win. The guiding set of values and principles of this group of people is just to preserve the status quo of making sure that there is an in-tray. If, for example, they had a very big agenda or a very big idea about where they want to take this place called Western Australia, why is it that we are sitting here, in our second week of Parliament, with not one bill to contemplate? Not one bill has been laid on the table. There is no legislative agenda that follows on naturally from the big grand vision that the Premier presented to the people of Western Australia. There is nothing. The notice paper should be groaning with what is on the agenda for us to deliver for the people of Western Australia. Look at the notice paper! It is one piece of paper, single-sided. It could have been printed on a piece of B5!

Dr A.D. Buti: Double space!

Mr P.C. TINLEY: Triple space! It is not even signed! When we left this place at the end of the thirty-eighth Parliament, the notice paper was some 20 pages long, double-sided, tight as, replete with the ambitions of this side of the house and the ambitions of that side of the house. But now we have nothing. The government did not even reinstate all the bills on the notice paper. It could have done that. It could have reinstated all the bills by means of a couple of motions. But it did not do any of that. So, here we are, out in the west, drifting along, rudderless, not sure of where we are going, at the whim and whimsy of the winds that prevail through Asia and through our communities and our society. We are just drifting along, wondering. We are wondering about what is going to happen when floating LNG happens and we get none of it. We are wondering about when the Premier is going to call time on Oakajee and be honest with the people and say that Oakajee—one of the masthead beliefs or signature policy ideas that he would like to lay claim to—is dead. We are wondering about where the gas pipeline development is. We are wondering about when the Ord River is going to deliver the food bowl—the food bowl, not the sandalwood bowl —

Ms R. Saffioti: Not the sugar bowl!

Mr P.C. TINLEY: Not the sugar bowl, not the corn bowl —

Mr D.A. Templeman: Not the rose bowl.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: We could probably do roses. We could probably do roses in the Ord.

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

Ms M.M. Quirk: No; too many insects.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: Yes; aphids.

So what is the Liberal–National government going to do? It is just going to chug along with the worst of those turgid ideas of just winning for the sake of it, just so that it can empty an in-tray. And, by the way, if the public servants get in the way and deign to question what the Liberal–National government is doing, they will be out. The government will have more front than Myers. It will come into this place and just wish things away. We have just heard the Minister for Energy come into this place and say, when he was asked a direct question about when did he learn about the re-merger of Verve and Synergy, that he cannot talk about that; that is cabinet-in-confidence. Rubbish! That is rubbish, and he knows it. The very fact that that is just the whim of the Premier is not lost on the people of Western Australia. It is not lost on the backbench. All those economic dries on the back bench know it. They do not believe for one second that a re-merger is anything but just the edict of the Premier. They do not believe for one second that it is in the interests of this state to re-merge Verve and Synergy. Before the Minister for Energy came into this place, he spent his entire professional life talking about market forces, an open economy and the need to liberalise these sorts of utilities, and making obvious connections to the fact that governments have gone out of all sorts of different businesses, not the least of which is airlines, and not the least of which is banks and floating the dollar—the sorts of things that are big economic movers. Yet this is the very person who wants to take a retrograde step that will take this state back to—where? Is this a progressive state? Not under this Premier. Those poor people in cabinet just have to kowtow and move according to the Premier’s whims and according to what he decides is in this state’s best interests. That is not democracy. That is not the Liberal Party’s idea of the right and power of the individual. Where is the right and power of the individual in the Liberal Party around that cabinet table? Where is it? The one thing I opened with was the differences between the left and the right of this chamber. There is the conservative side, the defenders of the status quo—small “i” liberals defending individualism and the right of the individual to go peacefully and quietly into this world and make their own way, safe in the knowledge that they can stand on their own resources and own their own private property, and that is sacrosanct. They are all good Liberal values—no problems—but where is that at the cabinet table? Where is it? Where is the spine that will actually stand up to this Premier? Which one of them is it, because it ain’t the Treasurer? He is too busy trying to buy off the backbench, with flashing 40-kay signs for any of his friends, because he knows he needs to line himself up; the clock is ticking. So, either they have been bought off by the Treasurer for their silence or they are just spineless; they are just jelly backs who cannot stand up to this man, and he will take this state down. He will take it down, and I will tell members where it will come from—\$23 billion worth of state debt! Suck on that, because in four years that is going to come home to roost, and all you dries over there, all you people, all you conservatives who want to defend the status quo, can defend that—defend our capacity, with declining revenue, to service that debt, and tell me that you are not going to consign certainly my eldest son to a long term of debt reduction and of cost and service reduction that will diminish the quality of life of the people of Western Australia. Tell me that. Tell me how we are going to pay down \$23 billion worth of debt.

By the way, of course, do not forget that we are borrowing on the credit card as well, because there is a future fund. We borrowed to put money into the future fund. I wonder what the interest rate is on that. What is the net return there?

Ms R. Saffioti: Gee, thank goodness we’ve got a future fund!

Mr P.C. TINLEY: Thank goodness we have a future fund.

The world is definitely upside down. The Premier wants to re-merge our electricity sector and he wants to create a future fund on the never-never card. He wants to keep racking up debt. He got cornered because he has no central value set in relation to where he wants to take this state. He has no centralised vision that actually delivers for a 10 and 20-year view of this state that the Premier or this government might hold. He got cornered into making a \$1 billion commitment to a rail line that he does not believe in and his transport minister does not believe in. He committed to a re-merger of the energy producer in this state, which runs completely contrary to the economic rationale of not only the energy minister, but also probably every economic-thinking member across the chamber. All those opposite know it. The government has to pay for an inordinate number of promises. They know that the cost of that stadium will not be \$1.3 billion with the associated transport infrastructure that will have to be plugged on the side of it; they know that it will not. They know that they cannot do a Friday night game, because to meet the requirements of the Friday night games for the east coast market, with the five o’clock kick-offs, they will be competing with people trying to use the rail line to actually get home. They know that they will not be able to fill the stadium, they know that these things are there, yet they continue to just sit there, either in the cabinet room or in the party room, and acquiesce. What has this guy got over them? Has he got photos of the goat? What does he know about them? What is he holding over them? What

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

has he got that is making them such little people—small, tiny people, with no spine and with no capacity to actually stand up to this guy and say, “Do you know what, Premier? You’re taking the state in the wrong direction. You’re taking the state down. Seriously, you’re taking the state down like a Lancaster bomber over Berlin. It’s going down in flames”?

In conclusion, I would like to move an amendment to the Address-in-Reply. The proposed amendment really speaks to the heart of what is wrong with this Premier, with this idea that he does not have, and with this intellectual cul-de-sac that is the Liberal Party.

Amendment to Motion

Mr P.C. TINLEY: I move —

That the following words be added to the motion —

but regrets to inform His Excellency that the Barnett government has failed to provide proper policing services in the Western Australian community

DR A.D. BUTI (Armadale) [5.30 pm]: In question time today the member for Belmont asked the Minister for Police a dorothy dixer. The minister got it very wrong, which is a bit embarrassing. The member for Belmont might like to know that Don Randall, who she congratulated in her inaugural speech, is a great champion of the 24/7 police station in Armadale. Last year the member for Darling Range and I, in concert with Don Randall, managed to obtain 12 000 signatures —

Ms R. Saffioti: How many?

Dr A.D. BUTI: Twelve thousand signatures of people wanting a 24/7 public access police station in Armadale. I know that the member for Belmont has a long history with Don Randall. Some would say that he has been the member for Belmont’s mentor. I think the member for Belmont should not be duped by what the police minister is telling her. She should have an afternoon with Don Randall, who is a local politician in the Armadale region, as is the member for Darling Range, and as also am I, as the local member.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: And Don Randall was the local federal member covering Belmont as the member for Swan.

Dr A.D. BUTI: He was the former member for Swan. We have a better idea of police concerns in the south east, or the Armadale region, than one would think the police minister has. The police minister tried to mock the public rally last Saturday. How dare she mock a public rally in Armadale of concerned citizens. How dare she try to mock that!

Mrs L.M. Harvey: I did not mock those people.

Dr A.D. BUTI: Yes, you tried very much to mock it.

Do members know what the Minister for Police’s response was to the public rally? It was, “I will monitor the police and the criminal situation in Armadale.” I will read to the minister an email I received on 10 April. It states —

On Monday night my daughter called 000 saying there was someone trying to get into the house here & her friend were sharing. She was told to go to a safe room & hang up. A few minutes later she rang & told them someone was in the house. The occupants of the house consisted of 2 females & 2 children. It took the police 25 minutes to get to them. This is horrific considering they live on Seventh Rd which is less than 5 minutes from the Armadale Police station. Because of the delay the burglar was able to enter the house & in doing so was able to steal a complete set of keys to the house before leaving. My daughter & her friend were so frightened with the delay she called me to take her 18yr old son to try to scare whoever it was away. I arrived 5 minutes after the police & I live in Kelmscott very close to the railway station ... I now have the 2 children staying with me as they are too scared to go home yet in case the prowler comes back. My daughter & her friend are staying with another friend. The locks have been changed on the house at a cost of \$800, which is a huge payout for a nurse who has to work extra shifts to make the money up. Because of the delay there are 2 children who are now separated from their mother so they feel safe. Please do something about getting better response times for our City.

When the minister was on 6PR radio on Friday afternoon, one would not have thought that there were any problems in Armadale. People would think Armadale is swarming with police and that if a person rang 000 in Armadale the police would be there within five minutes—surely. In this case there was a home invasion and it took 25 minutes for police to attend! According to the minister, the police are out there in their cars. They are everywhere in Armadale, they are out there in their cars, so members would think it would not take 25 minutes.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 7 May 2013]

p229f-270a

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

I will read parts of the speeches of a couple of people who made contributions to the rally on Saturday. I will quote initially from Cathy North, who is a resident of Camillo. I am sure the minister realises that Camillo is one of the higher crime rate areas in the south east corridor. In part, this is what Cathy North said —

A 24/7 Police hub will see an increase in officers stationed in Armadale, but more importantly, it will mean we have officers who understand the issues that are specific to us.

Whilst many of the crimes we see in Armadale are no different to what is being experienced in some other areas of Perth, we do have some issues that are specific to us.

It must be extremely difficult and frustrating for Police Officers when they are sent to areas with minimal information or history of the area, no understanding of the climate and limited back-up readily available, especially at night. This is a risk to the Officers, is ineffective and the worst type of modelling you can apply.

We need a Police presence that has a fundamental understanding of the underlying problems in the area. Who understand the Public Access Way system, where they lead and how they are used as a means of escape by both thieves and unlicensed bikes, especially at night. Officers who are familiar with nature and habits of the repeat offenders in the area and the tactics they use. Officers who have a local focus and can use knowledge gained over weeks or months, to recognise what is out of the ordinary especially at night.

And lastly a physical place to attend if you are in trouble, feeling scared, threatened or vulnerable. The dark of night, when there are far fewer people around, no shops open and plenty of hiding places leaves people feeling very insecure, especially if you are in transit and unable to retreat into your own home.

I wonder what the Minister for Police's answer is to someone who is outside their home without a phone, and someone is inside their house? They are going to ring up 000, are they? They might actually live only a few minutes away from the police station, but it is no good knocking on the door of Armadale Police Station because it is closed after four o'clock on weekdays and not open at all on weekends! How can a major regional centre like Armadale not have a police station open on a Friday or Saturday night? It is absurd!

Cathy North goes on —

At present, a call for assistance can see Officers coming from anywhere across the city, unless there is a car already in the area, we can expect travel times upwards of 25 minutes and should a higher priority call be received on route, the car will be diverted.

...

We call on Colin Barnett, Lisa Harvey and Karl O'Callaghan to get on board and recognise that the people of Armadale are of value, that the folk south of the river need the equivalent number of Metropolitan 24 hour Police Stations as North of the River where there are 4 compared to just Cannington and Fremantle down south and to accept that the Armadale station is the both the best placed and most in need for 24 hour, 7 day a week coverage.

Denise Hardie works for Drug ARM and has worked and lived in the Armadale region for 40 years. She has a particular knowledge of youth problems in the area. She made a contribution to the rally and said, in part —

Each year many organisations in the City of Armadale are given significant tax payer funding to tackle antisocial behaviour and crime, just based on our postcode being one of high crime risk areas. Youth Crime prevention and diversion is a huge part of my job. My staffs work with young people who all too often have been victims of crime, have drug issues thanks to the local drug dealer, or who are at risk of becoming perpetrators themselves because sadly it is the neighbourhood norm. My staff have been threatened with handguns, assaulted and are constantly reporting issues to the police, with no or poorly timed responses from the police.

Increasingly we are seeing young people become victims of crime and young people are telling us that being assaulted in Armadale and having your possessions stolen is just a regular part of everyday living here for many of them.

Gone are the day of community policing where the local police officer was visible known to all and was someone who a young person could go to when they found themselves in situations that were over their head. Gone are the days when you could expect to even see a police officer within a reasonable response time. Just last weekend when we needed the police to remove a person in our care for threats he made to staff and who had his bail revoked, it took two days for the police to respond.

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

We rang Cannington Police Station many times and the times when the phone didn't ring out, we were told that there was only two police officers available for the whole south metro area. If the person acted on his threats, we were told to ring triple zero. Not good enough.

In my role as a community sector worker, we need the support of the police to do our jobs properly and to ensure that those tax payer funds that are given to for crime prevention are as effective as possible.

...

And if you think it's bad in the Armadale central area, just ask the local residents in outlying areas like Forrestdale and Roleystone —

Which would be of particular concern to the member for Darling Range —

where an afterhour's police response isn't even considered anymore because both the residents and the crims know it just isn't coming.

The minister on radio and also today did the usual trick that the Premier used to do by saying that all the residents of Armadale and I, as the member for Armadale, are advocating for is a front-desk service. Nothing could be further from the truth, minister. That is not what we are asking for. I will tell members why we are asking for a 24/7 police station. I have been told by senior police officers that the problem is that, to paraphrase, Armadale is so far away that sometimes when police reinforcements are requested, the police do not make it to Armadale because they are diverted to equally pressing police issues. If we had a 24/7 public access hub in Armadale, there would naturally be more police closer to Armadale for longer periods than under the current system. That has been told to me by senior police. I look forward to the briefing that the minister offered me; I replied in a letter yesterday. I am interested in how the minister's briefing will be different from what police officers who work in the area have told me. They have told me that we are not asking for a front-desk service; we are asking for another Cannington. That is what we want in Armadale.

If 24/7s are not important, why did the government make an election promise that it will spend \$90 million or \$70 million on police stations, or some similar amount? If police stations are not important and every car is a police station, spend the money on the cars. Do not worry about the police stations. The minister has stated that every car is a police station. Do not waste the money on the police stations. Last Sunday, Cannington Police Station was closed for an upgrade. Why worry about it if police stations are not important? Why do we need to upgrade police stations if they are not important? It is interesting that Armadale is one of the areas with the highest crime rates and the local residents are advocating for a 24/7 police station as a conduit to a hub to have increased police, not just to have people behind the desk. The fact is we can use auxiliary staff in any case. In the last term did the Barnett government not commit to a 24/7 public access police station in Claremont? I think that is correct. The minister can correct me if I am wrong, but I think the minister admitted in the last —

Ms M.M. Quirk: It is the western suburbs.

Dr A.D. BUTI: It will be allocated in Claremont. It is very interesting that we will have this western suburbs hub based in Claremont when we have a 24/7 police station about eight or 10 kilometres down the road in Fremantle and we have Perth central headquarters about 10 kilometres the other way. What does Armadale get? We have Cannington, which has to deal with north of Cannington, south of Cannington and up to Roleystone. For the poor people who live in Byford and Mundijong, their hub is Mandurah. Mandurah has to cover Byford, Mundijong and Serpentine. If we had the hub in Armadale, it could cover Byford and Mundijong. As the member for Darling Range well knows, that council is the fastest growing local government area in Australia. Granted it is coming from a low base, but the population growth in Armadale and surrounding regions will be greater than in the western suburbs. The population in the western suburbs will not be growing much more, but it will out our way. However, the minister's only response is, "We are monitoring the situation; it's fine; the police are on the beat." There are so many police on the beat that it takes 25 minutes to respond to a home invasion! Surely the minister does not think that is sufficient or satisfying.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: I don't.

Dr A.D. BUTI: The minister surely does not think that it is sufficient to take 25 minutes to respond to a home invasion. I am sure that a lot of her backbenchers also would not agree it is satisfactory.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: It is not satisfactory; I accept that.

Dr A.D. BUTI: Because we are in Armadale the minister does not give a damn. The minister does not give a damn about Armadale. The Premier said that he was going to come out to Armadale. Two years ago when I became the member for Armadale he said, "I'm going to be visiting Armadale a lot in the next two years." How many times did he visit Armadale? It was probably no more than twice. He also said before the election

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

campaign that he was going to have a policy for Armadale. I did not see one policy announced by the Premier in regard to Armadale—not one. What was the minister’s response to the concerned citizens of Armadale who attended a public rally? In my memory of living in Armadale for 43 to 44 years, I have never seen a public rally of that size. It was done with limited advertising. If we had had the money to advertise it properly, there would have been at least 500 people. The minister’s response was to go on air and say, “Things are fine in Armadale. We have all this police monitoring. They are in their cars. Each car is a police station.” The minister got on 6PR —

Mrs L.M. Harvey: I didn’t say it was fine.

Dr A.D. BUTI: Yes, you did, on Friday.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: Get the transcript.

Dr A.D. BUTI: Then she said after the rally, “Oh, I’m going to monitor the situation.” I can tell the minister that the situation in Armadale is terrible and her policing policy is not working. Commissioner of Police O’Callaghan, who came out to a public meeting in Kelmscott last year—it might have been the year before—even agreed that there was great merit for Armadale to be the focus of a new hub. The police commissioner agreed that it was appropriate and that there was great merit in Armadale being a new hub. How could anyone argue otherwise? We are a growing regional centre. The minister’s response is, “Well, we will just have police cars.”

Mrs L.M. Harvey: What was your policy, member?

Dr A.D. BUTI: Does the minister know what our policy was? Read our policing policy for the election. It was that if we were elected, as a matter of priority we would be negotiating with the police commissioner about a 24/7 station in Armadale. That was our policy. The minister did not even mention Armadale.

Mr D.A. Templeman: You are ruling it out.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: I am not ruling it out.

Dr A.D. BUTI: Yes, you have. The minister has ruled it out. She has mocked the local residents who have concerns. The minister does not live out that way, although I believe she grew up not too far away so that she should be aware of the situation. The minister should be aware that people in Camillo, people in Brookdale and people in other areas of Armadale are scared to go out at night. The minister’s response is, “Oh, well; we don’t need people at the police station because they’re out there in the cars.” The fact is that they are not out there in the cars. It is an absolute disgrace!

It is a fact that when we have a 24/7 station, there will be naturally, as a senior police officer told me, more police in Armadale. Even the police out on the beat are not always in their car. They occasionally have to go out and have their meals or they have to do paperwork. With Cannington being the central hub, most of that is done at Cannington; therefore, if the police are called out to a job in Cannington, they take only three or four minutes. But because they are based at Cannington, when they are called out to a job in Armadale, it takes them half an hour to get there.

The minister’s policy as it currently stands has no merit, it has no credibility and it shows a complete lack of respect for the local residents of Armadale, Darling Range and even further south. It is a joke! It is bad enough in Armadale where we have some major issues with crime, but the poor residents of Roleystone do not even worry about ringing up as it is just not worth it—and the minister’s response is, “I’m going to monitor the situation.”

I look forward to the minister monitoring the situation and I look forward to her showing some respect for the residents in the south east corridor, but at the moment her response has not been respectful. How dare she say that the residents —

Mrs L.M. Harvey: I didn’t say that.

Dr A.D. BUTI: She did not say it, but how dare she imply that the residents of Armadale who attended a public rally on Saturday do not have merit in their argument for a 24/7 station. How dare the minister try to minimise it by saying that we want a 24/7 counter service. We do not want a 24/7 counter service; we want a proper 24/7 police station like Cannington or like the new one in the western suburbs. That is what we want and it is about time this police minister gave it to us.

MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan) [5.50 pm]: I think the member for Armadale has given the government too much credit. I do not think it has a policing policy. Does the government still support the hub policy or not? Over the past four years we heard that the hub policy was the way to go, that there would be massive police hubs and suburban police stations would be shut. Then during the election campaign we saw a complete 180 on that policy

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

with suburban stations supported and hubs maybe not being the way to go at all. The law and order policy of this government is absolutely all over the place. Today the member for Belmont outlined the policing and crime issues in Belmont. Everyone on this side —

Mr W.J. Johnston: Crime out of control for four years.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Exactly. Every member on this side, and I think many on the other side, is getting increasing complaints about a lack of police presence, a lack of police in the community and antisocial behaviour issues throughout the community. I do not think the government's strategy, if it has one, is working whatsoever and I think everyone knows it. We have seen the new Minister for Corrective Services. I do not know what he is trying to do, but in relation to his corrective services policy he said he now wants to reduce the prisoner population after saying for four and a half years that we should be increasing the prisoner population. I saw his interview last Friday night on 7.30 WA.

Mr D.A. Templeman: That was a cracker!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It was a cracker and I urge everyone to watch that interview because it was pretty much the highlight of my Friday night, which says what Friday nights consist of currently!

Mr T.K. Waldron interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The Dockers played on Saturday, mate!

Mr D.A. Templeman: It was a Vicky Pollard speech.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It was a Vicky Pollard speech.

Mr D.A. Templeman: "Yeah but, no but."

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: "So do you want to increase prisoner population?" "Yeah, but no!" I do not think the law and order strategy is at all working. I do not think that there is a strategy. I think the issue of policing the community is something that the government has failed to grapple with over the past four and a half years. The government went on the path of saying, "A police car is a mobile police station." No-one believes that. I do not think the police believe it. No-one in the community believes that a police car is a mobile police station. First of all, there is the issue of people wanting to know with some certainty that they can go to speak to someone in an office about an issue in their community. They want to establish relationships over time. Again, the key issue is a lack of community policing and that a police car driving past occasionally is not community policing. People want to establish relationships, they want to have trust in that relationship and they want to be able to access their police whenever and wherever possible.

Mr J.E. McGrath: You're taking us back to the 50s!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The concept of community policing —

Dr A.D. Buti: It might be all right for you in South Perth, mate!

Mr J.E. McGrath: We have a lot of crime in South Perth, don't worry about that. Most of it is probably coming from your electorate.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Sorry, what was that?

Dr A.D. Buti: I want to place on record you've got to be careful what you say, member for South Perth.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I heard it; the member for South Perth said that he has a lot of crime in his suburb and it comes from the member for Armadale's electorate; that is what he said.

Mr W.J. Johnston: And he's proud of it, too.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: He seems to be smiling about it. The issue of community policing might be a 50s concept but it is as relevant today as it was in the 1950s; it is actually more relevant. With the issue of more youth being disengaged, it is actually more important today to establish those relationships. We talk about police and community youth centres. They are something that governments ignore during the normal course of government and during election periods there is a sudden love for PCYCs because the government knows they are popular and they know that people like that relationship with their local police through those services. Like I said, community policing might be an old-fashioned concept, and call me old-fashioned —

Mr J.E. McGrath: The world has grown; the population has grown a bit.

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The population has grown and police numbers have grown, but not sufficiently and we need more police in the community; that is what we need. We need people to have trust and respect for the police, but trust and respect have disappeared over the years because relationships have not been developed.

I want to go over some of the law and order issues in Ballajura because it was probably the best example of this government's failure in the law and order debate in WA. In 2009 this government closed the Ballajura Police Station. They did it without any consultation and with little or no communication with the local community. They informed people at a forum I had organised to discuss policing. There I was organising a forum to discuss local policing when the police rocked up and said, "Oh, yes, by the way, we are closing your police station."

Mr B.S. Wyatt: They certainly discussed it.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes. They closed the police station. I raised the issue of the Ballajura Police Station numerous times. I raised it through correspondence, I raised it through grievances and I raised it directly with the minister and other senior people in the police service. We tabled a significant petition and ran another campaign. I think we got more than 4 000 signatures from just the Ballajura suburb. It was not as big as the member for Armadale's petition, but it was restricted to just the suburb of Ballajura. There was basically no support from the other side. Time and time again I was told that police cars were mobile police stations and that we do not need a police station to provide an appropriate service. The people in Ballajura who raised concerns were told the same thing.

A letter from the government in 2009 said that the relocation of police from Ballajura to Kiara would provide increased patrol capacity and the realignment would result in not only increased patrols but higher visibility. The argument put to me was that the closure of the Ballajura Police Station and moving the police up to 11 kilometres away to the Kiara Police Station—not a designated hub, just the Kiara Police Station—was that moving those police out of Ballajura would increase police visibility and police patrols.

Mr J.E. McGrath: You are denigrating our police force; that is what you are doing. Our police force does an amazing job. What about getting with the real world? There are helicopters there. You want police officers riding push bikes.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms J.M. Freeman): Members! The member for West Swan has the floor. She did not ask for that interjection, member for South Perth, so continue member.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member for South Perth just insulted everyone in Armadale and I am sure there are some police officers living in Armadale who currently feel insulted.

Dr A.D. Buti interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes, exactly.

Mr J.E. McGrath: We had the South Perth Police Station closed and had to go to the one in Kensington. Policing has changed. Don't you understand that?

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member for South Perth might like closing police stations, but I do not.

Mr J.E. McGrath interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members! Member for South Perth I understand. Member for West Swan, move on because you are now baiting the member for South Perth, so it does not help.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: All I am saying is that I support local police stations. It is not that controversial. I might be old fashioned, but I support police in the community.

As I said, I will raise a number of issues. I want to put on record once again some of the federal Liberal Party members' contributions on this issue during that time. The member for Armadale had support from the federal member for Canning. I did not have quite the same amount of support from the member for Cowan. I will read an email from the federal member for Cowan on not going into bat to save the Ballajura Police Station—no, no, no. It reads —

The state MLA is running on this and getting support.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: Getting support. They like police stations too.

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It continues —

I think that it will be just a matter of time before she tries to turn it on me as a Liberal. I had a concept that may be able to get the truth going in this issue and focus in the right area. Soon I have an unaddressed mail out of an envelope into Ballajura. I propose to include a letter to the Police Commissioner, that the resident can put their name to and put into a box at local newsagents. The letter would ask the Commissioner to reverse his decision. An explanatory letter in my envelope would say that this is his decision. The result being that the locals identify the decision with the Commissioner and not the State Government or Liberal Party, and I get profile for trying to assist.

That is good community work for the member for Cowan. It continues —

What do you think? Luke

Anyway, the minister's office at the time was not very happy with that strategy because they thought, "Hang on, it may actually backfire on us." Poor old Luke did not go ahead with that strategy after all.

Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.00 pm

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Before the suspension, I was in the middle of discussing the closure of the Ballajura Police Station by the government in 2009. In case some of my colleagues missed it, I will reiterate some of the comments made by the federal member for Cowan when the police station was closed. Instead of advocating for keeping the police station open, rather than trying to get the police station back, in 2009 he wrote in an email to the then Minister for Police's office —

... The State MLA is running on this and getting support. I think that it will be just a matter of time before she tries to turn it on me as a Liberal. I had a concept that may be able to get the truth going in this issue and focus in the right area. Soon I have an unaddressed mail out of an envelope into Ballajura. I propose to include a letter to the Police Commissioner, that the resident can put their name to and put into a box at local newsagents. The letter would ask the Commissioner to reverse his decision. An explanatory letter in my envelope would say that this is his decision. The result being that the locals identify the decision with the Commissioner and not the State Government or Liberal Party, and I get profile for trying to assist. What do you think? Luke.

That is incredible. As I said, he was not really going in to bat for it. I had very little support from the Liberal people in the area to keep that police station open. It was very disappointing to see that the federal member for Cowan was too interested in the politics of the issue and not in trying to keep the police station open.

I raised this issue on numerous occasions. I was going to count the number of times I have mentioned the Ballajura Police Station in *Hansard* over the last four and a half years, but I think it would be upwards of 100.

Mr D.A. Templeman: I think it would be, and I know because I sat next to you the whole time.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes. I raised it again and again. The government said that a police station was not needed in Ballajura. It said that policing would improve when the police station in Ballajura was closed because every police car would be a mobile police station. The government said that hubbing was the way to go and that police hubs would deliver a better service to the community. The government maintained that policy for 1 342 days. I will repeat that: for 1 342 days the government said Ballajura did not need a police station. Then a funny thing happened during the election campaign. The Liberal Party, as we know, had a lot of money and did a lot of polling. I am not sure whether some of my colleagues had a similar experience, but in the first couple of weeks of January the Liberal Party was polling my electorate on a daily basis. I know people who were polled three or four times by the same company. The last question in the polling was: what can the Liberal Party commit to in Ballajura that will change your mind? That was the polling question asked. What election commitment can the Liberal Party commit to that would have you consider voting for Natasha Cheung? That was the question asked. I think that in that polling a lot of people said they wanted a Ballajura police station. I think that is what happened, because for 1 342 days the Liberal Party said that we did not need a police station, but with 25 days to go to the election to our great surprise—we were agog and aghast—the government, the Liberal Minister for Police, came out and said, "We're going to build a Ballajura police station."

Mr P. Papalia: How embarrassing!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: That is what happened!

Mr P. Papalia: They don't get involved in operational decisions!

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I will go through it again for members: for 1 342 days the government told my electorate that it did not need a police station; police stations were so 1950s, so yesterday! They said we did not need police stations and that they were very old-fashioned. They said we did not need police stations anymore, because every police car is a mobile police station and we would get a better service if they put all the police 11 kilometres away in another police station! So, for 1 342 days the government said, “No, no, no! Police stations reduce the service to the community!” They told us that we did not need a police station and that all we needed were more cars whizzing past. So, for 1 342 days the government said, “No police station!” but after a bit of polling—or let us face it, a lot of polling—after ringing thousands of people, I think Menzies House said, “Hang on! We’ve got an issue here. We think the people in Ballajura want a police station!” Who would have thought that people want a local police station? After all of this polling —

Dr A.D. Buti: But they would not have agreed to it, surely?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: As I said, I was agog and aghast when I got a phone call from somebody saying that the Liberal Party had committed to a police station in Ballajura. I was doorknocking at the time and, seriously, I had to sit down on the grass to compose myself. I was waving myself with my little pamphlet, which set down my commitment to a police station, and thinking to myself, “Goodness gracious! Could they be so duplicitous?” I do not know whether that is the word, but I cannot even begin to describe how, after 1 342 days hearing the government say, “You do not need a police station! You’re an idiot for asking for one and the people of Ballajura shouldn’t get a police station,” and with 25 days to go to the election, after a bit of polling—or let us face it, a lot of polling —

Dr A.D. Buti: Luke might have had something to do with it!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Luke was doorknocking his little heart out. So, with 25 days to the election, the government committed to a Ballajura police station. As I said, it floored me for a little bit, but then I rebounded and I thought that people were not so crazy that they would not know that it was this government that shut their police station! Of course, the people in the electorate of West Swan realised that it was the Liberal Party that had shut the police station and had told them for 1 342 days that they did not need a police station. So, there it is: the Liberal Party committed to a police station, which I am happy about. I am happy that the Liberal Party committed to a 24/7 police station in Ballajura.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: It wasn’t going to be 24/7; it was for a police station.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Is the minister saying that it is not 24/7?

Mrs L.M. Harvey: No; it is 24-hour policing, but it was not a 24/7 police station—not in Ballajura, no.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: So it was not a 24/7 police station? The minister is on record saying it will not be a 24/7 service.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: Not in Ballajura, no.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The minister is saying there was no commitment for a 24/7 Ballajura police station.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: There was a commitment for a Ballajura police station, but I have already talked about the 24/7 police stations being located more strategically throughout the metropolitan area.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: That is okay. I just want the minister on record saying that she does not believe that the Liberal Party committed to a 24/7 police station. That is the minister’s belief, but I am sure that in the fullness of time the full facts —

Mrs L.M. Harvey: I invite you to look at the document that went out.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The minister can look at the documents, but I am sure that in the coming weeks the full facts will come out. I remember that the government said it did not promise an Ellenbrook train line! Do members remember that? It did not promise that there would be a train line!

Mr P. Papalia: It’s the Swan Hills strategy!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The way you guys treated the people of West Swan is absolutely incredible!

I will finish off. As I said, I wanted a police station in Ballajura. The Labor Party was going to build one, but we lost the election. However, the Liberal Party matched my commitment. It followed my commitment and after a bit of polling, with just 25 days to the election, it figured out that the people of Ballajura wanted a police station. But I was a little worried when yesterday on one of the radio stations—I think 720 ABC—a senior police officer in the executive said that he was not going to get into the politics of opening a Ballajura police station. He kept

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

going on and on; he said that the police were certainly aware of the community concerns out there and were paying them some attention. He was not very committal about a Ballajura police station. It reminds me a little of the Ellenbrook rail line commitment; there was silence, then there was, “Yes, we’re going to do it”, and then there was a redefinition and a hope that there would somehow be a second-term commitment. But there it is: the story of the Ballajura police station, of which I am sure there will be further chapters in this chamber. I am positive that there will be more chapters because the minister now says that the government never committed to a 24/7 police station. That is very interesting and, as I said, in the coming weeks it will once again be shown that the Liberal Party will say and do anything in an election campaign to get elected. It does not care how many people it lies to or what the truth is.

MR P. PAPALIA (Warnbro) [7.10 pm]: It is my pleasure to follow on from the member for West Swan in discussing this amendment to the Address-in-Reply motion —

but regrets to inform His Excellency that the Barnett government has failed to provide proper policing services in the Western Australian community

It is noteworthy that I am following the member for West Swan; she has spoken extensively and forcefully on this matter in this place for the four and a half long years of the first term of the Barnett government. She has come in here on behalf of those citizens of Western Australia who happen to be fortunate enough to reside within her electorate and to have such a forceful representative in this place, and on their behalf she has said over and again that the government should not have shut the Ballajura Police Station. Then, when that protest on behalf of her constituents was ignored outright by the Barnett government and it shut the Ballajura Police Station regardless of the views of the local citizenry, the member for West Swan took up arms on behalf of her constituents and fought for four years to get the government to reopen that police station. She even managed, very early on and under very difficult circumstances, to convince her own side to commit to the necessary funding and policy strategy required to support her argument for a police station in Ballajura.

As the member pointed out so well, the government argued against the police station for years and told the residents of Ballajura and surrounding areas, in language that was Orwellian in nature: “What we’re going to do is provide you with better policing by cutting your police station. Then what we’re going to do is provide you with better policing; because local police stations are so old, passé and 1950s, we’re going to provide you with a police station in a car.” That is modern policing, according to the Barnett government, and that is what the government said for four years. Whenever the government was taken to task in this place or in the local media by the member for West Swan, whichever hapless minister happened to have responsibility for the portfolio at the time would stand in front of the press and say, “Those sorts of operational commitments are not our prerogative; we do not control over where police stations go. Those are operational decisions made purely by the commissioner. We don’t get ourselves involved in that sort of detail. We allow the professionals to advise us on that subject matter.”

I know that is what they said, because they said the same thing in the electorate of Warnbro. They said the same thing to the tens of thousands of people who reside in the northern suburbs of Mandurah and the southern and eastern suburbs of Rockingham. That is something in the order of 60 000 residents who do not have a police station or a police hub, but are stuck in a policing vacuum, which happens by unhappy coincidence to coexist with a public transport vacuum in between Rockingham and Mandurah. That vacuum of policing is equidistant in geographical terms between the hub in Rockingham and the hub in Mandurah. When police ministers occasionally ventured south of the river, we were told, again using Orwellian language, that the locals would get better policing by doing away with the old-fashioned concept of a local police station. Apparently, they would get better policing because concentrating police resources in the hubs of Rockingham and Mandurah would somehow provide a better service to suburbs some distance away. We heard that frequently. We did not hear it directly from the mouth of the former police minister in Rockingham, because he was not willing to come to the public meeting; he sent the commissioner to the meeting. The commissioner and a couple of senior officers bore the brunt of local disquiet over the lack of police response in the southern and eastern suburbs of Rockingham and the northern suburbs of Mandurah. They were told by the police commissioner that there was never a requirement for a police station between the Rockingham and Mandurah hubs. He could not remember saying it anyway. It was mentioned in some other political debate or something of that nature. I like Karl and I respect him but on that occasion his memory failed him. For some time there was a clear commitment under the previous government, and I believe even the one before that, that a future police station in the southern suburbs of Rockingham would be located in Port Kennedy. The previous Labor government realised that the geographic base of the population or the centre of gravity of the base of population growth was shifting south and east of Rockingham and so it was necessary to move the police station to Secret Harbour to fill that gap—that is, for it to be equidistant between the Rockingham and Mandurah hubs. If we wanted to put a hub there, for want of a

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

better description, it would work because the police located in that police station at Secret Harbour would provide a presence merely by going to and from work. Beyond that, their response was going to naturally and undeniably be faster than a response from the Rockingham or Mandurah hubs or from some other distant location that happened to have an additional car or someone free to respond when someone called 131 444 or 000. It is undeniable that a police station should be located in the middle, and I would argue that it should be a hub if we are going to stick with the argument about hubs.

I suggest that for 50 000 or 60 000 people to be without a police station and without a permanent police presence is too many people. I know that is too many people because there are fewer people than that around the brand-new Cottesloe hub. Amazingly, the government managed to find money to build the Cottesloe hub immediately after it cancelled the plans to build a police station at Secret Harbour. It shifted the funds that had been allocated to building the police station that had been in the last budget of the Labor government. The land had been purchased. Immediately after it made the decision, having come to office and said it would fulfil that promise by the Labor Party, the police minister spoke to the local media and confirmed that the government would meet that commitment. Subsequently, the government realised that it needed to build a police station in the electorate of Cottesloe, so it miraculously determined that there was no longer a need for a police station in Secret Harbour or in the southern and eastern suburbs of Rockingham and the northern suburbs of Mandurah. Instead, there was an urgent need for \$10 million to be shifted so that could be contributed to building the hub in the western suburbs of Perth. Why can the Premier's electorate not get a police car? Why can the Premier not get the benefit of modern policing? Why do Labor seats benefit from modern policing in the form of a police car?

It leads me to suspect that perhaps there is more to this, because the response we invariably got was that the government had nothing to do with the location of police stations; that was an operational decision. So it was impossible for the police minister, as much as she commiserated and sympathised with the local population when she came down during the election campaign and went to a meeting with the councillors at the Rockingham council offices with my opponent—the guy with the promise of a \$55 million train station who did not deliver—and some guy from the upper house who purports to represent Rockingham but has delivered zero in his entire time in office —

Mr J.E. McGrath: He delivered a marina.

Mr P. PAPALIA: A road that was funded by the federal government. That is the only thing he has delivered, a road funded by the federal government.

They had a meeting with local councillors and some residents from the southern suburbs of Rockingham, which was interesting. They invited the residents' association to come along to that meeting, and the minister was cloistered in an environment where she could not possibly be questioned by any opponents. I think there was not even too much in the way of questioning from the media. It seems the communication was one-way traffic. The minister is very good at smiling. The former member for Pilbara often referred to that engaging smile in a number of his speeches. She is very good at engaging with the concerned citizenry and explaining that they have her full sympathy, her deepest empathy. However, she has no capacity to shift the location of a police station or decide the location of a police station because that is entirely Karl's job.

Mr J.E. McGrath: That's what he did. It was his decision.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Let me do the storytelling. The member for South Perth has already spoken about the hotbed of crime in South Perth, and his credibility evaporated the moment he spoke about the necessity —

Mr J.E. McGrath: We get plenty of crime in South Perth.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I like the member for South Perth, and I know that we get the benefit of modern policing, but I can honestly say that there is more need for a police presence in some Labor seats than in South Perth.

When the minister was asked about moving the police station and whether she could get one, the citizens of southern Rockingham and northern Mandurah were told, "No, I can't do that. I have no power. It is an operational decision by the uniformed police, represented by Commissioner O'Callaghan. They're the people who decide these things."

During the course of the election campaign I was out campaigning, a lot like the member for West Swan but probably nowhere near as effectively and powerfully, because her ability to withstand the onslaught of the Liberal Party money machine was extraordinary and worthy of acknowledgement on every possible occasion. Nevertheless, I was out there campaigning and I heard an extraordinary claim in the media that the government had apparently promised a 24-hour, seven-day-a-week police station in Ballajura. I knew that could not possibly be true, because I had been told so many times over the course of the first term of the Barnett government that

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

the government had no control over where police stations were located. It was not a political decision; it was an entirely operational decision, and so I knew that this claim in the media could not possibly be true. But it caught my attention because I was attuned to anything with the word “police” in it, particularly with the word “station” immediately following thereafter. That got my attention, but I knew it could not be true. So I contacted my good friend the member for West Swan and sought her advice. Was this true? Could it be true that the government made this claim in the media during the election campaign, and at the death knell of the first term of the Barnett government, in a desperate attempt to wrench from Labor a seat it so desired to win and on which it spent more than \$300 000 in the campaign, after telling the people of Western Australia for more than four and a half years that the government was not capable of making decisions about the location of police stations? They were so sure that they were going to win that the Premier showed up with television cameras on election day in the electorate of West Swan to announce the victory in advance. Could it be that, after all those years of one minister after another putting their hands on their hearts and absolutely denying the ability to shift the location of the police station, not only could they shift the location of the police station, but also they could completely backflip on the requirement for a police station that they had said for four years was not required? That could not be. Surely not, member for South Perth; tell me it ain’t so.

Call me a sceptic, but I have concerns about the honesty, integrity and transparency of some of the statements made by members of the Barnett government, particularly some of the ministers. Surely that would not have occurred. Surely the leader of a government who has, over time, purported to be open and accountable—I think that is laughable now; I think we all know that that is a joke—and who regularly told people that he was willing to be open, tell the truth and be honest and that he was about re-establishing the trust of the Western Australian public in the parliamentary system would not have had his police ministers tell the people in Ballajura that they did not need a police station, that it was unnecessary and that they were going to get the benefit of modern policing because they were in a Labor seat. Surely he would not have done that and then, only weeks before the election, following copious amounts of polling of the local Ballajura populace, backflipped and said, “Commissioner, you know how we’ve been saying that you control where police stations go? On this occasion, commissioner, sorry, sunshine; we need a police station in Ballajura. Those people in Ballajura are just not listening to us. They don’t believe us when we tell them that they’re going to get the benefit of modern policing. They don’t believe us when we tell them that a couple of blokes in a car will solve their problems. What they want is a police station. They’re old-fashioned out in Ballajura. They think that policing will be provided by a police presence.” That is outrageous and incredible. I am sure that whoever was on the phone to the commissioner would have commiserated with his feelings. I imagine he would have said something along the lines of, “But don’t you think that’s a bit transparent after having public meetings when we told them they did not need a police station? Don’t you think that’s a little transparent after we sent mail-outs informing the residents that they were going to get the benefit of modern policing and all the other associated pluses that come from living in a Labor seat under the Barnett government? Don’t you think that that might be a bit obvious?” Karl is a pretty sharp guy; not much gets by him. He would have said, “I’m sorry, minister, but it’s going to look a bit embarrassing.” The minister would have said, “No; we know what to do. We’ll send out the boss, because the boss is good at this. The boss has had a lot of practice. When the boss gets in front of the cameras and has to perform a backflip with a three-quarter twist with a difficulty of 9.9, he is like a machine. He delivers.” The guy delivers, and we have seen him do it with little Frankie—sorry; the member for Swan Hills. We have seen him do it, despite the reality of being caught on camera making a promise. We have then seen him deny that promise, and we have then seen him deny that he even made that denial! It is just extraordinary. But we have seen him. He is good. He is practised. He is well versed. This is the man for the job. So, what did we see in the election campaign? The boss went out there, dutifully accompanied by the new Minister for Police, who smiled at all the constituents with her engaging smile and said, “We sympathise and empathise with you so much in your Labor seat, which normally would get the benefit of modern policing, that we are going to deliver to you 1950s policing. We are going to deliver to you a 24-hour, seven-day-a-week police station, just like they had in the 1950s, and just like what you Labor constituents all want. That is despite the fact that we tried to re-educate you and tell you about the benefits of modern policing. We tried to tell you that a police car is better than a station. But we understand that in the end, you just did not get it. So we are going to send the boss out, and he is going to convince you.”

MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah) [7.30 pm]: There is absolutely no reason why members opposite, particularly new members, would not be supporting this amendment to the motion.

Several members interjected.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: Certainly the member for Southern River would be devoid of anything like that.

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

The seriousness of this matter of policing in Western Australia is a real problem that this government has created for itself. It is a real problem that the Minister for Police has created for herself. It is a problem that was created when the Barnett government was first elected in 2008, and it is a problem that will come back to haunt the minister. As has been said by other members on this side, the false promises that were made during the election campaign, and before, are coming home to roost for this government—they really are—and the minister is going to be backpedalling constantly over the coming months, and year, while she is still being favoured by the Premier. We know, of course, that the Premier has a history of booming about and boosting up someone, only to slice them off at the end. We only need to look at what happened to the Minister for Police's predecessor, and also, in more recent times, to the director general of the Department of Corrective Services. Any minister or public servant would quake in their boots if they were told by the Premier that they not only have his confidence, but he thinks they are the best minister or best public servant that he has seen for some time, because they know that is the death knell for them.

I want to tell the minister this, and I will use my electorate as an example. The member for Warnbro has very eloquently highlighted the ongoing issue of policing in the North Mandurah–South Rockingham area. His statistics are correct in terms of population growth. His comments about the views of the people who live in that part of the southern corridor are also absolutely correct. To use the words of the people who live in that area, they feel as though they are living in a police-free zone. Those are not the words of the member for Warnbro or me. Those are the words of the members of the public who attended the commissioner's forum that was held in Rockingham last July as part of the south metropolitan hub district commissioner consultation. A number of the residents at that forum, particularly those who live in the northern suburbs of Mandurah, and also in the southern suburbs of Rockingham, including Singleton and Golden Bay, said that they feel as though they are living in a police-free zone. This is not, and was not, a criticism of the police men and women who are expected to police a district area that is now massive, not only geographically, but also in terms of the population that it is servicing now and will be expected to service into the future. That is the term they used: police-free zone. They were not criticising the police; they were simply recognising that that area and the southern areas of Rockingham are now policed by the Mandurah station. The government's police officers tell me—they cannot say it publicly—and we know, that on any given night, particularly on weekends, Friday and Saturday nights, the Mandurah station will usually have three, and sometimes four, vehicles on the road at any one time, but they are expected to police an area that goes as far south as Lake Clifton, the island of Dawesville, Halls Head, central Mandurah and out to Pinjarra, and then, of course, across to the northern suburbs of Mandurah, the eastern belt of Greenfields, Lakelands and Madora Bay, and then, in the City of Rockingham boundary, to Singleton, Golden Bay and Port Kennedy. It is a huge population, with a huge number of young families. There are lots of young people and lots of retirees, and three vehicles are available on the weekends. It is simply inadequate, and it is being made more difficult because the government amalgamated the Peel police district in 2009. The Peel police district was a district in its own right, but the minister's government allowed it to be amalgamated with those northern localities, including the City of Rockingham and the City of Kwinana, which have, and have had, their own policing, community, social and crime issues over a long period.

The government then expected the new hub in Rockingham to deliver the same service, or what the government said was a better, improved service. That has not happened. In 2009, knowing that the government wanted to do this, I wrote to the five local government authorities in the Peel region, and I said that we need to fight a rearguard action against this, because the government had been trying to do this for literally nearly a decade—that is, downgrade the Peel police district. Unfortunately—this is a criticism I have of the five local governments—they did not respond. I said that they should be seeking urgent meetings with the minister and they should be moving motions in council. They did not do it. I did not even get a response. That includes from my own council. I think they were sold a pup by the then police minister and, indeed, by the commissioner's plans to create this new entity.

In November last year, I asked the Minister for Police, by way of a question in this place, how many community policing officers there are now under the new arrangement, or the arrangement post-2009, and how many there were prior to 2009. The minister's answer to me in November last year was that prior to 2009, 2.5 full-time equivalent community policing officers were stationed in Mandurah. Now there are two FTEs in the district, but that includes Rockingham and Mandurah. We now have only two community policing officers who are expected to do one of the most important and one of the most strategic roles. The government has reduced the number in total and then spread them out over a greater area to try to do an increasingly difficult job. That is one stark example of what this government has done.

A very worthwhile youth program called Street Net also operated in Mandurah prior to 2009. It involved two designated police officers working with youth workers on the streets. I went out with them in their vehicles on a

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

couple of occasions. What did this government do once this amalgamation took place? It took away the two police officers from Street Net. Street Net is now a shadow of itself despite the very good and hard work by the one youth worker now left there. That person will not ever be expected to do the strategic work with young people that was able to be done when two police officers were assigned to that program.

Towards the second half of last year there was a huge spike in burglaries in Mandurah. What was the police minister's response? Her response was, "Oh, we'll send a few officers down to try to clean up some of the unsolved burglaries, or burglaries that we haven't been able to get to." This was because just under seven per cent of the burglaries reported in Mandurah had actually resulted in prosecution. Seven per cent! What was the Minister for Police's reaction? It was, "We'll get a little SWAT team to come down and clean up some of the stuff." She totally missed the point that if we have more police officers working within the community, including resourcing community and strategic policing that should be taking place, we would actually be dealing with burglaries and other unsociable behaviours at source. Hopefully, if a good job is done of resourcing those community police officers and resourcing local police, and making sure they are actually not only present on the road but also working with a lot of community networks and the community organisations, we might start to prevent some of these burglaries in the first place. The Minister for Police totally missed the point.

During the election campaign the Minister for Police also came to Mandurah, on a whirlwind tour of electorates, to talk to people. There was a pitiful turnout in Greenfields; I think partly because the Liberal candidate for Mandurah actually got the date wrong and sent out letters for the wrong date! But apart from that, what people want and have been saying for a long time now, particularly since the amalgamation that this government foisted upon us, is more police officers based in Mandurah. That way, while we wait for a police station to be built in Secret Harbour or Port Kennedy, we can actually start servicing those people who in many respects have almost given up. I think the minister is absolutely missing this point: there is a lot more crime now that is not even reported. Whether it be petty crime or not, there is a lot of crime that is not even being reported because people do not even think that police officers will get there to deal with what has happened to them. When we get to that point, it is very serious. We then start to lose confidence in the whole system, not only the policing but also the other aspects of community that make a community not only feel safe but know it is safe.

This is a serious matter for my community, particularly in Mandurah. Two weeks ago a taxidriver died after an altercation in his taxi. It is alleged that there was a very violent altercation in his taxi that resulted in that taxidriver passing away. After the Crab Fest in mid-March there was the horrific murder of a young man, who was a dad going home to his family. It will be alleged that he was murdered by five perpetrators; a number of them young people, from various parts of Perth, not just from Mandurah. Added to that, I was talking to a fellow about an hour ago about an attack on him that happened while he was working as a manager of one of the local sporting clubs—I am not going to mention which one. It was a horrific attack; he was punched and stomped on, and ended up in Peel Health Campus.

What are people saying? This is serious; I have reached the stage of not liking watching the news, particularly on Saturday and Sunday nights, because when I see the headlines of some altercation, some stabbing, some violent attack or some out-of-control party the first thing I say to my wife is, "Please don't let this be Mandurah again." It is starting to hurt our brand. I do not like saying this publicly. I have lived in Mandurah for 26 years, but I now consistently hear about unsociable behaviour, the unacceptable stuff that is occurring in some neighbourhoods, the violence that is occurring, the way people are treating each other, and of course the high-profile murders and attacks that we have experienced in that place particularly in the past couple of years. I have been asking for more police, but do not get me wrong, that is not the only solution; more police will help us but it will not solve these underlying issues. But there is now a gutting of some of the community services that had a direct influence with policing, where the police men and women knew the families and worked with all the young people, and there was good corporate knowledge and good understanding. They knew families and they worked with them and liaised with them. When they went out in the street, like they did with Street Net, the kids knew them; they knew Phil Tuffin who was with Street Net for 10 years. Those people, as well as people who live outside Mandurah, are now genuinely saying to me, "Gee, what's going on down there? You're in the news all the time for the wrong reasons."

I live in a beautiful place. I have invested my life there and my kids are going to grow up there. But people are genuinely asking the question, "What's going on?" And I have to say that I am critical of the councils of the region because it is about time they stood up and started questioning the Minister for Police and the Premier on what they are going to do to turn around some of these trends that are increasingly worrying people in my area. On Facebook last night there were some reports coming up about some stuff happening in one of my northern suburbs. A fellow was waving down people in the street and trying to get into their cars; people were swerving

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

around him. This is a real concern. Some would say, “Oh, it’s only isolated”; it is not. People are getting sicker and sicker of the unsociable behaviour that is occurring there, and they are sick of the high burglary rates.

The council claims that we are one of the most liveable cities in the world—we apparently won an award for it. That is going to be a mockery if we allow this trend to continue. It is up to all of us—including me as one of the local leaders, and the Deputy Premier, who is supposed to be representing that community as well—to start standing up and saying that this is not good enough. I would like a zero tolerance in my community across the board in responding to a whole range of antisocial behaviour, but we cannot have zero tolerance when we do not have the resources. We cannot have a zero tolerance across things from graffiti to abuse to unwarranted and unprovoked attacks on people when we are not confident that the police are resourced properly enough to respond. I am repeating the plea to the Minister for Police that I have made since she became the minister. It is same plea that I made to the former minister: the hub system, by which all the main decision-making and operational stuff has been centralised in Rockingham—thank goodness Mandurah is still a 24-hour station, I might say; mind you, people who go there late at night are not going to be seen—has not worked.

This must be turned around. The minister should be saying to herself that this is not good enough, because it is not only my community that is telling her this. Armadale is telling her this. Warnbro is telling her this. Members on her own side know exactly that what I am saying, and that what the members for Armadale, Warnbro and West Swan have said is true because it is happening all around Western Australia. It is the minister’s responsibility to fix it and she has to stop saying that she cannot get involved because it is operational. That is absolute trash. It is trash. She did it with Ballajura. We already know she interfered because she knows that as soon as hot pressure comes on and it looks like the Liberal Party might win a seat, it will do something about it. I will continue to call upon my council to stand up for the people. They have a responsibility to the ratepayers. They should be coming to the minister. The Deputy Premier, the member for Dawesville, should be standing alongside me and demanding action because it is not happening. Those men and women who are police force members in my community deserve extra resources. At least 30 more police officers should be delivered to Mandurah alone. Then we will start to turn this around. Then we will start to see change. Then we will start to see a change in confidence.

MR W.J. JOHNSTON (Cannington) [7.51 pm]: I rise to make a brief contribution to the amendment to the Address-in-Reply. I draw attention to the problem of the drug house in Thornlie. For the time I have been a member of Parliament, constituents have been coming to see me about this drug house. I will not name the street, but I will be happy to tell the minister the specific address behind the chair. People have been coming to see me to complain about this drug house. I have been speaking to the senior police in the Cannington station. Cannington is lucky; we have a 24-hour station and I bet my bottom dollar that the response times in Cannington—the minister might tell us the response times—are better than the response times in Armadale given that Armadale is serviced at night out of the Cannington hub. It will be interesting to know what the answer to that is. I was particularly keen to listen to the dorothy dixer question that the member for Belmont asked the minister today because I think one thing that I agree with her on is that there is a serious crime problem in the eastern suburbs. The constituents in my electorate are constantly raising with me the problem of the rising crime rate in the eastern suburbs in the past five years. I point out that in Wilson in 2007 there were 33 assaults and in 2012 there were 55. There were 81 home burglaries in 2007 and 173 in 2012. That is the lived experience of people in my electorate. I am sure that it will be interesting to hear the minister’s view about what it is like in Scarborough, but I can tell the minister that in the eastern suburbs there are serious crime problems.

I return to this question of the drug house in Thornlie. The constituents are at their wit’s end dealing with a drug house across the road from where they live, next door to where they live and around the corner from where they live. I do not understand how every 15-year-old school kid in Thornlie knows where people can go to get drugs, but we have not been able to end the practice of selling out of that house. I was only just recently talking to Superintendent Darryl Gaunt at the Cannington police hub about the problems with this house and I know that the house has subsequently been raided, but would this be tolerated in the western suburbs? Would a house go for five years selling drugs if it were in Cottesloe? I do not believe it would. I do not know whether it is a matter of resourcing, because I know how dedicated the police officers are in the Cannington, Gosnells and Canning Vale stations, which service the electorate of Cannington. I talk to them regularly. I know the work they do. I know how hard it is for them to get all the evidence together to get a conviction. I have been told about the problems with having to keep police available on day shift to appear in court and about the pressures they are under. If there is a need for extra resources, minister, guess what? A great place for those extra resources to go is the south eastern suburbs. It does not make any sense that we can go from the central police station in Curtin House, soon to be moved to the brand-new police complex a few kilometres away in the western suburbs, yet the whole of the corridor going out to Armadale is served by one hub at Cannington. It would be interesting for the

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

member for Belmont to tell us whether she is satisfied with having the people of Belmont serviced at night from the police station at Cannington. Does she believe that is satisfactory?

Mrs L.M. Harvey: Can I correct that?

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: The minister can correct it, as I am sure she is going to speak.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: Yes, but —

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I have not even asked for any interjections. I am looking forward to listening to the minister's contribution on this question, and it is a very simple question that we have here.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: I thought there would be accurate information coming out of your mouth.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: As I said, I did not ask for the minister's interjection; I asked the member for Belmont to make a contribution. Is the member for Belmont satisfied that policing services at night in her electorate are handled out of the Cannington station? That is the question I have for the member for Belmont. It would be good to know whether she is satisfied with that arrangement; and whether the member for Darling Range—now a minister—is satisfied that the people of Mundijong have their police services handled out of Mandurah and the people in Byford have theirs handled out of the station at Cannington?

As I said, there are two stations between East Perth and the coast, a distance of less than 10 to 12 kilometres, but the entire south eastern corridor gets one hub. One hub! That is not right. That is not fairness. Would the people of Cottesloe accept a drug house selling to schoolkids for five years? I know the dedication of the police; therefore, I know that they try hard to crack down on that particular house in Thornlie. As I said, I have had a number of conversations with a superintendent and with other senior sergeants from the relevant police stations. I therefore know the work that they are trying to do, and I know that they appreciate feedback from the local community and calls to Crime Stoppers. I make the point to my constituents to just ring Crime Stoppers, because the police will commence action based on the Crime Stoppers information. But it does seem extraordinary that the services in the western suburbs are so very superior to the services in the eastern suburbs. I simply ask the member for Belmont to make a contribution to this debate, which is about her part of the world. Is she satisfied with the level of policing in her electorate?

The member for Belmont made the point, as I understood her question without notice—I do not have the *Hansard* in front of me—that the people in her electorate are very concerned about rising crime rates in the electorate. Is she satisfied with the service that is being provided? Clearly most constituents across the south eastern suburbs are not satisfied. It is also clearly ridiculous to have two hubs so very close together in the western suburbs but not in the eastern suburbs. As I said, I am happy to give the minister—behind the chair, as it were—more details about the drug house in Thornlie, but in my view it is not acceptable to have a drug house operating for a long period. Does it need more surveillance? Do the police at Cannington Police Station and Gosnells Police Station need to work overtime to provide extra surveillance for this drug house? Do they need some technological intervention such as some sort of electronic surveillance? What resourcing problems are leading to 15-year-old schoolkids knowing when drugs are available, yet we are unable to crack down on that facility? These are important issues for people in the south eastern suburbs. We are not looking for glib responses; we are actually looking for an outcome, because the current arrangement is not good enough.

MS L.L. BAKER (Maylands) [7.59 pm]: I rise to make a contribution to this debate. The minister will be well aware that during the four years prior to the election, I lobbied hard to make sure that Bayswater Police Station stayed open, and the minister has assured us that will happen, which is fantastic. I want to talk on a couple of levels—firstly in relation to my local community, but then to seek some clarification from the government over what its policy is around policing for the future.

The minister knows I wrote to her recently in February and I received a response after the election, which I was very pleased to get. I sought some clarification. We have had a number of incidents of antisocial behaviour, street drinking and violence happening on the streets around the central area of the Maylands precinct, which is just a small part of my electorate, as the minister knows, but which nevertheless was causing concern to both retailers and pedestrians. As a result of some fantastic work on behalf of Sergeant Paul Barfoot at Bayswater—he obviously went into bat for police resources in my electorate—he had an extra 10 officers allocated for three months. I think in police terms they talk about an inquiry team when they describe those officers. I wrote to the minister seeking some clarification about what would happen to those extra resources past the three-month phase, which, quite coincidentally I am sure, ended the week after the election. Nevertheless, it was a very welcome additional resource into the Maylands area. My figures from police websites indicate that if we ever need convincing that police on the ground are a major part of the solution to rising crime rates, we need look no

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

further than that three-month pilot. The broadbrush figures show that over three months we had more than 126 arrests. I point out that that is just for this team, so this is over and above the base rate of what the officers in that hardworking division have been able to deliver on their own. With these extra resources they pulled 126 more arrests, more than 115 summonses were issued and more than 280 charges were laid. It is too early to find the reasons for the success of that, but as we can see, they not only double the work that the Bayswater police were able to deliver without these resources, it in fact more than triples their outcomes.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: Did they make the station 24 hours at Bayswater to achieve that?

Ms L.L. BAKER: They were working very hard outside of the hours. I think it was pretty much close to 24 hours. I have not spoken to them about the hours. Can the minister tell me?

Mrs L.M. Harvey: But the counter wasn't open 24 hours to achieve that outcome, was it?

Ms L.L. BAKER: It was not? I do not know; the minister would have to tell me that.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: No, it wasn't.

Ms L.L. BAKER: It was not. So if they can more than triple what is happening on the ground by opening just a portion of 24 hours, can we imagine what the outcome would be if police were actually there for 24 hours a day? I am not actually arguing for a 24-hour police station; I am saying that I am very grateful for the resources, but I point out the fact that they have had an incredible response. The small amount of input that the minister has been able to make to increasing resources on the ground has had an incredible response. The point of clarification I seek, and the minister may be able to address this right now, is that in her response to me she stated —

WA Police have advised that Bayswater is also attended by WA Police support units including the Regional Operations Group (ROG) ...

This is based in Maylands, so I assume the minister means the Maylands Peninsula?

Mrs L.M. Harvey: Yes.

Ms L.L. BAKER: So ROG is based in Maylands. In the minister's response she goes on to say that ROG provides backup across the metropolitan area and that she has committed to expanding ROG to create two dedicated units, one for the northern suburbs and one for the southern suburbs. Am I to assume that that is in addition to Maylands? So it is three?

Mrs L.M. Harvey: Yes.

Ms L.L. BAKER: Right, so there will be three —

Mrs L.M. Harvey: We're expanding the capacity of the regional operations group, which we call ROG, so that we can have a ROG based in south metro to help supplement the stations in the south metro region, which will then free up the resources for the north metropolitan regional operations group to focus on north metro, and obviously they'll liaise together as required as a boost to resources.

Ms L.L. BAKER: Thank you, minister. Does that mean it will be just the two units?

Mrs L.M. Harvey: It will be in two locations because, geographically, that will then put our boost to police resources in geographical locations to better enable them to get to where they are required.

Ms L.L. BAKER: Will the Maylands regional operations group be moved out?

Mrs L.M. Harvey: No; it is staying there, and we will supplement that service with an additional ROG south. At present we are sourcing a facility to have it operate from.

Ms L.L. BAKER: Thank you for clarifying that; that is helpful. Of course, I was worried that we might lose them from my electorate. But I have to admit to some confusion. Surely the fact that the police have decided to expand that successful model and effectively put more police into those regions will support the argument that local policing and police on the road doing this work is what is needed.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: That was our Liberal Party commitment and the police were happy to receive it.

Ms L.L. BAKER: Absolutely. I would say that the 24/7 policing service is an extension of that. I acknowledge that the minister is probably working under budget constraints. Indeed, I think I have written to the minister about the future of the mounted division.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: That's a rumour. It will stay.

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

Ms L.L. BAKER: Fantastic! That is great.

Ms M.M. Quirk: That is a hobby horse of hers!

Several members interjected.

Ms L.L. BAKER: Thank you for clarifying that, minister. I am sure the people who were concerned about that will be happy to hear that from her. But I think the attempts to form a kind of patchwork coverage around the state because we have accepted this model wholesale, flies in the face of the government's argument about the need for hubs. If they need hubs but then need to bring in a whole lot of resources behind the hubs to give coverage over the area officers have been taken from, I am a bit confused about the government's strategy. It seems to me it has taken away but then realised its mistake and is trying to put back resources. It is a great strategy to put back resources! But I argue that the best method of doing that is to make sure local police are on the ground.

When the minister talks to police, as I am sure she does every day, she could not possibly sit there and tell me that the police on the beat have not let her know how important is the local knowledge they bring to their jobs. When they walk down the street they know that the person who has just got off a train every Thursday and Friday has come from Victoria Park, the city or wherever; they know their names and what are their problems. They can intervene with some credibility and, when needed, move in really quickly. It is not a case of ringing Mirrabooka or Morley Police Stations and spending time to get someone to help—someone who does not know the person, their mental problem, their comorbidity issues around drugs and alcohol and their mental health. They know the people they are working with. That is certainly what my community needs.

The win Sergeant Paul Barfoot has had is to be applauded. I am 100 per cent supportive of the work he does and of the work the west metropolitan superintendent is doing to try to string together some kind of a response from the very tight budgetary constraints they are experiencing due to funding cuts.

I am confused and I think many people who have spoken tonight could also say they do not understand why hubs are being created but replaced with some kind of patchwork quilt to support police resources that have been removed due to an ideological position.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.M. Britza): The member for Butler—no, the member for Girrawheen.

MS M.M. QUIRK (Girrawheen) [8.10 pm]: Beauty before age, Mr Acting Speaker!

I was absolutely amazed today when in a preamble to a government parliamentary question—or dorothy dixer, as members know them better—the member for Belmont said that crime was a problem in her electorate. I was astonished because for the last four and a half years when the Liberal government was in power, it has claimed that it has made great leaps and bounds and had great success in the area of law and order, yet apparently in the member for Belmont's electorate crime is still a real problem. I notice that the astute Gareth Parker from *The West Australian* also found those observations by the member for Belmont and other government backbenchers quite curious in light of the fact that the Minister for Police, the Premier and the government generally have claimed to have had great success in the area of law and order.

We are finding that the rubber has hit the road and there is absolutely no fat left in the Western Australia Police service. Many police stations are undermanned when taking into account those police officers who are on sick leave or maternity leave or are doing added overtime or attending courses to ensure that they are up to date, as they need to be. As I said, the rubber has hit the road. The government reneged on its promise in the 2008 election to deliver 500 police. It revised that promise down to 350 by making up the additional numbers with auxiliary police officers who, as we know, have very little operational activities. Although that might free the operational police officers, in a growing city with a growing population and growing demands on law and order services, it simply is not enough.

Another illusion that I believe the government is still operating under is that making more laws translates into better law and order outcomes. It is clear that that is not the case because it creates extra demands on the police who must come to grips with and understand even more laws that they are required to enforce. In addition, when we introduce changes to the law, there are budgetary implications due to the need to change computer systems and provide additional training for police officers, neither of which necessarily translates into the enforcement of the new laws.

I have said in this place on a number of occasions that I asked the Minister for Police questions last year about the enforcement of the hoon laws in my electorate. There were literally just a handful of arrests for hoon behaviour in the various suburbs in my electorate over the last couple of years. That relates to the fact that hoon

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

behaviour is down the list of the police's priorities. Obviously, serious assaults and homicides et cetera must come first, but there are simply not enough police to enforce all laws. Frankly, this government has made great mileage by saying that enforcement of hoon laws is an important area that must be taken seriously. It is an area that my constituents are concerned about. One can drive around most of my electorate and see evidence of the hoon activity that clearly is not being controlled. The fact that the government is passing laws does not necessarily translate into safe and secure suburbs.

Another area I want to mention, which I think Amanda Banks wrote about in *The West* a couple of weeks ago, is that in 2010 or 2011 some legislation was passed in this place that gave police wider powers to issue infringement notices. That was supposed to clear up the red tape, meaning that the police would get back out on the streets sooner and be visible enforcing the law rather than being tied up in paperwork back at the police station. As it turns out, that was not budgeted for at the time the legislation was introduced. The opposition supported that legislation, as we do on most occasions, despite the fact that the Premier would have people believe that we are generally not supportive of new law and order laws. As I said, if those laws do not have the necessary resources at the time they are passed, they may be of little utility. The Criminal Code Amendment (Infringement Notices) Bill 2010 has yet to come into force. There was a commitment in the 2012–13 election campaign to remove red tape for police, yet the government is not prepared to make the necessary budget allocation for one of the very pieces of legislation that would assist the police in that regard. I think that is very significant. Backbenchers such as the member for Belmont should appreciate that passing laws in this Parliament will not necessarily mean safe and secure streets in their electorates. They need to ask the hard questions in their party room when laws are put to them in that context. They need to ask: Will we have resources to enforce these laws? Will police give them high priority? Will police have the necessary information technology and other backup support so that the laws can be enforced properly?

The last matter I will mention relates to a street in my electorate where a number of my constituents feel they are under siege. For probably two years now antisocial behaviour has been occurring in mainly two houses, and one constituent, who is an elderly gentleman, has been assaulted in the middle of the street, been pushed off his pushbike and had missiles, such as rocks and various other things, thrown over his fence. He is very distressed and upset, and police have been called on a number of occasions. As these particular premises are Homeswest premises, we have made the necessary applications concerning antisocial behaviour, but we have been told that these matters do not come within Homeswest's antisocial behaviour policy because they are occurring outside these houses. In this situation, for two years the police have regarded the consistent commission of what are low order offences as not being of high priority, so they either do not attend or ignore the complaints altogether, and the Department of Housing has said that these offences do not fall within its category of antisocial behaviour, so they do not constitute a strike because they are committed other than in the particular houses. We have a catch 22 situation in which a number of residents feel under siege, which is very unfortunate.

The latest series of events occurred on 24 April this year, when one of the offending lots of tenants had a party in the front garden that went from 9.00 pm to 4.00 am, a bonfire was lit at the front of the house, disco lights were erected and fighting occurred. Someone did call the police, although others were reluctant to do so because they had been threatened in the past by these people. Only three days later another party was held at the same house, with another bonfire being lit, very loud music being played into the early hours of the morning and a car being broken into nearby. The Department of Housing has not returned any of the phone calls about this matter, and the response of the Warwick police is that it is not an offence to light a bonfire. Again, we have heard lots of rhetoric about out-of-control parties, but nothing was done on this occasion.

I have to take the opportunity, as the member for Maylands did, to compliment absolutely the work of our police officers; it is absolutely fantastic. Superintendent Charlie Carver, in the north west metropolitan district, is a former work colleague of mine. I have the highest respect for Superintendent Carver, and the direction he wants to take police in the north west metropolitan district is exceptional; however, he requires resources for that. Similarly, Senior Sergeant Ken Walker of Warwick Police Station is very accessible and helpful, and he certainly understands the difficulties many of my constituents are labouring under. At the end of the day, if the resources are not provided and the systems, such as information technology, that back up these new laws are not in place, the police have their hands tied behind their backs. Added to that is that it is a very dangerous and uncertain job.

I think the government's rhetoric about supporting the police and giving them the tools that they need is just that—empty rhetoric, and I certainly support this amendment because I think it represents a true reflection of the current state of affairs. The government is kidding itself and is delusional if it thinks law and order is under control. Judging by the question asked today by the member for Belmont, there are many members on the opposite side who agree with us.

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

MR M.P. MURRAY (Collie–Preston) [8.20 pm]: I, too, would like to contribute to this debate, albeit very briefly. There are certainly major problems in the south west, and they are never more highlighted than over the school holidays. I assume that that is not confined only to the towns in my electorate. It is a time when the police are run off their feet with minor and petty crimes, and in some cases a bit above that. It is when kids as young as five and six and up to the age of about 16 are not being supervised, are running out of control in the town and getting into—I suppose the term is “gangs”—groups of young people that then become involved in antisocial behaviour. The police are then expected to do three or four things: one is to be a parent to those children; another is to look after them and to make sure that there is discipline; and another is to be a policeman, which is very, very difficult for these people. Why are some of these problems there? It is because they took the police out of the PCYCs; or rather, they changed the role of the PCYCs to supervise people who have already offended. Instead of being in front of the game, the minister has now put the police behind the game, and they are having to pick up the mess that is already there. Instead of being role models within the PCYCs, they are now monitoring kids at risk or kids who have already offended. To me, that is a problem that has been caused by very poor management by a government that does not care about what communities say.

My community was very, very vocal about the PCYCs and the police who work in them. The PCYC has three years left to live; if it cannot make a profit within three years, there is every chance it will be closed down. So what happens? People will say, “Well, I’m not going to donate to that club because if I do, and it collapses, what happens to the gear that I donate?” Whether it is a motor for young people to work on, gym equipment or boxing rings, the sorts of things that are donated are, probably more so in small towns than anywhere else, very much appreciated.

That is one of the problems. Just this week I went to have a look at a house that had had its windows broken; it was reported to me by the real estate agent who said, “Go and have a look at what young people are doing”. As I got there the repair people were putting a window in; another window had already been broken in the time since I had been rung by the agent. This is a house that had been inhabited for only 10 weeks. I am sure this sort of situation is very common across the board. We cannot expect the police to be in 10 places at once, but we do expect some response instead of having to ring, say, Midland or Bunbury. We end up getting the runaround, because people do not understand local issues. There are not enough police in the police stations.

We heard the minister say today that she was not going to put police in 24-hour police stations. I think that is an appalling statement; I really do. I think that is just shocking, because when people pay their taxes they expect to get a response. They expect to be able to ring up a police station and tell them what they need. I think it is very mean-spirited for anyone to say that they do not want police sitting in police stations, wearing out the bum of their pants. That is not what they do. They have been overrun in today’s world with red tape. Surely we can handball some of those jobs off, more so than we are now, to take the red tape away from the police so that they can get on with what they do well and what they are trained for: to catch criminals and to prevent crime. Something that we seem to have forgotten is that part of policing is prevention. It is not all about catching the crooks; it is about prevention, being seen, and being on the streets, which is very rare in many country towns these days.

We have the hub system, which I think is disgraceful. It is very much like a bunker. When something goes wrong, all the police cars come out and chase people. The policemen look at their screens to determine the worst incident. Someone could be down the bottom of the list and they could wait not one hour or even two hours but maybe two days to get a response. Today I received a phone call about a car that was pushed out of a driveway and down the road. The father of the daughter who owned the car rang the police, who said, “Don’t touch it; we’ll be up in a while.” The police rang back and said, “We’ve found something more important.” The car was left down there. The owner was told to take it back because the police could not do anything as they did not have enough time. That means that not enough police are on the beat. That comes back to false promises from a government that has promised the world and done nothing. It is battling to maintain the dropout list let alone the top-up list. It has demeaned the police force by having security guards, as I call them, more so than real police, who are not fully trained in the whole system. It certainly is a worry.

We saw the minister stand in front of a public meeting and say, “I am not going to listen to you.” This occurred just before the election. Thank goodness she did that or I might not have been here. She made two trips—one to Capel and one to Dalzellup, which is south of Bunbury. She told the people in those areas that they were wrong and they did not need the same standard of policing as the rest of the south west. She stood in front of a public meeting and said, “Bad luck; you don’t need a full-time police station. You can be serviced from Bunbury.” Prior to the election, the average time the police took to get from Bunbury to Capel was 25 minutes. I reckon I could burn out a set of tyres in my old Nissan during that time. I could do a fair bit of hooning and leave before the police get there. There are so many roads out; I could go through Dardanup, Donnybrook or Busselton and

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

not get caught. That was the complaint of the people. The government ran a public meeting down there, put out 30 chairs and 150 people turned up. That told me what was wrong with that area. People were scared to go out at night. Sure, a small element causes the problems but the area was not being policed. We got no response from the minister other than to say that she heard people's stories and she would catch up with them later. She did not do that in Capel. She did say at Dalyellup, "I heard your story but I'm not listening" and left the meeting. I thought it was wonderful. It is probably one of the best campaigns from a minister to get me elected that I have had. I thought she was being friendly. It was very, very good. Otherwise, I might not have been in this place to give the member for Eyre the willies. It is as simple as that.

Older people now feel insecure in their own homes. I know that the press play on some of those incidents. It is true. When people start to lock themselves in their houses at six o'clock at night, when it is starting to get dark, I think we have lost the plot. We have to look at reinvention. I do not have the answers. I believe we should be working towards how we can make people feel secure in their homes. If we turn on the television to watch the six o'clock news and see an old person with their face bashed in or we pick up the newspaper on a regular basis, we see that we have a problem in our society. We cannot ignore it. I do not see any leadership coming from the government side of the house. I do not see a minister who is proactive and trying to get things moving. I hear her saying, "No, no, no." Government backbenchers ask dorothy dixers such as, "My electorate is in a mess, minister; can you help me?" She comes out and says she is not going to put police stations everywhere. I am not asking for them to be put everywhere; I am asking for them to be strategically placed and available, not just a shopfront with no-one in them so that when someone rings, they get Midland or when we call 000, we get connected to a call centre on the other side of the world. How can we eliminate that? How can we get better at giving the confidence back to the community that it does not have at the moment?

I recently had a very good meeting with the district inspector for the south west. I also have a good sergeant, Mike Dean, who is very proactive. I know many members would know Mike from a previous life. He has a new lease on life; he looks about 10 years younger since he got out of the union job. He is trying to catch those crooks, but he is also willing to work with the community, the police and community youth centre and the other groups in the town. That is the style that I like. Some call him an old-fashioned copper. I do not think that is bad; I think it is good. We have been working very hard to tidy up the main street of Collie to make sure that when people come down over the holiday period, they do not think there are no rules and they know they are being watched. Unfortunately, one of the officers was belted up on the long weekend when he went to one of those incidents at the weir. Certainly, he was off work for a little while. We do not want to see that. We want people to know that the police are around. That is what happens in country areas. People do not think the police are around, and most times they are not because there are not enough of them to go around.

In saying that, I do not see anything that gives me joy or shows me a way forward. All I see is the minister's negativity in saying, "No; I'm not going to do that." The minister has to be better than that; she has to rise above that and show some leadership. To be quite honest, I do not think she has the capability; I think she is really struggling in her job. All she wants to do is have a catfight across the chamber. We saw that today, and the Speaker should have sat the minister down 20 minutes before he did because she was not contributing to what we want to do, and that is to have good policing that is worthwhile. But, no, the minister was too busy with the individual fights that she was having across the table. It was disgraceful. I would like to think that the minister will go away and think about that, and that when she comes back, she thinks about what she is going to do to make things better and not just say, "You don't know what you're talking about." I think that is really bad.

From my point of view, the hub system does not work. We have to put full-time police back into the PCYCs. I think 34 coppers were taken out of them, but I could be wrong on that number; it might be 28, not 34. It was a very small number of police to put back onto the streets. It was put out as though we have another 500 police. A very small number of police went back onto the streets. They need to be put back to where policing starts—that is, when they are this high.

A tremendous impression was made on me some years ago by Tim Ellis when I went to the PCYC, but he was being transferred somewhere else. There were half a dozen pretty rough kids. He had taken them in and had them doing half-pipes and backflips on their bikes. All that sort of work was done within the PCYC. I have not seen him since to congratulate him on what he did. Tim Ellis was a PCYC officer. He told the boys he was leaving and one of them, a kid of about 15, who had all this metal in his head, with rings and tattoos, sidled up to him and said, "For a copper, you're not a bad bloke." What a compliment that was to that policeman. He went bright red, he did not know where to look and he left the room. That is the type of thing that really does the job. These six kids were not out there destroying cars, committing petty theft or smoking dope in the streets. That copper was successful, and I would like to see a lot more of them.

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

MR J.R. QUIGLEY (Butler) [8.33 pm]: I am asked on behalf of the community of Butler—that area of Perth stretching from Quinns Rocks up to Two Rocks and east across to Wanneroo Road as far as Carramar and further to Banksia Grove—to say that they regard this policing hub model as a failure for their area. The hub model carries with it the idea that there is a centre from which police or services spread out across spokes, if you like, to the perimeter. This area of Perth—this northern extremity of Perth—is unique. It is a very, very long tail. Two Rocks is the end of the line on that tail. This area is unlike the southern suburbs, in which police cars move through the area on their way to somewhere else, or on a return trip—for example, police cars going on patrol down to Mandurah, or beyond, and passing through Rockingham, Warnbro and the like.

Perth has developed with this long northern tail, which stretches right up to Two Rocks. This area is being policed after hours out of the hub of Joondalup. Joondalup is at best a 40-minute drive from this area. It is miles away. I know that a lot of members in this chamber would not have visited Yanchep or Two Rocks for many a year. But the housing development north of the suburb of Butler, which itself is a long way north, is exploding, in places like Jindalee, Alkimos and Shorehaven. It is more than a street a day. That used to be the mantra. It is now two streets a day. These people who are living way out in the northern extremities find that when they telephone the given number for after-hours policing, they are put through to Midland. Well, that is okay, we are living in a technological age, and Midland may dispatch the call to the police hub. But it is hours before these people get a police response. The community in that area is losing faith in the police service—not in the individual officers whom they meet and who may attend upon them the following day, after they have lodged a complaint, but in the service that is being provided.

It has often been said that a primary obligation of a commonwealth government is to secure the national borders. The primary obligation of a state government is to secure the safety of the suburbs. But out in the northern extremities that is not happening. If this hub model does work, then this area is an exception to the rule, because it is not part of the wheel. It does not have suburbs around it. It is a long tail that stretches north along the coast. Police cars do not go to and from this area on their way to other areas. If there is a call out, it is a call out to a problem in the far north, and that is where the cars go. As other members have noted, and it is certainly the case in my electorate of Butler and throughout these northern suburbs, the jobs are prioritised, and by the time a police car is dispatched, other higher priority jobs to the south have come up on the screen, so there is not a response.

The minister decided to engage with the local community by re-initiating local meetings between herself, the Commissioner of Police and the community. An advice went out at the time that these meetings would not be repeated if they just turned into a political football match. The advice was that if local members were going to use these meetings as a political football match, the minister and the commissioner would desist from trying to engage with the local community. I therefore deliberately made the decision not to attend the meeting that was held in my area so that it could not be said that I was leading any strife against the minister. But people came into my office afterwards to express their bitter disappointment about the meeting. Everyone will remember that the minister had gone out there not to announce new facilities in these far northern suburbs, but to justify a cut to the police budget. Everyone in this chamber will remember that some media people attended that meeting that was held at Gumblossom Hall in Quinns Rocks, and they gave some priority in their newscasts to the minister's announcement that she stood by cuts to the police budget. All hell broke loose over Western Australia and the government had to back down. I do not know what was in the honourable minister's mind. To go out there on this long tail that is starved of police services and announce cuts to the police budget was an act of sheer madness or crazy brave or something.

Dr A.D. Buti: Kamikaze.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: Kamikaze, member—crazy brave: “I’ll go out there and I’ll tell those people who are not getting enough services that they are going to get fewer services.”

Among the people out there we have a lot of—what shall I say?—economically challenged households. There is a lot of state housing, a lot of first home buyers, a lot of economically challenged housing and some social problems. Gangs of youths out there are becoming brazen because they do not see police in the area. They are becoming more outward in their criminality. The store hands at the Quinns Rocks BWS liquor outlet said that they rang the police when an offender who was on their premises had been threatening them and stealing—that is a serious offence, being on commercial premises and stealing with threats of actual violence—and it was three and a half hours before there was a response. By then, the offender was probably tucked away in a lounge room somewhere, drunk on the ill-gotten gains of his robbery—three and a half hours—because of the distance, and the minister says, “Well, if we open the Clarkson Police Station for longer periods, there is going to be even less policing in your suburbs.” That is what she told the people at Gumblossom Hall in Quinns Rocks; she said that

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

there would be even less policing. What she should have said was, “The minister who preceded me promised you 500 extra police and failed to deliver. I’ve come out here to tell you that I’ll make good the difference and I’ll deliver the 150.” If the government had delivered the extra 150, I would not be here on behalf of all the good folk of the electorate of Butler in Quinns Rocks, Merriwa, Ridgewood, Butler, Jindalee, Yanchep and Two Rocks complaining about the deprivation of protection and the deprivation of services out there.

I did not go to the meeting deliberately. I asked what happened. One woman’s son was assaulted at the rear of the Whale and Ale tavern. When he went, as a good Samaritan, to try to shoo off a pack of people attacking someone else, he was attacked with a great big rock and sustained very serious injuries. He is a university student who works there part time. It was hours before the police attended. The next day they got a crew to go and conduct some interviews and the crew then said, “Look, last night we were coming out here, but then there was a problem at Ocean Reef, so we had to go from Joondalup to Ocean Reef before we could come to Clarkson.” If the government is going to do what it is doing—that is, issuing liquor licences out there to sell booze until midnight—it has an obligation at least, if it does not keep the police station open for 24 hours, to keep the police station at Clarkson open for as long as the licensed premises are open, because the trouble is coming from people who have booze on board. Everyone knows that. On the one hand, the government is saying, “Yes, you can sell alcohol until midnight”, but also saying, “We’re going to shut our police station at four o’clock.” The people want a 24-hour station. The petitioners who presented a petition to this Parliament, signed by thousands of people from my electorate, were not greedy. They said, “At least just keep the police station open until all the liquor shops shut, until all the licensed premises shut. Give us somewhere we can get a quick response when these people are pouring out of these places at 11 o’clock or 12 o’clock at night full of booze and bad manners; somewhere that can give us a 15-minute response; somewhere that can help us.” But the government says that if it does that, there will be even fewer police. That is only because it will not hire enough police. That is only because the government duped my electorate by saying in the last term, “We’ll hire 500”, and then only hired 350. It then went into this election saying, “Didn’t you have a look behind our backs, our fingers were crossed. That was a promise that stretched over two terms—“Tricked you. It wasn’t a broken promise because our fingers were crossed.” It was some infantile thing it said. Everyone knew what was promised—500 extra police. From that 150 police who were not hired, there would have been sufficient to properly police the area out there.

I will give a further example of what is happening. Not far down the road from my office in Ocean Keys Boulevard lives a gentleman and his wife. Over the road from them is an aggressive woman who is visited by her aggressive relatives. The gentleman was assaulted badly, requiring him to go to Joondalup hospital. People witnessed this assault. When investigations are assigned, it is eventually investigated by police from out of the area. The police just said, “Oh, well; his word, their word. Write the whole matter off.” He came to see me with photographs of his injuries. We like the police who are actually there; there are just not enough of them. In fact, our district superintendent, although he is too far away from us in Joondalup, is one of the best coppers in Western Australia—Superintendent Charlie Carver. I wrote to Superintendent Carver. I sent him the statements and the photographs. I said, “Superintendent, I understand the law, that is a prima facie case, but there are police from out of the area who find it easier to write it off because they do not want to deal with the north.” I will hand it to Superintendent Carver—he wrote back and said, “I agree.” People have to visit their local member to mount the case to police to get some action.

I have another very similar circumstance in Yanchep. A man was assaulted in his carport by his next-door neighbour. Because the Yanchep Police Station shuts at four o’clock, the police assigned to investigate are way down at Joondalup. It is another city. Like the honourable police minister, I used to be the member for Innaloo; although she is the member for Scarborough. My old office is about 100 metres from her current office. Carine Police Station is up the road, as is Warwick Police Station. As other members have said, Wembley Police Station is part of a hub; it is part of an interacting policing community. What we have up in the far northern suburbs, at the extremity of the metropolitan area, is the community of Joondalup being policed after hours out of this hub system. It is all very well to sit here and mount an intellectual argument that a hub system will work better, but if members go there, as the minister went to Gumblossom Hall in Quinns Rock, and put that proposition to the taxpayers, they will get howled down. The police minister was actually protected—not physically but she was protected during the meeting, I am told, by the Commissioner of Police, who kept on saying, “We’ve got some other police; they’ll deal with that one after the meeting.” All they wanted to do was come along to Gumblossom Hall and let the minister know, in no uncertain terms, that she and the government had utterly dropped the ball and failed the electorate of Butler.

I support this amendment to the Address-in-Reply that condemns the government for the continual dereliction of its duty in securing the safety of the suburbs between Quinns Rocks and Two Rocks and over to Banksia Grove.

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

Banksia Grove is a little different, I agree, because it gets serviced more out of Wanneroo. I have a huge electorate. As I was saying to someone, the recent redistribution brought us all down to about 23 500 or 24 000 electors; by election day I was just a smidge under 29 000 electors. When one of the ministers was talking during question time earlier today on I think a health question about the number of people pouring into Western Australia to take advantage of our economy, so many of them are landing in the electorate of Butler it is unbelievable. People used to think Mindarie was north; Mindarie is where people have their brekkie on the drive, and then they start driving north. It is just an eye-opener. The government has to come good and put a 24-hour police station and a hub out there as soon as possible, because people are not getting police service. When the government talks about drug laws, assaults on police and people evading police chases, it talks about the need for a deterrent. That is why it keeps on bringing harsher and harsher penalties in—the need for a deterrent. Nothing deters these gangs of rampant youth and hoons out there more than knowing there is an open police station and seeing cars patrolling! Nothing deters them more. The lack of that is leading to the tragedies like we have had out there, such as the tragedy of the late William Maker. He was a lovely, lovely man, the late William Maker, and a member of the great Dinka tribe of South Sudan. He saw a hoon going up the road and sought to flag him down, and the hoon, seeing he was being flagged down—I know, Mr Acting Speaker (Mr I.M. Britza), you were also at the memorial service for the late William Maker on the weekend—went and did three laps of a roundabout before coming back like a bullet to deliberately run him down. They are getting the idea out there that there are no police so they can do what they like.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: Is this sub judice?

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: No! I am not talking about the issue in any way that is going to hurt the case; if the minister wants to take the point, take the point!

But he got run down. There are people out there who are just becoming brazen because of the lack of police presence. It does not happen down there when there are lots of police on the roads. They are just becoming brazen, minister, and I will not be quietened on that subject. I fully support the amendment now before the Parliament that this government has failed and absolutely dropped the ball in relation to its obligation to make safe the suburbs, especially the suburbs of my electorate of Butler.

MS S.F. MCGURK (Fremantle) [8.53 pm]: I join my colleagues on this side of the house to support the amendment, because the people in my electorate—the people of Fremantle and its surrounding suburbs—are feeling the failure of the government's policy on policing and they are feeling it very acutely. They are feeling that lack of effective policing policy in a number of ways.

They are feeling the lack of effective police resources in the centre of Fremantle. I spoke to one woman during the election campaign who said she was walking through the centre of Fremantle in the middle of the day, and after refusing a request for money, she was hit on the back of the head as she walked away. She told me she had not been back to the centre of Fremantle since that incident occurred. When I asked her whether she reported that incident to the police, she said that, no, she had not bothered. She said that the police needed to be around so that this incident did not occur in the first place. The stories that were raised with me last year as I campaigned against antisocial behaviour in the centre of Fremantle are too numerous to mention. There is a need for an active police presence on the streets of Fremantle in the CBD. I look forward to working with the local police to support them to ensure that presence in any way I can, but I am concerned that with their current resources and with the current strategy, that will be a very frustrating process.

Another big issue that has been raised with me over the past 12 months is home burglaries, in particular in some suburbs in my electorate. Some people are even investigating funding their own closed-circuit television cameras for their streets because they are so frustrated at the lack of effective responses to home burglaries. I was just re-reading an email from residents in Gold Street in South Fremantle. One resident said —

I know Gold Street is not the only affected street but you have to start somewhere. If actions put in place here improved the safety of residents through reduced criminal activity it could be replicated elsewhere within the neighbourhood.

It is a sad state of affairs when the community has to look at funding its own CCTV to feed into the City of Fremantle's network because it feels frustrated that the police are unable to respond effectively to calls.

I draw attention to a criticism of a particular aspect of the current government's policy; I am in defence of an interactive police presence in police and community youth centres. The Fremantle PCYC is situated in Hilton and serves a range of suburbs, including Fremantle, Beaconsfield, White Gum Valley and Hamilton Hill. It has been in existence since the 1940s when it started as a police boys' club. While it has changed its premises three times since its inception, its current premises in Paget Street were opened in September 1975 by Hon Kim

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

Edward Beazley, MP. I want to draw attention to the PCYC's plight. It held its AGM last night and a new committee was elected. I want to pay tribute to the people who are active in that PCYC. The Fremantle PCYC had over 35 000 attendees over the 2012 calendar year. It runs a range of services from aikido through to Yoga Boogie—from the As to the Ys, and everything in between. It runs some active services for the community and for parents. We visited the PCYC during the election campaign and that day it was working with young families with babies and toddlers, but many teenagers also interact at that PCYC. I spoke to the president, Bob Meredith, who has had active association with that PCYC for 43 years. I pay particular tribute to Bob Meredith. He talked about his frustration at the current government's policy to withdraw an active police presence from the PCYCs. In response to community outrage that police were taken out of the PCYCs last year, the decision was made to put police back in but not in any meaningful way. The PCYC in Fremantle now has a presence there. It has a youth liaison officer, but it is that officer's responsibility to service at-risk youth from Fremantle to Rockingham and, therefore, that person has no hope of any meaningful engagement with the teenagers and the youth who are present at the PCYC. In fact, it is not part of that officer's remit to interact meaningfully with any of the PCYC programs. If a police car is available and the officer can get from Fremantle up to the Fremantle PCYC in Hilton, they might make it up there, but they do not interact with the youth or the kids. A range of speakers tonight, including the member for Collie–Preston, raised how important that sort of interaction is. Bob Meredith told me about a number of instances of police officers who had been present previously at the PCYC interacting positively with the young people of Hilton and Fremantle. They were able to provide a positive police model for these children and young people, and also perhaps able to get intelligence about what was happening on the streets.

I therefore salute the work of Fremantle PCYC, its president, Bob Meredith, and its committee. I am proud to say that a few years ago the federal Labor government awarded a \$3.2 million grant, in conjunction with funds from the City of Fremantle and some Lotterywest money, to extend the structure of the PCYC buildings. It is a fantastic community service, but it is worse off because no police officer at that PCYC is interacting with these children and young people. I am just starting to see the results of that lack of interaction in places such as Gold Street, South Fremantle, but there could be any number of examples in the suburbs of PCYCs in which there is no interaction. Therefore, in support of the motion tonight, I wanted to draw the house's attention to that important policy that I urge the government to address again.

MRS L.M. HARVEY (Scarborough — Minister for Police) [9.01 pm]: Obviously, I rise today to speak against this amendment to the motion on the Address-in-Reply to the Governor, and I will address some of the issues that have been raised by members as part of this debate. I must say that, after hearing the contributions of members, I find it absolutely astounding that the community saw fit to re-elect us with such a mandate given that we had done such a terrible job over the past four years!

Several members interjected.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: What I will say is that the Liberal–National approach to law and order is very much a commonsense, pragmatic approach.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: We have always believed that the law-abiding majority should be the first priority in any decision of government with respect to law and order, and our belief system is based around ensuring that we have a robust and viable police force that is resourced effectively and that has the laws it needs to effectively maintain law and order in our community. We also believe that the sentences handed out that build respect for the law should be consistent with community expectations and should properly punish offending and take repeat offenders off our streets. In addition to that, we believe that our programs for offenders need to be realistic and accountable, and that we need to push those offenders into taking action to turn their lives around.

Our community safety plan—the Liberal plan that we took to the community around the last election—was built around three platforms. Those platforms were around building a more effective and responsive police force. To do this, we put to the community—and the community gave us a ringing endorsement of support for these strategies—that we would grow the police force by an additional 550 officers. This is in addition to meeting the commitment from the 2008 election to deliver 350 police officers and 150 auxiliary officers; a plan that we implemented in the 2009–10 budget, which we are on track to delivering within the time frame specified at the time.

We have put our money where our mouth is and have funded this proposal with \$282 million, which also includes \$67 million worth of funding to build accommodation for these police officers and to expand the

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

capacity in existing stations to house them. We believe that the officers need to go where they will count the most.

Tabling of Paper

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I notice that the minister seems to be reading from an official document and I wonder whether she could table that.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I am reading from a collection of notes, and I am happy for you to inspect and table them, if required, Mr Acting Speaker.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: It is a typewritten document the minister is reading from.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.M. Britza): I will be happy to look at it. Continue, minister.

Debate Resumed

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I am happy to provide it to you for your advice, Mr Acting Speaker, and I am happy to table the document, when I am finished if you do not mind.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Members —

Several members interjected.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Mr Acting Speaker, what —

Mr P.B. Watson interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Very uncalled for, member for Albany. I want a bit of silence please; I heard you in complete silence.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: One of the other measures for more effective policing was to address the issues that many members have referred to in this place as part of their contributions—those issues around the red tape that binds up police officers. We have funded an initiative to have a look at where the red tape is unnecessarily taking up police officers' time. We know that if we can free up officers from unnecessary paperwork that those officers will then be free to get out on the beat and be out there on the front line responding to calls from the community, which is exactly where the community says it wants them to be. We have also put a total package of additional funding of \$4.55 million into rapid justice—making the courts available over weekends for weekend sittings—and in addition, to build capacity in our video link facilities in regional stations so that regional stations can link into court facilities and can better deal with bail and remand hearings in regional centres, thereby releasing officers from those duties that tie them up watching people in custody, because if the case can be heard by the courts, offenders can be released into the community with conditions.

The other aspect, the second part of our election commitments to the community, was around tackling volume crime and crime hotspots in our suburbs. A lot has been said in this place about crime hotspots. Most electorates have particular parts where there are focuses—for example, there is the drug house on the street—and there are a lot of challenges in policing in trying to tackle the volume crime. We propose to tackle this volume crime with a couple of commitments. I will not go through all of them; members can look them up on the webpage if they want to get through the range of them.

Much was said about hoon behaviour. We have a proposal to change the hoon legislation so that on a first offence for a hoon driver in a built-up area, particularly in 40-kilometre-an-hour school zones, the police can apply to the courts to have that vehicle confiscated in circumstances in which it is causing fear and alarm in a community and it is particularly dangerous. We have put \$7.7 million towards tackling street violence. This is to beef up the capability of police to have mobile policing facilities move around between crime hotspots. Obviously, when criminals are caught by police or a police presence is increased in a certain area, there is displacement of people who do not want to be caught to different areas. That is why we have focused our strategies around policing that. We have put to the community the capability of having our police force be more responsive and more able to move from place to place and follow the crime around the communities. As part of this platform, we have also proposed to amend the loophole in the “three strikes and you're in” burglaries legislation. This legislation has been a problem for quite some time in that the interpretation of three strikes has been three court appearances rather than three offences. When the legislation was put to the community and put through these two houses of Parliament many years ago, the intention was that a burglar would be put away after three offences.

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

Mr P.B. Watson interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, member for Albany!

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: That is not occurring, so we have given a commitment to the community that we will amend that burglaries legislation to get those repeat offenders behind bars.

We know that the best way to drive down crime is to get criminals off the streets and into a facility so that the community at least has some respite from their offending. The other part of this legislative platform was to introduce mandatory minimum sentences for violent home invaders. There has been a lot of talk about it, and certainly in the community it was a very well received policy to make the minimum mandatory term for a violent offence in the course of a home invasion, such as grievous bodily harm—a violent assault—75 per cent of the maximum term. In the case of rape, for instance, the proposed minimum mandatory prison sentence is 15 years. In the case of an assault occasioning grievous bodily harm, we are looking at a minimum mandatory term of seven years and six months.

The other part of our election platform was around partnering the community in preventing and fighting crime. Indeed, many members touched on this when they were referring to the police and community youth centres. To assist the community and to assist police in driving down crime, we have put \$13.5 million into a closed-circuit television program. Part of this program is about building some capacity into the Maylands centre to allow the police more capability to receive CCTV footage from cameras located around the place. Also, \$5 million in community grants will be available to local governments to work in partnership with the state government in implementing CCTV infrastructure. In addition, we have put some money aside and made a commitment to develop a strategic plan for CCTVs across the state so that we get some consistency in our delivery.

We have put forward a range of other commitments but I would like to take some time to address some of the concerns raised by various members as part of their contributions. Since becoming the minister last year I have spent a lot of time getting out into the community and listening to the concerns of the community in various areas. Obviously an area of high focus for me was the south east metropolitan district —

Mr P.B. Watson interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Albany!

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The south east metropolitan area is responsible for a large proportion of the state crime, as I mentioned earlier today. I outright reject that I am neglecting the people of Armadale in my strategies to address crime. The south east metropolitan district has been a high focus for me. I have been briefed a number of times on issues relating to south east metro. At the invitation of —

Dr A.D. Buti interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Armadale, please! I have called you to order several times now. Please allow the minister to speak.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Thank you for your protection, Madam Deputy Speaker.

At the invitation of Don Randall, the federal member for Canning, I went to Armadale and took with me Assistant Commissioner Gary Budge, who was appointed assistant commissioner for the metropolitan region. We went through the Armadale electorate and Don Randall —

Dr A.D. Buti interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Armadale! I call you to order for the second time.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I respond to invitations from various people to visit their electorates and to view crime hotspots firsthand.

Dr A.D. Buti: I have invited you. I sent you a letter about three weeks ago and you haven't responded.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: On my tour of the Armadale electorate with Don Randall, we spoke to small business owners and we visited a number of drug houses. We looked firsthand at the issues in Armadale. As a result of that —

Dr A.D. Buti interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members! Allow the minister to complete her speech.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: As a result of that, Assistant Commissioner Budge and his people got together and put together a program for Armadale that the member for Armadale might like to hear about. Strike Force

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

Carombola has been two months in the planning. We will flood the south east metropolitan corridor with additional concept cars. Our mobile police facilities will be out there in force. We are inviting the community to engage with the police in their mobile police facilities and tell them about their volume crime issues and street crime issues so that the police can respond directly. We will be engaging the dog squad, mounted police and the regional operations group.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will members please allow the minister to speak. You have had your opportunity to speak and I would like to hear what the minister has to say.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Strike Force Carombola has come directly out of requests from my office to Assistant Commissioner Budge to brief me on what will be happening in the south east metropolitan district to address the issue of volume crime. I will be watching with interest because the member for Maylands referred to a targeted policing effort that was done in Maylands with the cooperation of the regional operations group, and that has had a significant effect in addressing the issue of volume crime. That is what modern policing is all about. It is about being responsible and able to deploy resources as required. Our policies have been about taking a targeted approach to get results. It is not about discussing with the commissioner the possibility or potential of changes; we are very much about targeting what our approach to tackling volume crime and other crime in Western Australia is all about.

There was some discussion about the closure of Ballajura Police Station. It is true that the decision by the commissioner to close the shopfront was made because the shopfront in Ballajura was deemed not fit for purpose. That has been widely discussed in here and I have been monitoring the statistics for Ballajura since I became the minister. I have requested frequent updates on those statistics and formed the view that Ballajura Police Station is warranted. A 24-hour policing service will operate out of Ballajura, consistent with a range of other police stations around the metropolitan area. We envisage that Ballajura Police Station will be well placed to accommodate some of our additional 550 officers.

I was pleased to see members opposite also agreeing with our policies on community engagement. The member for West Swan and others mentioned this aspect. Part of our platform of community engagement is about increasing capacity with our youth liaison officers so that the youth liaison officers can deal with the youths and bring them to facilities such as the police and community youth centres, which we have also agreed to fund to the amount of an additional \$10 million. That will help with the capacity upgrades so that our youth liaison officers can deal with youths at risk, because youths at risk and young offenders are a priority for this government. We want to make a significant impact on reducing the number of prolific young offenders in our community. Part of our community engagement is very much around giving the police the capacity to implement operations like Strike Force Carombola in other jurisdictions.

Before I run out of time, I would like to put on the record that members raised specific instances when the police response has been far from my expectations, and indeed from community expectations. I would very much appreciate it if members could forward that information on to me because I would like to give that information to the commissioner and have him advise me on what has happened in those circumstances. When people call the police and say that a home invasion is occurring right now, I expect the police to respond as a priority within an acceptable time frame.

The member for Girrawheen mentioned the criminal penalty infringement notice scheme. The CPINS legislation passed through this place in May 2011. At the time, we discussed and put out in the community that the time frame for its implementation would be mid-2014. This program does not have a funding issue; it is fully funded. It is in the tender process. CPINS is a complicated piece of information technology that needs to be implemented, and we expect it to become active. We are on schedule to deliver our commitment in the time frame that was put out there.

The member for Butler also mentioned my visit to Yanchep–Two Rocks, which was also around the end of 2012. I would like to put on the record that after strong advocacy from the member for Ocean Reef, we made a commitment to build some extra capacity into Clarkson Police Station. We have put an additional 13 detectives into Clarkson and we have funded the expansion of accommodation at Clarkson Police Station to allow those detectives to operate from there. Those detectives are at work right now in driving down volume crime in the Clarkson precinct. Since my appointment as minister and during the election campaign, it has become very clear during consultation with the community and from listening to the community that the community wanted more police officers, which is why the government made a commitment to put more police officers into the community. The community made it very clear to us that volume crime was an issue for it and we have put

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

strategies together to tackle volume crime. This government is listening to the community and I will continue with my program of community engagements so that the community can tell me directly what are the gaps in the service delivery of police and in my expectations and community expectations, so that we can continue to provide a more effective and responsive police force and ensure that we are tackling some of the causes of crime and working on crime prevention in our suburbs. I have these documents for tabling, if required.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members, I have looked at these documents. They appear to be typed notes as an aid to the minister's memory, so I do not think they rate as an official document.

MRS M.H. ROBERTS (Midland) [9.22 pm]: We have heard tonight a minister who is in total denial. The Minister for Police believes there are no problems with policing in this state and that the Liberal Party has done a fabulous job over the past four years. She believes that the community is grateful for the quantity and the quality of policing services and the level of crime in the community and on that basis has re-elected the Liberal government. The Minister for Police is in denial, and she has not taken up the issues that were raised by many members of the opposition.

We have heard tonight a litany of policing problems over the length and breadth of this state. Members on this side from country electorates and from electorates in the north, south and east of the metropolitan area have raised the most serious issues in which there are significant policing problems, yet the minister has failed to address them. Numerous of my colleagues have raised the issue of police and community youth centres and the withdrawal of police officers from programs in which they were meaningfully engaged in their communities and with the PCYCs. I can say from my experience that the problems are exactly the same in my electorate. I know that in the Midland town centre, after four and a half years of a Liberal government, we have significant problems. We have people being assaulted and robbed at all hours of the day and night. The Liberal Party has indicated that it will fund CCTV for the Midland town centre, and that that can be coordinated with police. Well, we are waiting for that, minister, and I look forward to that being announced as promptly as possible because it is a matter of urgency. We do not have enough police on patrol in the Midland town centre; the people of my electorate do not feel safe in the Midland town centre or at the Midland train station and surrounding areas. Many people will not frequent parts of the Midland town centre at various times of the day because of their fear of being assaulted or robbed. The police presence is not what it used to be; it needs to be stronger, and I certainly welcome the Liberal Party's commitment to CCTV. I call upon it to honour that commitment promptly.

Further, I recall that when I was police minister the then member for Kalgoorlie asked me whether the police would attend all home burglaries. In those years we did have a policy of attending home burglaries and collecting evidence from them. These days, I find out from most of my constituents that the average home burglary is not attended by police. This is a significant change in policing. Most constituents that I have spoken to who have been burgled or have experienced an attempted car theft or similar level crime have not had any police attendance at the home. In the suburb of Helena Valley, for example, I spoke to quite a number of people and there had been a spate of home burglaries and break-ins through the area. People have had bicycles and cars stolen and attempted car thefts and burglaries, and in every case there had actually been no police attendance. The common cry now is, "If you like, you can come in to the police station and report it." People lead busy lives; maybe this is how the government is trying to drive down home burglary and theft statistics—by not having the police attend and creating an incident report number, but by saying to people, "Come on down to the station." Oftentimes, because of their busy lives, their work commitments and their need to get the kids to school and other activities, people decide that it is not worth the effort, for a matter of a bike or even something more valuable being stolen, to go down to the station and fill in the paperwork, so those crimes go unreported. It is often only in circumstances in which people want to make a claim against their insurance that they go to the station to get a report number for the purpose of an insurance claim.

I do not see how we can catch those offenders. It does not matter what the penalties are if the police do not actually attend the crime scenes and collect the evidence. Evidence needs to be collected from where people have broken in, and it is possible to get fingerprints from around windowsills or doorways. It is possible to get other evidence that could be utilised, but I am guessing that in most circumstances home burglaries are simply not being prioritised and are not being attended by police. On that basis, the same people are presumably breaking into homes again and again. The response of this government is to talk tough on penalties. As I think one of my colleagues interjected on the minister earlier, there is little point in having tough penalties if we do not catch the offenders. In the vast majority of cases, home burglaries are not being solved. In the vast majority of cases, the offenders are not charged because they are not even identified, so there is no consequence for their actions and they continue to break into other people's homes, and more and more people feel violated, are violated, and live in fear in their homes because of the increasing number of burglaries and break-ins. It is most alarming for people when there is no police attendance whatsoever.

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

There is also a problem with the communication centre, which the minister may or may not acknowledge. I think she has partly acknowledged it in the past. People are having difficulty communicating the reporting of crimes or calling for police attendance. They have been kept on the line. They are waiting and waiting. In some instances they have to call back two or three times before they are connected.

The minister suggests that the hub model is the way to go and that that is how the community can best be serviced. It comes down to how many hubs are needed. I think we have had six hubs in the metropolitan area for a very long period. In answer to a question from the member for Belmont in question time today—I see the member nodding—about the south east metropolitan area, the minister pointed out the percentage of incidents that occur in that area. It is the biggest of the metropolitan regions. I think it is reasonable for the member for Armadale or the member for Belmont to ask whether an additional hub is required in the south east metropolitan area. That is something that the minister dismissed out of hand. Historically, there were six main centres. They are now known by their directional names, such as south east, north west, north east and so forth. They used to be known by their town names of Midland, Cannington, Joondalup, Mirrabooka and so forth. They have been the standard hubbing centres for decades. During that time the population has increased dramatically. The member for Butler pointed out the dramatic population increases in areas in his electorate. It is certainly worth considering whether there are sufficient hubs. It is not necessary to argue whether the hubbing model is the right model.

Quite separate to whether hubbing and deploying officers from central hubs is a good and sensible idea, the further question is: how many hubs do we need and is one hub enough for the south east metropolitan area? I happen to agree with the member for Armadale; I do not think one hub is enough for the south east metropolitan area. The problem at the station in Cannington has been growing for some years now. Before the call centre in Midland was set up by us when we were in government, come 4.00 pm, when stations such as Belmont, Armadale and the other ones in the south east used to manually divert through to Cannington, officers would run around and turn the ringer tones down on all of the phones because that station would just light up. The moment all the little stations within south east metropolitan diverted their phones through to Cannington, it was bedlam. It is a huge area population-wise, and it also has some lower socioeconomic areas within it where there are greater problems. As such, there is a very reasonable claim that it should have at least one other hub, and that could provide a better policing service.

The minister has said that, as an alternative, she will create another regional operations group. The ROG was created 10 or more years ago so that any of those six metropolitan regions could be supplemented. It meant that when there was a particular incident or greater demand, a group could be deployed anywhere in the metropolitan area. For example, if there was an out-of-control party or some other incident, a mobile group could be sent to Cannington, Midland, Joondalup or wherever. It has now been decided that there will also be one south of the river. I think that is a step in the right direction, but I question whether that is just policing on the cheap and whether it is needed, because each of those six hubs is under-resourced and does not have sufficient police officers to do the job. Again, as one of my colleagues suggested, if police officers are put on the ground where they are needed in each of the six metropolitan policing regions, maybe the additional ROG would not be needed. It is obviously a cheaper solution to put another ROG into the southern zone.

The minister has said that it is part of Liberal philosophy to resource the police force effectively. It is just a shame that it has not done that. When the minister pointed out that the government will allocate some more money in coming budgets, she failed to point out the money that the government has taken out of policing in recent years by way of the efficiency dividend. It was going to be more, but it was reduced. In 2012–13, some \$28.2 million is being taken out of the police service budget. In 2013–14, the police service is to yield an efficiency dividend to Treasury of \$36.8 million. In 2014–15, it will be nearly \$50 million; in 2015–16, it will be \$63 million; and in 2016–17, it will be required to make further savings of \$71.5 million. That in itself is well over \$250 million of cuts, or savings as the government likes to call them, that the police service will be required to make over the next four years. That is huge. In addition to that, all the money for the enterprise bargaining agreement is not on budget. The 2011 EBA is not fully funded over the period of the forward estimates. That is more money that needs to be found.

The question for the minister is: is the money that she is talking about that was promised at the election additional money? Certainly, in Liberal Party propaganda we were led to believe that this was additional money. With the EBA shortfall, plus the money that has not been given to support a couple of pieces of legislation that are being implemented, I estimate that the police service will be short about another \$16 million a year. So we are looking at a shortfall, or cuts to the police budget, of some \$300 million. We need to know that all that money will be there, that those cuts will not happen and that the efficiency dividend will not go ahead. There is little point in talking about giving the police service \$280 million more while with the other hand the

Extract from Hansard
[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 7 May 2013]
p229f-270a

Mr John McGrath; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Peter Tinley; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Lisa Baker; Acting Speaker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Quigley; Ms Simone McGurk; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mrs Michelle Roberts

government is taking \$300 million away from it. It is a pea and thimble trick. I think that my colleagues have very adequately described this evening the effects of it. There has been a failure to spend the money that is required in the police service, there has been a failure to appoint sufficient police officers to stations in the suburbs and in the regions, there has been a failure for the community in the level of assaults and the police presence in our towns, suburbs and regions, and there has been a failure to respond quickly enough when people phone the police or to respond at all to home burglaries and some other so-called volume crimes. This government does not have a handle on it. This minister does not have a handle on it. It was most disappointing tonight for her to stand up in some kind of strange state of denial and pretend that there is no problem and that all our suburbs are being policed effectively. They are not. My electorate of Midland is not being effectively serviced by police. The town centre does not have a strong enough police presence, and those in the suburbs are not getting a sufficient police response when they are the victims of crime.

Division

Amendment put and a division taken, the Deputy Speaker casting her vote with the noes, with the following result —

Ayes (17)

Ms L.L. Baker
Dr A.D. Buti
Ms J. Farrer
Ms J.M. Freeman
Mr W.J. Johnston

Mr D.J. Kelly
Ms S.F. McGurk
Mr M.P. Murray
Mr P. Papalia
Mr J.R. Quigley

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

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

Noes (31)

Mr P. Abetz
Mr F.A. Alban
Mr I.C. Blayney
Mr I.M. Britza
Mr T.R. Buswell
Mr G.M. Castrilli
Ms M.J. Davies
Mr J.H.D. Day

Ms W.M. Duncan
Ms E. Evangel
Mr J.M. Francis
Mrs G.J. Godfrey
Mr B.J. Grylls
Dr K.D. Hames
Mrs L.M. Harvey
Mr C.D. Hatton

Mr A.P. Jacob
Dr G.G. Jacobs
Mr S.K. L'Estrange
Mr R.S. Love
Mr W.R. Marmion
Mr P.T. Miles
Ms A.R. Mitchell
Mr N.W. Morton

Dr M.D. Nahan
Mr D.C. Nalder
Mr J. Norberger
Mr A.J. Simpson
Mr M.H. Taylor
Mr T.K. Waldron
Mr J.E. McGrath (*Teller*)

Pairs

Mr R.H. Cook
Mr B.S. Wyatt
Mr M. McGowan
Mr F.M. Logan

Mr D.T. Redman
Mr R.F. Johnson
Mr A. Krsticevic
Mr M.J. Cowper

Amendment thus negatived.

Motion Resumed

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

House adjourned at 9.46 pm
