

**FINES, PENALTIES AND INFRINGEMENT NOTICES
ENFORCEMENT AMENDMENT BILL 2019**

Second Reading

Resumed from 12 November.

MR S.A. MILLMAN (Mount Lawley) [1.57 pm]: I rise to add my voice to the chorus of members speaking in favour of this legislation. Now and again, we have the opportunity to lend our public support and endorsement to good legislation. I commend the Attorney General for bringing this legislation before the house. I will cover a number of things in the time allotted to me to contribute to this second reading debate, some of which relates to the long and storied history of the development of the policies that will be implemented by this legislation, some of which relates to the philosophical basis that underpins the legislation, and some of my contribution will be about the ways in which this legislation will give effect to policy imperatives—that is, the way that this legislation will work in practice.

Before I conclude my comments, I will pick up on a couple of the points that the member for Hillarys, the lead speaker for the opposition in this chamber, made during his contribution yesterday. I was most interested in the member for Hillarys' contribution and very pleased to hear him commence his contribution by saying that the Liberal Party would not oppose this bill. What was particularly interesting was that the member for Hillarys continued to repeat the fact that he was offering his personal views. The member for Hillarys, as a practitioner himself, knows that the ancient writ of habeas corpus and the role that it plays in making sure that people are not imprisoned inappropriately is a fundamental feature of our criminal justice system. I look at the member and I see that he is smiling. That is because he knows that. I know that as a Liberal, he is a person who purportedly is for freedom. He knows that imprisoning people without due and proper cause is something that we should not do. That is what our history tells us going back 800 years. I am pleased to see that he is nodding.

The member for Hillarys even said that perhaps the Attorney General should have been bolder. These were great sentiments. However, I was confused by the member for Hillarys' scepticism about whether this legislation will pass the upper house. I wonder what it is about the upper house in particular that may prevent the passage of this legislation.

Debate adjourned, pursuant to standing orders.