EVIDENCE AMENDMENT BILL 2015

Second Reading

Resumed from 14 September.

MR J.R. QUIGLEY (Butler) [3.34 pm]: I have got these back-to-back and I wonder whether the chamber could be patient with me for a moment. I have the amending bill here, thank you, manager of opposition business. I want to go to section 106 of the Evidence Act as it stands. This bill comes before the chamber because the judges, in their judicial wisdom and examining it with their keen forensic eyes, have detected a shortcoming in the Evidence Act related to vulnerable witnesses. Unsurprisingly, the Minister for Police's second reading speech is a replication of the Attorney General's second reading speech in the other place. I will turn to section 106HA. That was what I was seeking the chamber's indulgence to do. Section 106HA is titled "Visual recording of interviews with children and persons with mental impairment". There is the disjunctive "with children 'and' persons with mental impairment"; not limited to children with mental impairment. Paragraph (a) states —

> the interview was conducted by a person of a prescribed class who had reason to believe that the child, or another child, had, or may have, suffered physical or sexual abuse; and

Video-recorded evidence of a child's complaint can be led into evidence as the evidence-in-chief. As the Minister for Police and the Attorney General pointed out, a District Court judge said that when a child is being called to give evidence—not in relation to a circumstance of physical or sexual abuse against that child but is being called as a witness to an assault upon an adult—the child's interview could not be led in-chief. This provision was only applicable when a complainant was also a child. Even though we are dealing with a person of very tender years in a sexual assault case, the child had to give evidence-in-chief because the complainant was not a child. It is incredible that despite the consideration that is given to bills in this Parliament, from time to time they are found wanting by the judiciary, who look at a specific case and a specific circumstance; that is, the adult complainant and the vulnerable child witness. That was never contemplated by this Parliament but it has been identified by the judiciary as a shortcoming in the Evidence Act—not that the judge said it was a shortcoming. Even though defence counsel had consented to the recorded interview going in as the child's evidence-in-chief, the judge said that is not admissible under the Evidence Act because the complainant is not a child. The Labor Party supports this legislation in that regard. This was not raised in that case; that is, when a person with a mental disability has given a recorded interview with a witness to the alleged offence who was also mentally impaired, it would not be admissible at trial. That is, if the witness was mentally impaired as well as the complainant victim, the mentally impaired witness's evidence would not be admissible, because that witness was not the complainant. This has obviously come to the government's attention in considering generally the former proposition and the appropriate amendments to section 106HA. For those reasons, we support this measure as well.

I have given the whole area of vulnerable witnesses some thought, and I think that our regime for protected witnesses in Western Australia is superior to that found in the uniform Evidence Act that applies in other jurisdictions. That act has been adopted by most jurisdictions, but not by Western Australia. One thing that the Western Australian Evidence Act has in better form is the provision relating to protected witnesses, and this amending bill further extends and improves that.

One area is not covered by this amendment. This section came into operation as a result of the Criminal Law Amendment (Sexual Assault and Other Matters) Bill 2004, which set out the situation for protected witnesses by amending section 106HA of the Evidence Act. The deficiency is in the area of domestic violence, which this legislation and these amendments do not cover. It is so often tragically the case that, in circumstances of domestic violence, a child will be a witness to that violence. This amendment does not cover domestic violence cases. Mothers are usually the victims in these cases, although I note that there was a recent murder case before the Supreme Court—I do not know whether it has concluded; I think it has—in which a man was murdered and left in the boot of a car, and I believe that that murder was occasioned or organised by the mother of a girl who was in a relationship with the victim, so it could be said that it was a murder arising out of domestic violence. However, that is a rare case in which the man is the victim of the domestic violence.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: Member, will you take an interjection? My understanding is that if the child is a witness to an act of violence, regardless of whether it is an act of domestic violence or any other incident, they are covered by this legislation with respect to the recording of their interviews.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: I think it should also be extended, in cases of domestic violence, to the victim as well; that is, the adult woman. I have personal experience as a solicitor in advising women who have been victims of domestic violence who are very worried about going to court and being examined in open court by either the

husband in person—which I do not think should be allowed—the perpetrator, or the perpetrator's counsel. That is another case, but I point that out as an area that I see is of grave concern to the community.

Dr A.D. Buti: We had that as part of our bill.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: We did.

Otherwise, the opposition offers its full-voiced support for these amendments.

MS L.L. BAKER (Maylands) [3.45 pm]: I rise to make a contribution to the debate on the Evidence Amendment Bill 2015. The aspect I want to pick up on is the issue of trauma-informed practice around vulnerable children at this level. I know that this bill is about improvements to the Evidence Act to allow children who are victims of or witnesses to crime to give video evidence that is admissible in court, which is a very positive change. Well done the judicial system for picking up on this, and the government for making these changes.

I want to talk about childhood trauma, having spent the last nearly four years as Chair of the Joint Standing Committee on the Commissioner for Children and Young People, and having just recently completed a report into the sexual abuse of children and how the commissioner should be responding to that. We came across issues that related to trauma-informed practice, specifically trauma in children. I want to put on the record a brief contribution about the whole system that deals with children—anyone who comes into contact with children who have been victims of abuse. I want to place some of the facts about trauma-informed practice on the record.

Childhood trauma is anything that impacts on a child's life of major and devastating proportion, and changes sometimes not just their psychological behaviour but also the neurological pathways that govern that behaviour. Long-term abuse of a child will result in neurological changes that are very hard to reverse. Trauma-informed practice is, if you like, wrapped up in an understanding that trauma has deep, complex and long-term impacts on children. Childhood trauma exposure has been linked to involvement with the criminal justice system. A large study exploring adverse childhood experiences of serious, chronic and violent juvenile offenders, and juveniles referred to the justice system for single non-violent offences, found that every additional adverse childhood event experienced increases the risk of becoming a serious, chronic and violent offender by more than 35 per cent, even when other known risk factors for violent behaviour are taken into account. That in itself is a salutary place to start.

How, then, should we look at the practices that we are putting in place? What is trauma-informed care, and how does it get rolled out across organisations and people who work with children? I am going to talk specifically in a moment about the George Jones Child Advocacy Centre, which is a shining example of best practice in trauma-informed practice in Western Australia, but I will start by talking about what trauma-informed care is. It could best be described as a framework for delivering services based on knowledge and understanding of how trauma affects a child's life and the kind of service needs that follow. To do that requires consideration of a person's environment beyond the immediate service that is being provided, and how symptoms and presentations may be seen as adaptations to trauma rather than as pathologies in their own right. At the broadest level, trauma-informed care means that services have an awareness and sensitivity to the way in which clients present, and the service needs can be understood in the context of a trauma history. Trauma-informed health and welfare systems and practices, and indeed justice systems—this is a critical point—are radically different from traditional settings and systems. We are required to do a number of things fundamentally differently if we are going to deliver services that recognise and respond to trauma in children in this instance, but in anyone. I will refer to some of the more widely known principles around how to put this together in a service capacity. I quote —

> At the very minimum, trauma-informed services aim to do no further harm through re-traumatising individuals by acknowledging that usual operations may be an inadvertent trigger for exacerbating trauma symptoms.

I will give members the history of the George Jones Child Advocacy Centre and other child advocacy centres around the world because it is relevant to this point. Those centres were born from the United States' 1980 response to criticism of its system—that its system induced trauma on children who had already been harmed. The website of Parkerville Children and Youth Care states —

> In 1982, in Huntsville Alabama, an angry grandmother walked into the chambers of District Attorney Bud Cramer and said "my eight year old granddaughter has been sexually abused and you people are making it worse".
>
> After a lengthy discussion, the grandmother highlighted that, because her granddaughter had to visit so many different professional establishments e.g. hospital, police office, Department for Child Protection,

> mental health and tell her story to so many different professionals, each time she was being re-traumatised.
>
> District Attorney Bud Cramer called for a re-enactment of this young child's journey and concluded that the grandmother was correct in her assessment and a better way of providing services for abused children was needed.

That is where the advocacy centre model came from. There are now more than 900 child advocacy centres across the US and Europe; at the moment the George Jones centre is the only one of its kind in Western Australia. WA Police has the ChildFIRST centre in East Perth, but it is a bit different. The George Jones centre was purpose-built and is an amazing, functional centre; I know the minister is aware of it. The police are now operating from there on a regular basis, which is long overdue and a really positive thing.

The key assumptions about putting together trauma-informed care in an organisation are —

- Realisation at all levels of an organisation or system about trauma and its impacts on individuals, families and communities;
- Recognition of the signs of trauma;
- Response—program, organisation or system responds by applying the principles of a trauma-informed approach; and
- Resist re-traumatisation—of clients as well as staff.

In addition to those assumptions, there are six key principles of a trauma-informed approach that are —

- Safety—Staff and the people they serve feel physically and psychologically safe.
- Trustworthiness and transparency—Organisational operations and decisions are transparent and trust is built.

Trust has to be built into those operations at the very grassroots level. The key principles also include —

- Peer support … for individuals with lived experience of trauma or their caregivers. Peers are also known as "trauma survivors".
- Collaboration and mutuality—This principle is about levelling power differentials between staff and clients and amongst organisational staff to ensure a collaborative approach to healing.
- Empowerment, voice and choice—This principle emphasises the strengths-based nature of trauma-informed care. The organisation—and ideally the whole service delivery system—fosters recovery and healing.
- Cultural, historical and gender issues …

Those need to be recognised.

A trauma-informed approach incorporates all those processes. It moves past cultural stereotypes and biases and incorporates policies and protocols that are responsive to the cultural needs of children.

Trauma-informed practice in this day and age is, I think, the starting point for all the dealings we have with victims of crime, children who are survivors of abuse or even adults who are survivors of abuse. It is very clear to me that in Western Australia, although there have been some genuine attempts to start good trauma-informed practice—I know that in the Department for Child Protection and Family Support, the CEO, Emma White, has a very clear mandate to roll out trauma-informed practice across the DCP—I do not think it is happening fast enough. Whose fault that is, I do not know; I would not like to lay the blame at any bureaucrat. I suspect it is about the resources that can be applied to these kinds of reforms and the rapidity at which they can happen. We saw so much promise from things we read after the Blaxell review into the institutional abuses that happened at Katanning. They have pushed and prodded and insisted in our responses that we are far better at being ready to deal with the various complex factors that impact on children and lead to or allow them to become vulnerable and therefore subject to predators in our community.

I do not want to say a lot more. The point of putting on the record so much in relation to the George Jones Child Advocacy Centre and trauma-informed practice is to, I suppose, highlight the fact that the George Jones centre is best practice. Basil Hanna and his board have done, and continue to do, remarkable things in addressing good child protection and spreading the current, groundbreaking research on how to keep children safe.

While we are talking about the Evidence Amendment Bill 2015 and how the judicial system might record and respond to children and the mentally impaired who are giving evidence, I want to put that into the framework that I mentioned earlier. If this is actually going to work—if it is going to be of benefit and make it easier for the victims involved or for the people who are giving evidence and improve their experience—it can only be done if the whole system adopts a trauma-informed approach in how it takes that evidence. It cannot just be about sitting

in front of a camera and asking questions; it has to be the whole journey through this process. I ask the minister to think about that in the implementation of this bill and the changes the system may need to have in place to make a more trauma-informed system that is much more supportive of a child or mentally impaired person's journey through giving evidence.

DR A.D. BUTI (Armadale) [3.58 pm]: I rise to contribute to the debate on the Evidence Amendment Bill 2015. I echo the sentiments and words of the members for Butler and Maylands. My contribution will be relatively brief; as the member for Butler said, we are supportive of the bill.

Of course, the whole issue of the rules of evidence are very important in the judicial process and are driven by the concern or need to ensure that a trial proceeds on fair grounds, and that the evidence presented can be fully tested. It was interesting that the Australian Law Reform Commission produced a report on the rules of evidence. In regard to children's evidence, it stated —

> 14.57 In general, rules of evidence attempt to ensure that the trial process is fair for the parties. However, these same rules often prevent witnesses from fully explaining their evidence. They often interfere with the ability of the judge and/or jury to hear the words of a child witness and the special context in which they are spoken. Competency rules, judicial warnings regarding children's evidence, rules against hearsay and prohibitions on expert testimony and on tendency and coincidence evidence are significant ways in which children can be effectively silenced as witnesses.

Of course, we never want children to be silenced as witnesses, but one has to ensure that the evidence that is presented is truthful. The motivation behind this bill is to ensure that the visual recording of an investigative interview of children can be admissible. I also note from the second reading speech the issue about evidence provided by those with a mental impairment. In South Australia in recent years there has been an issue about people with a mental impairment making allegations of sexual abuse but judges deciding that they were not competent enough to give evidence so they did not allow the trial to proceed. That is an incredibly unjust situation when people who are vulnerable have made allegations of sexual abuse, but, because of their mental impairment, the trial has not been able to proceed because the competency of their evidence has been tested and questioned.

I will be interested in the minister's response to the issue in regard to domestic violence, which I think the member for Butler noted. As members know, we presented and debated the domestic violence bill in this chamber last week, and the minister refused to agree to that amendment. Let me make it clear what that amendment sought to do. It was a pretty clear and simple amendment that basically sought to ensure that victims of domestic and family violence could be categorised as special witnesses, and by being characterised as special witnesses, provision could have been made for them to give evidence without having to be in the same courtroom, face-to-face, with the alleged perpetrator. I am sure the minister would agree that it was a very sensible and appropriate move that victims of domestic and family violence should not have to give their evidence in the same courtroom as the alleged perpetrator. Why the minister would not agree to that measure is unclear. I look forward to the minister maybe commenting on that in light of the fact that this bill is before the house and the government does recognise that there is a need to have special witness status for certain vulnerable victims, such as children and people with mental impairment. I am sure the minister would agree that victims of domestic violence also should be considered to be in the vulnerable witness class.

Family law proceedings are interesting. The member for Maylands talked about the retraumatising of child witnesses, for instance, who have been victims of abuse. That is also the case for domestic violence victims. In a family law scenario before the Family Court, which often involves two partners, male and female, the female may receive Legal Aid and therefore have a lawyer, but the male may not have Legal Aid and will represent himself. That can be a very traumatising situation, because the man then has the possibility of cross-examining the female in a situation in which there has been domestic violence. There is also the retraumatising strategy of the male being able to write to the lawyer of the female. I am talking about situations in which there has been violence and there are restraining orders et cetera. That can just retraumatise the situation by the constant communication between the male perpetrator and the lawyer representing the female victim. That is made even worse if there is an issue of cross-examination in the witness box by the male perpetrator. The member for Butler mentioned the problems of the male being able to represent himself, but there is nothing prohibiting that. If they do not have the financial capacity to engage a lawyer, that is maybe what will happen.

The bill before us is something that I think should be supported. It implements the recommendations of the Law Reform Commission of Western Australia's 1991 report on vulnerable witnesses and also the Child Sexual Abuse Task Force report of 1987. The fact that the minister has brought this bill before the house just further confuses members on this side of the chamber as to why she did not support the bill that we introduced, which would have given special witness status to victims of domestic violence, who in the main are female.

Ms S.F. McGurk: I do not think there is any confusion. I think we know why the government didn't support it, and that's because it was an opposition bill and it was a private member's bill.

Dr A.D. BUTI: The member for Fremantle is very perceptive; she may be 100 per cent correct. If that is the case, it is even more disappointing. The minister said in her response to that bill that we should not play politics in fighting domestic violence. This side of the chamber has been asking for years for something to be done on domestic violence, but more so of the Attorney General. The minister represents the Attorney General in this chamber at this stage, although I think that might change tomorrow. Tomorrow, under the new ministry, will there be a new person representing the Attorney General in the Assembly?

Mrs L.M. Harvey: No, it'll still be me.

Dr A.D. BUTI: Okay. The minister said we should not play politics on issues. It would have been great if last week the minister had agreed to that issue. She did not criticise it, and I do not see how one could criticise that part of the bill. That bill could have been passed and gone up to the other house to be debated. It is really very disappointing that the minister has brought this bill before the house, which we agree with, but she would not support something that we instigated. It would be great if she had not come in here and said, "Let's not play politics on domestic violence", when the minister clearly did play politics last week. The minister mentioned that the government had introduced a bill in the other place. It may have done so, but the fact was that there was a bill before this house. Even if the minister did not agree with all of it, I challenge her to say that she did not agree with the provision that would have classified victims of domestic and family violence as special witnesses so that they could enjoy the privileges that that position entails, which the minister agrees is necessary for vulnerable witnesses, and that the evidence of vulnerable witnesses should be admitted if they are video-recorded. Child witnesses obviously are vulnerable. People with mental impairment are also vulnerable. I am sure the minister would agree that victims of domestic and family violence often are also vulnerable witnesses. That is all I want to say on that. We look forward to the passage of this bill.

MS M.M. QUIRK (Girrawheen) [4.08 pm]: We have heard that these amendments in the Evidence Amendment Bill 2015 were necessitated by a District Court decision that concerned a charge of sexual assault perpetrated on a young woman. In the course of the hearing, the prosecutor, with the consent of the defence counsel, had attempted to adduce evidence by way of a visually recorded interview of a child witness to the alleged assault as the child's evidence-in-chief. The court, however, looked at the relevant provisions of the Evidence Act and found that the admissibility of that recorded interview was restricted to circumstances where the child was either the complainant or a child witness to an offence alleged to be committed against a child complainant. A similar finding would apply to a mentally impaired complainant or a mentally impaired person who had witnessed an assault upon another mentally impaired person. However, if that mentally impaired person were to witness an assault on someone who is not mentally impaired, the video interview could not be adduced in court.

These kinds of provisions were put into the Evidence Act some years ago when, luckily, the justice system became much more witness-focused. Vulnerable witnesses such as children and people with mental impairments had to go through the rigours of giving evidence; in those days, it used to be a committal, then a hearing in a superior court. It was simply unacceptable that they had to be interviewed by police, then give evidence at committal, then give evidence at trial, all the while being cross-examined. Realising the trauma that this placed on vulnerable witnesses, changes were made to the Evidence Act that permitted, for example, the admissibility of video evidence and, in the case of child sexual abuse, the victim can sometimes be in a different room or be separated by a screen so that he or she does not have to face their perpetrator to give very difficult and sensitive evidence. In the dim, dark past, I was a prosecutor in Canberra. I specialised in child sexual abuse cases because I was the only female prosecutor in the office and they thought that I would be more empathetic with young witnesses. I was involved in the dim, dark days before these sorts of revisions were in legislation such as the Evidence Act. I was on the committee with the Chief Magistrate to introduce laws that were much more sympathetic to victims of crimes such as sexual assault so that they did not have to confront the perpetrator of the assault or offence. The corollary is that if evidence is produced in that format, it will limit the defence's capacity to cross-examine —

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr P. Abetz): Member for Butler, just keep your voice down. The member is finding it a bit distracting.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. Since I always hang on the member's every word, it is very difficult if I can hear him from here.

Because that will limit the defence counsel's capacity to cross-examine a child or another vulnerable person, some care needs to be taken in limiting or restricting the circumstances and the capacity of the defence to put its best foot forward. In those circumstances, that is why there are some limits on when this will occur. However, what appears to have happened and what seems to have been discovered in this District Court case was that the

restrictions were too strict and a loophole was created. The opposition supports this amendment bill and we think it is very, very important that whatever the capacity of a vulnerable witness, they have the potential to produce their evidence by way of a video-recorded interview.

I want to make just a couple of other observations. During the estimates committee in May this year, we expressed some concerns about the delays in the courts that were caused by the Attorney General's failure to appoint another judge and the effect it had on victims. Interestingly, the member for Warnbro, the member for Butler and I were absolutely astonished that the Commissioner for Victims of Crime volunteered, at that estimates hearing, that delays in trials going ahead were a good thing for victims. We were astonished to hear that. We were astonished that someone who was there to advocate on behalf of victims would advance that proposition. Anyone who has any experience in the judicial system—even with provisions such as this, in which a person can give evidence by way of video—knows that the whole process of having to relate what happened, first to police and later to prosecutors, is very, very difficult and traumatising. The member for Maylands outlined some of those issues very well. In the second reading debate of this bill, I have the opportunity to say how concerned I am that the Commissioner for Victims of Crime would say that delays in the judicial process are helpful to victims because, in my experience, it is quite the reverse. It is very difficult, at the best of times, to give evidence as a victim but for children or people with mental or cognitive impairments, it can be bewildering and, in some cases, depending on the extent of the crime, it can be as victimising and traumatic as the offence itself.

That brings me to the last thing I want to say. We have an ageing population and, by next year, I think about 20 per cent of the population will be over 65 years old. That means a proportion of those people will have some form of cognitive impairment by way of dementia. We can therefore anticipate that there may be more people who are witnesses to crimes who have some level of cognitive impairment and who would find the process of giving evidence in court and being subjected to cross-examination particularly traumatic, difficult and confusing. Because of our ageing population, it is good that this bill focuses on people who have mental or cognitive impairments. In that regard and regarding all this evidence, I would expect that directions would be given to the triers of fact—be they a jury or, in the case of a magistrate, that he or she would take notice of it—that because that evidence is not subject to cross-examination, to some extent, the weight that can be put on that evidence will be diminished. However, there will usually be corroborative evidence of one sort or another in those circumstances. Legislation to ensure that victims or those who have the trauma of even witnessing a crime are not put in the confronting, traumatising, perplexing and confusing world of a courtroom, with the hustle and bustle of a battering defence counsel, is certain to be welcomed. We support this bill wholeheartedly.

MRS L.M. HARVEY (Scarborough — Minister for Police) [4.19 pm] — in reply: I thank members for their contribution to the second reading debate on the Evidence Amendment Bill 2015, which amends the Evidence Act. To address some of the issues that members raised, the member for Maylands alluded to the Department for Child Protection and Family Support and the trauma awareness service being made available to victims of child sex abuse as an example. I am advised that the Department for Child Protection and Family Support is aware of that policy. Emma White, the director general of the Department for Child Protection and Family Support, is an outstanding female in the public sector executive. She is certainly advancing new and innovative ways of dealing with family and domestic violence in our community. I note that an 82 per cent increase in resources has been made available to the Department for Child Protection and Family Support over this term of government. We are quite pleased to be funding services for those vulnerable people in our community.

The Commissioner for Victims of Crime, Jennifer Hoffman, is conducting a review of the special witness status area with regard to family and domestic violence victims. Our legislation does not make special witness status compulsory for family violence victims. I acknowledge that the legislation —

Dr A.D. Buti: Ours wasn't compulsory either.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I was not making reference to the opposition's legislation; I was saying that our legislation does not make special witness status compulsory for family violence victims because it is deemed that that is not reasonable. It would have a significant impact on court waiting lists and the judiciary. Indeed, not every victim of family violence seeks that special witness status. Some victims of family violence want an opportunity to be in court and face down the offender. We need to look at these cases in situ and ensure that we are acting in the best interests of victims in all those situations. The Family Court Amendment (Family Violence and Other Measures) Act 2013 contains a number of measures to reduce trauma on victims; indeed, that was the purpose of us bringing that legislation to Parliament.

I turn to special witness status for victims of family violence. There is a range of requirements under section 106R, "Special witnesses, measures to assist", of the Evidence Act 1906 alluding to the ability of the court to declare that any victim of family violence who may be a vulnerable witness and who is giving evidence or going

to give evidence in court—should it be likely that they suffer severe emotional trauma or be intimidated or distressed so as to be unable to give that evidence or give the evidence satisfactorily—has an opportunity to be declared a special witness. Indeed, that occurs in certain circumstances. There is a specific reference to the consideration of the court when it is looking at special victim status for a victim appearing before the court in reference to the relationship to any party in the proceeding, which is specifically around that family and domestic violence relationship, which makes the witness feel increasingly more vulnerable. As I said, the existing legislation already details that special witness status under section 106R.

Once again, I thank members for their contributions to this debate. This is good legislation. The advantages of a visually recorded interview of a child being admissible as evidence-in-chief are well known. We can preserve the child's earliest report of events after disclosure. It can increase the accuracy and the completeness of the child's statement. It can capture the way the child presented at the time. If there is a flow of time between that evidence being recorded and the child recounting as a narrative, sometimes the impact on the child is less visible. It allows the child to feel much more secure and much less stressed as the recording of the evidence can be conducted in a child-friendly environment. It can also reduce the times the child has to retell their story and relive the traumatic experience. The whole purpose of this legislation is to ensure that we can reduce the stress of testifying and remove the need for the examination-in-chief for these very vulnerable witnesses.

I thank members for their cooperation in expediting this legislation through the house. I certainly thank them for their contribution to the debate.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to third reading.

Third Reading

MRS L.M. HARVEY (Scarborough — Minister for Police) [4.23 pm]: I move —

That the bill be now read a third time.

MR J.R. QUIGLEY (Butler) [4.24 pm]: I have nothing to add to my previous comments. The opposition supports this bill.

MRS M.H. ROBERTS (Midland) [4.24 pm]: This is good and long overdue legislation. We are seeking to help expedite its passage through the house.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.