



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
FOR THE AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY

STANDING COMMITTEE ON JUSTICE AND COMMUNITY SAFETY

Mr Peter Cain MLA (Chair), Dr Marisa Paterson (Deputy Chair),
Mr Andrew Braddock MLA

Submission Cover Sheet

Inquiry into Dangerous Driving

Submission Number: 001

Date Authorised for Publication: 10 August 2022

To:

[LA Committee - JCS](#)

Subject:

Inquiry Into Dangerous Driving

Date:

Monday, 8 August 2022 7:48:39 AM

Caution: This email originated from outside of the ACT Government. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe. Learn why this is important<<http://www.act.gov.au/emailsecurity>>

As a Canberra resident for 14 years, I have observed poor driving decisions and played my part in making those poor decisions. However there is a point where seriously deliberate and dangerous driving needs intervention.

I'm not talking doing 90 in an 80, or even 130 on a freeway signed at 110. Whilst these are exceeding posted speed limits and are therefore breaking the law, they may not be seen as dangerous p, if the road is clear etc etc.

What cannot be overlooked any longer is the deliberate dangerous driver behaviour such as that which recently took the life of a young man returning home from work, when struck head on by a car driven at speed on the wrong side of the road, knowingly by the driver in a selfish reckless manner.

It seems to me it's too late when ambulances are involved, too late when police arrive, too late to hear that the offender was on bail, or driving on a suspended licence etc etc.

I believe strongly that the protection of the many outweighs the second and third chances of the individual.

An individual who has chosen to thrill seek and race a motor vehicle in a dangerous manner, which involves circumstances which can be demonstrated to have put others at risk requires immediate physical intervention.

That is to say, simply suspending their licence is not enough. Separating the offender from the vehicle by impounding it, or physically disabling at its home address is needed.

If bail is granted, and sadly all too often it is, then the vehicle cannot be accessible to the individual. If they steal, acquire without consent another vehicle and reoffend whilst on the original bail, then physically removing the person from the community is a must. It is key to protecting the lives of the many, over the liberty of the repeatedly reckless.

A community suffers when it is continually impacted by a minority of individuals who think/know they can game the system and repeatedly claim special circumstances to avoid jail.

In summary:

It is key to protect the lives of the many, over the liberty of the repeatedly reckless few.

A repeat offender (two times is a repeat) of a dangerous driving incident has shown no care for their community, and therefore should be removed from it.

The vehicle of a repeat offender should be impounded and destroyed as a deterrent.

Rehabilitation programs need a degree of oversight and assessment at the end of the term. It is no use doing 100 hours community service without a KPI in place to record an improved behavioural or learning outcome. If there is no improvement, then rinse and repeat.

Thank you for launching this enquiry.

[Redacted Signature]