

Amber-Jade Sanderson; Mr Shane Love; Acting Speaker; Mr John McGrath; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Matthew Hughes; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr John Quigley; Mr David Templeman; Mr Simon Millman; Mr Peter Katsambanis

SENTENCE ADMINISTRATION AMENDMENT BILL 2017

Second Reading

Resumed from 22 June.

MS A. SANDERSON (Morley — Parliamentary Secretary) [4.25 pm]: I rise to make a contribution to the Sentence Administration Amendment Bill 2017, also known as the no body, no parole bill. This bill was essentially a Labor Party election commitment. It has also survived a previous Parliament when it was introduced into this place in another form as a private member's bill. It is pleasing today that the Labor Party is in a position to introduce this bill as a government bill and deliver its election commitment to the constituency. Its genesis was in a petition presented to the former Leader of the Opposition, Mark McGowan—now the Premier—and John Quigley, when he was the shadow Attorney General. The petition called for Parliament to introduce legislation that would essentially prevent people convicted of some of the most appalling crimes, such as murder, from not cooperating with police to find the whereabouts of their victims. The petition that Margaret Dodd presented to Mark McGowan, now the Premier, and John Quigley contained 40 000 signatures. Anyone who has pushed a petition and tried to get signatures knows that 40 000 signatures is an enormous amount of community support. I would certainly like to see which petitions in this place have had the most signatures. I hazard a guess that it is probably up there pretty high as a petition with such broad community support. It was incredibly disappointing that the party in government at the time—the Liberal Party—refused to support that legislation. It essentially provided no comfort to the victims of those crimes. The bill relates to a relatively small number of people in custody. It will not provide those families with any genuine comfort in that they are grieving for their relatives. I cannot possibly imagine what it is like to lose a child, even an adult child. It does not matter how old a child is, they will always be your babies. They can be grown adults or little children, but to lose a child or a family member in that manner is bad enough, but not to know where they are must make that pain unendurable.

We have heard a lot about this bill from members in this place. I was taken mostly by the member for Murray–Wellington in her description of what it is like as a mother to not know where your children are. There are many parents in this place.

Point of Order

Mr R.S. LOVE: I would really like to hear what the member for Morley has to say about this, but there is so much noise somewhere that I cannot hear.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr T.J. Healy): I have mentioned it to the Clerk. They are investigating it as quickly as they can. I concur. I apologise, member for Morley; can you please continue while we identify the noise.

Debate Resumed

Ms A. SANDERSON: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. This is really about hopefully providing an opportunity for those families to find out where their loved ones rest and to be able to say goodbye in whatever way that family needs to say goodbye. That has to be such an important part of the closure process for people who have lost loved ones. To lose a teenage girl, as Margaret Dodd did all those years ago, and not know where she is or what her fate has been is, to me, unimaginable. My partner grew up in Eneabba, and he lived there when Hayley went missing. It is a very close, small community and he says that it has always stayed with him. He was a teenager at the time she went missing, and it has deeply affected all the small, tight communities around there. For something so horrific and mysterious to occur and no-one know where Hayley is is just unbelievable. People know where Hayley Dodd and Craig Puddy are, but the people who most know are those who committed those crimes. It is more than reasonable that the perpetrators should be excluded from any possibility of parole unless they cooperate with the police to find the victims and allow their families closure. That is the very, very least they can do. From that point of view, this is important legislation. No, it will not impact broad sections of the community, but that does not mean it is unimportant. We legislate for, if you like, minorities all the time in this place to protect people; we do not just legislate for the majority. This is about legislating for a group of people and families, and future families who may be affected by this law, so that they have some hope of actually finding their loved ones. I understand that since the conviction for the murder of Craig Puddy, there have been around four cases to which this legislation may apply. That is, potentially, four other families who will have the opportunity to resolve their grief in some way and say goodbye to their loved ones.

This legislation is not an outlandish proposal. It is already in place and operating quite well in a number of jurisdictions. Where it is not already in place, it is being very carefully examined. The jurisdictions relatively recently came to their legislation in their own way. In Victoria the legislation passed the Legislative Council in

Amber-Jade Sanderson; Mr Shane Love; Acting Speaker; Mr John McGrath; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Matthew Hughes; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr John Quigley; Mr David Templeman; Mr Simon Millman; Mr Peter Katsambanis

late 2016 as an amendment to the Corrections Act. It was assented to on 13 December 2016, and has been in operation for the last six or seven months. In South Australia the Correctional Services (Parole) Amendment Act commenced operation on 11 February 2016; it also amended the Correctional Services Act 1982 by introducing sections that require the parole board not to release on parole a person serving a life sentence for an offence of murder, unless the board is satisfied that the prisoner has satisfactorily cooperated in the investigation of that murder. That has been operating now for almost 18 months. Queensland has recently conducted an independent review of the parole system, with a recommendation to introduce no body, no parole as part of the parole process. That would require an amendment to the Corrective Services Act. I understand that legislation is due to be introduced in Queensland relatively soon. The Northern Territory Parole Amendment Bill was assented to and commenced on 5 August. That bill provides that the parole board may not make a parole order in relation to the prisoner unless the board considers that the prisoner has cooperated satisfactorily in the investigation. The New South Wales Minister for Corrections has also indicated that the New South Wales government will introduce no body, no parole laws to provide more certainty for the families of victims of such horrible, horrible crimes. So the Sentence Administration Amendment Bill 2017 is not an unusual bill given the national perspective.

It is pleasing that the opposition will support the bill. If it had supported it last year it would already be in place, providing those families with some degree of comfort. The now opposition has had a change of heart and has now come to that party. I am very, very pleased with the opposition's support. I would like to acknowledge and welcome to the debate the members of the families of victims who are in the public gallery this afternoon. I am very proud to be part of the Labor government that will be responsible for passing this important legislation.

The bill is very short and provides for amendments to the existing Sentence Administration Act. Essentially, it defines homicide, but, importantly, it defines homicide-related offences so that any person directly involved in a homicide will also be captured. If someone procures a homicide, for example, they are absolutely captured under this legislation. I think that is very important. Proposed new section 66A, under the definition of "homicide-related offence", states that it covers anyone —

- (a) counselling or procuring the commission of a homicide offence; or
- (b) inciting another person to commit a homicide offence; or
- (c) becoming an accessory after the fact to a homicide offence; or
- (d) conspiring with another person to commit a homicide offence;

The legislation is not only intended to target the person who did the deed, if you like, but also any person who procured, assisted, coerced or assisted post the offence will be captured under this legislation, which is a very important aspect of it, I think.

Under these amendments the board will be required not to recommend any release unless the prisoner has cooperated. They do not have to cooperate directly, necessarily, but they certainly have to make the board aware of their cooperation. So, for example, if they confess to a prison officer, a remand officer or officer of the court, it is the prisoner's responsibility to make the parole board aware of that. So it does not just have to be the police, although I think it is acknowledged that in any murder investigation the police will be the primary investigators, as should be the case.

Proposed new section 66B outlines —

- (1) The Board must not make a release decision, or take release action, in relation to a relevant prisoner in custody for a homicide offence or homicide related offence unless the Board is satisfied that —
 - (a) the prisoner has cooperated with a member of the Police Force in the identification of the location, or last known location, of the remains of the victim of the homicide offence; ...

Proposed new section 66C states —

On each occasion on which the Board is required to consider whether to make a release decision, or take release action, in relation to a relevant prisoner in custody for a homicide offence or homicide related offence, the Board must make a written request to the Commissioner of Police for a written report.

The legislation is quite detailed on the requirements for that report, providing some safety net or mechanism, if you like, to capture the people who committed these crimes. The report has to outline the nature and extent of the prisoner's cooperation and the timeliness of the prisoner's cooperation. I think that is an important point in this bill. They cannot sit there for 10 years, realise they are up for parole and all of a sudden have an epiphany and

Amber-Jade Sanderson; Mr Shane Love; Acting Speaker; Mr John McGrath; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Matthew Hughes; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr John Quigley; Mr David Templeman; Mr Simon Millman; Mr Peter Katsambanis

remember where they disposed of a body or left any remains. That is not deemed timely cooperation; that is entirely self-serving. The board must be satisfied that that prisoner has cooperated at the earliest opportunity, and not left it until they are right at the point of possibly receiving parole.

The report has to deal with the truthfulness, completeness and reliability of any information or evidence provided by the prisoner. Vague coordinates in the bush will not be considered significant cooperation; they must be very specific and outline exactly where the police will find the evidence that they need and families will find the remains that they need in order to say goodbye. Down a dirt track down the back of someone's house is certainly not going to satisfy that requirement. The significance and the usefulness of the prisoner's cooperation—the wholeness of the information—needs to lead to the recovery of that body. I think that is the essence of this legislation: the information provided by the prisoner has to lead to the recovery of the body. That is a very important part of this legislation.

I am pleased that the opposition is supporting this legislation; albeit, it probably has little choice, given its numbers in the Parliament. We saw a number of important reforms in the last Parliament and previously that the Liberal Party refused to support. No body, no parole was one of those important reforms. I want to remind members opposite of another very important reform introduced in 2012 by the then Leader of the Opposition, Mark McGowan—that is, Saori's law, which was an incredibly important reform. For members who are aware of the events—it is pretty hard not to be—Saori was subjected to a most horrible death in front of her children and left for two weeks. Her ex-husband, Bradley Wayne Jones, king hit her. I think he was given a conviction for unlawful assault and received a sentence of five years. They used the one-punch laws. I will not go into detail about that case, because it is very distressing and most members will know it. A deeply, deeply upsetting chain of events occurred around that, not least the failure of the law to find justice for Saori and her children she left behind, but also the processes or lack of process that led to her death.

[Member's time extended.]

Ms A. SANDERSON: It is fair to say that government members were deeply moved by that case. The case instigated the Labor Party in opposition to introduce Saori's law. The majority of convictions for unlawful assault causing death under section 821 of the Criminal Code, which is known as the one-punch law, have been against men who, like Mr Jones, killed their partners or ex-partners. Although most people assume those laws are in place for the Northbridge drunk fight or the horrific random one-punch attacks we see and are all completely terrified will befall any of our children if they ever go out at night, most convictions in which one punch has caused death are related to family and domestic violence cases. The sentencing around those cases is completely inadequate. Despite carrying a maximum sentence of 10 years, convictions that involve domestic violence have resulted in sentences of between two years and five years. It is absolutely outrageous that Bradley Jones received a five-year sentence. Labor's plan was to lift the maximum sentence to 20 years' imprisonment for unlawful assault causing death in circumstances of aggravation, such as domestic violence, when there is often a history of violence. We introduced that legislation to provide a deterrent and some justice for those victims, and very sadly it was rejected by the then government. I hope that the opposition has a similar epiphany around the domestic violence reforms we will see come into this place over the next couple of years steered by the Minister for Prevention of Family and Domestic Violence—the first such minister in this state—and the Attorney General, John Quigley. I look forward to their support to improve protections for those members of our community as well.

I have another example of the now opposition not supporting what would have been an incredibly important law reform towards the end of the last Parliament, which was broadly supported by the community and introduced by one of its own former members, Dr Graham Jacobs. I was not in this place at that time, but I certainly could not ignore the fact that it was a very emotional and fraught debate. It was good legislation from one of the then government's own members and supported by the then opposition Labor Party that would have lifted the restriction on suing offenders of sexual abuse. It would have lifted the statute of limitations for sexual abuse victims. At the moment, there is a six-year limitation, which is completely inadequate considering that most victims of sexual abuse are children, because it entirely limits their ability as adults to seek recompense and justice from the perpetrators. The reform was generally supported across the community. No doubt there are legal issues with it, but for some reason the then government refused to support it. It was an outrage and a great disservice to the community and to the people who deserved the right to sue the perpetrator of crimes against them. Strangely enough, three months later, the then Premier announced that the Liberal Party would introduce that reform after the next election. It was just bloody-minded stubbornness to refuse to support an important legal reform that would have provided better recompense and justice for sexual abuse victims. It was absolute stubbornness that the Liberal Party came to that position three or four months after a very difficult debate.

Amber-Jade Sanderson; Mr Shane Love; Acting Speaker; Mr John McGrath; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Matthew Hughes; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr John Quigley; Mr David Templeman; Mr Simon Millman; Mr Peter Katsambanis

I hope that we see more enlightenment from the opposition on these law reforms than we had in the previous Parliament. I am very, very pleased that the opposition is supporting this legislation; it will be an important law. The legislation will not affect broad swathes of the community, but that does not mean it is not a deeply felt and deeply held view that it is important to find justice for people who have lost victims. It is an important part of the healing process for those people. It is fair to say that people never, ever recover from the loss of a child, particularly a child who is taken by somebody else. I do not know how people in that situation get up in the morning and get on with each day. I have enormous respect for people who have suffered such significant loss in their lives, and we, as legislators, should do everything we can to provide comfort for them by getting justice and recovering their loved ones so they can say goodbye.

MR J.E. McGRATH (South Perth) [4.48 pm]: I rise to make a few comments on the Sentence Administration Amendment Bill 2017. The Attorney General and those who were in the chamber when we were in government will recall that I have spoken previously on this matter. In fact, I was one of the government members who were very supportive of the member for Butler's private member's bill. I will tell members a bit of the history as we go through this matter, but, before I do that, I would like to remind the member for Morley that she will find in her time in this place that governments very rarely accept a private member's bill. It was the same when I was first elected in 2005. We came up with a lot of private members' bills. I remember when I was the shadow Minister for Road Safety and John Kobelke was Minister for Police and Emergency Services that, as good as a private member's bill was, John Kobelke would say, "The member on the other side makes a very good point and we understand what the opposition is trying to achieve here, but on this occasion we will not accept this private member's bill." That is what governments do. Very rarely do governments pick up private members' legislation. As I said, when this bill was put forward last year as a private member's bill by the member for Butler, it is on the public record that I supported the intent of it. I supported it in our party room and was told that the government would accept it, but with some amendments, which I did not think were necessary. I think the member for Butler then withdrew the private member's bill. The reason I supported it was that, firstly, I thought it was right; I thought it was good policy. I am not a lawyer, but it just appeared to me to be good policy. The other reason I supported the bill was that for some time I had known Laurie Puddy—the father of Craig Puddy, who was murdered. In November 2011—this has been mentioned in other speeches—Cameron Mansell was convicted of killing Craig Puddy, who was 45 years old, at Mr Puddy's Mt Pleasant home on 3 May 2010 and dumping his body in an undisclosed location. I was in my office one day and I got an email from Laurie Puddy, whom I met a long time ago when I was a sports editor for *The West Australian*. Back then there was a rugby league club that played in the national competition called the Western Reds. It did not last a long time, but it was in the national competition and had a very big following. Laurie Puddy was the chairman of this club, and he was also a very successful businessman. I got to know him quite well. He is a very decent individual and the Puddys are a very fine family. When the member for Butler introduced this private member's bill calling for no body, no parole legislation, Mr Puddy contacted me by email and said, "John, you guys have got to support this." He said that the Labor opposition was bringing the bill in and that we had to support it. I read his email in the party room, so I should read it to the Parliament. It states —

Mansell is in medium security and has a very easy life. The security people tell me he is a good inmate and he has his rights. He refuses to talk to the Police or me. so we have nil leverage. Please assist where you can in making sure this gets through the Parliament

When I read that, I thought that there needed to be some lever for families of victims to get some closure, so they can at least know where the body is or the remains can be found. They need to have some closure. Someone who has never been in that situation can imagine what it would be like for those people when, firstly, they have lost a loved one and, secondly, they have no closure on what has happened. That email was written to me in February 2016. In March 2016 Mr Puddy wrote another email to me. It states —

The Attorney General —

He would have been talking about the Attorney General of the Liberal–National government —

tells us he would not approve any such bail release without having details of body whereabouts..

In other words, the Liberal–National government's Attorney General was saying that the legislation was not needed because if the whereabouts of the body were not disclosed, he would certainly not tick off on any bail release. Mr Puddy said to me that if that was the case, why should we wait another 13 years before the guilty one has to consider his position? He was saying that the person who had been found guilty of murdering his son still had another 13 years of his sentence to serve and if the no body, no parole laws had been put through the

Amber-Jade Sanderson; Mr Shane Love; Acting Speaker; Mr John McGrath; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Matthew Hughes; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr John Quigley; Mr David Templeman; Mr Simon Millman; Mr Peter Katsambanis

Parliament and been in place, there might have been an incentive to make Cameron Mansell take more notice and agree to let the authorities know where the body was.

The other case that came up at the time was that of Hayley Dodd, which got a lot of publicity around Australia. I have never met the Dodd family, but the Western Australian community and the Australian community are certainly well aware of the case of Hayley's disappearance. I recall that Hayley Dodd's mother took a petition and I think she got something like 40 000 signatures all supporting this no body, no parole legislation. That is pretty powerful support from the community saying that something needs to be brought to the Parliament that can give closure to families who have been the subject of these terrible, tragic incidences that have taken the lives of their loved ones. As parliamentarians, we need to bring in something that can assist. As has been mentioned by other members, none of us can really understand that trauma and grieving. None of us can really know what people go through, and I notice there are family members in the public gallery today. That is why, as a member of Parliament, I felt that it would be wrong of us if we did not support the legislation brought in as a private member's bill. As I said, not being a lawyer, I quickly came to the realisation that no body, no parole legislation would offer the families of victims the one thing that might assist them in their times of uncertainty—hope. It would give them some hope that the culprit or the guilty person would let them know what they had done with the body. It would provide those families with a certain level of control over the very difficult situation they are in, and the fate of the perpetrators would depend on information provided on the whereabouts of their loved ones. I told Laurie Puddy last year that I would assist him, advance his views in the party room and personally support the legislation. I must admit that there was a general feeling among a lot of our members that we should support the legislation, but our party decided that there should be some amendments and I guess in a major party situation, a lot of members were persuaded to go along with that. My personal feeling was that we should not have amended the legislation and we should have put it through. It was not a very good day in our term of government when we let that bill go. That is why I am very pleased that this time the opposition is supporting the legislation. I congratulate the new Attorney General for his persistence in bringing this legislation back into the chamber. I would like to think that if we had won government, we would have introduced this legislation too, but, anyway, it has been done. I think this is a good outcome. We, as an opposition, will completely support this legislation.

MS J.J. SHAW (Swan Hills) [4.59 pm]: I rise in support of the Sentence Administration Amendment Bill 2017. I would like to acknowledge the Attorney General's fierce advocacy on this issue. I note that no body, no parole laws have been a longstanding issue for the Labor Party. Indeed, in February 2016 the now Attorney General introduced legislation into this place aimed at achieving a no body, no parole law, and I think it was a real travesty that that legislation did not pass. It is long overdue. The Labor government has continued to champion no body, no parole laws. The Premier in particular undertook extensive consultation with families who have been directly affected by the ineffectiveness of the current legislative regime. In January 2017, the Premier announced our law reform initiatives in which it was stated that the government believes in a proper functioning criminal justice system and how essential that is to ensuring a peaceful and orderly society. Labor wants to implement evidence-based policies that reduce crime and make our state a safe place to live and, most importantly, wants to put the interests of victims front and centre in developing new approaches to reducing crime.

This Sentence Administration Amendment Bill is one of several important changes to law that WA Labor committed to during the election period. We discussed three key pillars as part of our policy and they are, firstly and most importantly, a judicial system focused on the victims of crime; secondly, evidence-based solutions to law and order issues; and, thirdly, greater community access to the judicial system. Again, I congratulate the Attorney General for moving swiftly to introduce these laws and getting on with the job of governing and delivering on our election commitments, which WA Labor has been doing across a broad range of policy areas.

Currently, a convicted murderer can deliberately withhold information concerning the whereabouts of a victim's body and still be eligible for parole. That is an unsatisfactory situation and one that I am quite sure causes absolute heartbreak for the families involved and stops them from being able to move on with their lives. My heart genuinely goes out to families impacted by this situation. I hope they get some consolation from the fact that, finally, some legislative change in this area is underway.

The laws before the Parliament require the Prisoners Review Board to obtain and consider a report from police about the prisoner's cooperation in the investigation, so a proactive step will be required in which a prisoner has direct control over the consideration of their parole process, and the ability to demonstrate some goodwill in some terrible circumstances. In every case in which the Prisoners Review Board considers whether a prisoner should be granted an early release order, the board must not make an order or a release recommendation unless

Amber-Jade Sanderson; Mr Shane Love; Acting Speaker; Mr John McGrath; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Matthew Hughes; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr John Quigley; Mr David Templeman; Mr Simon Millman; Mr Peter Katsambanis

satisfied that the prisoner has cooperated with a member of WA Police about either of the two following matters; firstly, on the identification of the location of the victim's remains; and, secondly, on the identification of the last-known location of the victim's remains. The aim of the proposed provisions is to enhance the likelihood of locating the body of the victim of a murder. The provisions will not apply if the location of the victim's remains are known to a member of Western Australia Police. They will apply to all relevant prisoners as defined in the bill regardless of the date they committed the offence. That is a particularly important factor in this legislation. It will apply to people who are currently serving sentences for murder and, hopefully, will encourage those people to come forward and lay family members' minds at ease and finally give them some closure.

These provisions are intended to defend the rights of families and victims and also to reflect the core principle that parole is a privilege, not a right. It must be earned; it should not be automatically granted. A prisoner must demonstrate their intent to come back into society for rehabilitation. This bill provides a fundamental way in which that good intent can be demonstrated. Let us not forget the purposes of parole. It is basically an opportunity for a prisoner who has served part of a prison sentence to transition back into society. They can do that in a variety of ways, and this is a significant step that can have a huge impact on the lives of victims' families. It can be a significant indication by a criminal that they have indeed taken appropriate steps towards their rehabilitation and are ready to begin to transition back into society. A parolee is able to serve the balance of their sentence in relative freedom with the opportunity to lead a constructive life. If they want that, they have to earn it.

I really do think that the benefit of parole should be extended only ever to convicted criminals when they have demonstrated they are on the path to rehabilitation. In the case of *R v Shrestha* [1991] HCA 26, Justices Deane, Dawson and Toohey stated —

... the parole system allows for a review of the offender's case after he has actually served a significant part of a custodial sentence, for the purpose of deciding whether he should be released on parole at that stage. At the time of that review, the reviewing authority should have available to it up-to-date information about the prisoner's conduct while in custody, his current attitudes, his present circumstances and the prospects of his rehabilitation in the community if he be released on parole.

In my view, a key part of assessing whether those things are present is whether a convicted person has acted to ease the suffering of the victims' families. This should be and will be measured under the legislative proposals based on the timeliness and the truthfulness of the offender's cooperation.

It is interesting to consider the purposes of imprisonment. There are a number of reasons in society that we move down the path of incarcerating people. There is obviously retribution, punishment and deterrence, but rehabilitation is a core factor of imprisonment. We need to gear our corrective services system towards rehabilitation and create circumstances under which prisoners rehabilitate. I hope these amendments will encourage convicted criminals towards a path of rehabilitation and to recognise not only the service they perform to society as a whole but also the benefit they deliver to affected families. It has been quite some time—getting on for 20 years now—since I have studied criminal law. While I was at university, I had the benefit of going through a lot of the prisons in New South Wales with the then Commissioner for Probation and Parole, Dr Frank Hayes, who was a leading light in the New South Wales corrective services system, with his focus on the purposes of imprisonment. In all the prisons in which he operated, he tried to encourage that rehabilitation culture and to encourage criminals to see the error of their ways and to do their best through services to the community, self-improvement and focusing on the impact that convicted criminals have on victims' lives. He worked hard at that and I learnt an awful lot from studying the way he operated. He was held in high esteem within the prisons, the corrective services system and particularly the public service. An important point to make about this legislation is that mere cooperation itself will not guarantee a release on parole. The range of usual considerations under section 5A of the Sentence Administration Act will apply. I think that is a really important point to appreciate. This legislation perhaps will lift the bar and bring home the moral obligation that prisoners have to victims of crime in these instances. As I have said before, the retrospective application of these new provisions is a really important point to appreciate, on public interest grounds. A number of matters are alive at the moment, and a number of people have a real interest in seeing them brought to a close. There is a public interest both in past offences and also into the future in seeing perpetrators of these crimes bring forward information that will help alleviate people's suffering. Parole should contain particular provisions contingent on satisfactory cooperation, setting an incentive for people to assist in the recovery of the body or remains of the victim. I also note that these initiatives have been introduced into other jurisdictions across Australia. It is great that legislative regimes will be in place across the nation to alleviate the suffering of families.

Amber-Jade Sanderson; Mr Shane Love; Acting Speaker; Mr John McGrath; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Matthew Hughes; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr John Quigley; Mr David Templeman; Mr Simon Millman; Mr Peter Katsambanis

It is important, as we move forward with the implementation of this legislation, that we take time to review the operation of the legislation to see whether any amendments are required to further encourage and promote its effectiveness. It is important to acknowledge that, if a prisoner is unable to tell the police where a body or remains are located because they do not know, the board can still be satisfied that the prisoner has cooperated. However, quite a significant burden should need to be discharged on that. It is also appropriate to build incentives into the mechanism to encourage disclosure as early as possible. If someone is approaching the expiration of their sentence and all of a sudden makes a last-minute disclosure, that is quite disingenuous and should be treated as such.

It is wonderful that legislation is finally before the Parliament that will go an incredible way towards easing family suffering. It is disappointing that this was not done 12 months ago. These changes are long overdue, and I commend the bill to the house.

MRS M.H. ROBERTS (Midland — Minister for Police) [5.12 pm]: I rise to speak on the Sentence Administration Amendment Bill 2017, and to thank the Attorney General for bringing it forward with such speed. The government has spent just over 100 days in office and has already moved ahead on a number of fronts to deliver on its election commitments. In the last couple of years of the former government, nothing really happened in these areas. Indeed, when the then opposition brought forward a private member's bill for no body, no parole, it was voted down by the former government. In opposition we developed an agenda for the election and for government, and we have already been in a position to be able to move very quickly on a range of those commitments.

As members will be aware, I have already introduced a bill to increased penalties for methamphetamine traffickers. That bill went through this house in the last sitting week and is now on the agenda in the upper house. It will provide for a significant increase in the maximum penalty, up to life imprisonment, for people trafficking 28 grams or more of methamphetamine. The Premier and the Minister for Health have already convened the methamphetamine action task force, with senior police representation and leadership, and I am in the process of ensuring that we can recruit another 100 sworn officers for the meth border force, to deal with an issue that went largely ignored until the last year or so of the former government.

We have also moved ahead and extended the hours for a number of police stations—something those communities have been demanding for years—to 24 hours at Ellenbrook and Armadale, and extended hours at Belmont, Canning Vale and Forrestfield. These were election commitments, and they are being delivered. Although members opposite unfortunately still have not listened to the community and still do not understand the benefits of people in outer metropolitan areas in particular having the same access to police and police stations that people in inner-city areas enjoy, these changes have been welcomed in the community. In the area that was formerly called the south eastern metro region, and probably is being called that again, a huge area had only one 24-hour station, at Cannington. That meant that not only people in Armadale, but also people living beyond Armadale, at Harrisdale, Byford and the like, who needed police attendance were told that they had to go to Cannington. Now they have the option of going somewhere much closer to Armadale.

In its first 100 days the government has taken action to implement a range of promises. In the policing area, we have delivered more than \$800 000 to fund the Armadale youth intervention project, which will help to break the cycle of reoffending. I have already attended two ministerial council meetings, received numerous national security and counterterrorism briefings, welcomed a new safety alert system for child abduction, and launched a new gun amnesty. I have also been out visiting police stations, including a number in the country. I am delighted to have visited stations as diverse as Williams, Wagin, Albany, Bunbury and South Hedland, where I was able to announce additional resources. Ours is a government of action. We are active in legislation, in delivering for the community and, particularly, in delivering on our election promises.

Most of us enter Parliament because we want to make a difference for people in our community. The legislation before us today will make a difference for people in the community. That is what I am in politics for, and it is what the Attorney General is in politics for. We want to deliver some real benefits for the community, and we are doing that on a range of fronts. The no body, no parole legislation may affect only a very small number of people, but it is important for those people. I cannot imagine what it would be like to have a family member murdered, and to never learn where the body of my loved one was. I can only imagine the heartache that someone like Mrs Dodd has gone through. Having had responsibility for the police portfolio in both government and opposition, I have had the opportunity of meeting a large number of victims of crime. It is heartbreaking to meet parents whose children have been murdered. For those who do not know where their child's body has ended up, the sleepless nights must just continue. Although I do not think that any parent would get over the

Amber-Jade Sanderson; Mr Shane Love; Acting Speaker; Mr John McGrath; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Matthew Hughes; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr John Quigley; Mr David Templeman; Mr Simon Millman; Mr Peter Katsambanis

death of a child, to have a child taken in very tragic circumstances would be even more heart-wrenching, and then to never know where the body had been disposed of would just mean more totally sleepless nights.

I congratulate Mrs Dodd for taking up her petition. As the Attorney General outlined in his second reading speech, the history of this legislation in Western Australia starts with Mrs Margaret Dodd. Her daughter Hayley has still not been found. Her petition very quickly amassed some 40 000 signatures because, although most people in this state have not been and are never likely to be in Mrs Dodd's position, I think everyone in the community can empathise with her and the situation that she found herself in. As members may be aware, there is already, to use the colloquial term, no body, no parole legislation in Victoria, the Northern Territory and South Australia. I understand it has also been progressed in some other states. It should have been put in place in Western Australia some time ago, but with the do-nothing former government and the attitude of the former Attorney General and the former Minister for Police, not only did it not eventuate, but also the legislation put forward by the opposition was opposed. The former government said that our legislation was somehow flawed and that what we were proposing was not appropriate. If the former government agreed with the principle of no body, no parole, and given it had the resources of government, it should have devoted the resources necessary to draft competent legislation. It turns out that can be done relatively quickly, as our Attorney General has already proven by having the legislation drafted and ready for introduction in this first session of Parliament. Although it does not affect a lot of people, it will give comfort to those who are affected. It will not necessarily mean that every convicted murderer will give up the location of their victim, but it certainly puts an imposition on them if they do not. I believe it will lead to the discovery of the remains of deceased people whose whereabouts we currently do not know. That will be a good thing.

It will also provide a more general comfort to the community knowing that if they should ever find themselves in the situation in which a family member or friend is murdered and someone is convicted of that murder and the whereabouts of the deceased are unknown, effectively the murderer will remain in prison and not have access to parole unless they give up the location of the body. Now, it strikes me and I think it strikes most of the community as the right thing to do. This is probably what should have always happened. We should have always had this expectation, because I cannot imagine what it would be like for a person whose child has been murdered and someone convicted for that crime, to eventually find that that prisoner was out on parole without having given up the location of the body. That would add insult to injury and redouble the trauma already suffered.

I congratulate the Attorney General on bringing forward this legislation so quickly. I supported him when he introduced similar legislation when we were in opposition. I thought we made a convincing case for it from opposition. I know that we have enormous community support for this legislation. I am proud to be a member of the McGowan government and, together with the Attorney General, to be delivering on some important legislative changes like that which is before the house today.

MR R.S. LOVE (Moore) [5.24 pm]: I rise to make a short contribution on the Sentence Administration Amendment Bill 2017, otherwise known as no body, no parole legislation. I rise to say very briefly that I also support the bill. I think most speakers have been saying the same. The bill is very easy to defend, I think, because of the principle that a murderer should not be released from prison when they have not divulged information that would help to find the body and bring closure to the family. The idea that anybody could be released in circumstances when they have not divulged that information is contrary to what anyone would believe is decent. As far as I know, the practice has been that people have been refused parole if they have not cooperated and revealed such information. I think the former Attorney General when talking on this matter made the point that people were not being released, to his knowledge, when they had not cooperated and given that information. That being said, I think it is very good that as a community and a Parliament we restate and make very clear the position that persons should not expect to get parole if they have not cooperated fully, and that includes giving information the best that they can to reveal the whereabouts of the remains of murder victims.

As we have heard from other members, this legislation came about from a number of actions, but principally from the petition with 40 000-odd petitioners—I believe that is the figure that has been mentioned—that Mrs Dodd presented outside Parliament. No-one has been convicted in that case yet, but that does not take away from the fact that that family has gone through a lot. I speak as the member for that region. Badgingarra is the town nearest to the last-known whereabouts of Hayley; the last sightings of Hayley were around that area. In fact, the last known point that Hayley was seen is only seven or eight kilometres from one of my farms. People in our area certainly feel for the family. As a father and a community member, I cannot imagine what it must be like for the Dodd family and other families who are in similar circumstances. I hope that eventually some closure can be brought to them and other families. If this bill helps to make that happen and makes it very clear that the

Amber-Jade Sanderson; Mr Shane Love; Acting Speaker; Mr John McGrath; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Matthew Hughes; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr John Quigley; Mr David Templeman; Mr Simon Millman; Mr Peter Katsambanis

Western Australian community expects that sort of cooperation from anyone who has been convicted of a crime and then seeks to have parole, that is a very good thing.

I cannot see anything in this legislation that would raise any red flags with me at all. I think it is a good step and certainly we will support this bill. I expect that members of all parties in both this house and the other place will support this legislation and I hope that it can be enacted as swiftly as possible.

MR S.J. PRICE (Forrestfield) [5.28 pm]: I rise to contribute to this debate on the Sentence Administration Amendment Bill 2017. Firstly, I thank the Attorney General for expeditiously introducing this bill in the house. This bill is the right bill and the amendment is the right amendment for the victims and the families to whom we are trying to give some comfort.

The Sentence Administration Amendment Bill 2017 also implements a major and important commitment that the Labor Party took to the election. It is part of the government's law reform initiatives policy and there was a great deal of support from the community when this was announced during the election campaign. As people in this place have spoken about previously, no body, no parole legislation has been introduced in other parts of the country, including Victoria, the Northern Territory and South Australia, and is being considered in Queensland and New South Wales. The bill applies to offenders who are currently in custody, or those who may be in custody in the future, for murder-related offences. Proposed section 66A, "Terms used", encompasses a broad range of offences that are covered by this bill. As the Attorney General said in his second reading speech —

The aim of the proposed provisions is to enhance the likelihood of locating the body of the victim of a murder.

Every member who has spoken on this bill in this house has talked about the situation of losing a loved one and not being able to have closure. As a father, I could not imagine anything worse than losing a child. I have this adage that I subscribe to: a parent should not have to bury their children. We are not only talking about children here; this could happen to any family member. A terrible circumstance could occur and the end result could be that there is no closure. Parents try to keep track of their children running around shopping centres. When I have been out shopping with the kids, I have lost them for a split second but it has seemed like an eternity. The heart stops. When it eventually kicks back in, it is racing. The first thing parents try to do is identify where their kids are and that everyone is all right. Unless a person has been in this circumstance, they cannot imagine what it would be like. I say that with all due respect.

I will give members a couple of recent examples that I have experienced that go absolutely nowhere near what it would be like to lose a family member and not be able to locate them afterwards. A couple of recent life events have given me more insight into the situation. Having sat down and thought about how I could contribute to this debate, I thought I would explain this. As I mentioned, my father died earlier this year. As upsetting and terrible as that was, it was not a great surprise to my family. Dad had been crook for a while. He had had diabetes all his life. We had this really good doctor at Harvey Hospital who described it this way, which is the best way to describe it, "You're watching a slow car crash. Unfortunately, you can see what's going to happen here." We were able to prepare a little for that, but it does not help when it actually happens. It is still a shock to the system; everyone is really devastated. The grieving process starts. Dad's death and the following funeral arrangements were pretty standard. It all happened as one would expect, but there was a bit of a delay afterwards. Dad was cremated but there was a bit of a delay in the interment of his ashes. He sat on the bench at home for a little while. It was not until the day we were able to put dad into the ground that mum said that she had been unable to progress with her grieving because we had not finished the process of burying dad and saying goodbye to him. During the four or five-week delay she had been in a state of limbo. This is a wife talking about her husband; this is not a parent talking about a child. These are elderly people in their 70s. That effect was quite surprising. I had noticed myself that it was unfinished business. We had not actually said goodbye to dad at that stage. Once it happened, I would not say it was a sense of relief, but there was a sense we could start to move on with life. Everything was finished. Mum had the roses over dad that she wanted and everyone was happy, so to speak—we could move on. Not being able to "finish" by saying goodbye and finalising the grieving process that would allow us to move on to the next stage is something that really struck me.

Unfortunately, another thing happened not long after that. Over the Easter long weekend, my cousin died. He was six months younger than me. It was Easter Monday. His death was sudden and unexplained. We do not actually know what happened, and we still do not know. On Easter Sunday my cousin had spoken to my aunty and uncle and arranged to visit the family on Monday morning for a cuppa and a catch-up. But he did not show up. They did not worry too much. They thought maybe he got busy and moved on to do something else. Later in the day, they were getting a little bit worried. They started to try to contact him a bit more than they had earlier.

Amber-Jade Sanderson; Mr Shane Love; Acting Speaker; Mr John McGrath; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Matthew Hughes; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr John Quigley; Mr David Templeman; Mr Simon Millman; Mr Peter Katsambanis

Still, they could not get him on the phone. They rang a few friends; no-one knew where he was. About eight o'clock that night, the police came knocking on the door to say that they had found his body. It was unusual—it was found next to his car in a work car park with a wound to the head. There was no detail. Because they were in a state of shock, it took the family probably three or four days to contact the rest of the family to say that our cousin had died. They had to tell the family, firstly, that their youngest son had died and, secondly, that they could not explain what had happened. They could not tell people that this has happened and give them a reason for it. The first thing someone asks is, "What happened?" They did not want to have to say, "We don't know." It was about four weeks before the funeral could be held because of the investigations and everything else that was going on. It is still inconclusive as far as I am aware. From talking to my cousins during those four weeks, the biggest thing, apart from the absolute devastation of losing their brother and son, was not being able to mourn. They could not give him the farewell that he deserved. They could not finish grieving and start to move on with their lives. Once again, I am not talking about young people here. My cousins are older than me, but the devastation was horrible to see. It was horrible to see not only the impact this incident had had on them, but also the duration of time that had elapsed before his funeral could be held. They had to say goodbye and start to try to piece their lives back together and move on. Their devastation during that period was absolutely horrible to see.

Those two examples involved some sort of closure, but the delay in that closure had a significant impact on people. To not be able to find a loved one, to bury them and to say goodbye is absolutely hard to try to comprehend without having been there. Hopefully, this legislation will act as a deterrent for some of those horrible people out there who actually murder people. Some very good language was used last week to describe those people. Because of the retrospective application, the bill also gives hope that there might be closure for some current cases. That goes to the heart of the beginning of all of this. The real benefit of this legislation, hopefully, will be justice for the victims and their families. For them, unfortunately, to be laid somewhere where no-one can find them and no-one can respect them for the life they have had, and no-one can give them the farewell and goodbye that they deserve, is something that we should never ever accept in this country of ours, or anywhere. This legislation does exactly that. This legislation has been drafted extremely well to ensure that it encompasses all avenues and aspects of people who may be involved in murder and who think they might be able to get away with it by living in prison for a number of years—that is, living a reasonable lifestyle in reasonably well contained facilities whilst the victims' families are forever devastated as a result of their actions. They might be able to get out of prison after a period, but there is still no closure for families. That is something that needs to be stopped.

The Sentence Administration Amendment Bill 2017 is a significant piece of the law and order program the government is running. When the Minister for Police spoke recently, she touched on some of the great aspects of the McGowan Labor government getting on with the job of delivering on our election promises on law and order and policing. We have announced additional opening hours for the Ellenbrook and Armadale Police Stations, converting them into 24-hour police stations, and the extended opening of the Forrestfield and Belmont Police Stations. The electorates were very receptive to those election commitments, and were really keen to see them because they, too, know that law and order and crime and safety within our suburbs need a huge effort and are huge issues that need addressing. That is why the people of Western Australia voted for action, and that is what they are getting from the McGowan government.

As has been previously discussed, when the then shadow Attorney General first raised this private member's bill, the government of the time opposed it. The then Attorney General and the Minister for Police did nothing to assist the passage of the previous legislation. It was very good of the member for South Perth to rise to speak and, I suppose, admit to some of the failings on this type of legislation that should have been enacted a while ago. I suppose this process highlights the best parts of our democracy. There can be a change of government, ministers and approach, and we can get a government like the government we have that actually responds to the community's needs, listens to them and undertakes to try to address some of the issues and concerns raised. We have continued to demonstrate that for the first 100 days of our government. We have, and will continue to, met numerous election commitments.

The McGowan government believes that this legislation will put victims and their families first, second and third. The perpetrators in these instances should certainly not be under any illusion that they can undertake a crime like this, dispose of a body somewhere and think they will get away with it without enabling the victims to be found and their families to be able to say goodbye to them and give them the farewell they need.

It has been really pleasing to hear the support this bill has from all cross-sections of this house. It is a reasonable bill that makes a lot of sense. It is not one about which I have had anyone come up to me and say, "Oh, you can't do that." During the election campaign the feedback was overwhelmingly positive. It was, "Yes, this is great. It

Amber-Jade Sanderson; Mr Shane Love; Acting Speaker; Mr John McGrath; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Matthew Hughes; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr John Quigley; Mr David Templeman; Mr Simon Millman; Mr Peter Katsambanis

should have been done before.” The only people who do not like this legislation are those who will be caught by it. We really should not be listening to their concerns. Unless someone partakes in an activity that will put them into direct conflict with what is proposed in this amendment bill, it will not be an issue to them. Hopefully, it will provide a little closure for the families of victims of the past, and as we go forward I hope it acts as a deterrent to anyone else undertaking these sorts of activities and thinking they can murder, be part of a murder or complicit in a murder, dispose of the body and get away with it. On that, I commend this bill to the house.

MS L.L. BAKER (Maylands — Deputy Speaker) [5.44 pm]: Madam Deputy Speaker, good afternoon!

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms J.M. Freeman): You are the Deputy Speaker; I am an Acting Speaker!

Ms L.L. BAKER: I accept that, Madam Acting Speaker.

I rise to address the Sentence Administration Amendment Bill 2017, which, as we have heard from many of my colleagues this afternoon, will amend the Sentence Administration Act 2003. It seeks to introduce what we have been commonly hearing called “no body, no parole” provisions into the act. The proposed new provisions require that the Prisoners Review Board, when considering whether a relevant prisoner should be granted an early release order and when the location of the remains of the victim of the murder is unknown to a member of Western Australia Police, not make a release order or a release recommendation, as the case may be, unless satisfied that the prisoner has cooperated with a member of the police force in the identification of the location or last-known location of the remains of the victim of the murder. I suppose I feel really sad to be debating this legislation, but I acknowledge that it is really, really important to many, many people, not just Western Australians. The crime of murder changes lives forever. When someone is lost to this kind of violent crime it forever changes their friends, families and probably most of the people around them.

I had the great honour and privilege of working closely in my electorate with a group I think many members will know and to which I will dedicate most of this speech to describing in more detail. This not-for-profit organisation is a registered charity by the name of angelhands. It is housed in The RISE in Maylands. The purpose of angelhands is simply to help people deal with major crimes that have impacted on their lives, whether murder or rape, or the suicide of someone close to them—major crimes that have been committed on someone near and dear or someone who has just impacted on their lives.

I will start by talking about Dr Ann O'Neill, a most remarkable woman, who founded angelhands Inc over 10 years ago. She founded it as a way of effecting what she thought were helpful changes to help people affected by homicide and serious personal violence experiences manage to recover. Findings of her extensive and award-winning research underpin all angelhands' programs and services. I will talk a bit about services in a bit more detail shortly. Dr O'Neill's research findings support the findings of acclaimed trauma and grief theorists such as Herman, 1992; Janoff-Bulman, 1992; Taylor, 2005; and Parkes, 2006. They identified that helpful support is characterised by the ability to be benevolent, restorative and, above all, do no additional harm. I think that is one of the critical issues.

During my term in Parliament I have had the opportunity to work in the very vexing and perturbing area of child protection. I was chair of the Joint Standing Committee on the Commissioner for Children and Young People that reported to the previous Parliament on the workings of the commissioner, particularly on the follow-up after the Blaxell report into the Katanning traumas. In the course of that inquiry I listened to one of our witnesses give evidence at a hearing after experiencing extreme trauma to the level that we very rarely see in a young woman. She had been sexually victimised for most of her young life, into her early teens. Watching her respond, and indeed just survive that, and I suppose understanding how that trauma was affecting her life, was a very profound experience for me and members of my committee.

I do not specifically want to talk about that incident.

Ann O'Neill started angelhands partly in response to the thesis that she was completing on the impact of trauma on lives, but Ann had a very personal experience with trauma. Her two children were taken away from her in a dreadfully violent murder and I believe her husband was the perpetrator of those crimes. She also survived an attempt on her life at that time. Today she is a wonderful, intelligent, shining example of humanity. She now has a baby boy; he must be five or six years old now but he was a baby when I met him. Ann has recovered her life. She founded angelhands 10 years ago, which probably helped her own healing process as much as anything. She started to work with a group of board members who she personally co-opted. I would like to mention angelhands' co-founder and founding members to record them in *Hansard*. Of course, Ann O'Neill is the chairperson and founder. A gentleman called John Burrell was the co-founder. In mentioning his contribution to angelhands, John cites in his résumé the work he has done and why he came to angelhands. He talks about battling cancer in his family and his wife passing away. After that, he was thrust into a position of being

Amber-Jade Sanderson; Mr Shane Love; Acting Speaker; Mr John McGrath; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Matthew Hughes; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr John Quigley; Mr David Templeman; Mr Simon Millman; Mr Peter Katsambanis

a secondary victim of homicide when his dear friend and neighbour was murdered by her husband. He had their children on their first ever sleepover while that happened. He had to break the news to them the next day and then care for them for the entire week while the woman's family came from overseas to take the children back to her home country. That put him very close to intimately understanding the impact of trauma as a secondary victim. He was the co-founder of *angelhands*.

Carole Wilkinson, David Brereton and Judith Fordham were founding members of the board. I am sure many members know Judith. She is a leading Western Australian criminal barrister and associate professor at the centre for forensic science at the University of Western Australia, and an author and public speaker. She is also a past president of the Criminal Lawyers' Association of Western Australia, a past president of the Australian and New Zealand Association of Psychiatry, Psychology and Law and a member of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences. I do not know whether members know this but Judith was a battered wife with four small children. She was forced to feed her family through food vouchers she obtained from the Salvation Army. Today, Judith is one of Western Australia's best-known criminal lawyers, an expert in forensic science and an internationally known jury researcher. In *angelhands*, Judith saw a unique opportunity to contribute to a remarkable project. We thank her for all she has brought to *angelhands*. Karen Lang, Sue Gibbs and Sarah McLeod were also members of the original committee or outstanding contributors.

Originally, Ann and John met soon after the incident I referred to that sent Ann on a different journey in her life when she lost her family. I suppose there was a time of great bonding between the two that drew them together in trying to find a way through grief and trauma for other people. When Dr O'Neill completed her extensive and award-winning research and published it, she spoke to people who understood the experience of trauma and who had non-formalised opportunities to speak about their challenges. She discovered that something as simple as what she calls random acts of kindness accelerate recovery, particularly among secondary victims of homicide, by promoting trust, hope, and a sense of social justice. There is a very close relationship between this work in trauma and post-traumatic stress disorder. My colleagues for whom that is a specific issue should realise that *angelhands* does a lot of work in post-traumatic stress disorder with many people.

Angelhands has a very close relationship with Western Australia Police because the journey that a victim of this kind of trauma goes on has the capacity, in itself, to do irreparable harm. I will run members through the fact sheet on homicide and what someone who needs to cope with a family suicide or a homicide has to confront. There is the initial dealing with police, which can be difficult for families of homicide victims, particularly in early stages when people are in shock. They are confused. They are trying to cope with loss. Police could have already arrested someone. Sometimes a person who may be under suspicion could be a family member. Police may not be able to give out details because of the continuing investigation, which, members can imagine, would leave families of a victim incredibly worried and quite devastated. It would add to the confusion. Police may need to keep the victim's clothing and other positions as evidence and they may not be returned for some time. That can create a real feeling of loss and absence. They will also have to deal with the coroner's office. People do not really think about the journey that some people in this situation will have to go on. After dealing with police, they then find themselves dealing with the coroner's office. The victim needs to be identified by a family member or close friend. Other issues to be considered include learning about the cause of death. For someone who was not aware of how their loved one died, that is incredibly traumatic. They then have to deal with the funeral. If they have never dealt with funeral arrangements before, it is an added trauma for someone who is already traumatised. The other issue that people forget is that the media is quite likely to be involved as well. People in this chamber deal with the media all the time, but for a person remaining after this kind of murder or dreadful crime, having to deal with the media and having to give coherent reports or face the media, and represent the family or represent the victim, can sometimes be even more traumatic. As stories are printed, it is a dreadful exposure that they may not have anticipated. Of course, the courts then have to be dealt with. If someone has been charged with murder, there will be court hearings and possibly a trial. This can drag on for months and months, if not years, and quite often people will be re-traumatised by having to confront this on and on. During the sentence, they may have the opportunity to present a victim impact statement to the court that outlines the impact of their loss. There is no doubt that there are victim support services to help along the way. Western Australia Police tries very hard to relieve some of this burden, but, let us face it, it has a job to do—to apply the law and catch criminals. The issue of looking after somebody who is in a state of trauma is incredibly important.

As we know, homicide is a crime that can have a deep and lasting impact on the victim's family, friends and all the other people that it touches. There are many, many stages of grieving. At some stage of my life, I did a psychology degree and I clearly remember learning the stages of grieving that were widely recognised—shock, denial, fear and vulnerability, anger and rage, guilt and, if people are lucky, finally acknowledgement and then

Amber-Jade Sanderson; Mr Shane Love; Acting Speaker; Mr John McGrath; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Matthew Hughes; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr John Quigley; Mr David Templeman; Mr Simon Millman; Mr Peter Katsambanis

a focus on the next stage of life. The kinds of coping strategies that angelhands delivers are the benevolent friend, advice, the opportunity to recognise joy when it comes, and a number of well-thought-out and well-researched programs. I am very proud to say I was able to sponsor a program for the next 12 months. The WA Labor government is sponsoring a program called creative recovery emergence workshops. I am very pleased to be involved with angelhands. I want to put on the public record what a wonderful job Ann and her crew do. I thank the many, many sponsors, including the City of Bayswater, that do wonderful work making sure that the home for angelhands can stay in The RISE and that the good work it has started can continue.

Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.00 pm

Ms L.L. BAKER: I note with interest the masses of members who have come back after dinner to listen to the final few minutes of my contribution to the debate on this very important piece of legislation—thank you all for coming back and hanging on my every word. Before the dinner break, I went into quite a bit of detail about the amazing work of angelhands in my electorate in supporting victims who have experienced firsthand trauma from major crimes such as murder that have been perpetrated against members of their family and the like.

I note that I have only a few minutes left. I want to change tack a little and talk about the research that must have gone into getting us this far on this legislation and giving us the evidence we need about sentencing and sentencing provisions, the relationship between a particular crime and the sentence invoked around that behaviour, and the outcomes of that. We would have had to research that in some detail. I bring the attention of the house to the need for databases that adequately record what has happened in sentencing for particular crimes. An issue which is very near and dear to my heart and which I can use to exemplify how important it is to have a good database on sentencing is to do with crimes committed under the Animal Welfare Act 2002, such as the neglect of, cruelty to or torture of animals. I recently wrote to the Attorney General asking for advice on how we could go about looking at crimes committed under that act and the sentences awarded for those crimes. I find the situation interesting and quite confusing. Of late, for instance, I can mention three cases that have raised the attention of the media, in particular, and the wider community. One case, which was reported just recently, was very sensationalised. It was about a family pet that was stabbed in a park by a gentleman who was carrying a pocketknife. It was a labrador called Luna. That gentleman was convicted of the crime and was given a seven-month deferred sentence or suspended sentence—pardon me if I am not getting the language right. Effectively, he walked away. If he commits any other crimes during that seven-month period, obviously there will be ramifications, but it seemed to the public that his sentence did not seem a fair reflection of the community outrage over that crime. I am interested to know how that compares with other crimes. I mention those harmless little creatures on Rottnest Island, the quokkas, which are constantly getting kicked, beaten and tortured by tourists in various stages of inebriation. I find that quite unforgivable. They have been set fire to, people have tried to drown them, and they have been bashed and beaten. Most recently, a young man was acquitted of charges after having tortured those harmless little indigenous creatures on Rottnest Island. The third one was far more serious.

[Member's time extended.]

Ms L.L. BAKER: The third case, which I find extraordinary—I will not go into any detail because I think the case is subject to appeal—was a crime on a station up north. Some fairly horrendous footage showed what had happened to the animal involved, which was a bull. Despite this incredibly graphic footage, which I think is about to be released publicly, which showed the magistrate what had happened and the situation surrounding the attack on this animal, he did not award a punishment for the crime. At the end of the day, the magistrate said that he was unable to make a determination about the two actions that had been delivered to this poor creature. The first action had created a certain amount of pain and suffering and he was unable to determine whether the horrible attack that followed caused that creature any more harm and suffering than it was already in. I just do not understand how that could happen and how it is defensible. Those three examples demonstrate to me our community expectations around crimes and the judiciary's understanding of what is important and what people think. I think that needs to be improved. I have written to the Attorney General asking for some advice on how we might get information about sentencing practices, how they relate to the crimes and the outcomes of all of that from when the Animal Welfare Act was brought into play in 2002. Sometimes I just scratch my head when I look at some of the judicial decisions. Clearly, when one is not in the room for the case and does not know all the details, it is very dangerous to make comments on the decisions of judges or magistrates, but the public expects that they will have some understanding of why something has been delivered in that fashion or not delivered. I think it would be appropriate, as part of the review of the Animal Welfare Act, to gather information around sentencing under that act since the act was brought in and promulgated in 2002.

Amber-Jade Sanderson; Mr Shane Love; Acting Speaker; Mr John McGrath; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Matthew Hughes; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr John Quigley; Mr David Templeman; Mr Simon Millman; Mr Peter Katsambanis

That is pretty much all I wanted to talk about in the no body, no parole legislation. It is very timely legislation and I am very proud that this government has brought it into the house. It has been a great pleasure to add a small contribution to this debate.

MR C.J. TALLENTIRE (Thornlie — Parliamentary Secretary) [7.07 pm]: I rise to speak to the Sentence Administration Amendment Bill 2017. I begin by congratulating the Attorney General on honouring yet another McGowan government commitment. We committed to this legislation in opposition and we now see it before us in this Parliament. I am sure that the opposition will now appreciate the need for this legislation and I trust that it is supporting us in bringing it to the statutes of Western Australia.

Mr P.A. Katsambanis interjected.

Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE: The opposition is supporting it?

Mr P.A. Katsambanis: We have said that already.

Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE: It has said that already. I thank the member. The legislation before us is commonly called “no body, no parole”. This is for people who have had to go through the tragic, awful circumstance of losing a family member—first, having a family member disappear and then having it determined that that person has probably become the victim of foul play, or murder. They go through the whole process of a conviction and then the sentencing only to find that after all the trauma of that experience—of having to hear the court proceedings and having to learn about various details and aspects of the demise of a loved one—the perpetrator, the murderer, is refusing to identify where the body is located or where the body was set to rest. That adds to the trauma families, friends and loved ones have to go through. I am sure that in many cases it is just too much to bear. When I talk to people in my electorate about issues like this, their views are that a criminal, a murderer, deserves whatever sentence can be thrown at them and that a murderer is not somebody who should be allowed out on parole on their word. Looking at the origins of the word “parole”, it basically means that we will take the word of the prisoner—parole means their good word—but a murderer does not have a good word. I suppose for many people the idea of murderers going out on parole is an oddity and something that they are not prepared to accept. Nevertheless, we are building into the system this incentive that should a murderer be able to identify where the body is and meet a whole host of other criteria, they may be eligible for parole.

I wonder about the circumstances around this issue. I recall various media reports about the Moors murders in the north of England in the 1960s. I think about five young child victims were buried in shallow graves in the moors behind Manchester. The perpetrators of those crimes gleaned some sort of frisson of excitement as bodies were found using the various scientific technologies available in those days. I think bodies were found quite recently. All along, these murderers were in prison listening out for various media reports and speculation about where their victims' bodies might be located. I fear that listening out for those moments of media exposure for people who are as deformed and perverted in their thinking as those people is some form of motivation to continue to live. I assume that in prison they were able to hear any speculation about where bodies might be located, and that they would listen out for those moments to gain some sense of relish about it. Such is the ghoulish nature of the people responsible for these dreadful, dreadful acts. I fear that those people would balance the reward of exposure in the media with recognition that their crimes were of such a nature that they probably would never leave prison anyway. They are stuck in prison, but have this sense that they can have some degree of relevance and control over the media by not disclosing where the body is and allowing speculation to occur in little bits and perhaps a search in a certain area and the reporting that would go around that search. We have to be very careful about how we allow this process to occur when there is the absence of a body. I think we are best advised to keep it quite secret when a search for a body is going on because we do not want these ghoulish, murderous people to glean any sense of excitement out of maintaining some sort of control over the psyche of a state through speculation about where a body might be. I am concerned about that aspect of this legislation, but it can be resolved through policy decisions internal to the Department of the Attorney General and police procedure. We do not want to allow people to make this dreadful trade-off between disclosing where a body is and therefore, perhaps, becoming eligible for parole versus the idea that they could still control the psyche of a nation in some way from their prison cell by enabling ongoing speculation about where a body is located.

This is an awful, awful topic in many ways. The abbreviated name of this bill, by which it is commonly referred—no body, no parole—is a terrible topic, but a reality that we have to face. Like many other terrible topics in this world, this Parliament has to deal with people who sometimes behave in a ghoulish nature. The other side of the equation is how the media responds to the tragic and horrible murderous events that someone has fallen victim to. Those are things we have to consider when we are developing policy as well.

Amber-Jade Sanderson; Mr Shane Love; Acting Speaker; Mr John McGrath; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Matthew Hughes; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr John Quigley; Mr David Templeman; Mr Simon Millman; Mr Peter Katsambanis

There is another dimension to this issue; that is, the very human need for someone's demise to be not just a notional thing, but met by a burial service. We see this across humanity. The history of humanity is in many ways characterised by all kinds of things, but the rites and rituals around burial are very much a part of the character of many cultures and many civilisations. Some sort of burial ritual enables grieving relatives and friends to honour a person's life and, as some people say, seek closure. I am never sure about that terminology: the idea of closure. I think it is more about marking a time from which a person can try to adapt to a new world in which someone no longer exists on this earth. For many, closure comes with a burial or, indeed, the cremation of someone. The ritual around putting a dead person to rest is very important. It is a human need to be able to go through this process and it helps people to grieve. I cannot even begin to imagine how intense, magnified and strongly felt that grieving process must be and how deep the need is when someone has a friend or relative who has been murdered. In some cases, of course, there is no body. Indeed, in some cases, there is no body and there is no murderer. That is another concern I have with this legislation. We have to be sure that the legislation does not in any way diminish or reduce our chances of being able to identify murders. I think of the Madeleine McCann case in Portugal. About 10 years ago a young child disappeared while her family was on holiday in Portugal. The parents went out one night thinking that they had left their child in good care and came back and the child had disappeared. Madeleine McCann has never been found or heard of and no murderer has been identified. Unfortunately, legislation like this will not advance the cause of people in that situation. Those are some of the other tragic events, tragic circumstances, that we are sometimes faced with, and the grieving process when there is no body and no idea of how someone met their end is very sad. This legislation fundamentally has to be about how those who are left behind and grieving are helped to cope with the loss they have had to endure through a murder. Perhaps things can be improved, and if a murderer finds contrition about their horrible deed, they can point the way to where the body is so they may be eligible for parole. I understand the view, and I echo the words of my constituents, that murderers should just rot in jail. That is exactly what the view would be of a murderer who cannot point to where a body is. Letting people out on parole, on their word, seems odd when we are talking about taking the word of a murderer.

The Attorney General has been working on this legislation for quite some time. In opposition he was a strong advocate for it and now we see it. It was an election commitment and it has come to this Parliament. This is the honouring of a new election commitment. I know it will have great relevance to some people who are still going through the tragedy of having lost a loved one to an act of murder. It will be most welcome in the homes of people who have suffered from this. I close my remarks by saying that this legislation has the support of all sides of Parliament. It is honouring an election commitment and I trust that it will make the grieving process for some people that tiny bit easier, as tragic and horrible as the events that they have had to face have been.

MRS L.M. O'MALLEY (Bicton) [7.22 pm]: I rise tonight to speak to the Sentence Administration Amendment Bill 2017, which is also referred to as the no body, no parole bill. I do not have any personal experience of losing a loved one at the hands of another and I cannot even begin to understand the pain that that must cause the families left behind. I have some experience of having lost a loved one to an unexplained death, and in some ways I guess I can draw some correlation in that with an unexplained death there are always so many questions. There are questions left unanswered and questions that families repeatedly ask themselves: What if? How could things have been different? How did it come to this? Being a parent, it does not take much to stretch one's imagination to consider what it must in some ways feel like not to have a child with us anymore and to know that that child's life has been extinguished at the hands of another. It must cause not only great pain, but also great anger and a sense of wanting to avenge that loss in some way.

I know that the Attorney General has worked incredibly hard to bring this legislation to this point and I thank and acknowledge him for doing so. I would also like to thank the families of the victims who have also worked tirelessly to facilitate this legislation coming to this point. I know there has been a very long journey for many of them. They are joined in a very sad way to other families of victims not only in this state, but also across the country and extending back into history over the decades.

Once again, I would like to thank the Attorney General for bringing this amendment bill to this house. It is certainly time that we did the right thing by the families of victims and that we pass this long overdue legislation to begin to bring WA in line with the no body, no parole laws of Victoria and the Northern Territory, as well as other legislation being considered in other parts of Australia. If we review what is happening with this matter in other states, we see that Western Australia has sadly lagged behind. It is certainly not something we can be proud of as Western Australians, and I think that all too often we have a reputation for following on from other states. Whatever part of legislation that relates to, it is certainly time that we showed leadership as opposed to just following along behind other states. As we have heard from other members in the house, there have been

Amber-Jade Sanderson; Mr Shane Love; Acting Speaker; Mr John McGrath; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Matthew Hughes; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr John Quigley; Mr David Templeman; Mr Simon Millman; Mr Peter Katsambanis

attempts to bring this legislation forward before, and, unfortunately, I think it is another sad indictment of the previous Liberal–National government's inaction in this area. Certainly, that government failed to act quickly enough to provide a mechanism by which victims' families may achieve some closure through increasing the chances of convicted murderers revealing the locations of their victims' remains. The Sentence Administration Amendment Bill—the no body, no parole bill—brought to this house by the Attorney General, redresses this long overdue challenge to an accused person's right to silence in judicial review. Once again, I thank the Attorney General, the families of victims and the many community members who have worked tirelessly to facilitate the passage of this very important piece of legislation.

We heard earlier, and we have heard many times, about the petition of 40 000 signatures that was brought to this house. That is just an incredible example of the importance of this issue. It shows not only how it has captured the imagination of many members of our community, but also the solidarity that Western Australians are very well known for. The issue may affect only a few, but it does not mean that many of us are not also impacted in some way. At this point, I would also like to add my voice to the many others who have spoken to this house on this issue in expressing their sympathy for the families of the victims whom this amendment bill seeks to serve and support. I simply cannot begin to imagine the pain and loss for these families of these victims, nor the additional anguish of the unknown. Theirs is a life sentence, made worse by the inability to physically lay their loved ones to rest. Just a moment ago we heard about how terribly important it is for us to have these rituals of fully going through the process of grieving. That, of course, is made incredibly difficult when we are unable to physically do that, when the whereabouts of the remains of the victims are not known—there is that continual sense of the unknown. As I spoke about at the beginning of my speech, my personal experience of an unexplained death is that it is the unknown that causes continuing grief. Although nothing will bring back our loved ones, if there is any opportunity to provide some kind of solace, it is something we need to put all our energy and efforts into facilitating. We have before us an opportunity to finally put this legislation in place. I acknowledge and thank opposition members for their indication of support for this bill. I certainly hope, for the sake of families who are impacted by the horrific crime of murder, that we continue to approach this issue in a bipartisan manner and ensure there are no more delays in implementing this legislation.

As I said earlier, in some states, the no body, no parole legislation is under review, and in some states it has been enacted. Queensland has recently conducted an independent review to determine whether this element of the corrective services system is operating effectively to support the supervision of offenders who are on parole. The issue of no body, no parole was considered during that review and has now been referred for further committee review.

I want to reference an article in the *Brisbane Times* online on 23 May 2017. The article is titled, “No body, no parole will not be law—for now”, and it states, in part —

The LNP has failed to get its own no body, no parole policy into the government's parole board bill.

But it does not mean no body, no parole—which would keep murderers behind bars unless they reveal the location of their victim—will never become law in Queensland.

Both Labor and the LNP support introducing a no body, no parole law in Queensland, but they disagree about how to do it.

The LNP had attempted to move an amendment to Labor's Corrective Services (Parole Board) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill ...

...

The Katter's Australian Party's MPs, One Nation MP Steven Dickson and independents Bob Pyne and Billy Gordon all supported the LNP to allow them to debate their no body, no parole amendment to the parole bill.

But when it came to the crunch, the crossbenchers all stood behind the government to vote against the LNP's no body, no parole amendment as part of the parole bill.

That is an important reference to the need for all members of this chamber to continue to support this bill. It is critical that we expedite the passage of this legislation.

I would also like to pick up on the accused's right to silence, which is contained in proposed section 66B(2). That provides that a prisoner can be deemed to have cooperated even if he or she remained silent until all proceedings were exhausted. The Attorney General states in his second reading speech —

Amber-Jade Sanderson; Mr Shane Love; Acting Speaker; Mr John McGrath; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Matthew Hughes; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr John Quigley; Mr David Templeman; Mr Simon Millman; Mr Peter Katsambanis

... in every case in which the Prisoners Review Board considers whether a relevant prisoner should be granted an early release order, the board must not make a release order or release recommendation unless satisfied that the prisoner has cooperated with a member of the Western Australian police force about either of the following two matters—first, identification of the location of the remains of the victim; and, second, identification of the last known location of the victim's remains. The aim of the proposed provisions is to enhance the likelihood of locating the body of the victim of a murder.

The Attorney General goes on to speak about the importance of cooperation and states —

The bill refers specifically to cooperation with a member of the WA police force, which at all times remains the authority responsible for investigation of murder. It is, of course, possible that a prisoner could attempt to indirectly cooperate through a third person. However, the onus remains on the prisoner to ensure that any relevant information is brought to the attention of a member of the police force. The proposed provisions require the Western Australian Commissioner of Police to provide a report that must inform the board's deliberations. Courts may, and often do, consider remorse, cooperation and the identification of the location of the body when sentencing an offender to a term of imprisonment.

This legislation provides the opportunity for the prisoner to cooperate, which may assist in determining whether the prisoner is considered for parole. It is important to understand that it is not an automatic release trigger; the prisoner must still go through the normal parole process. However, I think all the members who have spoken in this debate agree with the Attorney General that the reason this legislation is incredibly important is that it may help motivate the prisoner to give up the whereabouts of the remains of the victim. During consideration in detail, we will undoubtedly spend a lot of time considering the issue of motivation. The member who spoke before me highlighted that we cannot necessarily rely on a murderer's sense of goodwill. Goodwill is clearly something that a murderer does not have. Therefore, we need to take every opportunity to motivate the prisoner to reveal the whereabouts of the remains of the victim, even if that means the person is released early on parole.

I would again like to thank the Attorney General for bringing the legislation to this house, and I commend the bill to members.

MR S.K. L'ESTRANGE (Churchlands) [7.36 pm]: I rise to add some brief comments to the debate on the Sentence Administration Amendment Bill 2017. Last year, when a bill to achieve the intent of this bill was introduced to this Parliament, I rose to my feet to support the intent of that bill, as did many members of the Liberal-National government. I take on board, as a member of this place, that the Liberal-National government could have done more in this space last year. I acknowledged that at the time, and I acknowledge it again today. The Sentence Administration Amendment Bill 2016 was essentially a one-page bill; it was very brief. Clause 4 of the Sentence Administration Amendment Bill 2016 sought to amend section 5A of the Sentence Administration Act 2003 by inserting after section 5A(c) a new paragraph (ca) that states —

if the prisoner is in custody for an offence relating to the death of a person, the extent (if any) to which the prisoner has assisted in the location of the person's remains;

That was it. I am pleased that the government has brought forward early in its term a new bill that addresses some of the concerns that were raised about the 2016 bill. I will not go through those concerns, because we are dealing with a new bill. However, one matter of particular significance in the bill we are debating today is that the words "remains of the victim" have been defined. That is a good thing.

Proposed section 66B of the bill is titled, "Board not to release or recommend release unless prisoner cooperates or victim's remains located". It goes on to refer to what that cooperation should be. That is further identified in proposed section 66C with regard to the Commissioner of Police report. One of the issues I had with the previous bill was how the Commissioner of Police could support the legislation. Proposed section 66C(3) outlines that the report from the Commissioner of Police must deal with the nature and extent of the prisoner's cooperation; the timeliness of the prisoner's cooperation; the truthfulness, completeness and reliability of any information or evidence provided by the prisoner; and the significance and usefulness of the prisoner's cooperation. This goes a long way to alleviating some of those concerns of the 2016 bill. I, as I am sure do all members in this place, agree that no parent, child, brother, sister or partner wants the remains of their loved one to go unfound after a seriously tragic event such as a homicide or a murder. This bill goes some way to helping support the intent, which is to make the prisoner accountable for showing us where those remains are.

I just wanted to make those short comments to say that it is important that we have something like this in place so that it sends a very clear message to the community that Parliament and the government are keen to support the innocent bystanders of a loved one who has been killed tragically and that they will be able to achieve some closure from the remains of that victim being found.

Amber-Jade Sanderson; Mr Shane Love; Acting Speaker; Mr John McGrath; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Matthew Hughes; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr John Quigley; Mr David Templeman; Mr Simon Millman; Mr Peter Katsambanis

MR M. HUGHES (Kalamunda) [7.40 pm]: I, too, rise in support of the Sentence Administration Amendment Bill 2017 and equally would like to compliment the Attorney General for his dogged determination to bring this legislation before Parliament. I note the endeavours that he made in 2016 in the thirty-ninth Parliament to bring to the attention of this house by way of his proposed legislation the concerns of the community that have been drawn to the attention of this Parliament by a petition brought by Hon David Templeman.

Before I go on to the bill, I would like to reflect on the comments made earlier by the member for South Perth, who I have observed over a period since I have been in this chamber. I regard him as a rather avuncular person—a person who is considered in his approach and measured in his response to various issues that are brought before this house. I am new to the parliamentary process and it was passing strange to me that he was able to stand in this chamber and say that private members' bills almost never receive the support of the government. I would have thought that the determination of whether support would be provided by the then government to the opposition's private member's bill would go to the intent and purpose of the legislation that was brought before this house, rather than an axiomatic approach—that is, the view that because it has been brought forward by the opposition, by a private member, the government will in fact talk it down. The member for Churchlands, who has left the chamber, needs to be reminded that that is precisely what the government did to this legislation. It created a significantly mired process with the deliberation that took place on the proposed legislation. The Attorney General will relate to that. He brought notice of his motion to this house on 17 February 2016. If things go well, he will find that, almost a year and a half later, this legislation will see the light of day. It will be passed by this house with the support of the now opposition.

The difficulty that the government had last time around was that it was brought forward by the Labor opposition. That really coloured its thinking. As much as opposition members might say that it was a short bill and they were concerned about the completeness of the legislation, surely it would be incumbent on the government to assist the opposition with passage of legislation when there is a great deal of community concern about remedying the problem brought before this Parliament by the people. I would like to remind the member for Churchlands of what he said on the legislation brought to this house by the member for Butler. In *Hansard* on 16 March 2016 he is reported to have said —

The member for Butler is like a jellyfish in a mire of Labor uncertainty! That is where he exists. The member has a spineless argument on this issue, and he does not know what he is talking about. He is out there trying to politicise the Sentence Administration Amendment Bill 2016 and he is a disgrace.

That is what the member for Churchlands said. He continues —

He is trying to politicise this bill and take advantage of the emotions of a highly emotive topic.

That is the nub and the gist.

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: You weren't here.

Mr M. HUGHES: No, but there we have the member for Churchlands' recorded comments.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Mr M. HUGHES: That was the member for Churchlands in this house.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr R.S. Love): Members! Member for Cottesloe, I am on my feet. Member for Kalamunda! Thank you. Can we please proceed in an orderly fashion so that *Hansard* can actually record what is being said and the member for Kalamunda can make his speech.

Mr M. HUGHES: I thought that the member for Churchlands would give me a little more licence than he has, given that I am a novice member of this place.

Several members interjected.

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: You were verballing me as a member here!

Mr M. HUGHES: I am quoting from *Hansard*.

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: You weren't here when the galleries were full.

Mr M. HUGHES: I am quoting from *Hansard*. It is the public record.

Amber-Jade Sanderson; Mr Shane Love; Acting Speaker; Mr John McGrath; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Matthew Hughes; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr John Quigley; Mr David Templeman; Mr Simon Millman; Mr Peter Katsambanis

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Churchlands!

Mr M. HUGHES: I would suggest that the reason that the member for Churchlands came into this house—I think he was on the clock for two or three minutes—was to correct the record, because he realises, now that he is in opposition, the extent of the concern that the community has. The truth of the matter is that members opposite frustrated the process of this legislation and it could have been enacted, as we will enact it with its passage in the upper house in a matter of how many days? It is 100 days and a bit. That is the disgrace, member for Churchlands. The disgrace is that he politicised what was not a political issue. We, on this side of the house, know that and so does the community. Do not try to rewrite the record. That is what I have to say about that.

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: Member, the opposition has supported the bill. We have supported the bill.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Mr M. HUGHES: I recognise what the member for Churchlands is saying.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members! The member for Kalamunda has the call.

Mr M. HUGHES: I recognise that the political reality has dawned upon the members of the opposition and they have made the decision to support this bill—in a somewhat mealy-mouthed way, I might add.

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: Member, I actually acknowledged that we were too slow on this last year. That is what I said in my comments.

Mr M. HUGHES: The member for Churchlands has not acknowledged that he effectively talked the legislation out of this chamber, which he now claims is important as part of the contribution through which we can bring some justice to the few families who are in the position in which their loved one's whereabouts are not known. This legislation may not alter the situation for people who are incarcerated at the moment for murders in which bodies have not been discovered or who are not prepared to indicate the last known location of the remains of loved ones, but it certainly would assist the police in future investigations for this legislation to be on the books. The important point of this of course is that the legislation applies to those people who have already been found guilty and sentenced and are now incarcerated.

I, too, was very impressed by the contribution made by my colleague the member for Forresterfield when he quite properly reminded us of the importance of burial. That was done equally by the member for Thornlie. Christine and I have six adult children. Happily, all of them are well. We have eight grandchildren. To be in a position in which any one of them suddenly disappeared from the face of this earth while walking home from school—I am talking about the grandchildren now, somewhat before the children—with their bodies never to be recovered, is a horror that I cannot contemplate. But it is an experience that, tragically, too many families have to manage. It is something that will never, ever be assuaged. That is the experience of a parent, having said goodbye to their child in the morning and never seeing them again, and being in the position whereby the person who is apprehended by the police, processed through the courts and found to be guilty and given a term of imprisonment in fact refuses to reveal their whereabouts. Those convicted of murder should not be subject to any parole opportunities unless they are prepared to cooperate with the police. That is effectively what the legislation last year attempted to do. Members opposite—those who were in government at the time—could have assisted the private member to achieve the outcome of a bill that we are about to achieve in this bill today.

What does this bill do? The Sentence Administration Amendment Bill 2017 will constrain the actions of the Prisoners Review Board to the parole of a prisoner convicted of murder who has not cooperated with the police in the identification of the last known location of the remains of their victim. Specifically, clause 4 will amend section 12 of the Sentence Administration Act 2003 by inserting a provision emphasising that the board is required to apply no body, no parole provisions prescribed under proposed section 66B(1) when reporting under that proposed section. According to the explanatory memorandum, proposed section 66B(1) envisages two scenarios. It states —

- Under paragraph 66B(1)(a) the Board must not make a release decision, or take release action, in relation to a relevant prisoner in custody for a homicide offence or homicide related offence unless the Board is satisfied that the prisoner has cooperated with a member of the WA Police Force in the identification of the location, or last known location, of the remains of the victim of the homicide offence; or

Amber-Jade Sanderson; Mr Shane Love; Acting Speaker; Mr John McGrath; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Matthew Hughes; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr John Quigley; Mr David Templeman; Mr Simon Millman; Mr Peter Katsambanis

- Under paragraph 66B(1)(b) the Board does not need to assess the cooperation of the prisoner if it is satisfied that a member of the Police Force knows the location of the remains of the victim of the homicide offence.

...

The requirement under paragraph 66B(1)(a) is broadly worded so that a relevant prisoner who does not know the location, or last known location, of the remains of the victim, can nevertheless be found to have cooperated with a member of the Police Force.

It covers those situations by ensuring that one of the preconditions for a convicted person to be considered for parole is that they actively cooperate with the police in the identification of the last known location of the remains of their victim. Importantly that information must cover the nature and extent of the prisoner's cooperation; the timeliness of the prisoner's cooperation; the truthfulness, completeness, and reliability of any information or evidence provided by the prisoner; and, the significance and usefulness of the prisoner's cooperation.

As we have said, the impetus for the legislation initially had its origin in the 20 000 signatures on a petition seeking legislative action by the Parliament to ensure that when there has been a murder and no body has been recovered, the murderer never be considered for parole. We know the position of the previous government, but as recently as 18 May, and as reported by Ten news, the former Attorney General, Hon Michael Mischin, remained equivocal on the issue. He was reported as saying that while the Liberals support the legislation in principle, they still need to ensure that it does what Labor claims. We understand that the opposition now supports the legislation, but what does Labor claim? It claims that if a prisoner who receives a term of life imprisonment refuses to honestly and in a timely manner assist with identifying the location of their victim's remains, he will never be considered for parole. That is at the heart of the legislation; that was at the heart of the legislation that was brought to the thirty-ninth Parliament in 2016. The legislation does not and cannot guarantee that a prisoner will reveal the location of the remains of their victim, but it can guarantee the principle of no body, no parole. I would argue that the bill's intent is clear. If a person convicted of murder wants to be considered for parole, then their level of cooperation must include cooperation on the whereabouts of the remains of the victim.

As we have heard, the legislation reflects the legislation already introduced and applicable in South Australia, Victoria and the Northern Territory, and that being considered by Queensland and New South Wales. The collective wisdom of the Parliaments of the states and territories says that this legislation is necessary. We are glad that the opposition now agrees with that.

The necessity for this legislation has been seen elsewhere. Members may be aware of the movement to introduce similar legislation in the United Kingdom that has become known as "Helen's law" and follows on from the murder of 22-year-old Helen McCourt in 1988. Helen's murderer was convicted of her killing in 1989, but has refused to reveal the location of her remains. Helen's mother is now 74, and she has been searching for Helen's body for nearly 30 years. Will the convicted murderer reveal the whereabouts of the body? Who knows? Will the legislation force a convicted person to reveal the whereabouts of the victim's body? No, of course, it will not. However, what it will do is to provide justice for the victim, and also for the sake of the victims of this crime—the families, the loved ones—who will know that the convicted murderer will not enjoy the privileges associated with parole if they do not reveal or cooperate with the police on where their victim's remains are. UK Labour member of Parliament Conor McGinn reported that laws similar to the proposed Helen's law had already been introduced in some parts of Australia and that there was no reason why similar legislation could not operate successfully in the United Kingdom. Members, the no body, no parole law enacted and contemplated elsewhere in Australia will successfully operate in Western Australia.

The bill will contribute to a set of circumstances that could assist in helping families with closure, as we have heard, by encouraging those convicted of murder to provide information to the police. The bill will help with police investigations. The police will be able to advise a person charged with murder that the law states that if they are convicted, they will serve the full term of their sentence if they do not reveal the location of their victim's body. Importantly, for those families confronted by significant grief over the murder of their loved ones, the law will provide some level of comfort and a sense of justice. I commend the bill to the house.

MS S.F. McGURK (Fremantle — Minister for Child Protection) [7.58 pm]: I want to make a brief contribution to the Sentence Administration Amendment Bill 2017. I do not know about other members, but since the beginning of the fortieth Parliament I have been impressed to hear the quality of the debate and the contributions made by new members of Parliament. I am not sure how long they have had to research their

Amber-Jade Sanderson; Mr Shane Love; Acting Speaker; Mr John McGrath; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Matthew Hughes; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr John Quigley; Mr David Templeman; Mr Simon Millman; Mr Peter Katsambanis

contributions to the debates, but they have been very enlightening and I thank them for that. In particular, I am thinking of the most recent contribution by the member for Kalamunda. We heard members of the opposition railing against his contribution, which reminds members of the comments of members of the Liberal Party when similar provisions were raised in a bill in the last Parliament in 2016. Of course the bill is a sensible bill. It is only fair that people who are convicted of murder and who do not cooperate fully with the police to find the body should be held to account for that lack of cooperation.

The bill that has been brought to us this evening is quite a narrow bill. I think that even members of the Liberal Party have conceded that their action on this measure in the last Parliament was wanting and that they are prepared to support the bill now. Other members have acknowledged the work of family members who have been, sadly, affected by circumstances in which their child or a member of their family was murdered and someone has been convicted of the murder but no body has ever been revealed or found so that family has not had the ability to properly say goodbye to their loved one. As other members have said, I cannot imagine what it would be like to have a close one or a family member die in such terrible and senseless circumstances. The least that we can do is to send a very clear message to those who are convicted of those murders that their lack of cooperation will be taken into account and that they will not be considered for parole. This is not an optional provision for the Prisoners Review Board. Under the provisions of this bill, it is a mandatory requirement that a report from the police be considered. If members like, this bill could be considered as a no cooperation, no parole bill. Even in the event that the body may not physically be found, if the police report to the parole board that they believe that the prisoner has cooperated to a sufficient level, that can be taken into account.

One of the considerations that arises in dealing with amendments to sentencing legislation is whether it might unfairly affect people who may be wrongly convicted. That is always a consideration. It is probably the primary consideration against capital punishment. In this instance, we are not talking about extending someone's time in prison. We are talking about sending a very clear message that offenders will not be considered for parole. Parole is not a right that people have. They have to demonstrate an element of acknowledgement of their crime and of cooperation with police in cases in which there is not a body associated with a murder. I would like to acknowledge the families of the victims, particularly Margaret Dodd, Hayley's mother, and Laurie Puddy, Craig's father, who have advocated for this measure, which they say will go some way to making them feel supported by the criminal justice system. I also acknowledge that it was the current Attorney General who took up this matter and advocated very ferociously on behalf of those families for measures that this Parliament can put in place to support them and to send a message to people who have committed those crimes. It is hopefully not a situation that the parole system, courts or prisons will have before them too often, but it happens across Australia and around the world. There are circumstances in which the grief of the family or people close to a victim is exacerbated by their inability to know what happened to their family member or friend and to bury them or to say goodbye to them properly.

It was particularly galling for the former Attorney General, Hon Michael Mischin, to say that these proposed changes were a beat-up and simply a reaction to a grieving mother, as if that was a small thing. It is not a small thing to react to and to represent a grieving family in these terrible circumstances. Hon Michael Mischin, in his former role as the Attorney General, was found wanting in areas that I now have responsibility for, particularly the prevention of family and domestic violence and making sure that our criminal justice system is responsive and deals with the circumstances of family violence. We are retrofitting the criminal justice system in relation to family violence and an increasing appreciation of the complexities of violence in its various forms and as it occurs in family and domestic settings. WA has been very slow to take up these issues and, shamefully, the former Attorney General was very much guilty of that. On the last sitting day of the thirty-ninth Parliament—the last sitting day of this house—we debated enacting amendments to laws so that family violence restraining orders could be issued, bringing us into line with amendments that all other states had already enacted. We welcomed those changes but WA was the last jurisdiction to bring them in. Western Australia is not the last jurisdiction to bring in a no body, no parole law, but we are amongst the last. Members have referred to South Australia, Victoria and Queensland taking up this issue. In fact, the United Kingdom has been debating this issue as well.

Other members have referred to definitions of levels of cooperation, so it might not be that a body needs to be found, but that the police are satisfied that the prisoner has cooperated and revealed information and was genuine and forthcoming in their cooperation with the investigation. That information needs to be given in a timely manner. This bill does not compromise the right to silence of someone charged with a murder or a crime, but it is after a conviction and not towards the end of their non-parole period that they must cooperate. All those things

Amber-Jade Sanderson; Mr Shane Love; Acting Speaker; Mr John McGrath; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Matthew Hughes; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr John Quigley; Mr David Templeman; Mr Simon Millman; Mr Peter Katsambanis

are contemplated in this bill. I am pleased to have been able to speak on this bill and its passing will fulfil yet another of the McGowan Labor government's election commitments.

MR J.R. QUIGLEY (Butler — Attorney General) [8.09 pm] — in reply: I wish to thank all members for their contributions to the Sentence Administration Amendment Bill 2017. Members have spoken of the anguish that this legislation has caused the families of the deceased. I would like to acknowledge the presence of Mr Don Spiers in the Speaker's gallery this evening. He, of course, is the father of the late Sarah Spiers, who passed from this world on Australia Day 1996, 21 years ago. Her remains have never been recovered. I am also conscious that Mrs Margaret Dodd and her husband, Ray Dodd, are listening on live audio. Their beloved daughter Hayley died on a date unknown in 1999. I understand that Nadine Puddy is listening to this debate live from the south west, along with her father, Laurie Puddy. They are the sister and father of the late Craig Puddy, who I believe was murdered—I hope they forgive me if I have got it wrong—in 2010. Prisoner Mansell was convicted in that case in 2011. I have had personal contact with each of those family members and I understand their deep anguish over not only the loss of their loved ones but also never being able to properly achieve closure because the remains of their beloveds have never been recovered. Mr Spiers has also asked me to emphasise in my closing speech that a prisoner who is sentenced to life will inevitably be considered for parole at the end of the day and may get parole, but for those families who have lost their loved ones and whose remains have never been recovered, their anguish is never ending because they can never achieve closure.

In replying to the second reading debate and thanking members I have to be very circumspect in talking about particular circumstances, because I am mindful that at least three cases in which remains have not been recovered are currently under consideration by the courts and as such are sub judice. I should also mention Mrs Dawn Edge, whose son was also murdered. The jury convicted the murderer only yesterday. That matter is still before the court and under consideration. I do not want to mention that case further but I also offer my sympathy to Mrs Edge for the loss of her son.

It is true, as was mentioned by members, that a bill was before this chamber on an earlier occasion. I do not want to say more than that. That is the past. We are here today to pass this bill through this chamber and I want to do so reasonably swiftly. As I said, I acknowledge the opposition and thank it for its support of this government's bill. The Sentence Administration Amendment Bill 2017 gives effect to the McGowan government's election promise to introduce no body, no parole laws as soon as Parliament resumed. It has been said in the chamber by the spokesperson for the shadow Attorney General, the member for Hillarys —

Mr P.A. Katsambanis: I am not shadow Attorney General.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: No, I said that the spokesperson for the shadow Attorney General, the member for Hillarys, has indicated in this chamber that he does not wish to go into consideration in detail and that I can just do a wrap-up second reading speech, at the end of which I will be seeking leave for the bill to be read a third time.

As members have touched on various aspects of the bill, I have asked policy advisers and senior counsel to prepare a second reading speech so I can wrap up the provisions of the bill. Senior counsel has prepared my second reading speech, so I will just run through those sections. I do not want to say anything controversial. I have acknowledged the families and the opposition's support for the government's bill.

Point of Order

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I have no objection to what the minister proposes to do but in parliamentary process, there can be only one second reading speech, which is often interpreted by the courts as the intent of the government. The response of the Attorney General has to be by way of comment, not a formal second reading speech. There can be only one.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: Both opposition members and government members have raised a number of issues about the sections. I was going through those particular sections that have been raised during the second reading debate. There is no more to it than that.

Mr C.J. Barnett: You described it as a second reading speech. They were your words.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: This is my response to all the second reading speeches in the chamber, when sections have been raised. I wanted to give an overview of those sections in response in wrapping up.

Mr C.J. Barnett: It is not what you said.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr S.J. Price): If the Attorney General will give the reply in the way he just characterised it, that will be okay. If he does it the way he did previously, that might be an issue.

Amber-Jade Sanderson; Mr Shane Love; Acting Speaker; Mr John McGrath; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Matthew Hughes; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr John Quigley; Mr David Templeman; Mr Simon Millman; Mr Peter Katsambanis

Debate Resumed

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: Members have referred to the current position of a prisoner's refusal to disclose the whereabouts of a person's body. That is currently covered under section 5A(d) of the Sentence Administration Act 2003, which states that release considerations include —

issues for any victim of an offence for which the prisoner is in custody if the prisoner is released, including any matter raised in a victim's submission;

That is currently covered in section 5A(d) of the act. We are now mandating that the Prisoners Review Board take into account the level of cooperation that the prisoner gave to the authorities, specifically to the police, and the timeliness of that information in locating the whereabouts of the deceased. The board must take that into account and cannot make a recommendation to the Attorney General for a release without having received a certificate of cooperation from the Commissioner of Police. The government considers that the issue is of such importance to require the board to give special mandatory consideration. This will ensure that the matter is expressly and specifically considered by the board and the relevant prisoners are aware of this specific consideration, which will provide an incentive to cooperate. As members described in their second reading contributions, the issue is at the outset of the investigation. Accused persons and convicted persons will know that this is a mandated requirement further down the track. Part of that mandated requirement further down the track when assessing their cooperation is the timeliness in which it is given. As members have referred to in their second reading contributions, it will not be sufficient for a prisoner to wait 10 or 12 years and when parole considerations come up, make the decision to cooperate. It will be too late for them. It will give investigators, as members referred to, that leverage early in the investigation to say to a prisoner that they have to consider their position vis-a-vis these particular amendments.

Members have referred to the homicide offences covered by the Sentence Administration Amendment Bill 2017. They are set out in the bill and include counselling or procuring the commission of a homicide offence; inciting another person to commit a homicide offence; becoming an accessory after the fact to a homicide offence; and conspiring with another person to commit a homicide offence. As members have also noted, they include not only murder, but also infanticide. The bill also covers those matters relevant to the prisoner, which are set out along with other sentence types relevant to a prisoner convicted of a homicide offence. They are prisoners who have been detained at the Governor's pleasure or who are in strict or safe custody by virtue of an order under repealed section 282 of the Criminal Code, or subject to a direction or sentence repealed under section 661 or 662 of the Criminal Code, when the offence was a homicide offence. As members have said, the no body, no parole laws will have retrospective application and will apply to prisoners who are under sentence prior to the passage of this legislation.

Members have mentioned various people who have been murdered and the people who have been convicted of those murders. Since the conviction of Cameron Mansell in 2011, four other people have been convicted of murder in instances in which the body of the victim has not been found. Members have mentioned most of them. They include Brent Mack, Gary David Jackson, Mark David Corbett and Aaron Raymond Craig. That information has been sourced from the criminal records. The total number of prisoners currently serving sentences for murder cases in which the remains of the deceased have not been recovered has not been finally determined, but when those prisoners come up for review, their particular circumstances will be assessed by the Prisoners Review Board. As I said, in cases in which the body has not been recovered, a certificate of cooperation will be required before a recommendation can be made. The member for Churchlands has said that the issues that caused him concern in the previous bill have now been satisfactorily addressed in the bill currently before the chamber, with both the description of the remains of the deceased and the particular offences that are captured by this legislation.

When the former Attorney General said that he would not, during his tenure as Attorney General, release anyone in cases in which the body had not been recovered and that he might not imagine any other Attorney General doing so, it did not statutorily mandate a prohibition on consideration. That is important, because this Parliament cannot predict the attitudes of future Attorneys General or oversight by the system, in a situation in which this legislation mandates it for the future.

Members have expressed concern—this was touched upon in the second reading speech—about what would happen if someone were innocent of an offence but had been convicted. I would say that parole was never a hedge against an unjust conviction or a miscarriage of justice. Indeed, some have suggested that a person who has been wrongfully convicted could not qualify for a parole recommendation by the board under this option. Our law is that once a person is convicted and sentenced, the parole provisions are applied without further consideration of guilt. It is accepted that the person is guilty; if there is a miscarriage of justice and an innocent

Amber-Jade Sanderson; Mr Shane Love; Acting Speaker; Mr John McGrath; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Matthew Hughes; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr John Quigley; Mr David Templeman; Mr Simon Millman; Mr Peter Katsambanis

person is detained—we all know that that has happened in Western Australian history—the redress is through the Court of Appeal, not the Prisoners Review Board, formerly the Parole Board.

Members also mentioned the matter that cooperation must be with a member of the police force. It cannot be a communication made to another prisoner, another person, or even the prison authorities. It is the prisoner's responsibility to contact the police and give his or her cooperation to the police because it is the police who have the authority and requirement to make the certificate of cooperation to the Prisoners Review Board.

Members also mentioned other Australian jurisdictions in their contributions to the second reading debate. On 8 December 2016, the Victorian Legislative Council passed the Justice Legislation Amendment (Parole Reform and Other Matters) Act 2016, which amended the Corrections Act 1986. The act was assented to on 13 December 2016. According to the second reading speech, part 3 of this Victorian act ensures persons who have been convicted and sentenced to imprisonment with a non-parole period for certain fatal offences are not granted parole if they do not satisfactorily cooperate with police in the investigation of the offence to identify the location, or last known location, of the body or remains of victims of the offence. The Western Australian position will be similar to the Victorian position once this legislation passes through both houses of this Parliament. South Australia's Correctional Services (Parole) Amendment Act 2015 amended the Correctional Services Act 1982 by introducing the requirement that a person serving a life sentence for murder cannot be considered for parole unless the South Australian Parole Board is satisfied that the person has satisfactorily cooperated.

In drawing this legislation, we have tried to make it consistent across the jurisdictions. The Queensland parole system has recently been independently reviewed to determine if this element of the corrective services system is operating effectively to support the supervision of offenders on parole. The issue of “no body, no parole” was considered during this review, which recommended that new legislation be introduced. Although Queensland has not yet passed that legislation, the review has recommended that it be passed. The relevant committee is due to report to the Queensland Parliament on 24 July 2017.

In the Northern Territory, of course, Bradley John Murdoch was convicted of the murder of the late Mr Falconio, whose remains were never recovered. On 13 July 2016, the Northern Territory Parole Amendment Act 2016 was assented to, and it commenced on 5 August 2016. The amendment provides that the board must not make a parole order in relation to a prisoner unless the board considers that the prisoner has cooperated satisfactorily in the investigation of the offence to identify the location or the last known location of the remains of the deceased. In New South Wales, the corrective services minister has indicated that the New South Wales government will introduce no body, no parole laws and will strengthen the parole system for killers who have not disclosed the location of their victims' bodies or remains. In New South Wales, the State Parole Authority is an independent authority and makes decisions on parole, so that is a different system. Every jurisdiction has a different system from Western Australia. Western Australia is the only jurisdiction in which the Prisoners Review Board or its equivalent makes a recommendation to the Attorney General for a release order. In other jurisdictions that order is made by the authority. In fulfilling the election promise to introduce this no body, no parole legislation, the McGowan Labor government has taken care to reflect that legislation. There are various different enactments. The wording in the legislation varies slightly, but the criteria is the same; that is, a prisoner will not be released on parole unless they have satisfactorily cooperated with the identification of the last known whereabouts of the remains of the deceased and, most importantly, have done so in a timely fashion.

Members have referred in their contributions to the second reading debate to the right to silence. That is a bit of a misnomer. It is not a right to silence; it is a right against self-incrimination. It is probably the same thing by a different name, but it respects that a person on trial has no obligation to take the witness stand and give evidence and has no obligation to participate in police interviews. They can decline to answer questions during police interviews, as Cameron Mansell did during his trial in relation to the murder of Craig Puddy. He never offered any explanation at all. He sat mute for the 11 weeks of the trial and then was convicted. Only after trial did he write to all and sundry—the media, me, the former Attorney General—protesting his innocence, but even then he did not give any hint about the whereabouts of the late Mr Puddy. The legislation respects a person's right to silence or the privilege against self-incrimination, so that a person could go through the investigation without revealing the last known whereabouts and could go through the trial and appeal process without revealing the whereabouts because he is not required to do so under the legislation, but if he delayed much longer after conviction, he or she—the prisoner—will have seriously prejudiced their position vis-a-vis this legislation. The chamber has been reminded time and again by members, which I want to reinforce in this wrap-up speech on the second reading, that timeliness is crucial if they are to get a certificate of cooperation. They cannot leave this matter in abeyance.

Amber-Jade Sanderson; Mr Shane Love; Acting Speaker; Mr John McGrath; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Matthew Hughes; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr John Quigley; Mr David Templeman; Mr Simon Millman; Mr Peter Katsambanis

I conclude my comments by once again thanking all members for their contributions. I once again acknowledge the families of the deceased who are in the Speaker's gallery and who are watching this debate being live streamed. I am sure that they will take heart that the Legislative Assembly of this Parliament has seen the relatively swift passage of this bill through this chamber and has sent it up to the upper house, may it please you, Mr Acting Speaker.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to third reading.

Third Reading

MR J.R. QUIGLEY (Butler — Attorney General) [8.35 pm]: I move —

That the bill be now read a third time.

MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah — Leader of the House) [8.35 pm]: I will be very brief in my comments this evening. I thank all members who have spoken on the Sentence Administration Amendment Bill 2017 over the 10 or so hours in which we have debated it. This is justice being done. I listened to a number of the contributions to the second reading debate that were presented to the house and I congratulate all members for their contributions. I also want to acknowledge the support of the opposition in ensuring that this bill will now pass from this place this evening and will go to the upper house. I hope that the members in the other place will be able to understand the importance of this bill and that it will be passed as soon as possible and become law.

To those family members who have been in the Speaker's gallery this evening and also last Thursday, and to those who have been watching the consideration of this bill in the last period of time, this is justice being done. To the families of loved ones whose whereabouts remain unknown, this is an important piece of legislation that is going to pass this place. To Ray and Margaret Dodd in Pinjarra, who have been tireless campaigners for this bill, and to those other family members and the supporters of those families who have been tireless campaigners for this bill, this is your moment. This is an important moment for you. It will not, of course, bring back your loved ones, which is what you want, but it is a piece of legislation that, when passed by this Parliament, will allow or will enshrine in legislation a process that states that if a person is convicted of a murder and the body of the deceased—of that person who is no longer with us—is not revealed, then parole is not an option. It is important that this piece of legislation passes this place. It is similar to other legislation that has been passed in other states in Australia. I am very pleased that this Parliament in Western Australia sees fit that we will also have this relevant legislation. To those family members I say that we will never be able to truly understand the pain and trauma that you and your loved ones have gone through, some for many, many years. I do not think any of us in this place would fully understand that. However, Parliaments are here to listen to the will of the people. When I presented the petition to this place early last year, nearly 40 000 people had signed that online petition saying that this legislation was something that we, as a Parliament, should consider.

Although there has been some debate in the second reading process that this should have happened last year—I think it should have happened last year—this Parliament will pass this bill now. I am very pleased for that. I am also very proud to be part of this historic piece of legislation in this place. With that, I ask that when this bill is presented to the other place the members in that place understand the importance of supporting this bill and, indeed, after due consideration, pass it into law.

MR S.A. MILLMAN (Mount Lawley) [8.40 pm]: I rise to speak in the third reading debate on the passage of the Sentence Administration Amendment Bill 2017. I thank the Leader of the House and member for Mandurah for his excellent contribution to the third reading debate. Once again, he has eloquently captured the passion and emotion that so many members of this place have displayed in their contributions to the second reading debate. I place on the record my commendation and my gratitude to the Attorney General for the work, effort, discipline and energy that he has put into bringing this bill to this Parliament—firstly and secondly for advocating very stridently and very passionately for its passage. It is a testament to the depth of feeling that the Attorney General has for this issue and his ability as an advocate that he was able to very passionately and dispassionately articulate the case for the passage of this legislation.

As this Parliament comes to consider this bill, it is important to remember that the criminal justice system is a finely balanced and nuanced instrument of our society. Members on this side of the chamber and I am sure many members on the other side of the chamber have a deep and abiding respect for the rule of law. We know just how particular and important adherence to the rule of law and appreciation of the criminal justice system is. This bill rebalances the scales of justice to provide justice for victims and for the families of victims, and puts

Amber-Jade Sanderson; Mr Shane Love; Acting Speaker; Mr John McGrath; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Matthew Hughes; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr John Quigley; Mr David Templeman; Mr Simon Millman; Mr Peter Katsambanis

those victims and those families of victims at the centre of the considerations of the criminal justice system. In my contribution to the second reading debate on this legislation I articulated that parole is a privilege and not a right. Parole is a privilege that must be earned by a prisoner demonstrating contrition, compassion, rehabilitation and a capacity to re-enter civil society. It is an absolute truism that a prisoner who has in no way cooperated with authorities to identify the location of the remains of a victim—of a loved one—has failed in those requirements to demonstrate that they are entitled to the benefit of that privilege. In no uncertain terms, this bill fairly and squarely places in the minds of these dreadful perpetrators—these commissioners of such outrageous crimes—the consideration that they will not be released until they have taken that first step of contrition and that first step of acknowledgement of their wrongdoing and moved towards making amends with victims, families of victims and society.

This bill is a fantastic work. It is a realisation of a McGowan government election commitment. Delivering on that commitment is an absolute vindication of all the work and effort that families of victims have put in. As the minister said, the passage of this legislation is a vindication and a celebration for the families of those victims. Nothing members in this place can do or say will bring back those loved ones—those lost ones—but we can provide people with some hope for the future. By passing this legislation we do just that. To the families of those victims I say: all the very best. I am sorry that we cannot do more. I am extremely proud that we are doing this much. I am grateful to be part of the passage of this legislation.

MR P.A. KATSAMBANIS (Hillarys) [8.45 pm]: In brief, the opposition supports this legislation and wishes it speedy passage. I thank all members who have spoken on this bill. On the opposition side, apart from me, we had the members for South Perth and Churchlands speak briefly to put their views on the record. Clearly, this is legislation that many families in Western Australia have been campaigning for and want to see pass, and there is no point in prolonging their pain. As I pointed out in my contribution to the second reading debate, the passage of this legislation will not bring the closure these families want, but let us hope that it is a trigger for them to get that closure. They are suffering and will continue to suffer, but they ask for one thing—that is, the identification of the remains of their missing deceased family members. They deserve that closure. We cannot give that to them; we can only give them this bill, which will hopefully assist. Let us hope that those families not only get the passage of this bill, but also the passage they have been asking for.

MR J.R. QUIGLEY (Butler — Attorney General) [8.46 pm] — in reply: In closing, I once again acknowledge all members' contributions and opposition support for the bill. I want to make one reflection in closing. When we were all in this chamber for the swearing-in of members to this Parliament, the Chief Justice sat where the Acting Speaker currently sits and addressed us all. He addressed us—if I might paraphrase, His Honour—saying that all members when working for the greater good of the community can bring about real results for the community when we apply our joint goodwill to legislation. I think that the passage of this bill in this Assembly reflects such an endeavour by all members to proceed in bilateral goodwill to bring this legislation about. With the passage of this bill those people who are currently under life sentence in the last five years or six years will receive a chilling message in their cells tonight. Cameron Mansell, Brent Donald Mack, Gary David Jackson, Mark David Corbett and Aaron Raymond Craig should urgently reconsider their positions with the vote taken in this chamber this evening. I thank all members again. Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

House adjourned at 8.49 pm
