

**ROAD TRAFFIC LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL (NO. 2) 2015**

*Second Reading*

Resumed from 17 August.

**MR W.J. JOHNSTON (Cannington)** [11.51 am]: I think I have 17 minutes on the clock. I had the joy of getting up three minutes before four o'clock yesterday to start my contribution on the Road Traffic Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2015, which I understand was introduced in November last year. I note that there are pages of amendments in the notice paper proposed by the government. Starting on page 9 of the notice paper, the minister has indicated the government's amendments to clauses 27, 37 and 66. Clause 66 has six amendments. Clause 67 has eight amendments. The eighth amendment goes for six and a half pages. The amendment to clause 68 goes over a full page. They are very extensive amendments. I was interested in that because yesterday, of course, Parliament debated the bill introduced by the member for Hillarys, the Road Traffic Legislation Amendment (Disqualification for Life) Bill 2016. I was interested that the government's position on that bill was that it did not support it. One of the reasons it explained that it did not support it was that it was badly drafted and required amendments. The minister asserted that the member for Hillarys had not been in a position to consider all the issues raised by that bill and, therefore, it was not adequately drafted. I note that the government is extensively amending its own legislation to deal with a number of issues. When we get to clauses at the consideration in detail stage, I imagine that the government will give detailed explanations about the need for each of these very extensive changes to the Road Traffic Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2015, yet it did not take the same opportunity to deal with the questions raised by the member for Hillarys. If the government's criticism of the member for Hillarys is valid, this was the opportunity—these pages and pages and pages of amendments to the Road Traffic Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2015—to deal with the issues raised by my friend the member for Hillarys.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** I would be more than happy for that to be incorporated into the present bill. I was not worried about having my name on it.

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** It so easily could have been done. As the minister made the point in her contribution yesterday, no-one is accusing the member for Hillarys of being driven by ego on the Road Traffic Legislation Amendment (Disqualification for Life) Bill 2016. The minister specifically noted the member's well-understood and genuine interest in road safety. When I bring amendments to the chamber on behalf of the Labor Party in my areas of responsibility, I always make the point that these are drafted to the best of the capacities of opposition. If the government agrees with the sentiment but thinks that the words in the amendment are not the best way to present it, please just take the issues that we are raising and bring the amendments to us.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** What really got me was the minister's explanation when she said that anybody who loses their licence could end up being a burden on taxpayers of Western Australia and Australia because they couldn't get a job because they would go on social welfare. How can you equate that to someone losing their life—to the families of someone who's lost their life? There is no equation there.

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** Interestingly, in my first term as member for Cannington, I wrote and raised the issue of a constituent of mine who had had a truck seized because the driver was unlicensed. Even though it was a commercial vehicle and the only tilt tray truck in his transport business and even though the business owner had checked the driver's licence, the vehicle was seized because the driver was unlicensed. The owner could not see whether it had been suspended and, in fact, it had been, so the police seized the vehicle under the hoon laws.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** I remember that case.

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** I am sure the member does, because I remember who the minister was at that time. I think I did a grievance in here on that issue because it was seriously impacting his business, and the Liberal-National government made the point that sometimes people's ability to make a living is impacted because of the Road Traffic Act. For example, if people such as any of us have their licences suspended, they would be inconvenienced. But a taxidriver or a courier driver who has their licence suspended would lose their job. The penalty of having a licence suspended has a major impact on a range of people, such as courier drivers. Courier drivers come into my office—Mr Acting Speaker (Mr P. Abetz), they may even come into your office; I do not know—to say, "Look, it is unfair; I'm doing 150 000 kilometres a year and someone else is only doing 15 000 kilometres a year. I am 10 times more likely to be caught for doing something wrong than the person who is doing only 15 000 kilometres a year, yet we get the same number of demerit points and we have the same period, three years, to lose those demerit points." Of course, there is an impact on people's capacity to earn a living through the actions of the road traffic laws.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** I would ban that opportunity for those who kill someone on our roads because they are drunk or drugged. That is the difference.

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** The Labor Party supported the member for Hillarys. We are happy to do that. I am making the point that the argument rings shallow. The government raised arguments yesterday—the first being that the draft that the member for Hillarys prepared was not comprehensive because it did not take into account all the issues involved that would have needed to be dealt with. That may or may not be true, but if it were true, look at the pages and pages of amendments that the Minister for Police is asking us to support. Some of these amendments deal with point-to-point cameras, which is not currently in the draft. There was plenty of opportunity for the minister to take in the underlying principles in the Road Traffic Legislation Amendment (Disqualification for Life) Bill 2016, but the reality is that the government fundamentally does not support imposing a greater penalty on people who kill others because of drugs and/or alcohol. I find it extraordinary that the police minister argued against mandatory sentences for people who kill others in traffic accidents because of drugs and/or alcohol. It was bizarre for the minister to argue, as she did yesterday, and of course I cannot quote —

**Mrs L.M. Harvey:** It is untrue.

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** I have the transcript here, but of course I cannot —

**Mrs L.M. Harvey:** I did not argue against a mandatory sentence.

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** Yes, you did.

**Mrs L.M. Harvey:** I argued against a lifetime disqualification. Tell the truth! I hope you're not quoting from uncorrected *Hansard*.

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** I am holding the proof *Hansard* from yesterday, which I am unable to quote in Parliament because of our standing orders. Having noted that, I ask people who are looking at this uncorrected *Hansard* to look at pages 38 to 45 of Wednesday, 17 August 2016. I cannot quote it, but I will read it out: “As well as this, the bill removes the discretion of a court to deal with exceptional circumstances, as under proposed section 59(4C). A permanent disqualification must be imposed if the requirements of proposed section 59(4C)(a) are met. This again could have unnecessarily harsh consequences, particularly for the families of people who receive a permanent disqualification. The bill also removes the ability of a court to grant an extraordinary driver’s licence under section 27 of the Road Traffic (Authorisation to Drive) Act.” As I say, that will not be indented in the text because under the standing orders I cannot quote from the uncorrected *Hansard*, but I make it clear that the minister’s argument was that the member for Hillarys was removing the discretion of a court to deal with exceptional circumstances. That is an interesting position because that is the exact position that the Labor Party argued in respect of other matters in this chamber, but the Minister for Police called us weak to argue those things. How ridiculous! There is a word to describe when someone says one thing and does another, but I suppose that word is probably unparliamentary.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** Integrity.

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** Indeed, it is integrity. It is interesting that the Liberal Party has said sending someone to jail is not something that the court should have discretion about, but giving people a driver’s licence is something that the court should have discretion about. It is strange. Then the minister argued that another provision of a different act, which the member for Hillarys did not seek to amend, meant that a lifetime disqualification could be reviewed after a period of 10 years.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** I was aware of that.

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** Regardless, it was not fatal to the member’s bill. It is simply a provision in another arrangement whereby something else could happen.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** Absolutely.

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** If the minister says that discretion should not be available, the minister could remove that discretion. Fortunately, I am not inside the mind of the member for Hillarys—it is not a place I would love to be, I can tell him that now!—but the point is that I do not know what was in the mind of the member for Hillarys when he wrote the words in his legislation. But if that was the problem the minister had, the minister had an opportunity to deal with that along with all these other amendments. I think I counted 37 amendments in total that the minister is asking us to support in her legislation. Remember her legislation has been sitting on the notice paper for eight months. It is not as though this Road Traffic Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2015 —

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** It is 10 months, actually.

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** Ten months—whatever. It is not as though this has been a priority of the government. Many other pieces of legislation were given priority way before this one, including the Marketing of Potatoes Amendment and Repeal Bill that was dealt with on Tuesday night.

[Member’s time extended.]

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** I wanted to debunk the nonsense that we heard from the minister last night in debating the legislation introduced by the Independent Liberal, the member for Hillarys. I note that he put out a media release today informing the community that following 76 per cent of respondents to a survey he conducted indicating they want him to run again, he has chosen to do so. I am sure the Labor Party would be desperately interested in the outcome of that election. We have always run a hard campaign in that seat. As the minister explained, the member for Hillarys has an undoubted commitment to road safety. I am sure if he is returned to this chamber at the 2017 election—none of us know whether any of us will get back in—he would continue to pursue his clear and personal agenda to improve road safety in Western Australia.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** Absolutely, because I do not want other families to go through what my family and the Roberts family went through when they lost their father, husband and brother. I want to try to save the people of Western Australia going through that terrible trauma. That is genuine.

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** Indeed; and I also note that the member for Hillarys' media release mentioned the finances of the state; that is, if the government had paid more attention to him and less attention to others, the state's finances would be in a much better position. We would have had more money to spend on road traffic and road safety.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** About three years ago a commentator said, "If only Colin had listened to Robbie J, we'd be in a different position." Everything I said has come true after three years, including the disgraceful unemployment statistics of today.

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** Yes, it is very tragic that over 90 000 Western Australians are now unemployed.

I want to go on to a few things about road safety in my electorate. The insurance company AAMI states that the section of Albany Highway past Carousel shopping centre is the most accident-prone road in Western Australia. I have grieved to the Minister for Transport about this and a number of other issues, and I have written to him. He basically said, "It's all because of driver behaviour. Driver behaviour is the problem past Carousel." That is absolutely unfair. There are major traffic problems through Carousel. The road simply does not function. Even on a Saturday, it does not function. There are many road safety problems there that need to be dealt with.

The RAC publishes a report about dangerous traffic intersections. There is a list of 103 or 107, something like that, most accident-prone, dangerous intersections in the metropolitan area. There are 34 metropolitan Assembly seats. If members divide that number, there are about three for every state electorate. The electorate of Cannington has seven of those 103 dangerous intersections. Seven are in the electorate that I represent. Again, I have grieved to the Minister for Transport about this. He basically said, "Tough"! Fortunately, the City of Gosnells has not been as derelict in its duty as the minister. I am very pleased that following the lobbying that I have done with the local residents in the suburb of Langford, the council is installing traffic lights at the corner of Langford Avenue and Spencer Road. That is a really good decision, and the lights are currently being installed. I was there the other day and they are very close to finishing the road infrastructure changes. One resident lives just on the northern side of that intersection and her house is maybe a metre and a half lower than the road level. She has literally had cars go through the intersection and her garden wall and nearly hit her house. They have not quite reached the house, but given that she has young kids, it has always been a big worry to her. It is good that through the work of the local residents and my support that that intersection is nearly finished. Those traffic lights will make a big difference to the number of accidents at that intersection, which local residents tell me are a regular occurrence.

At the other end of Langford Avenue, the City of Gosnells will put in traffic lights at the Nicholson Road intersection. It is a terrible intersection and putting lights there will make a big difference. The City of Canning responded to my request on behalf of local residents and is doing some minor works at the Lynwood Avenue–Nicholson Road intersection. It has widened the road to create a turn pocket for people wanting to turn left. In the past, if a driver wanted to turn right from Lynwood Avenue across Nicholson Road, because there was no space for two cars, there would be a queue of cars wanting to turn left and the intersection would simply cease to function. The problem is that Nicholson Road has traffic lights at Roe Highway and then Spencer Road, but the cars spread out as they travel down that part of the road. Although it is only a 60 kilometre-an-hour zone, people do various speeds and the cars all string out so there are no gaps in the traffic for people to turn right onto Nicholson Road. It means that if just one car wants to turn right, suddenly the Lynwood Avenue intersection ceases to function because nobody can turn left. The council has now widened that road and put in a turn pocket to allow three cars to queue to turn left. Unless four cars want to turn right, which is uncommon, that intersection starts to clear. Of course, when the Langford Avenue–Nicholson Road lights go in, that will break up the traffic. Lynwood Avenue is further north than Langford Avenue, which means that the drivers on Lynwood Road will get a bigger break in the traffic and get out. That will also probably help at Metcalfe Road and Nicholson Road, which is again another very difficult intersection. I have raised that matter with the City of Canning and it has explained the problems with it being quite close to the traffic lights at the Spencer Road–Nicholson Road

intersection. At least the changes further down at Lynwood Avenue and Langford Avenue on Nicholson Road will probably make some of problems at Metcalfe Road a little better. It might even give some people who are turning right out of Metcalfe Road a little bit of space as well. One way or another, the Cities of Canning and Gosnells are to be commended on their actions to improve those roads. I make the point that Main Roads Western Australia is responsible for those roads. They are not council roads but the councils are spending their money to do what the Minister for Transport refused to do; that is, to improve road safety at those intersections. They are to be commended, and I am very happy to work with local residents.

Another one of those bad intersections known by the RAC is where Station Street and Albany Highway meet. I understand that Main Roads Western Australia will put traffic lights in there, effectively funded by the Canning Agricultural, Horticultural and Recreational Society that owns the showground. It is running a commercial development there with a commercial tenant building a Bunnings Warehouse. The society has done a deal with the Western Australian Greyhound Racing Association for the dog track, which has given it a bit of money. It conceded a bit of land for planning approvals so that a bus lane can go past Westfield Carousel and the showground, and then traffic lights will allow buses to change from the left-hand lane to the right-hand lane. At the moment there is a bus stop in front of the showground but the buses have to turn right to go down Nicholson Road. In the past the buses have had to get across three lanes of traffic to turn right at Nicholson Road. At least with the traffic lights and a dedicated bus lane, the buses will be filtered out in front of the traffic rather than having to barge their way through the traffic in the afternoons when Albany Highway is at its worst.

The next thing that I need to talk about on road safety and road traffic in my area is the constant complaint about hoon drivers. Recently, the residents of Beckenham raised this issue with me. Beckenham is an older suburb with lots of long, straight streets. Although lots of traffic goes into that suburb from the City of Gosnells, the residents continue to tell me that many people use the straight streets as rat runs rather than William Street, which is causing lots of trouble. I raised it with local police who said that they will give it some priority to try to crack down on hoon driving, but it has always been a struggle to deal with ever since the member for Midland introduced Western Australia's first anti-hoon laws in the early 2000s. State governments have incrementally tried to address the question of hoon driving but it is a complicated issue. I will continue to work with local residents to reduce the impact of hoon driving whenever I can.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** More cops on our roads: that is what everybody says and it can be done just like that.

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** Yes. The police told me that if they know that hoon drivers are in one location, they will send extra patrols to that area. But what happens in the area without the patrol? There is only one solution to hoon driving. If the police are not there to enforce the law, it is very hard to achieve any other outcome. These are all important issues to the community that I represent. I will continue to advocate on its behalf, to listen to its needs and to improve the situation. Of course, that includes dealing with the three level crossings that I understand the Liberal Party is saying will all still be there in 30 years even though it wants to further increase the number of trains using the train line through to Kenwick that runs from my electorate. That is another major safety problem. There are queues of cars like you would not believe coming from the north on Wharf Street in the mornings. It is just amazing. We had some journalists out there a while ago and they literally could not believe that 40 cars were lined up on a suburban street waiting for a level crossing. It is a major problem because people end up using these streets as rat runs to avoid Wharf Street.

**MR C.J. TALLENTIRE (Gosnells)** [12.18 pm]: I rise to speak on the Road Traffic Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2015. There is no doubt that road safety impacts on all our lives. Every member here and every member of the Western Australian community is an active road user in one way or another. We all use the road network to commute to our work at Parliament, to shop, to see friends and to attend sporting events. To be active citizens we have to use the road network, and it is for that reason that everyone has a view on road safety. Everyone has ideas on how road safety can be improved. We all see behaviour on the roads that we would immediately respond to and observe as being dangerous. We need to distinguish that, though, from innocent mistakes people sometimes make. We have a problem in society sometimes when people perhaps forget to indicate a lane change and that gives people a reason to engage in road rage. We need to leave that sort of issue aside because it is a discussion for another day, but there is no doubt that some people overreact to relatively minor mistakes. What I am talking about here is the very serious problem of driving under the influence of alcohol and drugs, and the legislation before us contains some proposed remedies and responses to that problem. One remedy will make it permissible for police officers to insist upon a blood test from someone who has been involved in a particular type of traffic accident. I think that is an obvious remedy. I am amazed that police officers do not already have the power to require someone involved in a traffic accident to give a blood test when they deem it is necessary. I know that some people in the broader community have the attitude that if they are involved in a crash, they can just say, no, they do not want to give a blood test. I have no doubt in my mind that people should be required to give a blood test. All the detail about how the sample is to be conveyed to the ChemCentre is contained in the legislation. I understand it is necessary to have that level of detail in the

legislation. I am concerned, though, if I am reading the bill correctly—no doubt we will go into this in consideration in detail—that police officers will be able to require a person to give a blood sample only if that person has committed an offence at a certain level of seriousness. I am worried about that because I think we may have set the bar of the level of seriousness too high. It might be the case that someone who drives under the influence of alcohol or other drugs and who causes a relatively minor accident should be exposed. I do not think anyone who drives under the influence of drugs or alcohol should think that they can get away with it. I really hope that we are not allowing that idea to be put through this place—we all know how long it takes for legislation to come here and to be revised—and that in fact we are going further in this important area.

I would like to dwell now, however, on the idea that there is some sort of excuse in saying, “I was drunk at the time.” It is here that I am reminded of a Pink Floyd song from the 1970s—I think it is the song *Money*. I believe the artists of Pink Floyd got the lyrics for that particular song interviewing other notable musicians at the time. They asked them, “Why would you commit an act of violence?” I think in one case a member of the group Wings answered a question in the survey that asked why he acted violently in a particular case with, “Well, I was really drunk at the time.” As though that was an excuse! That was the attitude in the 70s, and it continues today. Some people believe saying that I was really drunk at the time is an excuse for a type of behaviour, a particularly dreadful act. We have to get over that. We have to say that, no, a person’s act of irresponsibility to let themselves get into that condition makes their act, if anything, even worse. That is an issue we have to face. That attitude is exposed in that song from the 1970s and it lives on today.

I, of course, have a particular interest in road safety matters that affect cyclists. I can see it in the dreadful spate of cyclists who have been killed on the roads and the immediate reaction of some perpetrators—the culprits—in those hit and runs. When a driver knocks over a cyclist, their response is to take off and not stop. They tend to not check the condition of the person, not offer assistance and not report the accident. There have been too many of those cases lately. I suspect that in some hit-and-run cases people would give very high alcohol readings; they might give a reading that suggests they are under the influence of methamphetamine or some other drug. That cannot continue. We must let it be known that if a person is under the influence of drugs, the crime is all the more serious and that they are not going to get away with it. On that front I am somewhat reassured that people are not getting away with hit-and-run accidents, but we have to make it really clear that if a person does that, they are culpable to a whole other degree. A case in which a person did not get away with it is the case of Professor Tom Lyons, an environmental scientist and climate change scientist at Murdoch University, who was knocked off his bike while taking a gentle ride along The Esplanade in Mt Pleasant. The driver of a white four-wheel drive ute failed to stop, drove on and did not check the condition of Tom Lyons. He did not report the accident and only came through, only fessed up, and went to a police station when it was apparent that CCTV footage from houses along that part of The Esplanade in Mt Pleasant had clearly identified the vehicle. There was a general community alert and search for the vehicle. These events occurred in September 2015. Reports at the time stated —

The man alleged to have been responsible for the crash, from Parkwood, has been charged with dangerous driving occasioning grievous bodily harm, failing to stop and render assistance, and failing to report a crash.

Police found the car that was involved in the incident yesterday and seized it for forensic examination.

An ABC news report on 23 May 2015 stated —

“We got a lot of assistance from the public in this matter but what was particularly helpful was CCTV footage that was seized from around the location,” Detective Senior Sergeant Brian Hunter from the Major Crash Investigation Section said.

One of the advantages of our highly technology influenced society is the many CCTV cameras around the place. In this case it was one that was part of a security set-up for a private dwelling on The Esplanade in Mt Pleasant. That enabled the community to identify the kind of vehicle that was involved in that accident. I think the culprit realised that he had no hope of going to ground and escaping eventual detection so he eventually came forward. The report stated —

The man handed himself into police yesterday after an appeal by officers for information relating to the crash.

“Handed himself in” is perhaps being a bit kind. It suggests that there was a degree of nobleness about his coming forward. It is likely he committed the offence, perhaps phoned somebody in the legal profession, was told to lie low until the alcohol or drugs were out of his system, and he then came forward. That is a problem we have. In fact, this legislation, which is all about making it compulsory for people to provide blood samples and to participate in blood testing at the request of police officers may in some ways make people think, “Oh well, I had better do a hit and run and move on until I am eventually caught and then have to provide the test.” I am

concerned about that. But, as I say, it is not a solution; it is in response to the number of cameras that are around and people need to realise that they will not get away with these things.

I highlighted a case of someone who was not killed by the dreadful event of being hit from behind, but we have had other cases in which cyclists have been knocked off their bikes and killed. One of the most notable events in recent times, or one that got into the media at any rate—because we need to realise that this happens with dreadful tragic frequency—is the case in 2014 of Brynt McSwain, who was training for a ride. He was a triathlete I believe. He had given his fiancée a meeting point in the Perth hills and had arranged to meet her on a Saturday morning. He was riding along Kewdale Road in Welshpool at 7.40 am. I would have thought the roads would be pretty quiet then; indeed, it is one reason that those of us in the cycling community do a lot of riding in the early morning—we have the impression that roads are quieter and safer then. But poor Brynt McSwain was riding along Kewdale Road at 7.40 am and was hit from behind. The driver of the ute that was involved did not stop, but police arrested the driver a short time later when his vehicle crashed just off the Roe Highway near Nicholson Road. Tragic events like that are all too common.

I will highlight one more case—that of Tim Anderson. Many members here will be aware of Tim Anderson, the rider who was killed just near Leighton Beach while riding, again training for a fund-raising event. Tim was riding home. It happened in the evening, and I will read from the report. It states —

The Perth cycling community is in shock over the hit and run death of a male cyclist at about 8pm last night. A 28 year old Watermans Bay man has been charged with a string of offences including aggravated dangerous driving causing death, failing to stop after an accident, failing to render assistance and driving under the influence of alcohol.

I have participated in Tim's Ride to commemorate the life of Tim Anderson and to increase awareness around road safety, particularly for cyclists. The article I just quoted noted —

The cyclist, who was wearing high-visibility clothing and a helmet, hit the windscreen of the car before being dragged with his bicycle along the road and died a short time later in hospital.

It is believed the driver of the white Toyota Camry may have been drinking at a pub in Fremantle with a work colleague a short time before they were allegedly involved in the crash. The driver fled the scene with his colleague and police were later called by a neighbour who noticed the two men arguing.

These are tragic, tragic incidents and we can only hope that if there is greater awareness of the consequences to innocent road users, to the victims and their families, and, indeed, the devastating consequences on the lives of those who act with such irresponsibility, that people will realise there is tragedy all round and perhaps will take more careful note of what needs to be done. It is really quite simple: do not drive under the influence of alcohol or drugs, which puts people into a condition such that they will not be able to drive responsibly.

I know that road safety is very much in the minds of all people in my electorate of Gosnells. The government has made various forays into this area with the hoon laws, and we have had long debates on that over the last two terms and before my time here. There has always been a need for a concentration of effort on this issue. I want to bring to the attention of the house something that is of concern to me that I do not think has been picked up by the current legislation.

[Member's time extended.]

**Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE:** We look a lot at people exceeding speed limits and at various dangerous behaviour—I might come back to the issue of people doing burnouts and other dangerous driving patterns—but something we do not seem to pick up on is the danger caused by rapid acceleration, which I see quite often in my area. A vehicle will start at zero and get to 60 kilometres an hour in incredibly rapid time. It does not exceed the speed limit, but that rate of acceleration makes for some dangerous events.

**Mr P. Abetz:** And there is the noise that goes with it, too.

**Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE:** Yes, thank you, member for Southern River. I do not think it is possible for people to properly control their vehicle as they rapidly accelerate. Indeed, it is done in such a way, along with the noise of the vehicle, to suggest the person is focused on the attention-seeking aspect of what they are doing. We need to look at that. I notice the legislation contains some fairly complex formulas for determining speeds and what have you. Acceleration should be looked at as a part of those formulas. That will raise the question: how can an unwitting motorist know whether they are contravening laws around acceleration? It is pretty fair to say that would be a category of vehicle that has a power that exceeds what anyone would ever need in vehicle for normal commuting around the metropolitan area and driving around the state of Western Australia. The issue then becomes that someone has a vehicle that can do this rapid acceleration and if someone observes them making that extremely rapid acceleration, the chances are that they are committing an offence. We should be redesigning our laws to ensure that we are picking up people who exceed not only the speed limit but also the rate of

acceleration that is beyond what is necessary. Let us say that someone is second at the traffic lights and they take off at a normal speed, but someone either alongside them or just behind them is intent on rapid acceleration, placing other road users at risk. I am not sure what statistics the government might have on the potential for rapid acceleration to cause accidents or whether they have done any analysis at all; I would love to know. I touched on this issue some years ago and I do not think I got a particularly strong hearing. It was seen as being a little beyond the bounds of whatever bill we were looking at at the time. Nonetheless, it is important, and as the member for Southern River indicated, it relates to other matters to do with hooning and people's general frustration with the standard of behaviour that we see on public roads. After all, public roads are there for people to get to work, to see their family and to get to all kinds of events, such as recreational events. Our public roads are not places for people to indulge in some dream of driving fast vehicles. That is not their purpose at all. In the City of Gosnells a great effort has been put into this issue.

People are doing their very best on the City of Gosnells' various committees, especially the RoadWise Advisory Group, which the member for Cannington touched on. The city has a whole range of initiatives, but the one that really stands out in my mind is the World Day of Remembrance for Road Traffic Victims, which the City of Gosnells hosts every year. The city also makes a point of taking that event into our schools, because it is the year 10 or year 11 students who are about to get their driver's licence who need to be educated and told about the risks. They need to be told about the benefits that come with having a driver's licence, but they also need to be told about the responsibilities as well. I note that the Minister for Police was at Thornlie Senior High School only a couple of years ago when we had a fantastic presentation by year 10 or 11 students about the dangers of texting while driving. The theatrical performance that was put on to get that message across was absolutely first-rate—really good. I think all of the student community at that school would have appreciated and got the message about what is at stake and what is being risked if people text while driving. It takes only a brief moment of inattention, the temptation to see who that text message is from while driving, for a tragedy to arise. That message was well delivered.

Since that event at Thornlie Senior High School a few years ago, I have attended other World Day of Remembrance for Road Traffic Victims events. I believe the General Assembly of the United Nations brought this program into effect in 2005, so it is part of an international recognition of the risks, the losses and the tragedies that occur when road safety rules are not adhered to. I have also been to other events—such as one last year at the Australian Islamic College, and one the year before that at Southern River College—and on both of those occasions speakers were brought forward who had been victims of road tragedy. Indeed, Mr Acting Speaker (Mr I.M. Britza), I know you were at the Southern River College event. The quality of presentation and the sincerity with which it was given, but also the harsh reality of it, all stay in one's mind and, I am sure, have stayed in the minds of the young students in attendance. I put it to the house that we really need to ensure that all Western Australian students are able to access these kinds of programs and are able to see and hear these stories for themselves firsthand. I recall the gentleman who came to speak at Southern River College. He made a point of just letting the story unfold in such a way that we heard about the fact that he had been drinking one night and that there had been this tragedy, and at the very end of the story he told us that he was the person who was actually driving the vehicle. We could see how devastating that was for him, personally, to have that on his conscience for the rest of his life—that he was responsible for the deaths of close friends. Those tragedies stay with people.

Legislation that comes to this place has to be designed to tackle these sorts of problems, but at the same time it has to be backed up by strong educational programs, and they require funding. These people who have given outstanding presentations to schools need some level of support just to help them cope with the injuries that they have sustained. The gentlemen who spoke at Southern River College and at the Australian Islamic College were both wheelchair-bound. I am sure they need additional assistance to be able to get around and tell their stories and help people appreciate what they have gone through. We have to make sure our school curriculums can accommodate this and that there is support in place so that these stories do not just get to one group of students but to whole year groups on a regular basis. I am very keen to see a very broad telling of these stories.

Finally, I want to talk about what I believe is called the road traffic branch. I can recall the Road Traffic Authority back in the 1970s that was almost a separate police force before we decided to merge it back in with the main police service. I do not want to question the wisdom of that decision, but I note that today, if one feels one has an issue as a member of this Parliament and wants to tell the police force about it, it is very hard to get onto the road traffic branch. My office has been trying to contact the road traffic branch about some problems on Helm Street, Maddington, and the need to have some cameras there. We have tried various phone numbers that we have acquired, but we are not getting any answers. It seems that we are required to go through the local policing system—perhaps the officer in charge of the local police station. That is all fine, but it would be much better if we were able to speak directly to the police road traffic branch about road safety matters so that we can have direct assistance and let them know that we need their efforts to be targeted on speed cameras, in this case at Helm Street in Maddington. If we were to contact the local police station, we would be causing the

deployment of police officers who otherwise might be involved in investigating burglaries and other things; it would mean that they would not be able to do that work because they would be out on Helm Street holding a speed camera. It would be good if we could have a better use of the police service in that respect so that we as members and the community in general can contact the road traffic branch. We could have much better targeting of police resources.

I look forward to getting into the detail of the legislation before us and the amendments that are on the notice paper. As other members have noted, the amendments seem to be quite extensive, suggesting perhaps that when the bill was brought into the house, due consideration had not been given to various aspects of it. I also note the issue around the rules for alcohol levels for driving instructors. I will also quickly mention the issue of supervisor drivers with young people and the idea that there can be young passengers in a car when someone is under some level of instruction—perhaps on red or green P-plates. I am concerned that it is a little too easy for people to be under instruction with other young passengers in the car, when perhaps the driving skills of the person under instruction would really require them to pay full attention to the road. Any additional contact or communication in the car should be with only the person who is supervising the learner driver, and there should not be any other young people in the car. That is an issue that is perhaps slightly separate to the point of this legislation, but it is an issue that I wanted to raise. This is a very important bill and I look forward to going into it in detail.

**MS L.L. BAKER (Maylands)** [12.48 pm]: In the extensive time that I have left to address the Road Traffic Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2015, I want to make a couple of very brief statements about speeding drivers. I see some really positive things in this bill and I congratulate the government on a number of the changes it will bring in and the significant amendments that our police force will be able to put into action. When reading the bill, I found it quite surprising that police are not able to compulsorily require blood tests of drivers who are suspected of being involved in traffic accidents resulting in death or serious bodily harm. I find that quite amazing. My brother and his wife are both police officers, and I cannot imagine how they can do their jobs effectively, given those gaps in the existing legislation.

I can, of course, refer to many instances in which it is essential that the police are given greater capacity to manage speeding drivers and to intervene when they can. I know that the Minister for Police is aware of the situation on Broun Avenue in my electorate, where a particular intersection sits between —

Debate interrupted, pursuant to standing orders.

[Continued on page 4911.]