

LIQUOR CONTROL AMENDMENT BILL 2010

Second Reading

Resumed from 12 October.

MR R.H. COOK (Kwinana — Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [12.14 pm]: I rise to make a contribution to this debate because the Liquor Control Amendment Bill 2010 is an important bill that impacts upon many areas of our community. Last night, before we were so rudely interrupted by the passage of time, the member for Alfred Cove was commenting on the public health aspects of this bill. I thought the member's contribution and the attitude towards the member's comments were perhaps reminiscent of debate of a time past when tobacco legislation would have been discussed; that is, a member of Parliament would have got up and warned the house of the health impacts and the need to restrict and regulate to protect people from harm and promote a healthier society. I think some of the attitudes of the other members of the chamber last night were also perhaps reminiscent of the attitudes that would have also been reflected towards a member making similar comments about smoking in time past; that is, to be treated with a certain amount of scorn —

Dr J.M. Woollard: Is the member not worried about the harm of alcohol?

Mr R.H. COOK: In the past, members would have treated the member's comments with a certain amount of scorn, derision and disrespect.

Dr J.M. Woollard: Is the member not concerned about the number of lives that are damaged because of alcohol or the families whose lives are destroyed because of their loved ones' drinking?

Mr R.H. COOK: I am trying to say that the speech made by the member for Alfred Cove last night, in large part, would have been misinterpreted, misunderstood and disrespectfully treated. I have spent the first minute of my speech supporting the member. I thank the member for her interjection. Perhaps I will not waste the next 19 minutes of my speech supporting the member and I will move on to the actual speech itself!

The member for Alfred Cove raised some very important issues. The member talked about the unique place that alcohol occupies in our society. Alcohol is a drug like any other that afflicts our community: it is recreated around; it is abused; and, as the member for Nollamara pointed out last night, it is used at a huge cost to our society both in terms of health and social impacts. But unlike other drugs, alcohol is legalised in our community. Alcohol is surrounded by this notion that it is somehow safe. Perhaps that is because of its qualities: alcohol is out of the system very quickly and offers a short form of sensation; therefore, alcohol is socialised throughout our community. Indeed, simply by virtue of the industry and the government regulations built up around it, it is institutionalised in our community. In large part, these are a lot of the issues that the government is currently struggling to deal with.

As the shadow Minister for Racing and Gaming would have pointed out in his speech, we on this side of the house are supporting this legislation, albeit with some reservations. I think the member for Nollamara summed up some of those reservations rather nicely when she said that this measure is a reaction. This bill provides the government with some short-term and high-publicity ways of reacting to the issues that confront our community.

A lot of these issues concern the fact that the social norms relating to alcohol that we thought we enjoyed are now challenged. The social norms are challenged by a new generation of younger people who increasingly abuse alcohol, and, in doing so, are changing the culture in which people participate in this drug. The other new generation is medical scientists. Through the application of years of research, we are now much more acquainted with the harmful impacts of alcohol. In fact, the impact of alcohol on our community can be quantified by not only medical scientists, but also social scientists and economists. Economists can quantify the economic impact of alcohol on our community. The Australian Hotels Association rightly points out that our entertainment and tourism industries, which employ a lot of people, are built up around alcohol. But also let us not forget the social and economic costs associated with alcohol in those industries. Until now, public policy participants were fairly unaware of these costs to the extent that they could not be quantified. Therefore, an evidence-based policy approach could not be made. We are now being confronted by that evidence and we are duty bound to respond to it.

I also said that what we now have is an institutionalised view on alcohol in our community. Because of that we are struggling in our capacity—particularly industry's capacity—to respond to the impact and the changing culture of alcohol in our community. For instance, we have large beer barns that are capable of churning out huge volumes of alcohol to a younger population that is now taking advantage of that volume, creating situations of physical harm, harm to health, and violence. We have a duty to respond to that. I think some of the changes that the member for Rockingham made when he was a minister in the previous government by creating small bar licences were about an institutional response to try to create a new culture about the way we drink.

A couple of years ago I had the opportunity to be in Melbourne with a colleague. I had an evening free and he was conducting some research into the business opportunities that might exist for small bar licences in Sydney on behalf of a business partner and he was in Melbourne to explore small bars. I was taken on a rather delightful tour of some of the small bars in Melbourne; I do not remember the second part of the tour very much, but the first part of the tour was extremely entertaining. Some small bars in Melbourne market themselves, by and large, on the basis that they do not advertise and people cannot get to them. I found myself walking down dark alleys and climbing over and between garbage bins to walk up several flights of stairs to find a bar hidden in the back corner of a warehouse in which there might have been between 100 and 200 people who knew about this bar. They were sort of entertaining themselves on the basis of they had found it and that it is wonderful that it is an exclusive bar. But I have to be honest and say that I did not see much cultural change about the way alcohol was being consumed in these bars; those people were going just as hard and long as anyone else was.

Mr T.K. Waldron: Member, where was the bar?

Mr R.H. COOK: This was in some of the small bars in Melbourne.

What we actually saw was very small groups of people who were determined to consume as much volume as they could have if they had been at their local pub; I am not necessarily convinced that we are changing the culture of drinking by virtue of the small bar licences. People tell me that they can see a change, and I hope that is the case. I have to be honest with members and say that I saw some pretty determined drinkers when I was taken on this tour of small bars in Melbourne.

Ms J.M. Freeman: Were you one of them?

Dr G.G. Jacobs: Yes; as long as you weren't one of them!

Mr R.H. COOK: Determined drinkers? I have to be honest with members: I had a spare evening and I had an all expenses-paid tour of small bars in Melbourne. I think it is fair to say that I was less informed about the impact of alcohol then than I am now!

Dr G.G. Jacobs: You are not sending a good message.

Mr R.H. COOK: I have matured since then.

Dr G.G. Jacobs: How long ago was that? Was that last week?

Mr R.H. COOK: No, it was a bit before now. Even though my mind might be willing, my body is certainly not when it comes to the impact of these sorts of things.

Our institutions are struggling to respond to the changing culture. I am disturbed about, I think, the attitude in our community that somehow drinking alcohol, particularly drinking alcohol to excess, is a right that people should be able to engage in. This is, in some part, similar to the debate in the Aboriginal community; a lot of people have heard about it in the past 12 months, but it has been going on for a good deal longer than that. The debate is about whether people should have the right to get themselves maggoted and be, therefore, responsible for the flow-on impact of that on their families, the cost to the community, and certainly the cost to community safety. When people enter into that debate and start challenging these norms and attitudes, as, indeed, the member for Alfred Cove did last night, they find an extraordinary amount of resistance. It is the same resistance that Healthway, for instance, is confronting as it tries to reconfigure its sponsorship of youth sport around healthier messages; that is, it does not want the Healthway message to sit alongside junk food and alcohol messages. I can understand why it does not want to see its brand polluted or diluted in that way, but it is being confronted by a huge amount of push back from some of the groups that it sponsors, on the one hand because of, obviously, the impact on the revenue streams that those community groups might receive. On the other hand, Healthway is also finding a good deal of aggression in the community when people challenge this culture of access to alcohol. I suspect the member for Alfred Cove experienced a bit of that last night.

I have been informed on this by the experiences of the women of Fitzroy Crossing, particularly June Oscar and Emily Forster who are key leaders of—I have never been able to pronounce this word; other people do it much better than me—the Maminwarrtikura Womens Resource Centre. I simply struggle with the words so that when it is spelt correctly in *Hansard*, it makes it look like I am articulate. I have never been able to say it. I did some work with June and Emily on a pro bono basis when I was working in public relations, and at that time they were going around not only their own community but also the halls of Parliament and government advocating for a partial ban or restriction on the sale of alcohol in Fitzroy Crossing. They met with the sort of resistance that the member for Alfred Cove experienced last night as well as violent and physical resistance to what they were advocating from not only members of the business community who were benefiting from the sales of alcohol in Fitzroy Crossing, but also people in Fitzroy Crossing who simply wanted to continue the pattern of behaviour of consumption of alcohol that Emily and June were actually threatening. This stuff is really difficult.

If we go about making laws that impose borders or boundaries on the patterns of behaviour of consumption, there will be a good deal of push back. The government is experiencing some of that push back from stakeholders associated with the alcohol industry. June and Emily experienced that push back, and we are now seeing a bit of it in the context of this debate. But it is important that we continue to promote healthier lifestyles and different consumption behaviour. Not only is it important to reduce the impact of alcohol on our kids, but also, as public policy advocates, we have a responsibility to the economy, the social fabric of our community and the health of our community to make sure that we respond to the evidence that is now being put before us.

I want to draw upon two contributions to last night's debate on the Liquor Control Amendment Bill 2010 because I think they are very important. The member for Nollamara talked about the role of education in this, which is the nub of the difficulty we have with this legislation. This legislation is about a reactive response and making punitive, ad hoc decisions about the sale of alcohol. I do not think that is the approach that we should be taking as a community in how we respond to this issue.

This legislation may be one of the responses, but it is one that we should be using sparingly. It is maybe one of the tools that the minister should be using and for that reason we are supporting the legislation, but there are other ways that we can go about tackling this issue. We have to do this with the same zeal, with the same vigour and with the same commitment to a change of culture that we had in the 1970s and 1980s with the change of culture in tobacco consumption; we have to now look at alcohol consumption. The member for Alfred Cove pointed to three very important aspects to alcohol consumption—they were access, affordability and advertising. Access is a crucial component in the way people get hold of alcohol. As I said, the small bar licences was one of the ways in which we sought to curtail that access. This legislation is another way, but we must continuously respond to how we go about regulating access to alcohol. Last night the member for Nollamara raised some really important issues about the way alcohol is marketed to our young people and their corresponding behaviours that result from alcohol consumption.

[Member's time extended.]

Mr R.H. COOK: It is important that we look at pricing regimes that do not promote the consumption of low-end alcohol when dealing with the issue of affordability. Last night the member for Nollamara painted a picture of some of the activities that take place around some of the bottle shops in Mirrabooka, in which members of the community are buying low-priced alcohol such as casked Fruity Lexia—perhaps we are all responsible for abusing that particular pricing regime at some point in our younger days! These pricing regimes promote the consumption of alcohol in an unhealthy manner. Another way that we can look at the regulation of alcohol pricing is through taxing regimes that encourage the consumption of drinks lower in alcohol content and appropriately tax drinks higher in alcohol content, in order to make sure that we curtail their consumption and resulting alcohol abuse.

Advertising is an incredibly important component of this issue. We have had this debate on tobacco; we now need to have it on alcohol. It was said that tobacco advertising did not actually promote the increase of tobacco consumption. We knew back then that that was a lie; we know now that that particular argument about alcohol advertising is also a lie. The advocates of advertising say that it is simply about promoting a brand within the existing market, but we know that alcohol advertising is targeted at young people. It is targeted at entry-level consumers to make sure that the alcohol companies capture a larger portion of the market; it is not about pinching people away from other brands. As a community we have to start getting serious about this. While we have our cricketers—icons of young sporting enthusiasts in Australia—emblazoned with alcohol advertising, we cannot, as a community, say that we are serious about addressing alcohol abuse. Alcohol abuse is a significant problem and we have to start getting serious about it.

The way in which the member for Alfred Cove expressed some of her points last night perhaps created a rather radical, indeed may I say extreme, perspective on the public health issues associated with this debate. However, I think she was trying to make some points that I do agree with; that is, that we have a responsibility to get serious about the public health aspects of alcohol. We have to get over this cultural hump that somehow alcohol, and indeed the abuse of alcohol, is all right in our community. It is not; alcohol is a drug. It is a legalised drug and we have to get serious about the way we deal with it. It has been put to me in some quarters that the impact of alcohol as a drug on our community is more harmful than some of the drugs that are not legal. That is a debate for another day, but while alcohol is in our community and while it plays a prominent role in our social lives—all of our social lives, we are all associated with this—we have a responsibility, and the government has a responsibility, to make sure that the laws and policies dealing with alcohol do not continue to provide opportunity for its abuse to go unaddressed.

This particular piece of legislation, as we say, is a reactive piece of legislation. It will provide the minister with some good media grabs around Christmas when he inevitably gets up and has a few bars around Northbridge

closed early. It is unfortunate that to that extent, he considers those duties in the area of alcohol regulation therefore discharged, because that passes up the opportunity that we have. With the growing awareness of the negative impacts of alcohol we should, as a Parliament, be providing the government with the opportunity to create some proactive strategies for alcohol regulation.

Mr T.K. Waldron: Member for Kwinana, you are making a good speech, and I am listening to it. The media, though, in all sincerity, is not what this legislation is about. I am not doing this for the media; this is far more important than any media. It is fair enough to make the point, but I want to let you know that it is not right.

Mr R.H. COOK: I appreciate the minister's interjection. However, I am disturbed that closing nightclubs between 5.00 am and 6.00 am, for example, is somehow seen as being part of the anti-violence campaign in Northbridge. We know, from the evidence presented before us, that between 5.00 am and 6.00 am violent incidents, or the police interventions that are required to deal with them, are next to nothing compared with the level of violent incidents that occur between 11.00 pm and 3.00 am. However, the response to the debate about violence in Northbridge unfairly targeted those nightclubs that were trading between 5.00 am and 6.00 am, in which, I believe, only 2.4 per cent of incidents requiring police intervention actually took place. For some reason, the related piece of legislation, the policy response, let the pubs off scot-free, whereas it unnecessarily and unfairly targeted nightclubs, which were clearly not the problem. That is a reactive response; a proactive response is to address the question of education about alcohol. A proactive response is to put in place a long-term policy dealing with access to alcohol, to address the taxing regimes for alcohol to make sure that we do not have these distortions in behaviours stemming from alcohol consumption, and to make sure that we regulate the way alcohol is advertised so that we can change some of the attitudes of young people and inform them about the impact of alcohol. For a moment last night, the minister and the member for Nollamara were engaged in an exercise of miscommunication, in which I think the minister was trying to say that our sporting clubs, particularly junior sporting clubs, play an important role in changing some of those attitudes and using their leverage around the issue of alcohol as a way to get that message of change out there. I think that that is absolutely correct.

I was at the launch of the Junior Speedway Racing Association of WA last week. The Junior Speedway Racing Association is a fantastic association made up of some incredibly dedicated revhead parents whose children charge around the motorplex speedway in converted Daihatsu Charades. In doing so, they actively engage their kids in life skills about questions of health and attitudes to drugs. These kids are also obviously being significantly skilled up in the area of driving. They also teach them how to properly thank their sponsors and how to accept a trophy. They tell them what to say and how to speak. That is a great example of how sporting clubs can play an important role. It is for that reason that Healthway has an important role to play in making sure that we use sporting clubs to change attitudes towards issues such as obesity and alcohol. I acknowledge the frustration of some sporting clubs in their discussions with Healthway. I would like to think that they are in the early stage of discussions and that they are redefining relationships. These things often create conflict. I wish all parties the best in their efforts to produce the best possible outcome for our kids and to determine how we can best support junior sport.

I conclude by saying, as the member for Collie–Preston has already indicated, that the opposition supports the Liquor Control Amendment Bill 2010. However, we have some reservations about the nature of its detail. I believe the member for Collie–Preston will refer to those concerns during the consideration in detail stage. I implore the government to take note of the comments made by the member for Nollamara and the content of the member for Alfred Cove's speech without endorsing her advocacy and the passion with which she made her comments last night. This is an important debate and one with which we will be confronted evermore to make sure that we continue to respond to the issue of alcohol abuse in our community.

MR B.S. WYATT (Victoria Park) [12.43 pm]: I rise to make a short contribution to the Liquor Control Amendment Bill 2010. I thank my colleagues on this side of the house for the excellent speeches they made on this bill. I had the pleasure of listening to the speeches made by the member for Nollamara, the member for Gosnells and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. Apparently the member for Alfred Cove made a good speech. Unfortunately, I missed it.

Mr D.A. Templeman: I thought my speech was quite outstanding!

Mr B.S. WYATT: I have no doubt that the member for Mandurah's speech was up to its usual standards.

All members of Parliament, through their role as a member of Parliament or in their personal lives, have somehow been impacted by alcohol abuse. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition outlined the long-term impacts of alcohol abuse in the Fitzroy Valley, the strong response from the community and the support it received from the government. He outlined what impact communities can have when they seek to take control of the issue of liquor abuse in their communities. I have an inner-city electorate that has some big pubs and some small wine bars. Regularly when those pubs close, some patrons who have imbibed to excess cause problems when they

spill out into neighbouring residential streets. The police at Kensington Police Station are often kept busy on Friday and Saturday nights. It is important to note, however, how much things have changed over the past 10 to 15 years. I am not saying that we have solved all the issues relating to alcohol abuse. However, having spoken to students at university and to students at schools in my electorate, it seems that younger Western Australians are more aware of the implications and health consequences of alcohol abuse. During my time at university, toga parties were huge events at the University of Western Australia. Without a shadow of a doubt, no thought was given to responsible service, responsible drinking or the consequences of binge drinking at those toga parties. I can confess to that because attending those parties by my side was the Attorney General—it was bipartisan abuse back in those days! The parties that were once officially sanctioned by clubs and universities no longer take place. I am not saying that they do not occur; rather, universities do not sanction drinking festivals.

It is important to note—the members for Nollamara and Gosnells outlined this well in their speeches last night—that we have missed an opportunity. The debate on this bill has become broader than the objectives of the bill. Parliament must be given an opportunity to have a broader discussion about these issues. In the minister's second reading speech he outlined what the legislation will do. He also stated —

The bill also contains a number of law and order amendments that are aimed at minimising the incidences of antisocial behaviour in and around licensed premises.

That is good. The opposition supports this bill. However, in my experience creating barriers and boundaries to limit access to licensed premises and liquor will not necessarily result in reduced alcohol consumption or a change in behaviour because people will find other ways to get hold of liquor. If we want to create cultural and behavioural change, particularly in young men and women below the age of 30—they tend to binge more than those aged over 30—education is the way to go. As I said, the drinking culture in Western Australia has come a long way in the past 10 or 15 years. As the Deputy Leader of the Opposition outlined, determined or binge drinking still takes place across Australia. I doubt whether we will change that behaviour entirely. However, we must make sure that people are aware of the consequences. As I said at the beginning of my presentation, having spoken with students at schools in my electorate and with university students, it appears that young people today are much more aware of the consequences of binge drinking than they were when I attended university.

This week is Mental Health Week. The issue of co-morbidity—the abuse of alcohol combined with mental illness—creates all sorts of problems for some of the more prominent homeless people in the electorate of Victoria Park. It is a complicated issue that requires a sophisticated response. Recently I held a successful community function that was modelled on the City of Perth's Homeless Connect. It focused very much on Victoria Park. My electorate has a large number of homeless people because it is an inner-city electorate. Bentley Hospital and a number of support agencies that deal with people who suffer from mental illness are situated in Victoria Park. Homeless Connect was a wonderful community initiative that was hugely successful. About 200 homeless people are now being advocated for and supported on the way through. I can almost guarantee that the underlying reason that many people in my electorate are homeless is because of a substance abuse problem combined with mental illness. Homelessness is a simple title given to a very complicated issue. Providing a home for a homeless person will not necessarily solve his or her problem. There are layers and layers of issues to deal with before a homeless person can live in a home and go through the normal process of paying bills et cetera, which we all take for granted. Homeless Connect was a huge success. I reflect on that briefly—I know that I am wandering from the bill—in light of the fact that we are in the middle of Mental Health Week, which has been a very busy week. This week we have acknowledged the stigma that is attached to those who suffer from mental health problems and we have celebrated those in our society who do all that they can to help people not only recover from mental illness but also assist their return to a normal way of life that includes employment. That often takes a long time. I am aware of the fact that my predecessor in the electorate of Victoria Park, Geoff Gallop, retired as Premier of Western Australia and from Parliament due to a mental illness. Since their retirement from state politics, both Geoff Gallop and Jeff Kennett have helped to create an environment in Australia in which the stigma associated with mental health has reduced. People are more willing to discuss and acknowledge mental health issues. We all go to the gym and work out, but mental health now is something that we acknowledge much more strongly, which goes a long way to reducing the stigma attached to people suffering from mental health problems.

On Monday, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and shadow Minister for Health and I toured the facilities of Bentley Mental Health Services. I believe any member who has had the opportunity to tour those facilities would acknowledge that the premises there are in many regards dated. However, one thing I want to say is that the staff at Bentley Mental Health Services are extraordinary. In my four and a half years as the member for Victoria Park, they have been wonderfully supportive to me and have provided me with a great education in mental health issues, which to be perfectly frank I thought I knew a bit about until I became the local MP. However, I acknowledge that my knowledge has certainly expanded largely thanks to the experts and parents of patients at Bentley Mental Health Services.

Yesterday, the Minister for Mental Health and I also had the pleasure of celebrating those people and organisations in WA—11 different groups—who do so very much to remove the stigma attached to mental health and who also help those people who suffer from a mental illness. It was a wonderful breakfast, I am sure the minister would agree. It was really quite humbling for a member of Parliament to sit down, have breakfast and speak with people about what they do on a day-to-day basis in a very hard, complicated area. It really was quite extraordinary.

This morning, I also visited an organisation in my electorate called PD Leading Enterprises. I do not know whether the Minister for Mental Health is aware of PD Leading Enterprises in Burswood; if not, I will have to get him out there. It is run by Jacquie Bellerby. Jacquie perhaps should be retired by now, but she said to me that she is very much committed to what she does. I will read one paragraph from the brochure of PD Leading Enterprises. It states —

We are a not-for-profit business established to provide training and employment opportunities to people with psychiatric disabilities.

That is what Jacquie and her volunteers do from small premises in Burswood. They get people suffering from a psychiatric illness back into employment, back into the disciplines of work and back into leading a normal life. The awards and certificates that I presented this morning were to those businesses that give work to PD Leading Enterprises to enable them to bring people suffering from a psychiatric illness back into work, which aids significantly in their recovery process.

There is something I did not know until this morning. As we shop in Coles, Woolworths or IGA—wherever we shop—and we go to the herbs and spices aisle, we see Whittingtons herbs and spices. Whittingtons send all its herbs and spices to be weighed, packaged, jarred, lidded and sealed by people suffering from minor to quite significant psychiatric illnesses—basically along the whole scale. I say to both the Minister for Health and the Minister for Mental Health that I will put in a plug for Whittingtons, simply because both Michael Braybrook and Ernie Battimiello are very local in what they do. They buy their mustard seeds locally when they are preparing their mustards. Apparently they buy their mustard seeds—my National Party colleagues will be pleased to know—from, among other places, Moora and Grass Patch. Although I would never attempt to put in a plug for a member of the other house, apparently they buy some of their mustard seeds from none other than Hon Philip Gardiner, who would no doubt know these two gentlemen very well. Whittingtons then turns those mustard seeds into mustard and sends them—not just mustard but also all sorts of different herbs and spices—to PD Leading Enterprises to be packaged and ready for sale. What we are seeing therefore at PD Leading Enterprises is a wonderful, small non-government organisation assisting people suffering from significant mental health problems to reintegrate back into society and into our community in a way that we can all be proud of.

I therefore want to make the point that, while we discuss this issue of liquor control, as pointed out in contributions from members on both sides of the chamber, this is a broader issue. We are talking about attempts to use police and penalties to try to effect cultural change. It certainly seems to me that when it comes to liquor abuse, those attempts have not worked. People find ways around them. As the member for Alfred Cove said, the issues are access, affordability and advertising. People will always find a way around barriers put in place for accessing liquor. What we need to do perhaps, if we are to be serious about this issue, is look at the advertising end and the education end, and perhaps have a more substantive debate on this issue in the future.

As the contributors on this side of the house have pointed out, the opposition will be supporting this legislation. I put on the record that I, like every member of Parliament, received an email yesterday from the Australian Hotels Association, which has some concerns about this legislation. I will endeavour to meet with the AHA. However, as I pointed out, the opposition—apart from the concerns raised by members on this side of the house—will be supporting this legislation. It is, however, really important to acknowledge that mental health issues and alcohol abuse are often linked. During Mental Health Week, this week, I take this opportunity to acknowledge the activities happening not only in my electorate, but also across Western Australia to address one of the nation's most debilitating problems.

MR P.B. WATSON (Albany) [12.56 pm]: I too support the Liquor Control Amendment Bill 2010, although I have some reservations on some clauses. I believe we are starting the wrong way around by looking at the end result with lockouts at hotels and all these sorts of things. We are not looking at the issue at the start that gets people there in the first place. I know that by the time most young people in my electorate of Albany go to the pub or the nightclub, they are well and truly tanked up because they cannot afford to pay the prices at the nightclub or the hotel. They will therefore get someone either in their age group or a little older to go to a bottle shop and get some drinks, and they will sit around and have a social evening. I remember in my younger days that I went out about nine o'clock in the evening and came home about one o'clock in the morning. Most young people these days do not go out until 11 o'clock in the evening. They have their social drink at home and then go out. I think the major thing that happens when they do go out is that drinks are too expensive, but drugs are

cheaper. They find that there is ready access to drugs at hotels. I think the main problem is that they do not really want to drink any more, so then they are getting onto drugs.

I am a little concerned about one of the options in this legislation—that is, the lockout provision. I have spoken to the owners of our local nightclub and visited it on Friday and Saturday evenings. The owners are a little concerned about the lockout provision because they say it will result in more people out on the street and more pressure on the bouncers at the front of the nightclub. For example, if a smoker goes outside for a smoke and his girlfriend or mates are still inside, he will want to go back because his mates are there or he has left his wallet; and, all of a sudden, there will be an incident on the street that would not have occurred before. It will cause friction. It will result in more people on the street than there are now. While people are in the nightclub, they would not cause as much damage as they would if they were out on the street. I think we would find that a lot of guys and girls go there for the music—maybe for the drugs. However, I do not think that much alcohol is actually consumed in nightclubs because of the cost and because of the environment of having to push their way through the crowd to the bar. That is therefore one thing that concerns me about the bill and it concerns the nightclub owner in Albany. I happened to be sitting on the plane with him the other evening when he came to Perth.

Alcopops are a huge problem. Young people used to go out and get mixed cans on a Saturday evening or when they were going to a party or events like that. They probably bought half a dozen cans or four cans, whatever they could afford. Now alcopops are so expensive that they go out and buy a whole bottle of alcohol and Coke and everything like that, and they will drink it because it is there and it is cool to drink it. That is another issue. I know that issue is probably not an issue with this bill, but it is part of the overall problem that I am concerned about. It is great that licensees can bar people from nightclubs and hotels. There are recidivist offenders in Albany. Local pubs display photographs because, especially in rural communities, licensees know who they are. They put their photographs on display and those people are banned. I think it is great that licensees now have legislation behind them.

We in regional areas have the issue of people bringing alcohol into sporting arenas, as the minister would know. During footy grand finals there is an alcohol area, but people park cars back-to-front, put the seats up and have an esky hidden underneath the seats, so they are in a position where they are not controlled. I think the fact that they will not be allowed to take alcohol to those venues in future will make it much better for all families. We want to encourage people in regional areas to go to sporting events.

On the question of sly grogging, the Education and Health Standing Committee was recently in the north of the state. The police there said that when they go into communities, especially those such as Fitzroy Crossing, they will stop a car and then be told by the occupants that they have six or 10 cartons of beer but they have a wedding coming up or something like that. The police do not actually have powers to deal with that situation now. They can take the alcohol off those people, but then that decision can be appealed and the people get the alcohol back. There is no legislation on sly grogging that stops people doing anything at the moment, because the police cannot prove that they are doing it for sly grogging. I know that in Fitzroy Crossing and Derby the police get very frustrated. They can stop a car with alcohol in it, but people are getting smart now. They will get half a dozen credit cards and have one for each carton, even if they are not buying it, and say that one is for one person, one for another and so on. That is another issue, especially in regional areas.

I am a bit open on the question of winding back nightclub hours. The longer we can keep people in nightclubs, the less damage they will do on the streets. I can remember the Minister for Racing and Gaming during the last quarter of the footy when I had to drag him off. He was always very, very tired. I think that the longer people stay in nightclubs, maybe the less they will drink and maybe they will sober up a bit before they go home.

We talk about the culture of drinking. The other night the minister and I went to the apprentice jockeys awards. What was on the tables? There was alcohol, wine and things like that. We need to get to a position where we do not say that it is acceptable to have alcohol every time we have a function or want to celebrate. For example, I can remember Collingwood Football Club winning the AFL Grand Final and the guys there with champagne. It is the same with Formula One racing, where the winners use champagne and drink it after the event. We cannot expect young kids and young people to not follow those leads. When people have a barbecue at home guests are told not to forget to bring the beer. The kids see this. We have to educate people. I do not know what the answer is. Apparently to be an Australian people have to drink beer. I remember in my younger days when I played junior footy, I did not drink beer in the under-18s side, and so I was not accepted and did not get a game. It was because I did not drink with everyone else. We have to educate kids from a younger age. We must get into preschools and everything like that to show what alcohol can do to people. We should not say that it is the in thing to have alcohol, and to not do so is not the Australian way. We must show that alcohol can cause damage to people. I think that the way we are going whereby we are putting in these nanny-state rules means that we are

starting at the wrong end; we should start at the other end. However, I applaud the minister for the legislation he is putting through the Parliament. It is commonsense.

One other aspect is that 16 to 17-year-old juveniles will be able to serve alcohol on licensed premises. That really concerns me.

Mr T.K. Waldron: Do you want me just to explain to you? That is when they have gone through a training course.

Mr P.B. WATSON: What I am saying is that now an adult must do it. We will find unscrupulous people in the industry who will just put kids in that environment to save money. That is the thing that worries me. There will be cheap labour in an environment where there is alcohol. For me that is a real concern.

Mr T.K. Waldron: This is to try to support those kids who have trained in the hospitality industry. Some of them finish their training before they are 18 and, therefore, they are qualified but they cannot work. They have already been doing the training. This is to allow them to work under supervision until they are 18, which I think is commonsense.

Mr P.B. WATSON: Could there not be something in the legislation to say that if they are trained —

Mr T.K. Waldron: It is not a matter of just going and grabbing anyone to do it.

Mr P.B. WATSON: That is what is going to happen; they are going to grab anyone.

Mr T.K. Waldron: They cannot.

Mr P.B. WATSON: It is stipulated that they have to have been on a training course.

Mr T.K. Waldron: I will go through the detail later on.

Mr P.B. WATSON: I thank the minister for that. I support the bill. As I have said, I have some reservations. I think we should be educating people more. I know it is not the minister's role but I think that as the Parliament and as Western Australians we should be doing more to look after our youth. I fully support the bill.

MRS L.M. HARVEY (Scarborough) [1.05 pm]: I have a short contribution to make. I support the Liquor Control Amendment Bill. I wish particularly to highlight a couple of aspects of the bill. I am really interested in, and very supportive of, the opportunity that we create with this legislation in allowing people to declare their house to be an alcohol-restricted area. I know that this initiative has been highly successful in the Northern Territory in giving people, particularly in some of the remote communities, control over their environment and giving them back control over the safety of their children, their household and, indeed, in the case of some women, their own personal safety. They can take control by prohibiting alcohol on their premises. I commend the minister for taking that into consideration and making it part of this legislation. I think that we will see a strong uptake of this provision of the legislation. I think that we will see a very significant impact in some of the communities that I am sure will be very pleased to have this particular control given back to them.

Another aspect of the legislation that I am very pleased to support is to do with making the managers' licences portable. During my time as chair of the Red Tape Reduction Group, we consulted extensively with the liquor industry. Many of the people who participate in the industry acknowledge the need for regulation in that industry and they acknowledge that they are in a very politically sensitive environment and that they are dealing with people who do not necessarily take responsibility for their actions. Although I do not agree with the transfer of patrons' personal responsibility onto licensees, I am pleased to see that we are working with business to try to ease some of the regulation that has been imposed on them previously. Prior to this legislation the approval process for approved managers took sometimes eight to 12 months. I believe there was an \$80 application fee involved in that process. Having to renew these licences on a yearly basis is really an unnecessary use of the time of the Department of Racing, Gaming and Liquor. Making the managers' licences portable between premises and also extending the period of the validity of those licences to five years will bring some considerable cost savings to business. Our estimation, from our consultation with business, was that the minimum we can expect to see as a saving is in the region of about \$450 000 a year, just by making those licences portable and extending the validity of the licences.

I commend the minister for picking up some of the recommendations of that report and for this good piece of legislation. I am happy to support it.

MR T.K. WALDRON (Wagin — Minister for Racing and Gaming) [1.08 pm] — in reply: First, I thank everyone for their contribution to this debate. For me as a minister it has been a really great debate. I think it has generally been very positive and some great matters have been raised. I have certainly learnt a lot from the debate and gained a lot from it about what people are thinking. I want also to say that I think it is important that a lot of members recognised some of the issues around alcohol-fuelled violence et cetera. Also, the need for

education came through very strongly. For me that was very encouraging, because we obviously want to work on all those things.

In looking at the Liquor Control Amendment Bill, its amendments and what we are trying to do, we want to provide an enjoyable, safe and protected environment for the general public and licensees, and even to also provide protection for some of the minor offenders who make mistakes. That might sound a bit strange, but I will say more about that a bit later.

One issue has come through to me about this debate, which I think the member for Mandurah referred to last night. While I have sat here listening, I think 16 members have spoken, and they all covered similar issues but at different levels. We all have different opinions on the issue of alcohol and how far we should go with regulation, with advertising and in allowing people access to alcohol et cetera. There are a range of opinions in this place, and within each party there are those who think this bill should go further and those who think it may go too far. It is an interesting subject. I agreed with the member for Mandurah last night because I think finding a balance is the big challenge for whoever is in government at any time when we are dealing with alcohol. It is certainly a challenge for our government and for me as minister. With this bill we are trying to find a reasonable balance to address some of the issues. As time has gone on, suggestions have been made about what we should be doing. I have taken those suggestions on board and they are all covered in these amendments. Obviously, down the track this bill will need further amendments, as has been its history.

I have been listening to the arguments during the debate and I have been speaking with industry and members of Parliament, particularly the member for Collie–Preston, about some of the clauses in the bill. That is why we have some amendments on the notice paper. In trying to find that balance, quite sensible issues have been raised and we are seeking to make some changes to try to strike that balance. I am not saying they are all dead right, but the very genuine effort here is to try to strike a balance to deliver better and safer environments for people, particularly when they are out socially.

It is also clear that members have considered the bill well, done research and met with other people about it et cetera. They have raised a range of issues, many of which we will deal with in consideration in detail. With 16 members speaking on this bill, 1 000 issues have been raised, many of which are similar. I will try to provide a general overview, and as we go through consideration in detail we might be able to pick up on some of the specific areas. I will say again that members' comments have certainly assisted me. I want to thank the member for Collie–Preston again for the amendments he has on the notice paper. We have agreed that some of our amendments will cover his amendment and he has one other amendment that I know has been drafted in very good faith. We will talk about that during consideration in detail. A number of points have been highlighted and I would like to go through some of the amendments we are proposing, and I think they will cover a lot of the questions members have asked.

We have looked at barring notices for probably the past 18 months. After further consideration and consultation, once again, with the Australian Hotels Association, other groups and the member for Collie–Preston, we have made some amendments that will alleviate some of the concerns that were raised. We will discuss them further during consideration in detail. One amendment is to reduce the appeal period to apply to barring notices that are issued for one month or more, rather than three months, as the bill currently stipulates. I will talk more about barring notices. The period in which there is no right of appeal will be reduced from three months to one month.

Access to the website on which details of barring notices will be published will be restricted to police, the licensing authority and the licensee. There will be no public access. An offence provision will be included in relation to improperly divulging any information regarding a barring notice. The offence provisions will be amended to provide for an exemption where a person is required to enter licensed premises for the purpose of their employment. A staff member of a licensed premises or an ambulance officer et cetera will be exempt from being barred so that they can carry out their duties.

One of the other things raised—I think rightly so—is that the term “quarrelsome” be removed from the barring notice provisions as a ground upon which a barring notice may be issued. The grounds for the issue of a barring notice will then be violent or disorderly, engaged in indecent behaviour or contravening a provision of any written law. Obviously, anyone who breaks a law can be subject to a barring notice.

Quite a bit of comment has been made during the debate and in previous discussions regarding the implication for licensees in the enforcement of barring notices, and I think that is fairly critical. The wording of the offence provision contained in proposed section 115AE requires that the licensee must have actual knowledge that a person has been issued with a barring notice. The publication of details on the website does not give rise to constructive or imputed knowledge on behalf of a licensee of all barred persons. That is, actual knowledge is required as opposed to constructive or imputed knowledge.

I want to make it clear in this reply, and I am happy to place it on the record, that the government's intention in relation to the offence provision is to target only a licensee who deliberately flouts a barring notice; that is, the

licensee knows that a person is barred and that the barred person is on the licensed premises, and he does nothing to seek to remove the person or to have the person removed. This raises another very valid issue—particularly, from my experience in the country, when a young girl might be left behind a bar by herself—and that is the safety of licensees and bar workers in trying to enforce this law. In this regard I am happy to make a statement here also for the record. A responsible person who becomes aware that a barred person is on the licensed premises but does not feel safe in attempting to remove that person should contact the police and enter the details of the offence in the incident register. Under no circumstances is a responsible person expected to attempt to remove a barred person when the person feels it is not safe to do so. It is not the government's intention to establish liability for an offence in these circumstances. If a responsible person is on the premises by himself and is unable to contact the police, he should just write it in the incident register so that it is recorded. If the person does not feel safe, there is no need to do anything about the barred person; that person will not be transgressing.

I will not address every issue raised by the members who spoke. The member for Collie–Preston is not here at the moment, but if he comes back into the chamber I might make a couple of comments. The member for Rockingham, very humorously, raised the possibility of mistaken identity in relation to publishing photographs of barred persons. It was a fair point and I enjoyed the humour, as well as the member for Mandurah's comments, although he did say it did not really relate to the bill. I acknowledge the member for Rockingham because as a previous minister with these responsibilities, I think he did some really good things. A lot has been mentioned about small bars. I give him great credit for their implementation because he was under pressure about them. I expressed some concerns in the Parliament during that debate. We opposed them at the time, but we were wrong. In my speech that night, being a country member, I said that I was concerned at the time about the effect small bars could have on our small country hotels. I probably did not do enough homework at the time to understand what the establishment of small bars really meant. I said in my speech that I would be happy to be proved wrong if they worked out as the then minister said they would, and they did. I give the member for Rockingham credit for that. A lot of people have commented on the establishment of small bars and how they could change the culture of drinking. I think they are playing a role in that and that we will see more of them. The member for Kwinana said he did not much agree with that. I guess in any small bar on a given night a group could go overboard a bit. I think, generally, people go to small bars to have a quiet drink and a chat. I think that is good. Well done, member, I congratulate him on that.

Mr M. McGowan: My recollection is that you said that if you were proved wrong you would resign.

Mr T.K. WALDRON: No; do not worry. I would never say that; I like this place too much!

Members opposite raised the issue of mistaken identity, and I will make a couple of points on that aspect. The legislation will only require a photograph of a barred person to be published if one is available, and, generally, a photograph of a barred person will only be available if the person has been arrested and charged with an offence. This could happen. I will talk generally about barring notices now, and come back to the photograph of the barred person. As I said at the start, sometimes we will want to stop young people—or old people for that matter—who might make a mistake one night and go a bit too far and get into trouble, and the next day they will feel guilty and wish they had never done it et cetera. The barring notice is there to give these people time to think about what they have done. They can be barred from particular premises or a range of premises. Hopefully, that will send them a warning so they do not get to the stage where they will be criminally charged or do something like glassing. This is an idea that will assist not only publicans, so they will not have these troublemakers continually coming in, but also young people who might make a one-off mistake. There is no criminal record attached. It will give them time to go and sit on the bench, like a footballer. I have used the example of Barry Hall. We have sometimes seen Barry Hall about to lose it; he gets dragged off for a while, cools down and then maybe later he comes back on and that might save him from a major suspension. It is a similar idea here. It is envisaged that in most cases police will use the barring notice as an alternative to arrest and charging, or in a case where the behaviour might not be bad enough to warrant arrest. In these cases, the photograph will not be available, and therefore will not be published. More often than not, there will not be a photograph.

The aim of this legislation is threefold, and I have probably covered this: it targets the small number of troublemakers rather than impacting on the enjoyment of the majority of people who are there to enjoy themselves; secondly, it provides an increased degree of safety and protection for the general community. As I said, I also think this protection is afforded to the licensee, the bar staff and, in many cases, the offenders themselves; and members opposite raised that point. I think that publishing a photo is a very small risk, and that small risk is greatly outweighed by the overall benefits to the community. In many cases, the publicans will know these barred people. In some cases, they will not; and, if they do not, then they do not.

I want to comment on liquor-restricted premises, which did not receive a lot of focus during the debate, although the member for Scarborough touched on it. I also acknowledge the member for North West, who was keen, and who came to me about this last year. I had been to Alice Springs to see how it worked there, and I was keen on it. The member for North West helped drive this, which I acknowledge, and I also acknowledge the member for

Scarborough, who also raised some really good points on this. This is aimed at helping people in their own homes who are experiencing people coming to their homes—maybe family members or others—and causing alcohol-fuelled disruption, violence and even sexual abuse et cetera. This will give the owner of the building or the lessee of the building the ability to apply to the Director of Liquor Licensing to have their building declared a restricted premises. There are a lot of checks and balances here, but I will not go into the detail now as that can be raised during consideration in detail. It is a strong move. When we talked about active, proactive or reactive, members opposite could say this is reactive but I see it as being quite proactive.

I want to clarify a couple of points on the issue of lockouts, and there will probably be more talk about them later. Currently a lockout can be imposed only by the Director of Liquor Licensing. The process is very cumbersome and is more aligned to dealing with individual premises rather than multiple premises. There have been problems with this, and the director has recommended that authority be included in the Liquor Control Act to allow a lockout to be established by regulation as a matter of government policy. This gives us a head of power. The government has accepted the director's recommendation, and a provision is included in the bill that will allow a lockout to be established by regulation. This is a head of power only. There is a lot of speculation and there are campaigns—I have seen what is going on—but no decisions have been made about any lockouts that might be implemented under this provision. There is some confusion because in some applications for extended trading permits and liquor licences, the Liquor Commission has instigated some 12 o'clock lockouts. That is separate from this. This is about giving us the head of power to regulate. We have not made any decisions, but it does give us that power. We are using the opportunity of this bill to include that. I think it makes sense. It is a possible tool for government to consider as it deals with alcohol-fuelled antisocial behaviour.

I talked about fairness and balance, and at the end of the day that is what we are trying to achieve here. I have tried to approach this with that balance and fairness, but with the antisocial alcohol-fuelled behaviour and some of the things that we see, if decisions must be made down the track, then this government, and I as minister, will make decisions. I think the government has a responsibility, for the safety of those in our community, to make those decisions, obviously in a properly informed way.

A lot of media reports have suggested that the government will introduce midnight lockouts. I am happy to place on the record here today that the government has no such plans, and I have no intention to seek midnight lockouts through this provision. I might add that I am not necessarily convinced about the merits of lockouts in hotels and taverns, but it can be one of the tools in a range of initiatives to prevent alcohol-fuelled antisocial behaviour. I would not move in that direction unless there was some very clear evidence, and I want to put that on the record. However, this bill will enable us to do that in the best interests of society, if one likes.

During debate on the bill, members opposite stated that a motion would be moved to amend the bill to read "regulating entry into licensed premises after a time of the day or night specified in the regulations". This is in regard to lockouts. The act previously read "prohibiting entry". The use of the words "regulating entry" will mean some flexibility around people coming out and going back in, and we can go into that in more detail later. That will allow greater flexibility to apply targeted lockouts rather than across the industry broadly and to prescribe conditions that may be applied to lockouts. That amendment will cover some of the issues raised by members opposite, which is fair enough.

I intend to make two changes to the sly grogging licensee offence provision; that change has occurred, once again, through consultation, and I will talk about consultation a bit more before I finish. The test has been changed from "suspected or to have reasonably suspected" to "believe or to have reasonably believed". In addition, a provision has been added so that a licensee can only be charged for an offence if it is believed the liquor will be onsold unlawfully, and the purchaser does in fact unlawfully onsell the liquor. These new provisions establish a very high threshold that needs to be met before a charge can be sustained against the licensee. I thought that generally there were some good points raised, which is why we have gone ahead with that proposition—to try to get that balance.

During the consideration in detail stage, we will talk more about the 5.00 am closing time for nightclub licensees for Friday and Saturday nights. This will bring them back in line with the time restrictions on other nights, which the previous government brought in. I will go through the reasons for that measure.

I want to make a couple more points; one relates to consultation. A lot has been said about consultation, and a bit of a campaign has been mounted about a lack of consultation. I want to make a few points so that people understand what has happened. The basis of this bill was a previous bill introduced into Parliament by the previous government in 2008 and which lapsed when the 2008 election was called. The previous government was going to make changes along similar lines. We have added a few changes, and we can debate which is right and which is not. Since that time, and since I have been the minister, there has been ongoing consultation with industry groups, including a number of face-to-face meetings with industry groups such as the Australian Hotels Association, the WA Nightclub Association and the BIG N group on the principal matters in the bill.

Mr D.A. Templeman: Have you met with Clubs WA as well?

Mr T.K. WALDRON: Yes, I have met with them all, including the WA Liquor Stores Association, on a range of issues. The main issues in this bill have been discussed and some of their comments have resulted in amendments. Since we introduced the Liquor Control Amendment Bill, my office has had lots of meetings with the Australian Hotels Association on this. In fact, a number of the amendments on the notice paper are reflective of this ongoing consultation and our desire to reach a well-balanced outcome through this bill. I think that is an important point to make. People could argue, I guess, that maybe there are a couple of points we could have talked on more, and I am happy to wear that criticism. However, generally, I think we consulted very widely and tried to work very much with those groups. I understand that those groups have their role, and I respect that. I think I have said that on radio et cetera quite a few times. The industry groups have very much helped with the formulation of some of these amendments. They might not agree with them all, but, at the end of the day, it is about doing what is best to try to reach that balance, which I keep coming back to.

I will make a couple of other points before I finish. A lot has been said about advertising and I agree; I think some of the advertising is over the top. Obviously, we can look at what we can do in this place. Advertising is also, of course, very much governed by the federal government, as are taxes et cetera. However, I am happy to look at that issue and I give an undertaking to. Some members made some very good speeches on that issue and I am happy to talk that through with them.

Mr D.A. Templeman: In terms of the ministerial council and the discussions you might have had with ministers of other states and territories, have issues like binge-drinking and the like come up at all in the recent past?

Mr T.K. WALDRON: I guess with racing and gaming it has mainly been focused on the racing. Actually, it is interesting that the member should mention that because at the AFL grand final recently, I spoke at some length to the sports minister in Victoria, James Merlino—I think he might have moved on to another role now—about this issue and the role that sport has to play. That is something that I will continue to do. I have a concern about some of the advertising that I see; there is no doubt about that. Once again, I think there will be a balance and that we need to work with the federal government on it. I am quite happy to do that and to get input from the members for Nollamara and Southern River and others who have raised the matter and made some good points.

Mr D.A. Templeman: Because, really, the advertising issue is one that needs a national approach.

Mr T.K. WALDRON: Yes, that is what I was trying to say. It needs a national approach. There are some things that we can do and we will look at some of those things for sure.

On the issue of sport, as the member for Kwinana said, I am also the Minister for Sport and Recreation and I played a lot of sport. I had a drink of alcohol, I was back there playing footy and cricket in the 1970s when —

Ms J.M. Freeman: Did you smoke when you played sport?

Mr T.K. WALDRON: No, I did not, but I used to have the odd social smoke, but I gave up. That social smoke started to develop, and I gave it away before it developed further.

Ms J.M. Freeman: My father played football; he was a league footballer. At half-time they used to go off and have a cigarette.

Mr T.K. WALDRON: In the 1970s there were still people who did that. I never did that but —

Mr P.B. Watson: It stunted your growth, didn't it?

Mr T.K. WALDRON: I think the great thing about this debate is that members who spoke on the bill approached it really well—I give credit to those speakers—and I think it highlighted the range of opinions. As I said, we all have different opinions of where we should go and I am trying to strike a balance. I think we miss a great opportunity through the sporting network. There is a big argument about alcohol and sport, I understand that, and points were made about the Grand Final, which I also understand. However, I think that we have to also realise that—I have made a couple of speeches on this and I have been very public on this—the sporting network and maybe other clubs, social clubs, theatrical clubs et cetera are a great mechanism.

Everyone talked about education. If we really want to educate people, there are the schools, the positive programs on TV, and all those things I agree with. The Minister for Mental Health handed me some stuff about what we are doing proactively with education. A lot of stuff is being done with the Alcohol Think Again campaign, the responsible service of alcohol—heaps of things—and a lot of money is being spent. I kept hearing that point about education and I take that on board. There is a great opportunity, a huge opportunity, to utilise our sporting networks to deliver the message because they do deliver it. I will not talk about juniors at this moment because I do not think there is any place for sponsorship in junior sport, but in senior sport I think there is a role to play to actually use those clubs to change the culture and deliver the message. I see it happening to a small extent now through the responsible service of alcohol that has made our pubs more aware. I have heard

Extract from *Hansard*

[ASSEMBLY - Wednesday, 13 October 2010]

p7617c-7629a

Mr Roger Cook; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Peter Watson; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Terry Waldron

presidents get up at social functions after a football match or a netball carnival or whatever and say, “Drink responsibly and make sure you get a skipper home.”

I remember when I first started managing country football, one of the things said to me was, “We can’t attract any sponsorship and we can’t do any of these things because we’re just country football.” I sat and looked at it and there was our network of hundreds of football clubs, seniors and juniors, from Wyndham to Esperance to Eucla to Norseman to everywhere, and we were not utilising it. We got on board with the road safety campaign Belt Up message and it has had a huge effect. People can argue about the final statistics et cetera but I know that it works. I know that it made young people think about putting their seatbelts on. I am sure—I have no doubt—that because of that campaign using those clubs, there are young people who are still here today who would not have otherwise been here. I think that we can be proactive. Being reactive and proactive in this legislation was a point that members raised with me. There probably are some reactive elements in this bill but I also think that this legislation has proactive elements. I think that we can be even more proactive by utilising those clubs in a very responsible way because I do fear that if we go completely the other way and throw the baby out with the bathwater—I think the member for Maylands used that term—we could defeat the very goal that we are trying to achieve. The issues the member for Alfred Cove’s committee is looking at and where it wants to get to, as I said when I appeared before the committee—it is all in the transcript if people want to read it—is where I want to get to, but I just see a different way of getting there. I guess that comes from my personal experience of living in the country and in the city during my life and being close to the sporting industry; I see the opportunity. I just wanted to mention that, as well.

I do not think that I will say very much more because there is so much detail. Some great points were raised. I have taken 20-odd pages of notes of issues that members have raised. I knew that I could not go through and answer all the questions asked by each member; otherwise, we would be here for hours and hours. However, I will take these matters up with members; some of it will come out in consideration in detail, but if it does not, I am happy to talk about them with members, such as the member for Gosnells who I thought made an excellent speech.

I thank everyone for their input. This is really aimed at trying to make things better so that people can enjoy going out, whether they do or do not drink, and we have tried to reach the balance that many members have talked about. I thank members for their overall support. I understand that there are concerns in different areas and I take those concerns on board. As we move forward from this bill, we will obviously be back at some time to deal with this legislation as we continually try to strive in what is the very hard area of the management of alcohol.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Leave denied to proceed forthwith to third reading.