

## OUT-OF-CONTROL PARTIES

### *Matter of Public Interest*

**THE SPEAKER (Mr G.A. Woodhams)** outlined that he was in receipt within the prescribed time of a letter from the Leader of the Opposition seeking to debate a matter of public interest.

[In compliance with standing orders, at least five members rose in their places.]

**MRS M.H. ROBERTS (Midland)** [3.00 pm]: On behalf of the Leader of the Opposition, I move —

That this house condemns the Barnett government for its failure to deal with out-of-control parties and violence in the suburbs.

This government has been in power for four years. Why are we still waiting for violence in the suburbs and out-of-control parties to be dealt with? Why are people living in fear? Why does the community have to put up with, by the government's own admission, at least three or four such parties on average each weekend? So far the government has done nothing about it. If we fast-forward to this year, we see that in *The West Australian* of 26 March the then Minister for Police, Rob Johnson, made a commitment to do something. An article headed "Booze-fuelled youth run wild" reads —

Police Minister Rob Johnson said the Government was working on a policy to deal with the riotous behaviour of party gatecrashers.

An article titled "Wild party hosts may face fines", published on 27 March this year, reads —

Mr O'Callaghan said secondary supply legislation, already in place in NSW, Queensland, Victoria and Tasmania, should be introduced in WA

The Commissioner of Police said secondary supply legislation is one of the things that would help. Have we seen that legislation? No, we have not, because of the government's inaction. The police commissioner is on record on 27 March as saying that he wants secondary supply legislation. The article also states that he wants the power to disperse crowds at those scenes. That was on 27 March. Where is the legislation? At the tail end of that same article, the then Minister for Police Rob Johnson said —

... he was speaking to Attorney-General Christian Porter about legislative changes, including ways to amend the convoluted laws regarding "unlawful assemblies".

We fast-forward to 18 June. I have skipped a few articles here, but I do not have time to go through them all. This article is titled "Residents terrified: Thugs cause party mayhem". I think we should look at some of the colour of some of those events. This was to do with residents in Hopman Rise. It reads —

As Hopman Rise residents cleared up shattered glass, pieces of bricks and wooden poles yesterday, the apologetic party hosts said armed thugs had arrived in the street intent on violence.

One neighbour, who did not want to be named, said he watched terrified from his window as one man jumped on the bonnet of a parked utility and smashed the windscreen with a wooden pole.

Every one of these articles I am holding refers to really frightening events such as that. By this government's admission these events happen three or four times on average every weekend in the Perth metropolitan area. What is the government's response so far? Nothing. The government makes promises, promises, promises; it will do something. Back in March the Commissioner of Police named two pieces of legislation that he wants, but we still have not seen them. What did Mr Johnson say then? An earlier part of the 18 June article reads —

... Police Minister Rob Johnson revealed that plans to deal with uninvited thugs and irresponsible hosts were before State Cabinet.

...

Mr Johnson would not reveal details of his proposal yesterday because it was before State Cabinet but he said the ... laws would be a priority because the community was fed up with the havoc caused by drunken louts.

There are some useful pictures there. On 27 June, in the same month, an article titled "Party troublemakers targeted" provides more news that the government will eventually do something. The article reads —

People using social networking sites to encourage others to cause trouble at parties would face penalties under the State Government's proposed laws curbing suburban rowdiness, Police Minister Rob Johnson said yesterday.

**Extract from Hansard**

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 18 September 2012]

p6006f-6020a

Speaker; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Roger Cook; Mrs Liza Harvey; Acting Speaker; Mr John Hyde; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Tony Simpson; Mr Albert Jacob; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Andrea Mitchell

---

The laws giving police the power to enter premises without a warrant or permission from the occupier drew fire from the Australian Council of Civil Liberties

...

Mr Johnson said penalties would apply to people posting messages on social networking sites “encouraging other people to come along and cause trouble”.

“Sometimes, and what’s covered in the legislation, is if you get an occupier who is not acting responsibly and is advertising for people to come and cause problems, there will be penalties for that owner/occupier,” he said.

“Very often you might get young people who are renting a property and they advertise a party on Facebook and they encourage people to come along and that’s when you get a lot of people there and that’s when you get the gatecrashers of 100 or 150 people.”

Mr Johnson said the laws would allow police to warn partygoers via loudspeaker to disperse or face arrest rather than having to warn them individually.

We fast-forward to the new minister. We know that the former minister said on numerous occasions in June that the laws were before state cabinet, they were well advanced and he would introduce them in the spring session. What does the new minister say? An article in the *Stirling Times* states —

Admitting she had little knowledge of the structure of the WA Police and Main Roads, she said the role would help her venture further from the solid foundations she laid with local authorities.

“Yes, it will be a bit of a baptism of fire but I don’t think there’s any other way,” she said.

She said her initial focus would be on managing out-of-control parties, discussing protection for police officers involved in high-speed pursuits and tackling a rise in home invasions throughout the metropolitan area.

What have we seen from 3 July? We have seen the parties get worse. They are the worst-ever, according to what Deputy Commissioner Dawson said on the weekend. That is what we have seen from the new incumbent. On 20 July, we are still being made promises. The article titled “Crackdown on wild parties: New minister wants hosts to cough up for police callouts” reads —

Mrs Harvey also reaffirmed the Government’s support for police having the powers to stop and search people in designated areas without suspicion of a crime, saying the laws, defeated in November 2010, had been “misunderstood”.

I think that sums it up. Those laws were not defeated. They are clearly also not a priority for this government. This minister does not know what she is talking about.

The Premier then got involved at the Liberal Party conference. The government will make this very much a political issue. It has promised a lot. It has said it would bring in laws, but it has not. The government then said that it will do something. A joint announcement was made at the Liberal Party conference. Colin Barnett and Liza Harvey’s smiling faces are at the top of the press statement. What is this three-point plan? This three-point plan involves \$1.2 million in new funding to boost the WA dog squad. Let us be clear here; in somewhere between 18 months and two years, nine dogs will arrive at these parties fully trained. I am not sure whether those nine dogs, which are not arriving for a couple of years, will solve the problem. Two new riot buses will also be introduced to assist the police response. Where are the two new riot buses? It is a bit like the helicopter the government ordered. The buses are still being fitted out and are still not deployable. For months and months and months the Commissioner of Police has been calling for an ability to remove multiple partygoers and take them offsite to arrest them. Why were those buses not fitted out and available last weekend? Why is this government so hopeless? The third bullet point in the media statement refers to legislative changes. Where are they? The government is still promising them. The former minister said that the legislation was drafted and ready to go and that he would introduce them as a priority when this Parliament resumed. Do you know what, Mr Speaker? I think he probably would have. I take him at his word.

**Mr P. Abetz:** First time ever!

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** It is not the first time, but when the former minister made a commitment, he generally followed through with it. I will highlight, while I am at it, the fact that he made a strong commitment to road safety—he has personal reasons for that strong commitment. One of the things that the Premier praised him for at the WA Police Union conference was his unswerving commitment to road safety. The former minister did introduce a number of initiatives to improve road safety, and I acknowledge those. As police minister he also

**Extract from Hansard**

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 18 September 2012]

p6006f-6020a

Speaker; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Roger Cook; Mrs Liza Harvey; Acting Speaker; Mr John Hyde; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Tony Simpson; Mr Albert Jacob; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Andrea Mitchell

---

promoted this program, through *The Sunday Times*, in November 2011. The headline is “Plan to Save Lives” and refers to why the spotlight will go on novices and drink drivers in 2012. There was a double-page spread on pages 54 and 55 of *The Sunday Times* on 20 November 2011. Another article in *The Sunday Times* is headed “Phone ban and no passengers” and refers to a crackdown on novice drivers. That was the plan. That is what the minister committed to. Can members guess how much consultation had gone into this? The Road Safety Council and researchers had been working on this for somewhere between two and three years. If the current Minister for Police reads the articles, she will find out that experts on road safety—not the minister—and the whole Road Safety Council have been considering these proposals for a minimum of three years. The former minister made a commitment in April this year, via ministerial media statements. He was supported by the government and the Premier. The Premier repeatedly said that he had confidence in the former minister when it came to road safety, and he repeated that recently at the WA Police Union conference. This media statement tells us that there will be restrictions on passengers and phone use to save young lives. It reads —

A ban on mobile phone use and passenger restrictions will be introduced for novice drivers as part of a new safety package designed to reduce the incidence of young people being killed or seriously injured on Western Australian roads.

The changes have been endorsed by the Road Safety Council ... Road Safety Minister Rob Johnson said the State Government had accepted the RSC’s advice, which was based on a two-year independent study by the Curtin–Monash Accident Research Centre in collaboration with the Centre for Automotive Safety Research of the University of Adelaide.

I think they might know a little about road safety and what works. It continues —

...

The Minister said based on recommendations from the council, the Government would introduce other evidence-based measures to improve novice driver safety, such as:

- Peer passenger restrictions for novice drivers: In the first six months of provisional driving, novice drivers under the age of 25 can only carry one passenger under the age of 21 between 9pm and 5am. Novice drivers are 30 per cent more likely to crash in the first six months of provisional driving than in the second six months. Research also indicates that a young driver’s crash risk increases as the number of similarly aged passengers increases.
- Ban on mobile phone use by novice drivers: Under current laws, all drivers are prohibited from using a hand-held mobile phone while driving and can only make or receive a call when it is hands-free. Under the changes, novice drivers will be banned from using any function of a mobile phone —

The statement goes on, and the former minister refers to the restrictions on blood alcohol content for instructors of learner drivers. These are all things that the former minister committed to.

As introduced by the former minister, novice drivers are banned from driving at night between midnight and 5.00 am in the first six months. The science is there. That science took two or three years’ worth of consultation and discussion. That science was promoted by this government in a huge spread in *The Sunday Times* last November and was committed to eventually by the former minister in April. I dare anyone in this place to say that the former minister would not have brought these laws into place, because he knows they would save the lives of young people. Be it on the Barnett government’s head that these laws were not introduced. But the Premier sacked that minister—a minister who would have saved the lives of young Western Australians.

**Mrs L.M. Harvey** interjected.

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** The current minister should be embarrassed and ashamed of herself.

**Mrs L.M. Harvey:** Read the MPI! Your own MPI does not refer to any of this.

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** It refers to your total incompetence and the mayhem we have on the street. The minister may not like me talking about this, but this is about her total and complete incompetence.

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr P.B. Watson):** Order, members!

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** This minister is unbelievable. I am raising the very important issue —

**Mrs L.M. Harvey** interjected

Speaker; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Roger Cook; Mrs Liza Harvey; Acting Speaker; Mr John Hyde; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Tony Simpson; Mr Albert Jacob; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Andrea Mitchell

---

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** — of young people, largely between the ages of 17 and 24 years of age, some of whose lives would have been saved. Read the research, minister, and you will find out —

**Mrs L.M. Harvey:** Who wrote the MPI? Did you write this?

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** The minister is incessantly interjecting and she seems to think it is funny that she has not introduced legislation which would save lives—the lives of people under 24 years of age. The minister can sit there and smirk. She can say that it is not specified in the motion, but, guess what? She is not the Speaker; it is not for her to tell me what I need to say in the MPI. It is my choice. The minister will choose how she responds. Frankly, I am disgusted that the minister would sit there and smile and smirk. There has been three years' worth of research saying that these laws need to be introduced. The member for Girrawheen questioned what was happening with these laws again and again.

Today I asked a question in question time, which the minister knew nothing about. She said, "It's important and we consult; we have a lot of consultation." That is an excuse for the minister doing nothing, for not being on top of her job and for not realising there was a commitment to introduce not only the out-of-control party laws but also laws to save the lives of novice drivers on our roads.

Under this government we see a total failure on law and order issues. We see two very inexperienced members of Parliament—two people without ministerial experience—handling the most important portfolios of Attorney General and Minister for Police. The Premier should hang his head in shame, because however bad the opposition claimed the former minister was, he is a shining light compared with the current minister. Likewise, previously in this place we had an Attorney General with considerable experience. We have now got a brand-new Attorney General upstairs. It may be that the new Attorney General could do a good job if he were operating with a competent police minister, but look at the team! We have a totally inexperienced team when it comes to community safety. We are seeing people in the community being let down badly by the Barnett government. It is an insult to have appointed this member as the Minister for Police.

**MR R.H. COOK (Kwinana — Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** [3.17 pm]: This week in Perth we saw blood in the streets. The suburbs of Perth, in particular Piara Waters, resembled the streets of Damascus, not the streets of Perth in Western Australia.

Several members interjected.

**Mr R.H. COOK:** They resembled the streets of Sydney. Sydney has its own national notoriety for its riots, and Perth can add its name to the list as a result of the government's inaction this weekend.

We have young people throwing rocks, hurling abuse and attacking police; and, for goodness sake, we had young people breaking the windows of an ambulance. This is writ large as a demonstration of how the Barnett government has lost control of Perth's streets. This is the incompetence of a minister who is incapable of delivering on the solemn promises of the Barnett government for over a year. We had the promises around road safety from the former minister in November last year, and in March this year we were told the government was working on a policy to deal with the riotous behaviour of party gatecrashers. In March the former minister said, "I am working with the Attorney General on a package; it is all systems go." Later, in June, we heard, "The cabinet is looking in great detail at the proposals that we have," and still what we have is the situation in Perth streets deteriorating into an uncontrolled rabble. As I said, there were stabbings on the weekend, with Perth streets out of control and looking more like a scene out of the Middle East than streets in the suburbs of Perth.

We are used to the incompetence of this government; we are used to the hand-wringing incompetence of a minister for police, Sunday after Sunday, getting up to apologise to the people of Perth about the fact that the government has not taken one —

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Members, if you want to have a conversation across the chamber, everybody go outside and have it. I want to hear what the member for Kwinana says.

**Mr R.H. COOK:** Weekend after weekend we see the hand-wringing incompetence of police ministers trying to explain away why they have done so little to get under control out-of-control parties and stop this riotous behaviour. Most galling of all are the fraudulent activities of the Liberal Party, particularly those prosecuted by the member for Southern River in calling on the Labor Party to support the government's legislation. What legislation? Just recently, next to the very suburb where the riots were taking place on the weekend, the member for Southern River was calling on the Labor Party to support the government's legislation or the Liberal Party would make it an election issue. The election issue is the fact that this government has done nothing to address out-of-control parties and comprehensively failed to deliver on any legislation that it promised the people of Western Australia to bring to this place as a matter of priority.

**Extract from Hansard**

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 18 September 2012]

p6006f-6020a

Speaker; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Roger Cook; Mrs Liza Harvey; Acting Speaker; Mr John Hyde; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Tony Simpson; Mr Albert Jacob; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Andrea Mitchell

---

Over the weekend we also had the media asking the shadow Minister for Police whether we would be supporting this legislation. Of course we will support any legislation that makes an effort to try to drive down the level of violence on Perth streets. But what we expect before we are asked by the media, prompted no doubt by the Premier's media spin doctors, is to actually see the legislation; to see what this government has in mind. As I said, what we have is, weekend after weekend, the Minister for Police, with hand-wringing incompetence, trying to explain away why the government has still not stemmed the flow of blood on Perth streets.

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** They're gutless; they're gutless!

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member for Mandurah, I know you were not referring to anybody, but it is unparliamentary and I hope you will not do it again, otherwise I will call you to order.

**Mr R.H. COOK:** We have to ask the question: what the hell is the government actually doing? We know that yesterday cabinet sat for over an hour longer than it was scheduled to sit, obviously deliberating on something important. What the hell was it discussing? If members of cabinet were not bringing this legislation forward, what were they talking about—the colour of the wallpaper in the “Premier's Palace”? What is more important than bringing forward to this place legislation that the government promised the people of Western Australia time and again that it would bring to this place to stop these out-of-control parties? What, for goodness sake, could be more important than delivering on these promises, and what could be more important than not making the member for Southern River look like a complete idiot by getting him to put out a leaflet calling on the Labor Party to support this non-existent legislation? What could be more important than bringing forward to this place —

Several members interjected.

**Mr R.H. COOK:** The true tragedy of this event, the true tragedy of this incompetence, is that ambulance officers were attacked on the weekend. The true tragedy of this incompetence is that a young man went to that party to try to retrieve his younger brother to take him out of a dangerous situation, and he ended up getting stabbed. The true tragedy of this situation is that weekend after weekend we see gangs of youths terrorising the streets of Perth, with people cowering in their homes, worried about young people on the rampage, which this government is clearly incapable of bringing legislation into this place to stop.

We are reasonable people on this side of the chamber. We are happy to wait for this government to bring this legislation to this place. Having made the announcement in March this year, it would be reasonable to expect that after a few weeks' deliberation over this sort of legislation, we might see a draft exposure, that we might see a position statement and that we might see the legislation brought forward to this place and left on the table for close consideration. But, of course, we have not. Perhaps we would have seen it in June. Perhaps we would have seen it directly after the winter break when the government had six to eight long weeks to consider this legislation, to undertake the consultation that the government says is so important and to actually look at the legislation and to finetune it before bringing it to this place. Perhaps by August that legislation should have been here. Perhaps by August the government would have got its act together and delivered on commitments that the former Minister for Police made back in June this year, but it has not. What we have seen is a government dithering and, weekend after weekend, police ministers wringing their hands and hiding behind the press conference of a deputy police commissioner, trying to deliver to the people of Perth excuse after excuse for why they have done absolutely nothing—absolutely nothing—to address what is clearly a situation that is out of control.

On this side of the chamber, I, like anyone in this chamber, stand to condemn the government for having delivered so little in this very important area. The government knows that right across its back benches it has members who are nervous that next weekend it will happen in their electorate, and nervous that once again they will be looking across to their colleagues in the party room, saying, “Why haven't we acted on this? Why have we stood by for so long and allowed this situation to continue to get out of control? Why have we elevated to the senior position of police minister a newcomer to the front bench, when clearly what we are trying to do is to demonstrate that we are the party of law and order and that what we want to say to the people of Western Australia is that those godless hoons on the other side of the chamber, the Labor Party, will obviously oppose all the legislation that we bring into this place?” But of course that is untrue. They will say, “What we want to do is to be able to put out leaflets in our electorates, saying the Labor Party should support our legislation, and we need its support”, which, of course, member for Southern River, is untrue, because on over 90 per cent of occasions we have supported the passage in this place of legislation in relation to law and order, and we stand committed to bringing the streets of Perth back under control. I only wish the government was equally committed to that task.

**MRS L.M. HARVEY (Scarborough — Minister for Police)** [3.27 pm]: I am rising, obviously, to speak against this motion —

---

**Extract from Hansard**

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 18 September 2012]

p6006f-6020a

Speaker; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Roger Cook; Mrs Liza Harvey; Acting Speaker; Mr John Hyde; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Tony Simpson; Mr Albert Jacob; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Andrea Mitchell

---

That this house condemns the Barnett government for its failure to deal with out-of-control parties and violence in the suburbs.

To go back over the time line, in March 2012, the former police minister started a conversation with the Attorney General about legislative changes, including ways to amend laws regarding unlawful assembly. At the same time the Commissioner of Police said that he supported secondary supply legislation, and also changes to unlawful assembly laws. In April 2012, in a media statement, the opposition called for an obligation to register parties if they are big enough, a new circumstance of aggravation for people who fail to disperse, and more police on patrol. It was a bit vague as to what might constitute a big enough party, but that was one of the comments made in the media in April 2012, earlier this year. Following that, cabinet approved drafting of laws to target irresponsible hosts, and powers to disperse. In June 2012, the former police minister and member for Hillarys went out into the community and did a terrific job in outlining the government's proposed laws to target irresponsible hosts. These laws would allow police to warn people that they need to disperse.

*Point of Order*

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** The minister —

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr P.B. Watson):** Members! I am running this, member for Eyre. It is a point of order, and I hope everyone will be quiet while I hear it.

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** The point of order is that members are not allowed to read their speeches in the house. Of course they can read when they are quoting from a news article or document, but the Minister for Police is not doing that; she is reading her speech, so I ask the Acting Speaker to call her to order.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Minister, you are not allowed to read directly. You can have copious notes, to which you can refer, but you are not allowed to read directly.

*Debate Resumed*

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** What the former Minister for Police, the member for Hillarys, said in June 2012 has been previously mentioned. The member for Hillarys said that the laws would be a priority for the spring session of Parliament, which is now. The opposition said in June 2012 that it broadly supported the laws but that some elements sounded half-baked. In July 2012, I went to the media to say that the management of out-of-control parties and legislation around nuisance gatherings would be a top priority. I said that I was investigating measures to ensure that the hosts of out-of-control parties would be held accountable, and that they may be liable to pay compensation for the use of police resources. The opposition at the time accused me of presenting the former minister's legislation, and foreshadowed that legislation such as this often has unintended consequences.

**Mrs M.H. Roberts** interjected.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** That was part of the reason, member, that I wanted to be sure that the legislation that I bring to this place is sound legislation, that the appropriate consultation had, indeed, occurred, and that the potential for unintended consequences was minimised; we have a process. In August 2012 I announced, with the Premier —

**Mrs M.H. Roberts** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member for Midland, when you spoke you had a pretty good go. I have called other members to order. You have had your say; let the minister have her say.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** On 12 August I announced, with the Premier, that we would put \$1.2 million into training for the dog squad, to double the number of general-purpose police dogs. We would also put funding into equipping two special riot buses that would enable police to carry large numbers of people away from these out-of-control gatherings. In addition to that, I said that we were well in the process of drafting —

**Mrs M.H. Roberts** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member for Midland, I call you to order for the second time. I have warned you once, and I will keep calling you to order if you keep doing this. If it happens three or four times, you will be on your way home.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** At that time I outlined my proposed changes to the legislation, to help police tackle out-of-control parties. On 13 August, in response to a question from Paul Murray, the member for Midland refused to commit the opposition to a policy on out-of-control parties. In the absence of policy, I guess the opposition is

**Extract from Hansard**

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 18 September 2012]

p6006f-6020a

Speaker; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Roger Cook; Mrs Liza Harvey; Acting Speaker; Mr John Hyde; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Tony Simpson; Mr Albert Jacob; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Andrea Mitchell

---

left with reacting to the policies that the government puts forward. Just to outline the process for members, there is time for this legislation to be passed.

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Members!

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** I said today, and I say it again, that this legislation currently before cabinet —

**Dr G.G. Jacobs** interjected.

*Withdrawal of Remark*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr P.B. Watson):** Member for Eyre, would you withdraw those remarks?

**Dr G.G. JACOBS:** I withdraw those remarks.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Thank you.

*Debate Resumed*

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** I expect to introduce this legislation to Parliament next week.

**Mr M.P. Whitely** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member for Bassendean, I call you to order.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** Under the standing orders of this house, the legislation has to lie on the table for three calendar weeks, so if I bring the legislation to Parliament next week it is likely that the legislation will be debated in October. After it has passed through this house, the process is repeated in the other place, which will have all of November to consider the legislation and to pass it if it sees fit. It is not a lengthy bill; it is somewhat complex, but it is not a lengthy bill, and I will be bringing it to the house next week. I believe that the police need this legislation, so in the interests of having it passed, I will bring it to the house next week and I will offer full briefings to the opposition to ensure that it is across the bill after giving it due consideration for the three weeks that it lies on the table. The greatest risk to this bill is actually from members opposite.

**Mr D.A. Templeman** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** That is rubbish, too, member for Mandurah. You get called to order for the first time today.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** Members opposite say that they want to support law and order legislation in this house, but supporting law and order legislation also involves engaging in discussion on the intent of the legislation and allowing its passage through Parliament without filibustering, deliberately employing delay tactics —

**Mrs M.H. Roberts** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member for Midland, this is your last chance. I have warned you; I will throw you out. I am not scared to do it. Just keep going on like that, and I will throw you out.

**Mr P. Papalia** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member for Warnbro, I am just seeing whether you already have one; you have now. I call you to order for the first time. Members just need to remember that in this place, the person who has the call has had the courage to get up and speak. Members can snipe from the sidelines, but the person who has the courage to get up and speak has the floor.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** I have engaged in this process in good faith —

*Points of Order*

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** Mr Acting Speaker, you have called me to order three times now. The minister has directed a range of her comments directly at me and the opposition. She has extensively quoted from comments I have made in the media, she interjected throughout my speech, and the Speaker ruled earlier today —

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** There is no point of order.

**Mr J.N. HYDE:** Mr Acting Speaker, I raise a serious point of order on standing order 92 and imputations of improper motives and personal reflections on members of the Assembly. The minister made repeated and extensive imputations on members on this side in respect of legislation that this house has not even seen. She is clearly in breach of standing order 92.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** There is no point of order, member for Perth. If you get up and do something like that again, when there is no merit to it, I will call you to order.

**Extract from Hansard**

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 18 September 2012]

p6006f-6020a

Speaker; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Roger Cook; Mrs Liza Harvey; Acting Speaker; Mr John Hyde; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Tony Simpson; Mr Albert Jacob; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Andrea Mitchell

---

*Debate Resumed*

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** To further elaborate on the point that I was making earlier, people can say that they are supportive of legislation in this house and may, indeed, vote for the legislation at the end of the process of debate, but they can also engage in tactics that result in the debate not necessarily building on the points made by previous members. Members can engage in filibustering; there are many tactics employed by oppositions in this place —

Several members interjected.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** I just find it absolutely atrocious, Mr Acting Speaker, that in light of the serious issue that has been brought to this house today, members opposite are mocking me and carrying on —

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Members! Let us just have a proper debate here and let the minister have her say.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** This is a really serious issue and I know that every member in this house is aware of its seriousness. The community is fed up with these out-of-control parties, and community members have complained to local members and the police about it. Last weekend, an inordinate amount of police resources were spent in managing the out-of-control party at Piara Waters. We can have a serious debate about it or we can have a debate in which members are constantly interjected upon. It is the choice of the house as to how things are progressed.

One thing I would like to mention is the process involved in the consideration of legislation by this government. In March, when this policy was being developed by the member for Hillarys, the policy had to go through due process. We needed to consult police and to make sure that the ideas that we came up with would be consistent and operationally acceptable to the police. We wanted to make sure that legislation we brought to the house would work when it is brought in. The process from there then involves drafting instructions going through Parliamentary Counsel, ensuring that after the instruction to draft is given by cabinet, the drafting is done in a manner —

**Mrs M.H. Roberts:** You should have consulted us; we represent the community.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** I find it incredible that you, member for Midland, are interjecting on me. I quote from *The West Australian* of Friday, 7 October 2005. You lobbied to get rid of the police ministry, according to Graham Mason in the *West*.

**Mrs M.H. Roberts:** The “police ministry”—what are you talking about?

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** It said that you lobbied to be rid of the police ministry.

**Mrs M.H. Roberts:** To get rid of it—you’re making it up!

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** They are quoted as saying that you were an underperforming minister; that you were —

... the master of passing the buck and not taking responsibility for major incidents that occurred in her ministry, especially ones that might reflect poorly upon her.

**Mrs M.H. Roberts:** Not true!

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** That is what they were saying about you —

**Mrs M.H. Roberts:** It’s lies!

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** — when you were Minister for Police.

**Mrs M.H. Roberts:** Lies! You are making an incorrect imputation on me!

*Suspension of Member*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr P.B. Watson):** Member for Midland, I have given you every opportunity. I am going to suspend you for the rest of the day’s sitting. I have warned you; I have warned you twice. I ask you to leave the chamber.

[The member for Midland left the chamber.]

*Debate Resumed*

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** To go back through the process I have engaged in —

*Point of Order*

**Mr J.N. HYDE:** Under standing order 92, imputations of improper motives or personal reflections on members of the Assembly are disorderly other than by substantive motion. The member opposite stated that the member

**Extract from Hansard**

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 18 September 2012]

p6006f-6020a

Speaker; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Roger Cook; Mrs Liza Harvey; Acting Speaker; Mr John Hyde; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Tony Simpson; Mr Albert Jacob; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Andrea Mitchell

---

for Midland lobbied to abolish the police ministry. That is a blatant untruth. It is an imputation and clearly meets standing order 92.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** There is no point of order.

*Debate Resumed*

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** To go back over it again—I am not sure whether members have been able to keep track of what I have been trying to get across to the Assembly—we followed due process in this cabinet, and due process means developing a policy properly.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Members!

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** It means ensuring that if there are costing implications for other agencies, those costs are built into the policy. It is about ensuring that any regulatory impact is assessed.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Members, could we just have a bit of quiet. If members want to have a conversation, they should take it outside.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** It is about ensuring that any legislative change we bring to this place is workable. I am confident that the legislation I will be introducing into this Parliament next week will ensure that police will have the tools they need to tackle out-of-control parties. If this legislation passes through this Parliament, police will be able to go to an out-of-control party and order people to disperse. If people refuse to disperse, the police will have powers of arrest over those people. Under the current system, the only tool available to police is for them to issue a move-on notice to people who are acting disorderly at these out-of-control parties. Picture 500 people and 70-odd police officers. What are those police officers supposed to do? Are they supposed to stand there with their pads, write out a move-on notice, issue that to people and then arrest them if they breach the move-on notice? This legislation is about ensuring that police have the tools available to arrest people after a verbal order is issued for people to disperse from an out-of-control party.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Members!

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** This is about creating an offence for hosts of out-of-control parties—people who have behaved irresponsibly. However, one of the pitfalls of this legislation could potentially be that we would be capturing other people. Parties are part of our culture, but we do not want the legislation that I will be introducing next week to cover people who are going about their usual business as part of our Australian cultural fabric—who are having a party. It might have a lot of people there and it might be noisy, but it may not be out of control because it may not involve youths rioting in the streets and it may not involve a police response of the magnitude that we witnessed over the last weekend. That is why care needs to be taken to ensure that the legislation would not capture people going about their everyday cultural practices within Australian society. I stand by the fact that I have taken the time to consult people and I have ensured that there is no adverse regulatory impact or regulatory requirement on our police service in the legislation when I introduce it next week. That is called following due process. I would like to record my appreciation of Parliamentary Counsel's cooperation in facilitating the drafting process.

**Ms M.M. Quirk** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member for Girrawheen.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** Drafting legislation, particularly amendments to the Criminal Code, can take an incredibly long time, because there are ramifications and sometimes aspects of amendments will have an impact on other areas of the Criminal Code. We have to be very careful with this legislation. We need to ensure that we anticipate adverse outcomes and impacts as much as we possibly can.

In closing, the Barnett government has reacted to managing out-of-control parties. We have put additional money into training up police dogs. The riot buses are just about ready to go to the next out-of-control parties and they will be able to get large amounts of people away from the site of the antisocial behaviour as quickly as possible. If this legislation goes through, police will be empowered to arrest people if they fail to comply with an order to disperse. The legislation will come to the house next week. I think that the drafting process has been done in a very timely manner and I appreciate the efforts of Parliamentary Counsel in —

**Mr J.N. Hyde** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member for Perth.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** Legislation is before cabinet. I expect to bring it to the house next week. I hope members of the opposition will support the legislation when it comes before the house next week.

**Ms M.M. QUIRK** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member for Girrawheen.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** I will provide a full and frank briefing to members opposite, and indeed any other member who is interested in ensuring that the solution to out-of-control parties is being tackled by the Parliament.

**DR J.M. WOOLLARD (Alfred Cove)** [3.47 pm]: I will not support a condemnation motion, but I think this house should look at why we have these out-of-control parties and why we have violence in the suburbs. One of the reasons we have the out-of-control parties and violence in the suburbs is that minors are able to purchase alcohol at liquor outlets. We know that for several years now the police have been trying to persuade the government—I do not know whether it was this government and the previous government—to bring in legislation that has provisions for controlled purchasing operations by the police so they can go into the liquor stores with minors to see which liquor outlets sell alcohol to minors, because it is not all liquor outlets. Again, with these out-of-control parties, we also know that minors are going to parties and are being provided with alcohol, possibly by their friends who are minors who have purchased the alcohol or by the parents of the child who is holding the party.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member for Mindarie!

**Dr J.M. WOOLLARD:** Minors are being given alcohol without their parents' consent. They are going along to parties and parents do not know that when they go along to those parties that alcohol will be there and will be provided to their children, but that is what happens. That is why we get these out-of-control parties, and, sadly, why we sometimes then get violence in the suburbs. In talking to this debate, I ask members on both sides to consider the following. I put a private member's bill on the table last year that would have ensured that no parent provided alcohol to someone else's child without parental consent. That would have stopped some of the problems we have now. Within that private member's bill, there is provision for police to monitor minors going to liquor outlets. Some minors being sold alcohol are obvious minors, 13 and 14 years of age, and look that age. No checking is being done and they are being sold alcohol. Controlled purchase operations have been in existence in Scotland. It was found that one year after that legislation had been introduced, the number of minors sold alcohol reduced from 20 per cent to seven per cent. Legislation relating to the provision of alcohol to minors has been introduced in four other Australian states. Western Australia is the only state that has not legislated. At the moment we are looking at legislation that will bring in a punishment. We all know that prevention is better than cure. When this violence occurs with young people, we should be trying to stop minors being given alcohol.

The Liquor Control Amendment Bill comes off the table next week. The current Leader of the Opposition says there has not been time to deal with the bill, which has been on the table since last September. Next week would be the last week we could debate it. There has been ample time for people to look at it. We could do something now. We could introduce legislation that would stop not only young people getting hurt but also those who are causing harm to other minors and other older people. I ask members of this house to look carefully at the bill before it comes off the table. The three proposed amendments in that bill were supported by the Education and Health Standing Committee. I know the committee members would support those amendments. I hope that other members would look at those amendments as well and see that they relate to prevention. Rather than punishment, it is an opportunity to do something to stop the harm.

**MR A.J. SIMPSON (Darling Range)** [3.52 pm]: The out-of-control party last Saturday night was in Piara Waters, which is in my electorate. It is a very new suburb. It was quite disturbing to hear on radio on Sunday morning what had happened. I thought that a few Collingwood supporters were out of control on Saturday, in their winning excitement! I quickly checked the internet to see what had happened. The green shed on Warton Road is well known as a place where a number of parties have been held over the years. I can see how, with modern-day use of Facebook, Twitter and so forth, parties get out of control very quickly. We need some legislation to fix that. As a government, we have to address that. I also raise a concern about trying to bring in legislation too quickly. If we are to do it, it has to be done properly. I would hate us to bring in legislation that is not well thought through. We need to ensure we get it right.

**Mr R.H. Cook:** You must be pretty slow thinkers!

**Mr A.J. SIMPSON:** Member for Kwinana, we need to get it right. If we look at what happened last Saturday night, we see that at about 8.50 pm, over 300 people converged onto Warton Road all the way down from that green shed up to CY O'Connor Village Pub, which is a very nice tavern in Piara Waters. That whole stretch of road was littered with children—or juveniles, whatever we like to call them—from an out-of-control party. The interesting part is they made so much mess with the bricks. Because it is pretty much a new building site all around there, they picked up anything they could use as missiles. The City of Armadale had to bring in a bobcat to clean up the mess the next day. There was too much to do by hand. An incredible number of people were out

of control, using anything they could as missiles. The amazing thing is that on Monday morning, two calls were made to my office. I spoke with Angela, a young mother who lived nearby. She was concerned about the people coming into her street. Luckily, they did not, but it was very close. She could hear the party very clearly from her place. Everyone in the street was awake looking out at people walking up and down the street. They wanted to make sure there was no more damage to their cars or houses.

I have full confidence in our Minister for Police to bring legislation to this house next week to address those concerns. We need to take one step at a time to make sure we get it right. We also have to do what we can as a government to protect the innocent people of WA. I listened to the Commissioner of Police talk on the radio about police having the power to disperse crowds. Nobody can say that is straightforward—it is a hard issue. We need to find a way to give police power, and protect them as well in the process. The actual tools they need to make this work is something we need to work on carefully. I have full confidence in the minister that we can bring in these laws to do that and give police the resources they need to do that. Piara Waters in my electorate of Darling Range is a new suburb. It has the growing pains of all new suburbs. It is probably one of those things that reflects a little on the growing needs of the Forrestdale area. That part of Piara Waters is zoned “deferred urban”. It is vacant land at the moment but in years to come, urbanisation will take place and it will all be taken up along Warton Road to become more rooftops. It gets pushed further away. The reason Warton Road is isolated is that it is still very much semirural, even though it is zoned deferred urban. There is a very large green shed that everyone drives past and notices. In theory, if 20 people met there, it would be a great place to have a meeting because it is quiet. The music could be turned up and not affect anyone, but that is not the case for 300 people who are out of control.

I am sure the legislation to be introduced next week will go a long way towards fixing these problems and addressing the concerns. We will give police the power to do as they need.

**MR A.P. JACOB (Ocean Reef — Parliamentary Secretary)** [3.56 pm]: I have been sitting here quietly listening to all the opposition’s points. It is the opposition’s motion. A lot of emotive language and a lot of rhetoric has gone on around it. It was interesting how little of their debate even addressed the very motion before us.

**Mr J.N. Hyde:** Because there is no bill!

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** Member, it is the Labor Party’s motion. Members opposite could not even address the motion that was moved. The member whose name is on the motion was not even the member who moved the motion! That is a complete aside. I think we are on fairly firm ground when the opposition does not even address the actual motion it has moved. No facts were presented. There is a very good reason that no facts were presented. This motion condemns the Barnett government for its failure to deal with out-of-control parties and violence in our suburbs. What are the facts on violence in our suburbs? Violent crime is down by 5.3 per cent under this government. Under the Barnett Liberal–National government, since September 2008—four years—violent crime is down by 5.3 per cent and overall crime is down by 9.1 —

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** Do you reckon the streets are safe?

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** That is not what I said, member.

**Mr D.A. Templeman** interjected.

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** No, no, no—I am not letting the member put words in my mouth. Overall crime is down 9.1 per cent and violent crime is down 5.3 per cent. At this moment I have to acknowledge the efforts of the former police minister, the member for Hillarys, as well as the former Attorney General in working to help achieve this ongoing result in crime. I have absolute confidence in the new Attorney General and the new police minister. Opposition members absolutely hate the fact that these statistics are running down. That is why the entire debate, as I said, was around rhetoric and emotive language, and did not address any of the actual facts.

As to the motion before us and the facts of out-of-control parties, I imagine I might well be unique in this house—I welcome any interjections that tell me otherwise—in that some months ago I contacted my local police district to ask if I could spend a Saturday night on patrol with them to see firsthand the issues that our local police deal with on the streets.

**Mr J.N. Hyde:** Everyone has done that, years ago—well done!

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** Member, have you done it recently? Was there an out-of-control party when you were out there, member?

Several members interjected.

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** On that night —

**Extract from Hansard**

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 18 September 2012]

p6006f-6020a

Speaker; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Roger Cook; Mrs Liza Harvey; Acting Speaker; Mr John Hyde; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Tony Simpson; Mr Albert Jacob; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Andrea Mitchell

---

**Mr J.N. Hyde:** First you say there isn't a problem, and now you say you go out and you find this everywhere. Make your mind up!

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** I never said that there was not a problem. I am the first to acknowledge that there is a problem.

**Mr P. Papalia** interjected.

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** No, that is absolutely not what we said.

Mr Deputy Speaker, there is a serious problem, and I am probably alone in this house in having been out and looked at this firsthand; I have been there on the ground. I would like to illustrate two very different parties that I saw that night. The first call-out was what we suspected was an out-of-control party.

**Mr P. Papalia** interjected.

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I will address my comments to you. I have only nine minutes left.

The very first call-out that night was to a party. We showed up. The first party was a demonstration of how responsible management and responsible hosts can absolutely make a difference in these volatile situations. When we arrived at this party, it turned out that gatecrashers had arrived. It was a fifteenth birthday party, and about a dozen or so gatecrashers had read about it on Facebook and tried to force their way in. As this party was for a fifteenth birthday, both parents were out the front with a few of their friends. Not only that, they had personally issued tickets to every invitee to make sure that only invitees could come along. This was an absolutely fantastic example of how responsible hosts can turn a situation around. We were the only squad car that was required to go. The police officer made sure that the gatecrashers had access to public transport, which they did, and they carried on their merry way. There were no more problems for neighbours.

The very next party we had to go to was the exact opposite. This very much shows the problem we are facing right now in the suburbs. Within minutes of arriving at this party, I found that it was so out of control that I could not even tell which street that party was emanating from, let alone which house this party was emanating from.

**Mr J.N. Hyde** interjected.

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** I will tell you what, member: I was not getting out of the police car for this one. I was down there in the car, and watching firsthand this party —

**Mr T.R. Buswell:** In the boot!

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** Just about. And again, it was only a fifteenth birthday party.

**Mr D.A. Templeman** interjected.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Mandurah!

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** Whereas the first party required only one police car, which showed up for only five minutes and everything was absolutely fine, this next one tied up around a dozen police cars, at least twice as many officers, all of whom were effectively playing babysitter for high school juveniles who were completely out of control on alcohol and drugs and who knows what else. It was absolutely shocking to see firsthand. It was spread out all over the streets. It was out of control.

In speaking on the record today, I want say that the forbearance and patience of those police officers was amazing. Seeing the way these kids would mouth off at them, threaten them and throw things at them, I found that the police were impeccably professional; they are an absolute credit.

Interestingly, while we were at this incident—as I said, there were about a dozen police cars and more than two dozen police officers on the ground—there was another very serious incident. Without going into too much detail, somebody had taken a child and threatened to do something with the child and himself. It came over the police radio that this was occurring only two kilometres down the road. Rather than being able to have police resources to go and search for this person before something happened, all the police resources were tied up on those parties. This is the front-line of this problem. It is not only the fact of the annoyance, the antisocial element of it; it is the amount of police resources that it consumes. The bill for this night, if it were to be quantified and put back on the party hosts, would surely number in the tens of thousands of dollars. Even the police chopper had to be called out at a cost of about \$1 500 an hour.

On 12 August, the Liberal–National government and the Premier announced a strategy that we will take forward to tackle this problem. I stress that this strategy was announced only on 12 August—only a month ago—yet already in this place we are debating this motion right now. The Premier promised a number of points at that time. He said that we would double the number of police dogs, which is a highly effective way to disperse crowds. This will take them from nine to 18 dogs.

**Mr J.N. Hyde:** Four years! You've had four years.

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** Member, I started my speech with what our four years have already reaped. This is what we are doing now to address this problem right in front of us.

That will be done at a cost of \$1.2 million. We will grant police new powers to enter private property when they receive complaints specifically about out-of-control social gatherings. We will also place—I think this is very important—the responsibility of out-of-control parties onto irresponsible hosts. I illustrated earlier the difference between how a party can go when there is a responsible host and how a party can go when there is an irresponsible host.

**Mr P. Papalia:** Have you seen the legislation?

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** This is the strategy, member. We are debating the strategy here. The legislation will be coming in very, very shortly. This strategy was announced only a month ago.

The final two points are that we will convert two 14-seat buses into riot buses to act as mobile police stations for charging and locking up out-of-control partygoers. These buses will act as high-capacity on-site lockups. Having been out there on that night, I saw the police at the party pick up a couple of younger people, but they only had capacity for one in the back of each vehicle. No doubt if they tried to put in more, they would just feed off each other, which again would tie up resources. These buses will be especially effective in addressing this problem. They will also be used to detain juveniles who attend out-of-control parties until their parents or guardians can collect them. It is putting the onus, the responsibility, back on not only the party hosts but also, in the case of individuals, the parents or guardians who I am sure in many cases do not know what their children are up to. I would hate to think that any parent was advocating that sort of behaviour from their children, but these children are their responsibility and we are putting that back on them.

This may not end up being the silver bullet solution that will forever remove this problem from our community. In law and order I do not think we will ever end up with those. Challenges will always come. But this will go a long way to address the problem. It will also increasingly reduce the occurrence of these incidents over time.

This government's track record already stands in the hard facts and figures of crime in the state. It has all been trending progressively down. It has all been going in a positive direction. We are the first to acknowledge that there is still a lot of work to be done. This is the very next step in tackling that.

From the outset of our government, despite the successes that we have seen in law and order, the opposition have made a point of frustrating virtually every law and order measure that this government has brought into this place. I do not yet know whether the opposition will support these measures. The opposition may not have the legislation yet, but it most certainly has the strategy.

**Mr R.H. Cook:** Which one, member? Can you name the legislation?

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** I just went through the strategy, member, and I do not yet know whether the opposition will support these measures. What I know is that opposition members are yet to articulate any alternative strategy of their own to tackle the problem. Indeed, the police minister read out excerpts of a recent interview.

**Mr P. Papalia** interjected.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Warnbro!

**Mr A.P. JACOB:** Member for Warnbro, that does not even bear responding to.

I suspect that in the end, the opposition will reluctantly support these measures, much as it did with mandatory sentencing. As with mandatory sentencing, I believe that these commonsense approaches will see the number of incidents reduce over time, much as crime in this state has reduced overall. Mandatory sentencing, by way of example, has made a very big difference in assaults on police officers.

**MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan)** [4.07 pm]: What we have heard in this place today is probably the worst defence of the government record and a government minister I have heard. At no time did the government tell us why it has delayed this legislation. We just heard from the member for Ocean Reef that this legislation, which we understand will be brought in next week, will prevent things such as those that happened on the weekend. We can say that if the government acted more quickly and as it promised, last weekend's events would not have occurred. This government has deliberately dragged its feet. It made the announcement in March and again and again and again. The real picture is that this government is more interested in producing leaflets and spin than bringing legislation into the Parliament. We know that is the case because we saw the pamphlet from the member for Southern River. It is all about what the government is going to do to crack down on out-of-control parties. It talks about legislation that has not yet been introduced.

**Extract from Hansard**

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 18 September 2012]

p6006f-6020a

Speaker; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Roger Cook; Mrs Liza Harvey; Acting Speaker; Mr John Hyde; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Tony Simpson; Mr Albert Jacob; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Andrea Mitchell

---

This government has been beating its chest for years, pretending to be tough on law and order, but all it does is produce leaflets and spin. It does not address the emerging issues in our community. We have seen suburban streets now become weekend battlefields. Under this government, we have seen suburban police stations close down and we have seen drug labs occur on every street corner. What does this government do?

Several members interjected.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** What do government members do? They come in, beat their chests and say, “We’re tough on law and order”, without actually focusing on policing in the suburbs. This government is closing down police stations in the suburbs. It has ignored emerging issues. We all knew this was a problem, yet the government dragged its feet. The minister stood and said, “We’re going through a cabinet process; that’s why it is taking a while.” Of course, we expect it to be costed. Of course, we expect key stakeholders to be consulted. That is what governments do. This should have been done much earlier in this government’s term. It has been four years and this is an emerging issue that makes people feel unsafe in their homes. The government has done nothing. What government members have done is produce leaflets, so there are leaflets to combat what is happening on our streets. That is all we have.

Honestly, the defence was absolutely incredible. We heard about the member for Ocean Reef’s night embedded in the police force.

Several members interjected.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** For an hour! He was embedded in the police force, reporting live on CNN what was happening in the streets of the northern suburbs. This is not story time about what I did on my holidays; this is a serious issue about crime, particularly out-of-control parties, which this government has left unattended. I say “unattended” because government members are out there producing pamphlets stating, “Labor has got to support it”. Bring it in! If everyone knows what is in the legislation, why is it not in the chamber today? If it is so important, the government should call an emergency cabinet meeting tomorrow morning, get it through cabinet and bring it in tomorrow. Why are you laughing? This incident happened on Saturday night. Innocent people —

Several members interjected.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Ocean Reef!

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Innocent people had serious injuries, and you are sitting there laughing, and you cannot be stuffed bringing in legislation tomorrow? The government cannot think about calling a cabinet meeting tomorrow?

**Mr P. Papalia:** What happens this weekend?

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** So what happens this weekend? Come on, this is a serious issue. As we said, it is a government that is more focused on spin and propaganda.

**MS A.R. MITCHELL (Kingsley)** [4.12 pm]: I wish to speak against this motion because unfortunately in one of my suburbs there have been two out-of-control parties. It is very, very unfortunate because the first party was actually set up perfectly by the people hosting. They did everything right. They notified the police and did everything right, yet this poor family experienced a horrific situation—one that no-one else should have to deal with—in which there was personal injury, damage to property and emotional distress, because people arrived uninvited. Word had got out and they had examined how it could possibly occur. I want this legislation to be very thorough, very organised, very precise and effective. I do not want a rushed job; I want this done very, very well. I have spoken to this family and heard what they have gone through, and I have heard what the school that these children are involved with has gone through.

Question put and a division taken with the following result —

Ayes (23)

Ms L.L. Baker  
Dr A.D. Buti  
Ms A.S. Carles  
Mr R.H. Cook  
Ms J.M. Freeman  
Mr J.N. Hyde

Mr W.J. Johnston  
Mr J.C. Kobelke  
Mr F.M. Logan  
Mrs C.A. Martin  
Mr M. McGowan  
Mr M.P. Murray

Mr P. Papalia  
Mr J.R. Quigley  
Ms M.M. Quirk  
Ms R. Saffioti  
Mr T.G. Stephens  
Mr C.J. Tallentire

Mr P.C. Tinley  
Mr A.J. Waddell  
Mr P.B. Watson  
Mr B.S. Wyatt  
Mr D.A. Templeman (*Teller*)

**Extract from *Hansard***

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 18 September 2012]

p6006f-6020a

Speaker; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Roger Cook; Mrs Liza Harvey; Acting Speaker; Mr John Hyde; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Tony Simpson; Mr Albert Jacob; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Andrea Mitchell

---

Noes (27)

Mr P. Abetz  
Mr F.A. Alban  
Mr I.C. Blayney  
Mr I.M. Britza  
Mr T.R. Buswell  
Mr G.M. Castrilli  
Mr V.A. Catania

Dr E. Constable  
Mr J.H.D. Day  
Mr B.J. Grylls  
Dr K.D. Hames  
Mrs L.M. Harvey  
Mr A.P. Jacob  
Dr G.G. Jacobs

Mr R.F. Johnson  
Mr A. Krsticevic  
Mr W.R. Marmion  
Mr J.E. McGrath  
Mr P.T. Miles  
Ms A.R. Mitchell  
Dr M.D. Nahan

Mr C.C. Porter  
Mr D.T. Redman  
Mr M.W. Sutherland  
Mr T.K. Waldron  
Dr J.M. Woollard  
Mr A.J. Simpson (*Teller*)

---

Pairs

Mrs M.H. Roberts  
Mr A.P. O’Gorman  
Mr E.S. Ripper  
Mr M.P. Whitely

Mr C.J. Barnett  
Mr M.J. Cowper  
Mr J.M. Francis  
Mr J.J.M. Bowler

Question thus negatived.