

McGOWAN GOVERNMENT — LAW AND ORDER

Motion

MR P.A. KATSAMBANIS (Hillarys) [4.01 pm]: I move —

That this house condemns the McGowan government for its soft approach to law and order.

In moving this motion, as a member of this community of Western Australia, it brings me no pleasure to make the points I am going to make, because one of the major expectations that all Western Australians have is that they ought to be safe in their homes, their streets, their suburbs and their towns in any part of Western Australia. They have an expectation that their police force will be well resourced and available to them to protect them from crime, and they also have an expectation that the corrections system will also work to detain people who need to be detained so we can protect our community. In that regard, in the last two-and-a-bit years the McGowan government has been found wanting time and again when it comes to protecting the community—when it comes to putting our police force first and giving them the resources they need to fight crime and to keep us safe. As a result, wherever we go across Western Australia, whether the northern suburbs, the eastern suburbs, the southern suburbs or any of the regions of Western Australia, we hear time and again that the public is concerned. The public is concerned about criminality in its community; it is concerned that despite their best efforts police do not have the resources to respond in time to stop criminality or to apprehend criminals after they have committed an offence. It is just not good enough. What we get from this government instead of action, instead of support, instead of the creation of a safer community, is more and more spin—twisting of statistics and selectively briefing stories that supposedly make the government look good. I have pointed out again and again in this chamber that this government is far more interested in making itself look good in the media and the spin cycle than it is in protecting the best interests of Western Australians, and that includes keeping Western Australians safe from harm.

Dr A.D. Buti: You know the 2020 police model was the greatest failure. It was a public relations exercise.

Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS: The member for Armadale will get his opportunity to speak.

Dr A.D. Buti interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Armadale!

Mrs A.K. Hayden interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Darling Range! Goodness, we are three minutes in! Let us all just calm ourselves down. Thank you.

Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS: I understand —

Dr A.D. Buti interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Armadale, you are called!

Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS: I understand that the member for Armadale would get aggrieved by this motion —

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member!

Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS: — that calls out this government for its wrong approach on law and order. I understand that, because he is perhaps one the best qualified people on that side of the house to help in this, but instead he has been condemned to the backbench and others have had to pick up the cudgels, and they are failing. The member for Armadale, the minister in waiting, knows that they are failing, so I welcome the member for Armadale's support for our motion calling on this government to do something rather than talk about doing something, like it does in so many areas.

It is unbelievable that every day we see this government spinning us another story when we know that members of the Western Australian public are concerned about safety in their homes, safety in their streets and safety in their suburbs or their towns right across the state, and we hear it time and again. We see the latest publicity around the release of dangerous sex offenders such as Latimer, MGD and others who are probably in the pipeline ready to be released—I am sure the member for Churchlands will talk about this in his contribution later—and the public is worried because there are not significant police resources to monitor these dangerous criminals. We ought to care that the public is worried and concerned, rather than bring up esoteric debating points, as the minister and the Premier often do, to deflect community concern.

When the Labor Party came to government it made a series of commitments around law and order that the public expected it to keep. By not keeping those promises initially, the government set the scene for the continuing decline of safety in our community. The Labor Party promised that it would support mandatory minimum sentences for meth dealers. That was an election promise made by the now Premier himself. The government brought in legislation to this house without including mandatory minimum sentences for meth dealers, thus breaching its promise. We gave the government opportunities by moving amendments to the legislation and the government did

not support them. It voted against its own election promise, proving right from the outset, right from the early weeks of this new Parliament, that it was not serious about protecting our community from dangerous criminals, especially dangerous criminals such as meth dealers. I will speak more about meth and meth dealers in a moment. The government proved that it was not interested in protecting our community. All the government is interested in is spin. During the election campaign it was convenient for the Labor Party to suggest that it supported mandatory minimum sentencing, because it took the issue away. The Labor Party was not exposed and the public did not really get to understand that the Labor Party was not prepared to be tough on meth dealers who are wreaking havoc in every city, every town and every regional area right across the state. They are wreaking havoc. They are destroying families and they are destroying communities, but the government was not prepared to get tough on them.

If that was not enough, the government then set about destroying the morale of our police force. Again, in its election campaign the Labor Party promised our police officers—our hardworking men and women of the Western Australia Police Force out there putting their lives and health on the line to protect the rest of us—a 1.5 per cent pay increase. That was the Labor Party's promise. It matched the then government's promise of 1.5 per cent. Again, it was part of the spin cycle. The issue went away for a couple of months and then the Labor Party came to government. What did it do? It pulled the offer off the table. The new minister had given a commitment to the WA Police Force in the election campaign but she pulled it off the table. Instead, she offered police officers a measly \$1 000 a year pay increase, not enough to keep up with inflation, hardly enough to pay the \$800-odd a year additional fees and charges imposed on every family across Western Australia, including families of police officers, and particularly regional police officers. The government hiked up the cost of the Government Regional Officers' Housing by \$30 a week so that they ended up, financially, going backwards. A police officer in the regions gets a \$1 000 pay increase, has to pay a \$1 560 year rent increase and \$800 on top in government fees and charges like every other household, so they are going backwards. As a result, month after month, year after year, we see the inability of this government to fill police officer vacancies in every single region outside Perth. Every region outside Perth has fewer police officers than their authorised strength, making it more dangerous for law-abiding citizens and much easier for criminals, but the minister has done absolutely nothing about it. I know there is a review into GRO housing, but she has put a pause on it for a few months. However, there is no indication in the long term that she will recompense police officers in the regions for the additional rent. With a new pay round on at the moment, the minister continues to renege on the 1.5 per cent pay increase promise and she has again offered a measly \$1 000 a year to our police officers.

Is it any wonder their morale is shattered? This is a government that simply does not care about police officers. There are many, many more examples of that. Police officers, through their union, were calling for modern personal-issue stab-proof ballistic vests. Initially, the government refused. Eventually, the government was forced, kicking and screaming, to accept that it was a good idea but police officers are still waiting. That can has been kicked down the road. The minister promised the vests but they have not arrived yet, so our police are exposed. It is dangerous out there. Criminals are getting more and more dangerous— some are on meth; others are radicalised or otherwise fixated—and our police officers are going to work every single day with equipment that is not fit for purpose. This government had to be forced, kicking and screaming, to the line to commit to funding better equipment but it has not come out yet, and we will wait and see when it comes out. We will keep the government to its promise and keep asking questions about where it is because our police deserve to be as protected as possible when they are on the frontline protecting us.

It is the same with body-worn cameras. The minister has again sat on them and sat on them; police want them. Eventually, the government has committed to funding them. Let us see how they go. The police do not have them now. The criminals have them now and we have seen some of the selective video footage highlighted on a number of occasions in the media when criminals have the cameras but our police do not have the capacity to film an incident.

Mrs M.H. Roberts: Yes, they do. There are 600 with them already.

Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS: The minister says there are already 600 with them. That is good but again the minister had to be dragged to that position by continual requests from police officers, the WA Police Union and the opposition doing our job. As a result, police morale has been shattered.

Morale has been further shattered by the lack of numbers. Our police do a wonderful job. They work extraordinarily hard under possibly the most oppressive conditions of any worker in this state. They confront danger on an hourly and daily basis. They go to work expecting to confront danger. Others experience it but these people expect to confront it; yet they front up every single day at great personal expense to their physical and mental health. Has the minister resourced them properly? No. Has she given police additional resources? No. This minister loves saying she has provided 125 extra police. However, at the last round of estimates hearings we interrogated the figures and, guess what? In the last financial year, 2017–18, there were fewer police officers than there had been in the financial year 2016–17. At the end of the financial year, the actual physical number of police had dropped. Crime is going up, the population is going up, albeit slower than before, the needs of our community are going up, criminality is getting more complex, and police are being asked to do more with less, but their numbers are going down. Today, we found

out why. We know that the government offered a voluntary separation package to police officers, amongst other Western Australian government workers. Certain people were encouraged to take a voluntary separation package. I do not necessarily criticise that; it is a management tool that has been used across the board. We would expect there to be attrition of police officers. There is the minister's claim that 125 officers will be recruited as part of an election commitment and about 150 people will be going out on a voluntary separation package. We would therefore expect more recruits to be coming through the system. However, finally, after asking again and again, we get an answer from the minister about the number of police recruits for each of the last three years. From January to December in 2016, under the previous government, there were 289 recruits to add strength to our police force to give them stronger resources to fight crime. In 2017, this government was elected; there was a bit of a go-slow and it stripped \$250 million out of the forward estimates for the police budget—a \$250 million cut to the police budget—instead of recruiting 289 officers as occurred in 2016. In 2017, only 176 officers were recruited to the police force. That is how many graduated from the police academy in 2017. We hope it was a blip and that it was temporary.

This government talks a good line and says it provides more resources. It has brought the budget into surplus; it has a big surplus now with lots of cash flashing around. We would expect that it would prioritise law and order, safety of our community and giving our police force a bit of a cut out by giving it a few extra resources so it is not always stretched to the nth degree whenever they are on the front line.

Mr J.E. McGrath: The thin blue line.

Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS: Instead, the thin blue line, member for South Perth, becomes thinner and thinner. It will eventually fade away if this government continues on the trajectory it is on. We bring these motions to the house in the hope that the government will wake up. This government responds only to the media cycle; it does not respond to anything else. I will talk about that in a minute. I will finish on the police numbers. We would have thought that in 2018, given the government has its feet under the desk, it is no longer a new government and it claims to be committed to law and order, more police would be recruited. No. In 2018 only 159 new police were recruited. It is 27 fewer than the previous year and 140 fewer than recruited in the last full year of the Barnett Liberal government when the Leader of the Opposition was the police minister—almost half the number. Last year, this police minister recruited almost half the number of police that the previous police minister had recruited in 2016. Is it any wonder, whenever we visit any police station across the state, they say they are doing it tough and they would absolutely love more resources. They would love a bit of love from this government that they are not getting. That is the number one complaint we get from the public and from police officers. The public complain about it because they notice the decline in numbers by a lack of police presence on our streets and a lack of police response. This is not because the police do not want to respond, but because the few officers out on the beat are run off their feet responding to crime, so response times are dragging out further and further. As we know, that encourages non-reporting of crime. People eventually say that if they report the crime to the police, the police will either take a long time coming or not come at all, and after a while they lose faith in the system and just stop reporting crime. This makes the minister's figures look good, but it does not make anybody feel safer, and does not help our police or the community. That is exactly what is happening now.

The minister loves to trumpet the fact that she has been really tough on methamphetamine by cracking down on meth dealers and importers, and that the police have done a great job in increasing the number of drug busts. They are doing as much as they can with their limited resources. However, what has been the impact of recent drug busts at the street level? We saw that impact when the latest Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission national wastewater drug monitoring results were revealed a little while ago. It found that Western Australia had the highest average regional methamphetamine consumption and the second highest average capital city consumption nationally. We had fallen off the top of the ladder for meth use, but then returned to the top of the ladder for meth use. We also, sadly, recorded the second highest average capital city consumption of MDMA and cannabis. We are seeing a bit of substitution of drugs. As one drug is taken off the streets, people move to other drugs. I applaud the commissioner and all those hardworking police officers who continue to target the meth dealers and try to get as much meth as they can off the streets. Unfortunately, it is pouring in at unprecedented rates. There are hardly any reports of local manufacturing in the old clandestine labs in the suburbs and the towns, but it is still pouring in, and the evidence is there from the national wastewater drug monitoring program that, despite the big busts, we have hardly made a dent in it. This government proved that it really was not up to the fight when it walked away from mandatory sentencing of meth dealers, as it had committed to do.

The minister likes to say that there have been some changes in the crime statistics. She was out the other day announcing that the rate of burglary was down. I am glad burglary is down. It is a horrible crime. I support police in targeting burglars, and stopping them from bursting into people's properties, particularly their homes—they burst into commercial premises as well—and invading people's private space, stealing their possessions, causing them financial harm and often also inflicting physical harm on them, if they find the victims at home. I do not think it is much of a surprise that burglary has gone down. I am not one of these people who subscribe to the theory that all criminals are completely stupid. Criminals are rat cunning. They might not all be sharply Mensa-style intelligent, but the majority of them are rat cunning. They get really wise to what is going on. The previous government introduced

tougher mandatory jail terms for people who assaulted others in the course of the commission of a burglary on a home. So what have those criminals done? They have shifted. They are no longer breaking into houses, because they know they will cop a long prison sentence. They have shifted to the easy targets. We have seen a reduction in burglary and an increase in stealing—theft—from cars or shops. It is opportunistic theft, because they can get product that they can then sell, or fence off, to other people, without the risk of long and mandatory jail terms. We are seeing it all over our community. There has been a massive increase in stealing between last year and this year.

When the minister gave her media conference trumpeting the success on burglary, she did not mention a word about stealing, but we all know the impact that has on local shopkeepers—retailers who are doing it tough right across our community. The member for Cockburn has seen it in his community. Shopkeepers in Fremantle and Mandurah have seen it. All credit to the member for Dawesville for highlighting this. I know the member for Dawesville. He absolutely loves Mandurah, Dawesville and his community. The last thing he wants to do is highlight the fact that his community is suffering a crime epidemic. He wants people to visit Mandurah, perhaps buy in Mandurah and make Mandurah their home, like he has. He had to do that, because he saw the plight of his local shopkeepers, including people who have been so badly impacted by stealing that they now have to close their stores, because it has become uneconomic for them. They cannot afford to lose stock they have to pay for from suppliers, and argue with the insurance companies for months and months. Even if their stock is insured—if the insurance company has not deemed them so much of a risk that they will not insure them anymore—the insurance company might argue for months about paying, but the supplier wants payment before supplying more stock. It is a vicious cycle for these people, and they are being condemned to that by this government's attitude.

Shoplifting has gone up by more than 30 per cent over the last 12 months, and it does not seem like it is abating. This government has no effective policy to stop shoplifters. Shoplifters know it is easy. They can go in an organised gang, distract shopkeepers and steal to their hearts' content. If they steal less than \$500, they will only be issued with an infringement notice if they are caught. They will not pay that infringement notice anyway, and they will continue on their cycle of criminality. We know that shoplifting, especially for younger people, is usually a gateway to other crimes. Often these young people are recruited to go and steal to order—a pair of high-priced sneakers or a trendy jacket or coat. Sports stores seem to be heavily targeted, as well as fashion retailers. As I said, criminals are not stupid. They know what sells, and they also know what looks good on them for bragging rights in their thieving criminal community. There is an epidemic.

Dr A.D. Buti: And well-dressed thieves.

Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS: Yes, well dressed, and do you know what? When there are security guards in the store, usually the well-dressed people go under the radar, so there is method in their madness. That is the other point. Shopkeepers right across the state are being forced to invest money they do not have at the moment. Retail is in a depression. The retailers association talks it down; everyone talks it down, including the Reserve Bank. Everybody says how bad retail is in Australia. These retailers are struggling to make ends meet, keep their doors open, put food on their table, and keep their staff on so that their staff can put food on their families' tables. The last thing they need is added capital expenditure, especially if they have to borrow it, because they are probably already hocked up to the hilt on their home mortgage in order to continue to pay their staff and keep their business going, and some of those homes may well be in negative equity, so they could not get any more money. It is no solution to tell a small retailer to put in really expensive security systems when that could be the difference between them staying in business and going out of business. If they have to find \$20 000, \$30 000 or \$50 000 because there is a stealing epidemic and our police cannot respond on time because there are not enough of them, it is not good enough to say, "Go find that money, because this government doesn't care. It doesn't care whether you go out of business. Unless you find money you don't have to put in some sort of elaborate security system, you won't be protected because there's not enough police to go around. I'm sorry, you're going to be a lower priority if police are responding to a threat of violence, whether it's family violence or any other violence." The police should rightly prioritise violence but there should be more police officers so that there are more to go around—some can go to the violence incidents and some can go to the stealing incidents. What does this government do? Whenever there is media attention on an area, it moves police officers from other areas to the hotspot. Earlier in the year there was media attention on Fremantle. Fremantle traders were crying out about not only theft but also vagrancy and general lawlessness in the streets of Fremantle, which is one of our premier tourist hotspots. They were not making it up.

Ms S.F. McGurk: I know they weren't making it up. I went and spoke to the Minister for Police and she allocated extra resources and they did an intense search.

Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS: Exactly right.

Ms S.F. McGurk: I got praised and she got praised.

Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS: Yes. Good on you, as the local member, for getting the minister there. That is what the member ought to have done and she did that. Good on her.

The minister had to borrow police officers from somewhere else. She did not automatically go to a pool that was just sitting there. She borrowed police from somewhere else and put them on the beat in Fremantle and things in Fremantle got better—a visible police presence works. The regions freed up some resources, pulled police from somewhere else and put them on the beat in Fremantle—and, surprise, surprise, crime went down! Of course. But then it moved to Cockburn, so we moved those police or we got another cohort of police from somewhere else—perhaps Joondalup or Mirrabooka—and moved them to Cockburn, and, magically, the Cockburn problem disappeared for a while. But then it went to Mandurah. It probably went through Rockingham for a while; I am not sure. These people are very adept at reacting to a police presence.

Mr F.M. Logan: Direct them to Hillarys.

Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS: I thank the member for Cockburn for mentioning Hillarys because as the southern suburbs are targeted, the criminals move on somewhere else. When the government trumpets fantastic crime figures, it should not go looking too hard in the northern suburbs because things there are not rosy. Let us look at some of the suburbs in my electorate. In the last 12 months, crime in Craigie has gone up 21 per cent. In particular, stealing, fraud and related offences and breaches of violence restraining orders have more than doubled. In the suburb of Hillarys, there has been an 11 per cent increase in crime, and it is a pretty similar pattern. The stealing of motor vehicles has gone up, and stealing has gone up—as it has right across the state—drug offences have gone up, and fraud and related offences have gone up. But it gets worse. In the suburb of Sorrento, there has been a 38 per cent increase in criminality. The majority of the increase is again in stealing, as it has been across the state, and also property damage, drug offences, and fraud and related offences. There is a pattern there. Worst of all, if members think the statistics in those suburbs are bad—that is, an increase of total reported crime of 21 per cent in Craigie, 11 per cent in Hillarys and 38 per cent in Sorrento—in Kallaroo it has increased by 66 per cent over the 12 months from 2017–18 to 2018–19. Dwelling burglaries are up; stealing of motor vehicles, up; general stealing, up; and property damage, up. Drug offences are up significantly. Fraud and related offences—here we go again—are up, and breaches of violence restraining orders have gone off the charts from two to 43. That shows members that the pattern of criminality is moving around. It is good to target Fremantle, Cockburn and Mandurah to reduce crime, but we need a police presence everywhere. It is not good enough to rob Peter to pay Paul, which is what the government and the Minister for Police are doing. Whenever there is media focus on a particular area, the government sends police from somewhere else, exposing that somewhere else to more crime in their community. It is just not good enough.

Fraud and related offences, again, are going up and up. It is a big area. In 2015-16, just over 15 000 fraud offences were reported to the Western Australia Police Force. In the following year, 2017-18, 30 584 fraud offences were reported. The incidence of fraud doubled within 12 months. In the last financial year, 2018-19, the figure went up a tiny bit to 30 601. The figures have reached a new level—they have doubled. All of sudden, over two years, the number of fraud offences went from 15 000 to 30 000. Fraud and related offences are now competing neck and neck with drug offences for the number two spot on the most common offences committed in Western Australia. Stealing is by far the number one offence, and it is also going up. The most common offence is going up and so is the equal second most common offence of fraud and related offences. That area requires some specialist technical skills. It is not good enough for the minister to sit back and say, “We’ll look into it”. We tried to get into this area during estimates but, again, the minister shut us down. Fraud can take many guises, as we know. It could be as simple as skimming credit cards or stealing a credit card—stealing has gone up—and using it multiple times quickly in low-value transactions. But it can also relate to businesspeople whose staff have systematically ripped them off over a long period. It can be other types of criminality involving online fraud or conning people into parting with their money online. It can cover a great range of individual-type events and they all fall into the category of fraud and related offences.

What is necessary to combat the doubling in fraud and related offences is specialisation in the Western Australia Police Force; that is, people who understand forensic accounting and people who understand and have specific skills in the new digital world in which we operate. Where is the government’s commitment in that area? Perhaps we need to recruit specialists who are specialised in other areas to do some of the investigations and have them come on and work as police staff or be fast-tracked as police officer recruits. This government has made no investment in providing resources to the Western Australia Police Force to investigate these crimes. I know that other members of Parliament get it just as much as I do. I have people walking through my office door all the time. The most common concern about fraud is the area I spoke about earlier that involves staff or trusted individuals systematically ripping money off a business over a concerted period—it might be six or 12 months—and it might not be picked up for a couple of years. Often people come to me and say, “I’ve reported it to the police and I am waiting, waiting”. When I inquire about this issue, I am told that the police are doing their best. There are usually only one or two officers in each district with the capacity to deal with these crimes, but they are run off their feet. It is not as though they are sitting back with their feet up on their desks. Rather, they are trying to prioritise multiple offences at the same time, and that just does not work because there are not enough of them. There was an obvious solution in 2017–18. When fraud and related offences doubled under this minister’s watch,

resources should have been put in. Hopefully, the minister will now see sense and put in additional resources to help those members of our community who are being financially fleeced. Yes, it is not assault, and, no, they are not coping financial damage, but some people are losing their life savings and others are losing enough money from their businesses that it is making their businesses unprofitable. They are not able to keep their doors open and they are shutting up shop at a very difficult time.

As I said, the response of this government has been to move the problem around and to not properly resource police. It simply says, "Oh, there's a problem in Cockburn. We'll get some police from somewhere else and move them to Cockburn." When that dies down and the media moves on to the next story, what does the government do? When it hears that there is a problem in Fremantle, police are moved to Fremantle to see whether that makes a dint there for a little while. The criminals then move on to Mandurah, and the government then puts the police in Mandurah. Meanwhile, in the northern suburbs criminals are free to roam because police have been taken from the northern suburbs and put in the southern suburbs. Eventually the public starts to lose complete and utter faith in the system and they stop reporting crime. That in itself is dangerous. First of all, it means that the statistics that the minister has quoted are not accurate. They do not reflect real crime in the community; they reflect only reported crime. Secondly, and just as importantly, the public loses faith in the system. They lose faith in politicians, members of Parliament, to properly resource the community. They then start to lose faith in the police force. It is bad enough when people stop reporting crime and they lose faith in the system; but worst of all it demoralises police officers, especially when they are run off their feet, do not have enough resources and are crying out for support. Police officers want to know that when they are on the front line their government has their back. They are not feeling that at the moment. They want to be in a position to be able help the community, but when they cannot respond to every incident, they feel as helpless as victims of crime. Speak to any police officer and that is what they will say.

One of a police officer's biggest regrets on a daily basis is that they cannot do more. We do not want individual officers to do more, because they are working at absolute capacity. We want to give them some backup and some additional resources. That is what this government should be doing. But it is not doing that; it just puts out spin. When we delve into that spin, we find exactly the same thing is happening. If government members do not believe that people are losing faith in the police, then I refer them to a newspaper article about a horrible incident that happened to a Perth resident on the weekend. Rabia Siddique is a well-known British human rights lawyer who has made Perth her home. On the weekend, she was out shopping with her family and suffered an incident that she describes as the "worst of humanity". The article states —

... a man rammed his car into hers as she was getting out, pinning her behind the driver's door. The furious stranger hurled abuse at Ms Siddique as she screamed for help and panic about the safety of her 10-year-old boys, who cried in the back seat.

It was a horrible incident that no-one would want to be caught in. *The West Australian* article, by Amanda Keenan, which was published online on 11 August and appeared in the newspaper on 12 August, continues —

After the car lurched again, hitting her leg Ms Siddique said the man reversed just enough to allow her to extricate herself then parked, only to climb out of his car and continue his tirade. He refused to provide his details and ran off.

Adding insult to injury, Ms Siddique said nobody stepped in to help.

That is scary, but it is an indication of the circumstances that we are facing. I commend those people in Sydney yesterday who helped apprehend that person who was running around with a bloodied knife, yelling and screaming and making incantations to his god, and asking that he be shot in the head. I think that is the Australian thing to do. I know some of them were not Australians, but hopeful they become Australians. They seem to be very good people; the sort of people we want to become citizens. But that action is becoming rarer in our society because people are worried. If people see someone going off their head, like Ms Siddique's assailant, they think, "My, goodness! What'll happen to me if I step in there? I'll be the one who is hit, stabbed or run over by a car, assaulted or whatever." They walk away. I hope that Ms Siddique and her family are well after that horrible incident. I know that I speak on behalf of every person not only in here, but also in the community, when I apologise for what happened to her. I wish her and her family all the very best. I hope they recover from that incident, because it is not just the physical scars, but the mental scars that remain. There is a line at the end of the article that clinches it for me that we should be doing far more to help people like Ms Siddique and every other member in our community —

Ms Siddique contacted police but after nearly two hours of waiting—her kids traumatised and tired—she went home and filed a report online. She was yet to receive a reply yesterday.

This lady was attacked by a madman in a car park in suburban Perth. She called the police, as anyone would do. She waited two hours. Her children were traumatised—rightly so—and tired. She did the right thing. Rabia Siddique is a human rights lawyer. She was stationed in Iraq as part of the British Army. She negotiated the release of two kidnapped British SAS operatives and was at one stage taken hostage herself. She is someone who understands

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 14 August 2019]

p5534b-5558a

Mr Peter Katsambanis; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Hon Fran Logan; Mrs Liza Harvey

trauma and has suffered trauma herself. She has been in a war zone. She did the right thing and waited for the police. She waited and waited and waited and waited.

I assure members that the police would not have been ignoring her pleas for help. The police would not have been simply shrugging their shoulders and saying that there was nothing that they could do. The few police who would have been on the beat that day in that area were probably busy dealing with other matters—matters that I am sure were even worse than a madman ramming someone's car and blocking them in and then continuing to yell at them in a car park. The police were probably at the scene of a domestic dispute or something else. They just did not have the resources on the ground to get to this lady at the scene of a crime within two hours so that they could perhaps gather some DNA or other evidence that would have been there and to interview a few bystanders who might have witnessed the attack so that they could apprehend this criminal. They could not do that because they were run off their feet, and that lady had to report that incident online. If that happens to a person once or twice, in the future they will not bother reporting it online. Maybe I would and maybe members of Parliament would, but the average person in the street perhaps would start to lose faith in the system. This is only one high-profile example of what is happening all over Perth and Western Australia right now, because our police are not properly resourced.

There is a solution but it is not the only solution. A number of things can be done, but the first and most obvious solution is for this government to return morale to our police officers. It has an opportunity to do this because a pay round is going on at the moment. The government should show them that it cares by doing a few things. Firstly, it should offer them a fair pay increase in the pay round, rather than hiding behind a whole-of-government policy crafted in a completely different era when the government did not have \$2 billion budget surpluses. Firstly, the Minister for Police should have the guts to go to the Economic and Expenditure Reform Committee and the Premier and say, "I want to stand up for hardworking police officers and give them a fair pay increase." Secondly, she should give them some additional resources and commit to putting more police on the ground.

Mrs M.H. Roberts: We have.

Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS: The minister says she has given them more resources, but why are the numbers going down?

Mrs M.H. Roberts: They're not.

Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS: The minister gave me the numbers in this place during the estimates hearings last year. They are in *Hansard*. Last year, more police officers were on the beat than there are this year, and the number of recruits going through the academy are decreasing at a time when we know attrition is high and there has been a voluntary separation package. The minister is not even replacing the police who are leaving. The number going through—159 recruits in a year—does not replace the police who leave each year, nor do the 176 recruits who went through in 2017, which was before we put in the 150 officers for voluntary separation. The minister can play hard and fast with the figures, but the proof is in the pudding out there in the community. The public is saying that the thing that works best is a visible police presence. The member for Fremantle verified that. She went to the minister and advocated for her community. The minister put some extra police on the streets for a little while and things got better because of that visible police presence. Now those criminals have gone. It is winter and hopefully they will not return. I do not want to see them there. It is interesting to note that two weeks before I was contacted by those traders, I was in Fremantle on a Saturday afternoon with my nine-year-old daughter. I was leaving Fremantle Oval and what we had to confront between leaving Fremantle Oval at the end of an AFLW match and getting to our car is the sort of stuff that makes many people vow never to go back to Fremantle, and that destroys traders and the reputation of a beautiful city and tourist spot. I confronted it myself.

Ms S.F. McGurk: Was it an East Fremantle player?

Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS: No, it was not players. There were vagrants on the streets and criminal behaviour. There were direct and very threatening approaches to little children. It just was not good—not good at all. I am glad that the member has responded.

Ms S.F. McGurk: Did you report it?

Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS: Yes, I did. I am glad that the member did the right thing as a local member and police were sent there, but the member has to understand that the police who went there were taken from somewhere else. That is why we see the patchiness in the figures. Crime rates in some suburbs go down and then the rates in other suburbs go up, because when we remove a visible police presence, criminality goes up. In my local area where crime has gone up, the police are working as hard as they possibly can. They are not sitting around waiting for a call; they are run off their feet. Whilst they are at jobs, they are trying to prioritise their next job because they are simply run off their feet. Members opposite can champion all they like that the general statistics have gone down, but they should ask the police officers on the beat whether they think crime has gone down and whether they have got it easier. Obviously, if reported crime has gone down, police have less to do theoretically, but they do not.

They have more to do, especially in my area. I read out the statistics; I do not have to read them again. They are scary, and that is replicated across many communities. A visible police presence works. We need more visible police presence. We do not want those charades like the government's election promise to man more 24-hour police stations. That would not be a bad idea —

Mrs M.H. Roberts: It is “staff”, not “man”. We have women police officers.

Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS: I am sorry. It is the English language. If the minister wants to twist it around, she can. It is not a term that I used in a sexist or gendered manner. It is a term that has been used—I do not know how old the English language is; it is about 1 000 years old or so. We can say “person these” or “staff” or whatever we want. The minister can throw out red herrings but I will not be distracted from the main point; that is, if the government had recruited more police and asked some of them to sit behind a desk in a police station, perhaps that would have been acceptable, but police have been pulled off the front line to keep the counter open so that at two o'clock in the morning someone can stagger into a police station—because, of course, crime happens around the police station, does it not? Someone who lives two kilometres from the Armadale Police Station is going to wander into the Armadale Police Station to report a crime rather than ring up the station!

Dr A.D. Buti: They do, actually.

Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS: Once in a blue moon. We have seen those figures and we know what is happening. Very few people go there. This government's response is to take police off the front line and put them inside police stations where crime does not occur. The public is saying that it wants more police on the beat, and government members have verified that, but when this government shuffles the cards around, the areas that get the extra cards do better. They are safer, the traders feel better and the public feels better. If visitors such as my nine-year-old daughter and the many other people who were confronted by that horrible and nasty behaviour on a beautiful summer's day in Fremantle in the middle of the afternoon do not see that behaviour, they will go back and enjoy themselves. It is the same if they go to Mandurah, where there was a crime spike. When I was in Mandurah the weekend before last, I spoke to the local police who were wandering around. They verified that a police presence had worked and said how good it had been since all the publicity and receiving extra resources. It had given them an opportunity to get on top of the problem. In the next breath they said that they did not know what would happen when those guys and girls—those officers—were pulled from Mandurah and sent to the next hotspot. It is just not good enough to simply respond to media pressure. It is not good enough to make one community suffer so that another community can get a bit of respite from criminality. It is not good enough for the minister to selectively quote figures when she knows that a large part of the improvement in the burglary figures is a substitution for other forms of stealing that are considered to be “safer” by criminals because they are likely to not go to jail or, if they do go to jail, it will be for a lesser period. It is most likely that these criminals will never be caught because the police do not have the time to devote resources to catching them. This government prioritises spin ahead of substance. It prioritises saying that it is protecting the community ahead of protecting the community. This government talks a tough game on crime, but everywhere we go across our community people are saying that they do not see enough police on the streets, or enough traffic police. I have not even gone into that area today because I do not have time. I sometimes wish that I was in the upper house where I would have unlimited time to really highlight all the failings of this government, but others will get that opportunity.

We do not see police patrolling our streets. We do not see them on the roads. We feel less safe. We know that crime is happening in our community. The police are doing their best, but, as we said earlier, that thin blue line is being stretched further and further; it is diminishing every day. The minister and the government have an opportunity to reverse the trend. There are still almost two years to go before the next election. Yes, like Labor, we can try to make political mileage, but I would rather have a safer community. I would rather come in here and applaud the government for what it is doing than lambast it for what is a clear major failing of this government in an area in which the public expect better. It is one of the major areas. The public expect the government to deliver health, education and law and order. It is failing in all three. Particularly in law and order, it is badly failing. We have reached the stage now when the public report crime and there is no response, not because the police do not want to respond but because they cannot because they are too busy. Do the right thing. Protect police officers. Give them a fair pay increase and give them the resources they need to protect our community.

MRS M.H. ROBERTS (Midland — Minister for Police) [5.02 pm]: What a load of drivel and shambolic commentary we have just heard. The member for Hillarys has been all over the shop with all kinds of little anecdotes. In fact, he got so short of anecdotes about crime in Western Australia that he talked about what occurred in Sydney yesterday, a very significant event. I agree with his sentiments about the issue, but it was in Sydney. That shows me he did not do his homework or he just grabbed what he saw in the newspaper in the last 24 hours.

I agree with him on one thing though. He said, “Sometimes I wish I was in the upper house.” Sometimes I wish that for the member too, because his contribution here does not grip my attention all the time. It was difficult to follow all those little anecdotes and to distil what he was trying to say. A lot of what he said was a misrepresentation. He likes to say that the government misrepresents the figures but he is the one who does it. He says, “Oh, compared with

this year, the last year” and often he quotes—I have checked this on occasion—three months to the next three months or three months one year to three months the previous year, rather than looking holistically at what has happened over a time.

If I had to sum up the theme of it, somewhere towards the end of his speech he said police officers want to know that the government has their back. I could not agree more. The shame, member, is that that is not how police officers felt at the end of two terms of Liberal–National government. He quoted from a few articles. I am going to quote from an article. They are not my words. They are not the government’s words or the police service’s words. This was printed in the Western Australian Police Union’s *Police News* journal in June 2017 on page 21. I am going to quote extensively from it this afternoon because I think it sets the context of how the police force and police officers felt at the end of his term of government. How they felt and what is happening is very well explained in this article by Mr Kevin McDonald who was, and I think still is, the metropolitan regional director for the police union and sits on the police union board. It is printed in the journal, so it is not only Mr Kevin McDonald’s view, but also the union’s view. It does not print articles in its journal that do not have its endorsement. It sets the context of what occurred in the past few years under the member for Scarborough’s watch as Minister for Police and their expectations of an incoming Labor government. The article headed “Sleeping with the PELBF” on page 21 of the June 2017 edition of *Police News*, the union’s journal, refers to its survey of police officers. Later in the article, it explains that “PELBF” is the union’s acronym for police executive and their loyal band of followers. As I read this article, members will find out who the most loyal of those followers was. It reads —

Prior to the survey, and in clear and concise language, the Government informed WA Police Management that in its view the MOM —

Metropolitan operating model —

had failed to adequately deliver policing services to the community and instructed they open themselves to frontline feedback, facilitated by the WAPU Survey, to improve the situation.

The Survey attracted a Member response almost twice that of any other WAPU Survey ...

There was a big response from police officers on the frontline. Mr Kevin McDonald continues —

The response solutions from the Executive, published in a recent edition of *From the Line* (without any WAPU acknowledgment I might add) was a pittance when compared to the wholesale changes called for by our Members.

Increasing the number and reducing the size of metropolitan policing districts is the first step of an array of necessary changes from which a new model could materialize however, this has been rejected for the current piecemeal solution as current management desperately hangs on to what doesn’t and will never work.

It’s a shame the police executive had to be forced kicking and screaming to make the paltry modifications they did, and it’s an even greater shame that it took a change of State Government and some external political authority to actually get them to budge in the first place. Political influence (and media white noise!) was only achieved through the hard work and extensive lobbying of WAPU.

Imagine if there was no change of government. We’d still be getting *From the Line* MOM propaganda shoved down our throats from an immovable police executive and their loyal band followers (the PELBF).

Former Police Minister Lisa Harvey was seen by Members to be inexperienced, naive and blind-sided into accepting the validity of the MOM and its purported benefits. Hailing from a Hansonesque shopkeeper style background, how could this politician have possibly known any different?

Mr S.A. Millman: That’s so harsh.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: It is harsh, but it clearly shows members that the police union board do not use those harsh words and criticism unless it is frustrated, which it was at this point in time. Mr McDonald continues —

One way might have been to listen more intently to advice coming from a variety of sources. To recognise voices of dissent and concern distinct from the prevailing influences and sycophantic persuasion of the PELBF.

On the other hand the ‘new’ Police Minister Michelle Roberts comes into the role with a wealth of experience and unlikely to be swayed by B.S. or the unrelenting hubris. Her reaction to the chickenfeed remedies being offered up will be eagerly anticipated.

Of course, there is a real danger when governments start dictating to police management how they ought to go about their business however, what’s even more perilous is that government intervention was even necessary in the first place.

It's quite alarming that politicians with no operational policing experience have to call out senior management on frontline service delivery failings and also direct senior management on how to go about fixing the mess.

The comprehensive failure that is the MOM is an indictment on a bunkered management commitment to someone else's idea, devoid of original planning, strategic implementation or incorporating essential review. Implemented on the back of a flawed trial using inflated and unsustainable numbers on the ground and, with the exception of the PELBF, everybody knew the MOM was a house of cards stacked on a crooked table.

I point out that this is a kind of ironic congratulations —

Congratulations must go to the PELBF and the former Police Minister because, if not for their communal mismanagement, self-absorption, timely propaganda and ambivalence to good advice, we may not have experienced the lessons we have now learnt.

As the legendary American Film Director George Cukor once remarked: "You can't have any successes unless you can accept failure."

One can only hope that the relentless 'we know better' management style, that was a feature of the PELBF, is soon replaced with a receptive, thoughtful and inclusive police leadership.

Along with a better operating model.

Let us not believe any of this nonsense we have had from the member for Hillarys today. When we came to government, the Western Australia Police Force was on its knees. Policing was at an all-time low and morale was at an all-time low. They sent out surveys to frontline officers and got double the responses they ever got for any other survey. The metropolitan operating model was a complete failure. The previous government separated police officers into what were known as local policing teams and response teams. The response teams were broken into four huge metropolitan districts. They had half the numbers they previously had and they had to respond over such a huge area. It was a failed model. I do not blame the police executive, and I certainly do not blame the former Commissioner of Police; I blame the former government, because it was the government that put the police under pressure, ripped budgets out year after year, and made the police force function with less.

I do not think I have ever seen such universal opposition to an operating model and to what was being inflicted upon the police. I recently saw some context for this. I had heard that, because of the budget cuts, the former police executive was really pushed into a situation of having to make these changes. Because it simply could not afford to run seven metropolitan policing districts, reducing the number to four policing districts was the cheap and nasty solution that it came up with, and that had huge consequences. We saw frontline officers becoming stressed and we saw morale decreasing. We saw crime rates increase and we saw response times blow out significantly.

I recently read the transcript of an interview the former police commissioner did on ABC radio, in which he referred to the financial pressures that were put on him. He basically explained that that operating model came about because of those pressures. This is Mr Karl O'Callaghan at 8.33 am on Wednesday 19 June, talking to Russell Woolf and Nadia Mitsopolous. It is a direct quote in which he is questioned about the operating model —

Well, look, I just think that what... what's happened here is there... there would be people who are dissatisfied in the WA Police, it's not unknown that many people were not happy with that current policing model that we were putting in at the time, but that was in the context of the Government's economic environment back in 2012 or 2011 or whenever it was... and it's a very different context today in terms of the Government's financial position.

Without wanting to directly criticise the former government, the cat was belled there. He basically said, "You have to look at it in the context of the financial environment that we were in at the time", and that is less-than-subtle code for, "We had to make do with less. We couldn't make ends meet. We could no longer fund a seven-district metropolitan operating model, so we went to four."

Let us look at what the response has been since then. We have moved on. Commissioner Dawson reviewed the whole operating model. He, like the police union, the community and key members of our government, had been critical of the police operation model. He has reviewed that and he has implemented a lot of changes. Those changes go far beyond having eight policing districts, getting rid of the old model and no longer having separate local policing teams. He has put in place a third regional operations group, which is a group of officers who can respond when instances arise. He has also implemented our government's commitment of a regional enforcement unit; that is 25 additional officers in at least six vehicles that are now patrolling key roads in and out of Perth, with a focus predominantly on a 200-kilometre area that we know, statistically, to be the major area in which road fatalities in regional areas occur.

This week I announced some further changes to be made to our responses to home burglaries. Things are operating very differently and to complement each of the districts, we have officers who can be deployed. When the member for Hillarys says that it is some group of officers sitting around, doing nothing, who get allocated to areas, I say there are no officers who sit around doing nothing. We have centralised units that can respond across a broad area. We also have the regional operations groups. We used to have just one north and one south; we now have one north, one south and one central, so three groups. Those officers are mobile and available to respond. If there is an out-of-control party in Mandurah, Scarborough or Armadale, those officers are able to respond.

We also have separate teams of officers doing specialised policing activities that can also respond. Police are now tackling crimes that the former government ignored. As was clear from the police union survey, police officers were frustrated that they were not getting some jobs at all. They were arriving hours late because they were responding over huge distances. We got to a situation where, for a lot of home burglaries, there was no attendance at all; or, if there was attendance, it was potentially the next day. Imagine coming home from work to find that your house had been burgled earlier in the day. Under the previous regime you would ring up, and because it was not a hot burglary, had not happened particularly recently and because the offender was believed to be no longer in the area, it would not get priority. People would sit around, wondering when the police were going to attend. All their cupboards are open, their draws upturned, and they think the police are coming in an hour, two hours, or three hours, and then the police might attend the next day. That is a lot of heartache and anxiety for people.

Having conducted that review in recent weeks, the Western Australia Police Force has taken the view that it will prioritise those burglaries and, as far as possible, will attend within two hours, so that people are not wondering, later that night or the next day, whether the police are even going to attend at all. As I said yesterday, sadly, burglaries will continue to occur. Crime continues to occur, but our efforts are to reduce the amount of crime in the community where we can and to provide an appropriate police response where crime occurs. The member for Hillarys likes to say that we trumpet our home burglary figures but things bubble up somewhere else, or that we trumpet prior results in one suburb and it bubbles up somewhere else. Yes, sometimes there is crime displacement, but the fact of the matter is that, overall, over the last three years—over a long time now—the trend is down. It is not three months to three months or one suburb here and one suburb there, which is picking out stats selectively—I am saying: take the lot.

In 2009–10, the total number of reported crimes of all types—burglaries and everything else—in Western Australia was 213 910. That is a bit over 200 000 crimes in total. That is all kinds of crime; everything—fraud, home burglary, theft, assault and murder. I fast forward to 2015–16, under the former government's watch. The start of that government's watch was 2009–10, and 2015–16 was towards the end of it. There was a 27 per cent increase in those six years. By 2015–16, there were 292 884 crimes in total. In 2009–10, the total number of crimes was a bit over 200 000, and six years later it went to nearly 300 000. Those figures do not lie. They are there in black and white on the police website. That is the dimension of the increase in crime that we saw under the former government's watch.

Everybody in the community knew that methamphetamine was a driver of crime. The only people who did not recognise it at the time were the member for Scarborough and others in the Barnett government—they ignored it. A drug summit was held back in 2008 because the previous Labor government recognised that this was an emerging issue that needed to be dealt with. When the Liberal government was elected in September 2008, that report just gathered dust. That government did nothing. As the member for Hillarys recalled, every week there were a couple of explosions in people's houses, vehicles or wherever caused by people manufacturing drugs. What happened? Year in, year out there were more reports of the same. The former government did nothing.

Earlier today I quoted the Drug Use Monitoring in Australia results. That process is independent and it is Australia-wide. They are really relevant figures to look at, because these are the offenders—these are the people who are taken into police custody in watch houses. They are taken into the Perth watch house and watch houses in Brisbane, Sydney, Melbourne and right around Australia. The DUMA testing tests people who present at the police lock-up for a whole variety of crimes. They are asked whether they can be tested for drugs and there is quite a high compliance rate, because it is anonymous. I find the figures staggering. At the start of the member for Scarborough's time as police minister in 2012, 28 per cent of people were testing positive for methamphetamine at the Perth watch house. I thought that was pretty high—nearly one in three people—but by 2016, under the member for Scarborough's watch, the percentage of people testing positive for methamphetamine had grown to 60 per cent. It had more than doubled. Two out of three people presenting at the Perth watch house were using methamphetamine at that time. That is a staggering figure. What was the former government's response to that? It did not have an election commitment, like we had, to increase police numbers. It did not have a commitment for a meth action plan, like we had; it was not putting up the dollars for that. Imagine if the former government had been re-elected; it would have stuck with the old metropolitan operating model, which was a disaster.

Dr A.D. Buti: It was a failure; an absolute failure.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: It was an absolute disaster. There would be no separate policing district for Armadale. There would be no separate policing district for Mandurah. There would still be no traffic officers based in Mandurah. There would be no district office for police in Mandurah. That was the former government's plan for WA; its plan was more of the same. It did not promise a single extra police officer. In contrast, we promised 100 additional officers to target methamphetamine, because this is so important, and 20 additional public servants to work as part of that team. In addition to that, we promised 25 officers for the regional enforcement unit, because, again, we recognised that there needed to be a special effort towards regional road safety and because, under the former government's regime, police cars were almost invisible on those country roads. The regional enforcement unit now supplements local policing efforts and the patrols that they do.

Let us look at response times, because we can present a lot of anecdotes and say person A or person B waited a little while longer than they should have. Unfortunately, that will happen from time to time. I cannot recall off the top of my head how many calls the police assistance centre gets every year, but it is in the order of hundreds of thousands of calls; it is a lot. Occasionally, they will get one wrong and they will make the wrong call—they will not give it a correct priority level or there will be an issue. Let us have a look at the overall results. Under the former government's watch in 2011–12, 81 per cent of priority 1 and 2 incidents were responded to within 12 minutes. By 2014–15, that figure had dropped to 69 per cent, so it got worse, with those response times blowing out.

The other furphy that the opposition keeps trying to perpetrate is that somehow we have decreased funding. No, we have not. The budget papers show \$295 million in extra police funding for the Western Australia Police Force in 2017–18, 2018–19 and 2019–20, which is over and above the funding in the last Barnett–Harvey budget in 2016–17. The member for Hillarys seems to have brought forward a bit of a grab bag of issues today. I quoted the DUMA statistics for urine tests of people in police lock-ups, whereas the member for Hillarys selectively quoted from the Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission national wastewater drug monitoring program. He likes to talk about how Western Australia compares with other states. If the member for Hillarys were really honest, he would have fessed up that we took on that number one mantle under the watch of his government. Yes, the percentage of people using methamphetamine that shows up in the ACIC national wastewater drug monitoring program is way too high and it has to be reduced, but we have been reducing it. That is something that the member for Hillarys failed to say. The fact of the matter is that the ACIC national wastewater drug monitoring program survey shows that meth consumption in the metropolitan region has decreased by 20 per cent since October 2016. Methamphetamine use in regional WA has decreased by 25 per cent since August 2016. We heard a bit of rhetoric about how we compare with other states in Australia. The member for Hillarys quoted methamphetamine figures; it is without doubt a key target for our government. The fact of the matter is that people addicted to methamphetamine find it very hard to get off it. They cannot just turn off the tap overnight. When a certain number of people living in the community are addicted to this highly addictive substance, no government can get everyone off it within three, six or 12 months. We cannot halve the number of people on it in 12 months or two years; it does not work like that. We have to work hard and consistently on a range of levels. We have to drive down the supply of drugs coming into the community. We also have to drive down the demand for that supply in the community. These things take time. However, contrary to what has been alleged this afternoon, progress is going in the right direction and there appears to be quite significant decreases.

The other advice I can give members is that police response times are once again on the increase. The percentage of priority 1 and 2 incidents responded to within 12 minutes or less has increased from 78 per cent in 2015–16 to 83 per cent in 2017–18. As I have highlighted, the rate of crime has gone down right across the board. The other day when I was checking the police statistical website, I saw that there was more information on there than has ever been put there before. We can click on various crime types—crimes against the person and crimes against property—and it produces little graphs of how crime is trending over a number of years. When I clicked on overall crime, crimes against the person and crimes against property, virtually every one of the individual crimes showed a decline. The only thing that seemed to vary was the angle of the decline. It is a bit hypocritical to even be raising this issue today given the former government's record. I am not sure who chose this topic for this afternoon. The member was embarrassing his leader by raising this topic because her record in government is one of embarrassment. I was reluctant to read out the *WAPU News* from a couple of years ago. Only when I reread it recently did I think it was an excellent summary of the context of what was presented to us when we came to government.

People move on pretty quickly, but do not talk to me about low morale among police. Members opposite in government had it at its absolute lowest point. There were pressure points in every metropolitan policing district. Feedback from officers was stronger than ever before. The level of vitriol that came back in that survey was phenomenal. I think the strength of the article printed in *WAPU News* was also unprecedented. The union said it had high expectations for our government. I think Mr Dawson has been delivering. I think the changes he has been putting in place are all very positive.

It is almost farcical of the member for Hillarys to talk about people not being encouraged to report crime now. I encourage people to report crime. Reporting of crimes was actively discouraged under the former government.

People were discouraged from reporting shoplifting. We need speak only to the National Association of Convenience Stores, which is an overarching organisation that covers service stations such as Shell and BP. They were at their wits end over fuel drive-offs. I well recall a grievance made by the then member for Kingsley to the member for Scarborough about fuel drive-offs and all we got were apologies about it: "It's a little hard to prove; it's a bit like shoplifting; you have to be able to prove intent, and you can't prove that someone actually intended to steal the petrol." It is therefore all too hard. The member for Scarborough provided no comfort whatsoever to the then member for Kingsley. Police did not regard it as a priority crime. We have seen a whole change of heart now. Do not take my word for it; talk to the people from the BP and Shell service stations and the National Association of Convenience Stores. They have found the change in approach by the Western Australia Police Force to be totally and completely refreshing because now we are taking that seriously. Data collected from service stations when people drive off is being shared. As was pointed out to me at the time, if someone repeatedly drives off without paying for their fuel, week after week, time after time, guess what? I think we can prove in court they intended to do it. If there is clear video evidence of someone putting their hoodie over their head and looking furtively around as they put fuel in the car, guess what? I think they might be able to prove intent. It was put in the too-hard basket by the former government, along with shoplifting. In every one of our policing districts in recent times, officers have been working with major shopping centres and encouraging them to provide the evidence. We are taking a new approach. We are interested in collecting the video and photographic evidence. There is a wealth of information there that people can provide to the Western Australia Police Force. The fact is that one of the advantages of CCTV is that we can collect a lot of photos of people and when people commit minor crimes, they tend to often move on to major crimes. Not everyone who commits minor crimes goes on to commit major crimes but just about everyone who commits a major has started with minor crimes, so collecting that evidence is important to the Western Australia Police Force.

This again is part of our fresh approach. It is part of responding to the fuel drive-offs. We are responding to shops that are repeatedly burgled. People are taking forensics, collecting evidence and taking video footage and comparing it with information in other databases. Police are finding also that sometimes when they are looking for people for more serious crimes, collecting video footage from either shops or service stations can be extremely helpful in locating the whereabouts of an offender that they might be looking for.

Without doubt, there will continue to be issues in individual areas from time to time, potentially, quite regularly. The member's example in Sydney shows us that crime is not unique to Western Australia; nor is it unique around Australia or the world. It is a sad fact of life. However, all we can do from a policing perspective is provide the best response to the public we can and apprehend as many offenders as we can.

The burglary strategy is really important, although in the scheme of things, compared with some crimes, some people, including the former Liberal government, did not see that as a priority crime. The fact of the matter is that very few offenders who do home burglaries commit only one or two burglaries. They do not do just dozens; some of them do hundreds. If we take one those people out of commission and target the offence and lock up a home burglar, we will be locking up someone who over the next year might have committed 50 or 100 more burglaries. Other people's homes and personal safety are then not violated because this person is not out there in the community.

Where there are hotspots, it is just good policing to respond. Quite sophisticated systems are available to police now at our police operations centre and the like. If there is a spate of burglaries on a particular day, they are red-dotted onto a map, so we can see that in a particular suburb, in a particular few streets, there have potentially been six home burglaries within a couple of hours. Chances are that the same person or group of people have done them all. It makes sense to then target that area and try to apprehend those offenders. We do not just spread everyone evenly; we respond to the situation. When some theft incidents occurred in Mandurah, police targeted them. People were not borrowed from everywhere. For example, a sports store was burgled and, amongst other things, 70 fishing reels were stolen. It appeared on the news one evening. Rockingham detectives were already onto that. They cover a wide brief, and they had been looking at what had been occurring. People do not necessarily stick to just their district. The very next day, they apprehended someone and charged them with a string of offences, including the theft of those fishing reels, stealing a car, closer to Melville than anywhere else, and a range of other burglaries. When they went around to the person's house, they recovered a range of stolen goods. We can pretend that the police were only responding to an incident that occurred, but they were not. They were already looking at that individual and following up leads before that burglary ever took place. It was not like magic and it was not as though we suddenly threw 100 officers at it and found out who did it. Dedicated officers had been looking meticulously and methodically at a pattern of crime within those southern suburbs. Because we had the resources deployed there, someone was able to be apprehended and charged so quickly.

It was disappointing to hear the member for Hillarys make his comments. They are not actually borne out by the facts. Let us have a look at what his leader said when in government. She was highly defensive of the model, and we clearly would have had no change at all had the previous government been re-elected. In 2016, she said —

“My job as Police Minister is to ensure police are well resourced to do their job ...

“I have confidence in the commissioner and his team to use their best practice model to try to get on top of these increases. They are disturbing.”

She acknowledged that the increases in crime were disturbing, but did she do anything about it? No; she said that that is the police’s problem. She said, as I highlighted earlier today, that the solution to home burglary was not getting police out there more quickly, and it was not about getting forensic officers out there. The solution was for people to lock their doors and windows. I remember seeing the front page of *The West Australian* at the time and saying, “Really? That is your response?” Yes, it is sensible practice to lock our doors and windows and secure our homes as well as we can, but that is not what the community was asking her. The community was saying, “What are you doing to assist? Why don’t police come to my home? Why aren’t fingerprints being taken when my home is burgled? Why don’t I know, hours later, whether somebody is turning up or not?” At one stage, on 25 January 2016, the acting Minister for Police, who was the member for Nedlands at the time, hit out at calls to abandon the frontline model. He said —

“It is a nonsense to suggest that we abandon a model that has resulted in more officers on the front line, more police cars on the road and significant increases in charges and prosecutions,” Mr Marmion said.

I do not think he knew the first thing about it, because what he was saying was different from what every police officer was saying, and different from the facts of the case. Every police officer was saying that they were stressed and under pressure, driving long distances and arriving hours late. Crime was increasing, response times were blowing out and morale had never been lower. They pleaded with the government to do something about the operating model, but there was no response whatsoever from the government.

I think we have worked out what we are going to get from this opposition. Members opposite do not deal in facts, and they do not really support our police. They did not support the police when they were in government. The idea of having body cameras and stab-proof vests was not something that came new in 2017. Police officers had been asking for those things since about 2014–15. Other states already had money in their budgets for those items. When we came to government, there was not even any agreement on what kind of vest would be appropriate for police officers. The former government, as best I can understand, was looking at perhaps some vests that could be shared around, and police officers would wear the same vest. The old-fashioned ballistic vests are not personal issue. If we moved to a stab-proof vest model, we could not expect officers to share the vests with people on the next shift. We had to start from the beginning. We had to get the police executive to sit down with the union and talk about what kinds of vests would be appropriate. Our government made the call that we would personally issue vests. We would not expect officers to pull on a vest that had another officer’s sweat on it, apart from anything else. They have to fit properly. A whole range of issues meant that sharing vests was not appropriate, but that was something that was under consideration by the previous government. We have ruled it out; it is not happening.

It is the same with the body cameras. Yes, it stands to reason, but these guys kept the police in the technological dark age. When we came to government in 2017, Western Australia was the only police jurisdiction in Australia where police officers, to issue a ticket for speeding or going through a stop sign, were still writing tickets out in longhand. We are spending over \$35 million on a digital policing model. That is not some unnecessary thing; it is a vital and necessary thing in this day and age. We are spending money on police that the previous government would not spend. It did not buy them vests or body cameras. The member for Hillarys does not appear to even know what is going on. I do not know—maybe he does not talk to police officers. I visited officers at the Wembley Police Station earlier this week and they all had body cameras. The Perth police district officers all have body cameras. People working on the booze buses have body cameras, and as of yesterday, body cameras were due to be rolled out across the Pilbara. I expect that that has started.

We have had to play catch-up because of the former government, and now members opposite are saying that police officers should know that the government has got their back. For about five years, police officers asked the previous government to say that medically retired officers should not be retired from the police force under section 8 of the act and be associated with that. We were told over and over again, year after year, that this was adding insult to injury for officers who had put their lives on the line and whose medical health was in jeopardy as a result of their work. They were being pushed out the door under section 8 of the Police Act, the same section that the Commissioner of Police uses when he has lost confidence in a police officer who has perhaps done something corrupt. That was not acceptable, and I am very pleased that that legislation has gone through the house. As a further sign of our support for police officers, we have put in place a redress scheme for former police officers who are medically retired because of the disparate arrangements for so many of them. Some people got some form of a payout because of the nature of their injuries. As members would be aware, sometimes when police officers are in a traffic crash, money is payable because of the injuries they sustain. Others got some form of ex gratia payment. It is a total mismatch. A panel that is chaired by Karl O’Callaghan—he is aided by Susan Barrera and Lilly Cvijic—is currently assessing applications from retired officers. We have set some strict criteria around it. If

people have committed criminal offences or done other things, they are not eligible, and if it is deemed they have already been appropriately paid out, they will probably not be eligible. Three very able people, two of them former police officers—indeed, one being a former Commissioner of Police—are sensitively going through those applications at the moment. That is a \$16 million commitment from our government. We are moving forward. I do not know what the former government can point to in terms of what it did for police. In its last few years, it gave police officers the most shocking operating model, which lowered morale and was bad for the community and police officers. By contrast, we have increased the police budget and we are increasing police numbers. Crime rates are going down and response times are improving. We are equipping our police with the modern and protective equipment that they need to do the job, things such as body cameras, stab-proof vests and modern technology. Having talked to officers at Wembley Police Station yesterday, this will have a flow-on effect in other areas. When they tap on their camera twice to activate it, it captures the previous 30 seconds of film. Officers told me that they have confronted a number of scenes at which they have advised people that their interaction is being recorded. Hopefully, that will mean that people who are perhaps thinking of doing something inappropriate, such as hurting a police officer, or doing something stupid may not progress in their action when they realise that they are on camera. But if they do, clear evidence will be available for the court. I expect that the availability of body cam recordings will mean more and quicker guilty pleas in court because it will be hard to argue when the police have video footage of them doing something. If there is an altercation of some form, it will be recorded and when the person involved and their lawyer are shown the video evidence, it will be pretty hard for them to say that it did not happen and to plead not guilty. One of the added benefits—in addition to providing an extra level of protection for police officers—is that those who have done the wrong thing are aware that there is clear video footage of them committing a crime and they are more likely to admit to doing it. That will reduce court time and it will also free up police officers because at the moment they take notes with a pen and paper. They take those notes to court and present their evidence at court as a verbal witness account. We may find that video evidence means that more people will plead guilty and hopefully that will mean that the police spend less time in court and more time solving crime and providing reassurance to the community.

MR S.K. L'ESTRANGE (Churchlands) [5.54 pm]: We have only five or so minutes before we rise for the dinner break, but I will make a start. I will offer a corrective services perspective to the debate on this motion. We have heard some very strong arguments from the member for Hillarys about policing in Western Australia and the failure of the McGowan Labor government to deliver the results that the community of Western Australia expects. We heard the Minister for Police defend her government's position on this matter. It has had three budgets so there is enough data out there. Although it is natural for the minister to defend her record after three budget efforts, it is just as credible to listen to the concerns of the community, which have been voiced by the member for Hillarys. I will add to that voice from the perspective of corrective services.

The Minister for Corrective Services took some joy in suggesting that he is up to his third opposition spokesperson on corrective services. The facts are that the Minister for Corrective Services has given us so much content to deal with in his mismanagement of the portfolio that it takes almost the entire opposition team to share the workload to deal with the mismanagement of the portfolio that he has had since the Labor Party took power in March 2017. No doubt many more opposition members will have to pass the baton to try to take it to the minister over his appalling handling of this portfolio.

The Minister for Corrective Services clearly does one thing well—he is very adept at making a situation worse. The minister had eight and a half years in opposition to think carefully about what he would do with the corrective services portfolio when the Labor Party was eventually returned to power.

Mr F.M. Logan: Bear in mind that I was the shadow for emergency services.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: I know that the member was not the shadow minister at the time but he was certainly a shadow cabinet member, and a key policy that he would have focused on in his time in opposition would have been law and order and how he could better support the people of Western Australia by improving law and order.

The minister has had three budgets. What have the McGowan Labor government and the minister done about people who are locked up for committing crimes? That is what law and order is about. It is one thing to tag them and another thing to bag them, but it is another thing to make sure that they do not become repeat offenders. Those last two elements are right in the minister's realm of responsibility, yet there has been an abrogation of responsibility and an exacerbation of problems under his watch. We have seen a habit, a pattern, of passing the buck instead of focusing on getting the job done. We need the minister to step up and take an approach that will fix the issues and prevent crises, not add to them. There is no better example of this than the biggest prison breakout in Western Australia's history, which was under the minister's watch. We know that there was another biggest event in history on his last ministerial watch with the massive explosion up north on Veranus Island. But there has been an equivalent blow-up on this watch—namely, the massive breakout at Greenough Regional Prison. It is fascinating to read an article by ABC News on Wednesday, 28 November last year, which states —

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 14 August 2019]
p5534b-5558a

Mr Peter Katsambanis; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Hon Fran Logan; Mrs Liza Harvey

It took just an hour for a mattress lit in a cell at Greenough Regional Prison at 4:00pm to explode into a full-blown riot involving dozens of prisoners that culminated in the escape of 10 dangerous inmates.

One burning mattress. If it takes one burning mattress to create that type of drama under the minister's watch, I hasten to think what type of drama could evolve if there were two burning mattresses. The minister's response to this was quite extraordinary. In a Wednesday, 28 November media release, the minister tried to assure the people of Western Australia that he had gripped it up, that he had a hold of the problem. The media statement reads —

Immediately following the riot and escape, Minister for Corrective Services Francis Logan spoke with Corrective Services Commissioner Tony Hassall —

I am glad to learn that he spoke to the Commissioner of Corrective Services given that there had just been the biggest prison breakout in history —

about the removal of all power tools and ladders from within prison grounds.

After the biggest ever prison breakout, his advice to the commissioner was to make sure that all power tools and ladders were removed from inside the prison grounds. The minister failed to add to the list wire cutters and tunnel-digging equipment because those types of things could also be used for future prison breakouts.

Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.00 pm

[Quorum formed.]

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: It is very important that we continue to hold the Minister for Corrective Services to account for his failings —

Mr A. Krsticevic interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Carine!

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: — over the handling of the Greenough Regional Prison riot and its massive breakout— Western Australia's biggest prison breakout in history.

Mr F.M. Logan: No, it was Fremantle.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: There was more under the minister's watch?

Mr F.M. Logan: No! Don't be smart; Fremantle and Casuarina.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: Very good.

Looking at how the minister handled it post-event, the opening paragraphs in an article in *The Geraldton Guardian* on 22 January this year titled "Officers fear prison not safe in wake of shocking July riot" state —

A Greenough Regional Prison officer says she fears another riot at the facility.

"I am still not confident the prison will be safe once it is back up to full capacity, and many officers share my opinion," she said.

The situation does not look as though it is under control, when prison officers who are very concerned about their own safety are prepared to talk to the media, particularly after 10 very dangerous prisoners escaped during those riots last year and caused havoc in the doing. Riots and misconduct have not been confined to Greenough under the minister's watch. We know that all is not well at Hakea Prison. In fact, some of the recent reporting on Hakea was cause for considerable community concern. Phil Hickey in *The West Australian* on 16 July, just last month, said —

The Comanchero bikie gang is treating WA's most notorious jail like a "clubhouse", with prison authorities having all but given up trying to tackle the gang crime that is plaguing the southern Perth jail.

...

Under-resourced prison guards say they are losing the war to control the jail, with 11 staff bashed by inmates on a single day last month.

That is pretty serious. Those prison officers have a pretty tough job. They do not get enormous amount of thanks from the community, as the minister knows. They go to work and they have to try to keep their chins up, maintain positive morale and go about their business when they know they are dealing with prisoners, some of whom, without notice, can flick a switch and create an incredibly dangerous situation. The last thing we want the prison officer employee group to be feeling is more unsafe than they would normally feel in that type of environment. I am sure the minister recalls the first time he visited a prison, and not having experienced that before, he would have been a little bit unnerved by the environment. Imagine what these poor prison officers are thinking right now about this when they fear for their safety, because the leadership of the officer group is saying that it is out of control.

The Labor government response to assaults in prisons was also remarkable. It was almost an admission of complacency. I refer the minister to his own media release dated Thursday, 8 August, in which he highlighted —

A 2018 internal audit on the rate of serious assaults per 100 prisoners has estimated an under-reporting of 27 per cent in data collection.

The minister is quoted as saying —

“It’s particularly concerning that there has been an increase in staff assaults and we are working as fast as possible to address the inherited issues of overcrowding and understaffing.

The minister talks about inherited issues, but these issues are going on after this government has passed down three budgets—after it has had eight and a half years as an opposition to have a plan for how it was going to deal with the prison population. Even earlier today the minister remarked during question time that the 43 per cent increase in the number of sex offenders under community supervision orders that has happened over the last 12 months—the minister can correct me if I am wrong, but I believe he said this—was due to increased population pressure in our prisons.

Mr F.M. Logan: That and the decisions of the former government.

Mr S.K. L’ESTRANGE: It is due to that and the decisions. Yet, the data does not support what the minister is saying. The data shows that from March 2018 to March 2019, there was only a 0.7 per cent increase in the adult prison population. If there is only a 0.7 per cent increase in the adult prison population, yet there is a 43 per cent spike in the number of community service order people who are considered dangerous sex offenders, what the minister said in question time today does not match, does it? What we, as an opposition representing the community, are saying is that the government needs to grip up the situation. We need the government to communicate to the people of Western Australia what it is doing with its prison population and those on supervision orders to make sure that it reduces the recidivism rate. We want the government to demonstrate to us that it is doing everything in its power to make the situation much better, not worse. There has been a fair bit out there from the Inspector of Custodial Services on just this matter. In fact, the Inspector of Custodial Services puts out reports, and a recent one acknowledged that all prisoners—the minister also acknowledged this in question time today—who serve a sentence greater than six months should receive an individual management plan. Yet Hakea Prison alone has a backlog of around 20 per cent, or around 1 000 prisoners, waiting for their individual management plan. Those plans are critically important, as the minister knows, for preparing people for release. It is good for the community to know that when prisoners are locked up, they are not going to get out. We know the minister has had problems there, but the community needs to be assured that that is the case. However, when prisoners have finished their sentence and get released by the courts back into the community, we want to make sure that they have an individual management plan that has got them as safe as possible for that reintegration into the community, because an IMP outlines how prisoners should be managed. It includes the security rating of the prisoner, where the prisoner should be placed in the prison, the rehabilitation program, the reintegration program, and any special intervention needs for that prisoner. If 1 000 prisoners are without an individual management plan, they will stay longer in that environment —

Mr F.M. Logan: It’s not security rated.

Mr S.K. L’ESTRANGE: They are given a security rating.

Mr F.M. Logan: All of them get that, regardless of an IMP.

Mr S.K. L’ESTRANGE: No doubt, they do. In any case, if there are prisoners without fully signed-off individual management plans that are tailored for their needs, particularly if they have a track record of domestic violence, or drug or alcohol addiction, they need to get onto an IMP as soon as possible to help them improve their chance of not going off the rails when they leave prison. That is the hope, minister, surely. We have to give people hope; we cannot give up. We have to give people hope and to do our best to make sure that at least the system is working to help the individual, so that the safety of the community is better supported when they are released.

The Office of the Inspector of Custodial Services noted in its 121st report “2018 Inspection of Hakea Prison” that Hakea Prison was overstretched, overcrowded and overstressed—as I said, it had an unacceptable backlog of prisoner assessments. The Office of the Inspector of Custodial Services also observed the need for better alcohol and other drug facilities in the prison system, acknowledged the rising prison population in certain areas and the need to build a new prison in our system, and noted that Western Australia has the highest Aboriginal incarceration rate in Australia, our remand population remains too high and the proportion of women in custody is continuing to rise.

Other issues highlighted in the media point to the minister’s management of this system. I have already talked about the bikie gangs at Hakea. We have had allegations of sexual harassment, nepotism and bullying in the special operations group—the minister would have read about that. In the recent past, there have been stories in the media about deaths in custody, drugs in prison, the pressures at Hakea and, of course, the riots at Greenough and Albany Regional Prisons. It is no wonder that the Western Australian Prison Officers’ Union is deeply concerned with the direction this government is taking the prison system in Western Australia—no doubt. In the past five months, when I have met with the union, I have been told about four deaths, numerous assaults and a prison breakout in which two male prisoners broke into the female unit. These are unacceptable system management events that impact

on people's lives. They impact on prison staff and the families of prisoners. No doubt when those prisoners leave, when they finish their sentences, they could be more damaged by the system than supported to reintegrate into society, and that has an impact on community safety. The government needs to be doing more. The Prison Officers' Union and the Inspector of Custodial Services are offering the government plenty of advice that is well worth listening to.

The Corruption and Crime Commission has also recently offered the government advice.

[Member's time extended.]

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: The Corruption and Crime Commission made some very interesting observations. The CCC worked with the Department of Justice on this report; it was not done in isolation. As a side note, the minister would know that on 1 July 2017—this was clearly a policy position the government came up with in its eight and a half years in opposition; it did come up with something—the government decided to amalgamate the then Department of Corrective Services and Department of the Attorney General to form the Department of Justice. I will talk about that in a moment. In any case, the CCC worked with the Department of Justice. The report refers to that commission's recent interaction with the Department of Justice and notes allegations that officers were using excessive force against prisoners —

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms M.M. Quirk): Member, I will interrupt you there. There are a number of CCC reports involving the department. Could you reference which particular report you are reading? It might be of use to Hansard.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: This one is called the "Report into misconduct risks in WA prisons", dated 26 October 2018.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Excellent; thank you.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: It is very good that we have an Acting Speaker who is sharp. It is a shame she is not on the front bench opposite to help out the failing ministers we have.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I am relieved, member.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: We need some sharp minds on the front bench, Acting Speaker; you would do well to tap the Minister for Corrective Services on the shoulder.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Let us get back to the subject.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: I do believe you had experience in that portfolio, Acting Speaker.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I have served my penance.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: The Acting Speaker says that she has served her penance. Acting Speaker, you may well have served your penance, but you are dishing it out to us now by not holding that portfolio and our having to deal with the minister, I will tell you right now. You are making our work over this side that much harder. In any case, I will move on.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: The report refers to allegations that officers were —

- a) using excessive force against prisoners;
- b) maintaining inappropriate relationships with prisoners;
- c) trafficking contraband into prisons;
- d) falsifying records;
- e) failing to report serious incidents; and
- f) engaging in corrupt conduct.

That is a pretty serious suite of concerns that this inquiry looked into. It goes on to say —

The joint investigation identified a number of factors which increase the serious misconduct risks within Corrective Services, specifically prisons, and which raise serious questions about DoJ's ability to identify and manage serious misconduct risks.

That is a pretty damning report card.

Mr F.M. Logan: Read it properly.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: I just did.

Mr F.M. Logan: Read it properly.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: I am quoting it.

Mr F.M. Logan: Read the whole lot.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: I am quoting it. Let me move on. I know it is painful; I know it is difficult.

Mr F.M. Logan interjected.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: When you read your own report card and it has Fs and Ds, no-one is happy. Let us move on. Under chapter 4 and the subheading “No corruption prevention framework”—a pretty damning heading—at paragraph 61 it states —

Mr Hassall —

He is the Commissioner of Corrective Services —

told the Commission that “there may be some work [on a corruption prevention framework] in its infancy, but at present there isn't one”. Mr Hassall said he had recently delegated this task to Mr Maines and Mr Elderfield.

It is good that someone has decided to think about an anti-corruption framework but, for goodness sake, the Minister for Corrective Services spent a lot of time in his eight and a half years working out how to amalgamate the Department of the Attorney General with the Department of Corrective Services but did nothing before coming into power to make sure an anti-corruption framework is in place. That is absurd.

The minister will recall that just last week the Attorney General took his bill through this place that deals with indefinite detention of high-risk offenders. The minister will recall the High Risk Offenders Bill, which will replace the Dangerous Sexual Offenders Act to enable the capture of more violent and dangerous criminals under that act as well as serious sex offenders. It dealt with how we can detain those people indefinitely and how we can release people into the community under detention orders and supervision orders.

The Attorney General has clearly had a bit of experience. He has been around the block a few times. He has even said in this place that he was a barrister for a while and has represented the police and been in this place for some time. It looks as though he is trying to do something to beef up the law and that is why we supported his efforts last week. I hasten to add, however, that I am not sure whether, given the Attorney General's and the minister's departments have amalgamated, the Minister for Corrective Services is living up to his side of the bargain. The Attorney General is making the laws tougher but what is the minister doing in the corrective space to make sure that the people convicted of crimes are being housed properly, supervised properly and reformed as best as possible to reduce the recidivism rate that sits at around 38 per cent, I think?

What is the minister doing? Department of Justice statistics for the first quarter of 2019 show that from March 2018 to March 2019 the prison population increased by 0.7 per cent. It went from 6 919 prisoners to 6 967. Members would not think there has been an increase in population pressure in 12 months—0.7 of one per cent. Would members think there has been a big increase in pressure? I would not have thought so, yet in that time there have been all these prison riots and a massive breakout. We have had male prisoners breaking into female prison sections. We have had prison officers assaulted. There has been a 43 per cent spike in the number of serious sex offenders on community supervision orders. What is going on? There is no increased pressure on this minister, yet there is this massive increase in drama. It is not good.

We need some answers from the Minister for Corrective Services about these statistics that the Department of Justice now releases. We would like to know how many of those 43 per cent of serious sex offenders under supervision orders are repeat offenders. How many of them had an individual management plan implemented within weeks of arriving in prison; that is, if they were going to be in that prison for more than six months? How many of them started one on time? What did it look like? What type of programs were actually used by the Department of Justice to try to support these people not to reoffend? It is very easy for an opposition or the media to be sensationalist when serious sex offenders are released into the community. That is the easy bit. The hard bit for the minister is not to be reactive to the type of hype that surrounds these cases. His job is to communicate to the people of WA what the individual management plans will do. The minister needs to demonstrate that he is doing his best to make sure that when people are released on community supervision orders, they are made much safer for the community. That is what the community wants to know.

We want to know why there has been this big spike of 43 per cent. Again, I am not trying to be sensationalist, but when it hit the media, for example, that a judge had released into the community Edward Latimer, a serious sex offender, but with a supervision order that had 52 conditions, no doubt that supervision order would have been very detailed. But how many of that 43 per cent include people like Latimer? We do not know. I think the minister owes the community an explanation for that spike of 43 per cent. He also owes an explanation about what the government has done in its three budgets to try to support them.

A private sector organisation was doing its bit to try to support the reintegration of prisoners into the community. The minister will recall that it is called the Whitehaven Clinic. What is fascinating about the Whitehaven Clinic is

that it was essentially, at the start, a volunteer effort by a psychologist to try to run a program. The minister will know all about this. It was voluntary from the prisoner side to actually get in there and reform. Tabitha Corser headed up this program. Two hundred and eighty prisoners went through the program over two years on a pro bono basis. Then she said, "I can't live on air forever." She asked the minister at the time, Minister Francis, whether it was okay to charge a fee for service. He said, "Yes, go for it. If it's working, you've got my permission to go in there." She did. She has seen over 300 prisoners over the years. Suddenly, without much warning—I do not think there was any warning at all—on 3 April, her program was scrapped and she was refused access to 37 prisoners while they were mid-program.

She came to the opposition and said, "This has just happened to me", so I called a meeting with her. I think it was one of my first meetings after being appointed shadow Minister for Corrective Services. I met with Tabitha Corser that week. I think I also met with the union that week. I asked her to tell me about it. She then went on 720 ABC talkback radio that afternoon. The radio station tried to contact the minister to get him to comment on the situation. His office said no, so the radio station called me. I was sitting there, "ready 5" waiting, and then bang, I was on air! I basically said, "Why would we stop a program that is working? Instead, why wouldn't we"—meaning us as a society, but pointing the finger at the minister representing the government—"collaborate with that private sector provider, find out what they're doing that might be working, and enhance it, support it and back it?" It started getting some traction the next day on the radio and talkback through the morning and then, lo and behold, the minister did something right—he changed his mind, which is something this government is very good at. It is very good at backflips when the pressure starts coming down on the Premier. Premier McGowan does not like pressure. He gives you guys the rope, and then he lets the rope run out, and when the noose starts to tighten, he says, "Gee; I've got to get in there and sort out another one of these ministers. It's the Minister for Corrective Services this time. Last time it was the Minister for Fisheries and the time before that the Minister for Education." Over the past three years, we have had rolling backflips that would make Nadia Comăneci look like an amateur. That is the standard; that is what has been going on. So Premier McGowan to the rescue—get on the bat phone, call up the Minister for Corrective Services and get him to change his mind now. So the minister went on radio that afternoon, and, thank goodness, he reintegrated that program.

Before the bell knocks me out on this speech today, I will say that the minister needs to step up. He needs to fulfil his side of the bargain. We have heard our shadow Minister for Police talk about what needs to happen on the policing side. The minister needs to step up and do more on the collections side. If the three corners, including the Attorney General, do not work well together, we are not going to have a good system. It is going to continue to fail, and it will continue to fail under the minister's watch.

MR F.M. LOGAN (Cockburn — Minister for Corrective Services) [7.26 pm]: Thank you, Madam Acting Speaker —

Mrs L.M. Harvey: We've got 35 minutes left. You've already taken up an hour of our time.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Who did?

Mrs L.M. Harvey: The Minister for Police, and we've got 35 minutes left.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Stop grizzling. The motion was to her. Let us just move on.

I thank the member for Churchlands for his contribution.

Mrs L.M. Harvey interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms M.M. Quirk): Many more comments, member, and you will be perceived to be canvassing a ruling, so proceed, minister.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: I thank the member for Churchlands for his contribution. One thing I can be reassured by is that, thank God, nobody listens to what the member says in here, or indeed to anything that anybody says in here at this time of the evening. I think people would be very worried if they had listened to that contribution. In terms of my longevity in this role—remember, the member started this—he raised the issue. I feel sorry for the member for Churchlands, as he knows. I get on very well with him, and I feel sorry for his role, and the fact that somehow he has been taken out of health, where he was doing a good job, put into corrections, through no fault of his own, and replaced by a 15-year-old. That is the height of embarrassment for the member. I feel for him. If that happened to any shadow minister, they would feel embarrassed.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister, can you move on? I notice that a few members are referring to the standing orders, so the inevitable is going to happen.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Let us go first to the issue of what we are doing, and what we inherited. The member has heard me speak on numerous occasions, when it was raised by the member for Dawesville, about what we are doing in this portfolio, and what we inherited in this portfolio. The member says, "What have you done; why haven't you fixed up all these problems in two and a half years?" Why did members opposite create the problems in the first place? As a new shadow minister in the portfolio, let me put this to the member very clearly: nothing was done in

the area of corrections between 2014 and 2017; there was no investment, no new employment, and the very programs that the member just talked about for sex offenders and various other offenders inside prisons were cut. Does the member know why that was all done? We were loaded up with cuts. There were \$117 million worth of cuts in the forward estimates loaded up in 2016–17. Does the member for Churchlands know why that occurred? It occurred because the previous government had no intention of keeping the prison system. It was all going to be privatised, so it put nothing into it. That was the worst possible time for the government to put nothing into it. During that time, the number of prisoners increased by 35 per cent. When I inherited the portfolio in March 2017, the number of prisoners was still climbing. The number of people on community service orders was still climbing. The member for Churchlands referred to them, and I will go to those figures in a moment. Those numbers were still climbing. It was a difficult situation. In March 2017, we did not have enough beds for the number of prisoners in our prisons, so after the budget was delivered in September, the first thing I did was to get funding to put an extra 212 beds into existing cells so that prisoners were in a humane situation and had a bed to sleep in instead of on a mattress on the floor. That is what the previous government left us. If that does not contribute to undermining law and order in this state, I do not know what does. People were leaving prison in a far worse situation than they were in when they went into prison.

The recidivism rate that the member talked about earlier has not changed much over the years. It did not change during his period in office and, unfortunately, at this point, it has not changed during my period in office, but it has been only two and a half years. Do not laugh, member for Dawesville. We are leading the country in the area of drug interdiction and drug rehabilitation. I hope that those figures will start to improve and the rate of recidivism will be reduced. As the member said, it is about 38 per cent. I think it is slightly higher than that; nevertheless, we have the second lowest rate in the country. It is not just at that rate under our government; it was at that rate under the previous government. We can beat ourselves up as much as we like about recidivism, but at the end of the day, our recidivism rate is not that bad compared with the rates in other jurisdictions, particularly given the size of our state, some of the offences that occur and the types of offenders, who have very complex and difficult issues. That shows that the people who work for the Department of Justice do a blooming good job. Even in the member's period in office, when they got no support and jobs were cut, they still did a good job and got people out the door at a rate that was the second lowest in the country. That goes to the calibre of the people we employ and the effort that they put in.

I turn to the statistics on offenders managed in the community, which the member has referred to. He is right. For sexual assault and related offences, 48 per cent of offenders were managed in the community compared with 7.3 per cent in the period between 2014 and 2017. I also refer the member to these other figures. He has these figures, so he should look at them and consider the statistics himself. If he wants to play around with statistics, he should look at the homicide statistics. In his period in office between 2014 and 2017, the number of offenders managed in the community was up by 63 per cent, whereas during my period in office, it has been 1.5 per cent. For theft and related offences, during his period in office, the number went up by 30.8 per cent, whereas during my period in office it has been 7.64 per cent. For illicit drug offences, it was up by 48.3 per cent, whereas during my period in office, it has been up 18.6 per cent. For prohibited regulated weapons and explosives offences, during his period in office, it was up by 81 per cent, whereas during my period in office, it has been 20 per cent. What does that show? Does it show that during our period in office, more sexual offenders are being managed in the community but during the former Liberal government's period in office, more bikies with explosives and guns were murdering people? Is that what it means? All that the figures show, member for Churchlands, is that people who come before magistrates and judges who are placed on community orders are there either on bail or parole or they are finishing their sentences and they are still not on parole but on a community work order. The member for Churchlands can play around with the figures as much as he likes, but I will throw them back in his face because they mean nothing. These are the decisions of judges who decide to either manage people in the community or let them out at the end of their sentence.

Quorum

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Madam Acting Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

[Bells rung.]

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms M.M. Quirk): Members! Can I just say to the children in the public gallery that they should not try this at home!

[Quorum formed.]

Debate Resumed

Mr F.M. LOGAN: I will go through some of the issues raised by the member for Churchlands about what the government is doing. Between 2014–17, in its last few budgets, the former government committed no money to the Department of Corrective Services and employed no-one. The member for Churchlands asked, “So what have

you done over the last few budgets?" We have only just put in over half a billion dollars into corrective services. At the end of our existing expansion phase, we have only created nearly 2 000 beds in the system. The member for Churchlands asked me, "What have you done?" We have only put in just over half a billion dollars in the last three budgets. During the former Liberal government's last four years in office, it put in nothing. In two and a half years, we have put in just over half a billion dollars.

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: It wasn't me.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: No, I am not accusing the member for Churchlands. I am talking about the former government in general.

Over two years, we have given just over half a billion dollars to justice and corrective services, which can be compared with what the former government put in during its last four years in office, which was nothing. We are employing 485 officers; the previous Liberal-National government employed none. Indeed, the number of prison officers shrank because people left, they retired, and no-one was employed. Indeed, there was an employment freeze in place. I inherited all those things. The member for Churchlands talked about Hakea Prison. Hakea is a very difficult prison. I will take the member for Churchlands through Hakea. I do not want him to go in on his own because he might be frightened. I will hold his hand and take him around the prison.

A government member interjected.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: He will be all right. It is a dangerous and difficult prison to run because it is a remand prison. All Western Australian prisons that fall into that category —

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: I've been in all the prisons.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Has the member been to Hakea?

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: All of them.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Hakea?

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: All of them.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: When? When was the last time the member went?

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: I had my own consulting business and I was there consulting for the Department of Corrective Services and I was taken through all the prisons.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: How much money did the member make from corrective services?

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: I had to pay the bills, minister!

Mr F.M. LOGAN: The member never answered that question! Not only did the former government do nothing with the prisons, before that it employed the member for Churchlands, who was probably giving advice on how to stuff up the prisons! Was the member there giving advice on privatisation?

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: No.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Hakea Prison is a very difficult prison. The member has been there; he knows what it is like. It is the first time in prison for a lot of people. A lot of them are on drugs, and they are still coming off drugs. It is a very difficult prison, and made worse because of the employment freeze that I am getting over. Only last week we had the largest graduation in the history of the academy. A total of 167 graduate prison officers, most of whom are going to Hakea, by the way, graduated on the one day. That is the highest number of graduates who have come out of that academy at once.

Along with putting more prison officers into the system to ensure that we have a safer, more manageable prison system, we have employed 50 new adult community officers to ensure that we manage people better in our community. In 2014, the previous government sacked 200 corrections officers. It said that they were not needed any more. No wonder we were under pressure. Holy hell! This was done at a time when the numbers were going through the roof. The member for Churchlands cannot understand how mad the decisions that were made in corrections were in the last four years of the Liberal-National government. It was crazy stuff. No-one in their right mind would make those decisions. I am still picking up the pieces. As I have said to the member for Dawesville before, we are absolutely rehabilitating that department from the bottom to the top. Every single component of that department is getting overhauled—all in line with the findings of the Auditor General, the Office of the Information Commissioner, and the Corruption and Crime Commission. The department is getting completely overhauled. In two years we will see a totally reformed Department of Justice, from the bottom to the top. It will occur only because I am doing it. I just explained to members opposite that it certainly did not occur under the former government. It could occur only under an experienced minister like me, who in a very difficult situation can get that money and put it back into the Department of Justice.

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: Minister, given your self-appraisal of your capacity and ability, do you think it would be important for the shadow minister to understand what you are doing?

Mr F.M. LOGAN: It would be. I would love to give the member for Churchlands the briefings that he wants.

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: I'm curious as to why you've refused to brief the shadow minister.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: I would love to give the member for Churchlands the briefings.

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: When I asked the Minister for Health for a briefing, I got a full briefing in his office. The chief of staff was there and the director general briefed me, but you're a very secretive minister.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Does the member know why he is not getting a briefing? If he puts, "You should be sacked" in his first press release, he should not come to me and ask for briefings.

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: So you're not as thick-skinned as you think you are.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: If the member for Churchlands wants to dish it out, he is going to cop it.

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: You don't think that I dished it out to the Minister for Health? The Minister for Health can handle it. You can't handle it.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: No. Before the member opens his mouth, he should use his brain. That is all.

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: So the minister is saying that I have to toe his party line to get a briefing from the head of corrective services.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: No. If the member wants to continue along the same lines as the bloke who now has his job, and carry on that line, he will be replaced with someone else because we will get rid of him. But if he wants to be a nice guy, as he was to the Minister for Health, that is fine; he can talk to me.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Churchlands, you have had the opportunity.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: If the member wants to be a nice guy, he should talk to me and we will see what we can do. If he wants to be a smartypants, he will get it back. If he dishes it out, I will certainly give it back.

In terms of the overcrowding at Hakea, as I explained before to this house, as soon as the extension at Bunbury Regional Prison comes onstream—it will be open in a few weeks—we will take people from Hakea, particularly those difficult prisoners, and put them into Casuarina, and then we will take prisoners from Casuarina and put them into Bunbury. That is the initial decision. It will be the first effort to take pressure off Hakea since well before 2014.

Following on from the Bunbury prison expansion is the Casuarina expansion of four units comprising 512 beds. The first two units will be open in December or January.

Mr S.K. L'Estrange interjected.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: No, the member cannot.

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: I was going to say that we'd like to come along!

Mr F.M. LOGAN: If the member for Churchlands is a good boy, he will. If he carries on being a naughty boy, he will not.

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: I am keen to know what the criteria for "good boy" is in your book!

Mr F.M. LOGAN: I will explain it to you later.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister, you should refer to the member by his seat.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: I did. I said, "Member for Churchlands, if you're a good boy." I did say that. If he keeps being a good boy, I might look after him.

[Member's time extended.]

Mr F.M. LOGAN: We are dealing with Hakea. We are dealing with the security in Hakea, we are dealing with the overcrowding in Hakea and we are dealing with the prison officer representation in Hakea. In terms of the overall prison estate, as I just indicated, we are putting 512 beds into Casuarina. The first two units will be open in December or January. The second two units, which will be the alcohol and drug facility and the mental health step-up, step-down facility, will be open in April next year.

I will deal with the step-up, step-down and the AOD facilities. The member for Churchlands cannot get up in this house and ask what we have been doing, particularly in the area of rehabilitation and reform, without acknowledging the work that we have done at Wandoo Rehabilitation Prison. He cannot do that.

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: Why don't you brief me on this work?

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Why did the member not just watch television yesterday afternoon? It was all on there. Why does the member not just do some research?

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: We were a bit tied up with the Minister for Small Business yesterday, minister.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: I am not here to do the work for the member for Churchlands. Opposition members have to do their own research. Even though the member is a good bloke, I cannot keep giving him a leg-up. I just cannot do that, particularly when he is rude or naughty. The member has to do his research. Remember, when I was over there in the member for Churchlands' chair, he gave us nothing. He never provided any assistance to us whatsoever.

Point of Order

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I point to the standing order in relation to relevance. I am not entirely certain that the minister's contribution here is relevant to the motion that has been moved.

Dr A.D. Buti: It is relevant because it is enjoyable!

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I will wait for Madam Acting Speaker to make a ruling.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms M.M. Quirk): I rule that there is no point of order. Please continue, minister.

Debate Resumed

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Exactly. There is no point in him at all! Member for Dawesville, I was simply responding to the interjections of the member for Churchlands; that is all. Do not wind me up; I will finish when I want to finish.

In terms of the issues that the member raised about where we are going, as I said, there is half a billion dollars in investment. The AOD facilities that the member claims to know nothing about will lead Australia, member for Churchlands. Wandoo prison has been open one year. It has had 26 graduates, of whom only one has fallen off the cart in terms of their rehabilitation from addiction to drugs, particularly methylamphetamine. Seventy-eight women are going through that program as we speak.

Over the year in which that prison has been open, no drugs have been identified in that prison and no drugs identified in any of the prisoners. If the member for Churchlands asks people around Australia who are in the area of corrections and rehabilitation, they will say that that statistic is unbelievable. It is a fantastic outcome. Western Australia is setting a record in this jurisdiction in this country.

In April next year, the alcohol and other drugs facility will be open in Casuarina Prison with 128 beds for men, using the same therapeutic techniques to try to encourage those men with addictions to get off drugs, particularly methylamphetamine. Next door to that facility will be a step-up, step-down facility, which will be guided by the Mental Health Commission's advice on dealing with people with what it calls P1 problems, which are the lower level mental health problems. After we finish the 512-bed expansion in Casuarina, we will immediately move to the 344-bed expansion in Casuarina. In that facility, we will deal with prisoners who have what they call P2 and P3 mental health problems. P3 is for people who are having psychotic episodes who would normally end up in the Frankland Centre. We will then be able to treat those people in the prisons. When the member for Churchlands is talking about making our community safer, how can he not acknowledge what we are doing? It is world-leading stuff. We are taking people who are in prison with shocking methylamphetamine addictions and rehabilitating them before they go back into our community, hopefully, in a safer and more productive way so that they do not go back into the criminal world and associate with people who have led them down the wrong path. We are doing that for both female and male prisoners.

In the mental health area, we are separating the cohorts of people who are suffering from mental health problems in the prison system into areas that are more suitable for dealing with their issues and problems. We are taking them out of the normal prison system and putting them into areas within which they can be properly treated. That gives us the opportunity to break up our prison system into the type of cohort management that should have been there all along and is the way modern prison systems work. The whole thing under the former government's period of office was thrown in the bin. Everyone was locked up together: minimum, medium, maximum, people who were drug addicts, people with mental health problems. The whole lot were cooped up in overcrowded understaffed prisons and the member has the temerity to stand there and ask me what I am doing. We are leading Australia in our prison reform program and rehabilitating people.

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: I look forward to the briefing when you can tell me that.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Forget about the briefing. Just read and do some research. Do some reading and the member will see how good it is. Instead of being critical, he should be proud of what we are doing. We are doing a great job and we are changing the nature of incarceration in this state for the better for the people who have very, very difficult problems who come out and continue to reoffend. The member was talking about this law and order issue. They come out and reoffend. Why is that? It is because they have not been dealt with in the prisons, particularly over the time when it was a Liberal–National government. Now that is changing radically so that we are getting health and science in the prisons to look after these people with these very, very difficult afflictions. That is what we are doing and it is good work. It will make our community safe. That is what we are doing. It is costing a lot of money. I do not know the Liberal Party's policy. We are only 18 months away from the next election and we have not heard a peep from his side about what policies there might well be. The last and only policy that the Liberal–National government took to the last election was that it would build a 2 000-bed prison. Is it still going to do that? Probably not. It never had any money for the last one. The Liberals are probably not going to build this one either. The only other policy idea that I heard from the Liberal–National opposition was the one put forward by the member for Dawesville when he was shadow Minister for Corrective Services and that is we should let the public know when there is a Telstra outage. Particularly, we should let the people wearing the electronic monitoring bracelets know that there is a Telstra outage. That was a great policy—a terrific policy! Thank god they are covered by GPS anyway and we know exactly where they are! Thank god we have them on that as well. That was a great policy initiative from the member for Dawesville! It was the only one from the period he spent as shadow Minister for Corrective Services. No wonder the member for Churchlands has the portfolio now and the member for Dawesville does not.

In question time today the member for Churchlands asked about dangerous sexual offenders. I said I would get some figures for him, so I have those figures. I refer to dangerous sexual offenders who have breached supervision orders—that is where the member was going —

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: No. It was repeat offenders.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: I thought the member was driving at those who had breached supervision orders—no?

Mr S.K. L'Estrange interjected.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: No worries. If it is about recidivism, I think it might be difficult to get those figures, but I will look for them. It is not good news for the opposition. I will read them out if the member wants, but it is not good news for him. I will just say that the number of offences of people breaching supervision orders has dropped under us. They were bad under the previous government. If the member wants me to read out the figures, I will do it, but I will stick to his original question.

The member for Churchlands also raised the issue of prison assault statistics. He talked about a 27 per cent increase in underreporting. The 27 per cent underreporting was under the Liberal–National government. I wonder why? The state had overcrowded prisons and not enough staff. The former government had not put any money into the system and had loaded it up with a future debt. There was a 27 per cent underreporting of assaults. Maybe members opposite just did not want anyone to know what was going on in those prisons. That information is now out there so members opposite will have the figures and know what is going on. We are an open and transparent government, which is letting people know exactly what is going on in prisons—good or bad. If we do not deal with the good and the bad, how can we fix these problems? It does not embarrass me. The member for Churchlands can stand up any time and raise those issues. If it gives me another thing to fix, I will do it. I have done an awful lot of fixing up the previous government's problems over the last two and a half years. We are at the point now where we are seeing very good outcomes for justice in Western Australia.

MRS L.M. HARVEY (Scarborough — Leader of the Opposition) [7.57 pm]: I note that the government has once again chewed up half of private members' business time, particularly the member for Cockburn. I will tell members why it has done that. Stealing offences in Cockburn are up 31 per cent on last year. Dwelling burglaries in the suburb of Girrawheen are up 64 per cent and stealing offences are up 54 per cent. Stealing offences in Thornlie are up 56 per cent and dwelling burglaries are up 15 per cent. In Jandakot, stealing offences are up 14 per cent. In Scarborough—my own patch—stealing offences and property damage offences are all heading northwards. The member for Kimberley needs more police resources, because crime in her area has gone off the charts. This is why the government wants to silence me and not give me airtime. I have the statistics to prove that we are onto something with the issue of law and order. What do members think the figures for non-domestic assaults are in Northbridge? It is up by 39 per cent on last year! In Northbridge last year, 530 people were assaulted. That is the problem the government has, and that is why it wants to silence the opposition when it raises matters of law and order. Over 300 people turned up at a rally in Mandurah because they are outraged at what is happening in the member for Mandurah's patch. Businesses are being targeted by professional criminals who are robbing them repeatedly. Hundreds of thousands of dollars are being stolen and businesses are going to the wall because of crime in the member for Mandurah's electorate. That is the problem the government has and is trying to silence us on.

That is why the Minister for Police stood and said that there was nothing to see. Every year in Northbridge, 530 people are getting bashed, but there is nothing to see! It is up 39 per cent! Are we happy with that? Is that a good outcome?

Mr T.J. Healy interjected.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Wait until I get to the stats in the member for Southern River's electorate. The stats in his electorate are atrocious. He needs more police as well.

I am here to say that the opposition will raise this issue again and again. When the government chews into our private members' time and takes 50 per cent of our airtime, we will have suspension after suspension. We will disrupt the government's chaotic legislative agenda even further. It cannot run this chamber, it cannot run the legislative agenda in the other chamber, and we will disrupt if the government continues to let this state down by not being open and transparent, as it promised. It is appalling the way the government treats this chamber and it is appalling the way it treats the opposition, and we are going to scream from the rooftops about how atrociously law and order is being managed in this state.

Debate adjourned, pursuant to standing orders.