



Parliamentary Debates

(HANSARD)

FORTY-FIRST PARLIAMENT

FIRST SESSION

2022

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 22 February 2022

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, 22 February 2022

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr S.J. Price) took the chair at 2.00 pm, acknowledged country and read prayers.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY CHAMBER — REMOTE PARTICIPATION

Statement by Deputy Speaker

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr S.J. Price) [2.01 pm]: This week, Madam Speaker will not be present in the chamber, so I will be in the chair to start proceedings each day, to preside over question time and to approve the matter of public interest. However, I will continue to have a deliberative vote. I am keen to continue the trial of the remote participation technology that Madam Speaker started last week. Today at question time, we will have questions asked remotely. On Wednesday or Thursday, there is the possibility of a member giving their speech remotely during the second reading debate on a bill. On Thursday, members may deliver their 90-second statement remotely. If members want to participate in the trial, please let me know.

GOURMET ESCAPE 2022

Statement by Minister for Tourism

MR R.H. COOK (Kwinana — Minister for Tourism) [2.02 pm]: I would like to inform the house that Tourism Western Australia has made the decision not to execute the contract extension for the Western Australia Gourmet Escape 2022 with event holder IMG Events and it will not be extending funding for the event for a further term. Given the ongoing impacts of COVID-19 on events, as demonstrated by the cancellation of the WA Gourmet Escape in 2020 and 2021, Tourism WA is reassessing the current delivery model of a Western Australian culinary event.

The WA Gourmet Escape began in 2012 as the Margaret River Gourmet Escape and was initially operated by Brand Events Australia, which was purchased by IMG in 2015. The state government has supported the event since its inception through Tourism WA. In 2018, following a review requested by then Minister for Tourism, Hon Paul Papalia, MLA, a request-for-proposal process was undertaken for the development and management of a major culinary event, with the intention of expanding the Margaret River Gourmet Escape concept to other parts of the state. IMG was the successful respondent to the RFP, which resulted in the development of the Western Australia Gourmet Escape, first held in 2019 in the Swan Valley, Perth and Margaret River.

The government recognises the hard work and dedication of IMG in delivering the Margaret River Gourmet Escape and, more recently, the WA Gourmet Escape, and it appreciates the visitation and promotional benefits it has delivered to the state over this time. IMG is a valued partner and Tourism WA remains positive about working with the organisation on other future event opportunities for Western Australia. Tourism WA continues to assess Western Australia's blockbuster events calendar to ensure we have events that will not only attract new visitors, but also deliver strong economic benefits for the state as we adapt to living with the COVID-19 pandemic.

INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

Statement by Minister for International Education

MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah — Minister for International Education) [2.04 pm]: I rise today to inform the members of this house on the safe return of international students into Western Australia. The McGowan government values international students, who add much to our community and our enduring relationships with countries throughout the world from where the students come. Western Australia remains a great place to live, study and work, and there are many employment, social and cultural opportunities for international students across the state.

International education is critical to the growth and diversification of the state. It is estimated that in 2019, international student enrolments provided value of \$2.1 billion to the Western Australian economy. The McGowan government continues to invest in the recovery and long-term growth of the sector through the *Western Australian international education recovery and renewal plan*, Reconnect WA and international education initiatives within the safe transition industry support package. I have worked closely with the sector to ensure the initiatives are responsive to the needs of the sector and international students, and I will continue to do so.

The \$77 million safe transition industry support package includes international education support totalling \$16 million, of which \$8 million is for a student quarantine support program to support international students to self-quarantine in Perth. The industry support fund of \$6 million will provide grants of \$50 000 and \$100 000 to assist eligible small and medium-sized education providers impacted by the change, and \$2 million will go towards a university services for students support program that provides universities with a supplementary payment of \$500 per student to assist with support services including student welfare. Western Australia's full border opening will occur on 3 March 2022 and will allow for safe travel into the state for international students from overseas. International students add much to our diverse and vibrant community, and our enduring relationships with countries throughout the world from where they come.

DEMERSAL SCALEFISH

Statement by Minister for Fisheries

MR D.T. PUNCH (Bunbury — Minister for Fisheries) [2.07 pm]: I rise today to inform the house that the latest stock assessment undertaken by the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development of demersal scalefish in the west coast bioregion, which is from Kalbarri to Augusta, has shown that we are not on track to recover stocks by 2030, as per the 2010–30 recovery plan. The recovery plan was set in motion by former Minister for Fisheries Hon Jon Ford and continued by Hon Norman Moore in response to serious sustainability concerns raised at the time. Current management arrangements and the responsible fishing practices of recreational anglers and commercial fishers have helped to halt the decline in demersal stocks, but there has been limited recovery of indicator species dhufish and pink snapper stocks. More needs to be done to safeguard their future.

In late 2021, a harvest strategy reference group comprised of Recfishwest, the Western Australian Fishing Industry Council, Marine Tourism Western Australia and DPIRD recommended to reduce the total catch for demersal species by 50 per cent in order to meet 2030 recovery targets. I have accepted this recommendation and in line with the principles of the harvest strategy and integrated fisheries management policy, the new recovery benchmark will be set at 375 tonnes, reduced from 750 tonnes. No new management changes have come into effect at this stage.

From this point, the department will work with the fishing sectors to develop management options to meet the new catch limit and additional measures to reduce fish mortality. All options are on the table for consideration and the state government welcomes any proposals from the sectors to assist with the implementation of the new total catch limits. Proposed management options developed through discussions with the sectors are due to be released for wider public consultation in April this year.

I am always proud of the research and science underpinning WA's world-class fisheries management and I want to thank DPIRD, WAFIC, Recfishwest and Marine Tourism WA for working collaboratively in the interests of the fishery. I want grandparents to be able to take their grandchildren fishing for decades to come. The science has made it clear that decisive management action needs to be taken or we risk a future without the demersal scalefish we value so highly as Western Australians.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

CORONAVIRUS — RESTRICTIONS

52. Ms M.J. DAVIES to the Premier:

I refer to the introduction of level 1 restrictions that were introduced on Monday, 21 February, and the Premier's advice that level 2 restrictions will be required, according to modelling that he still has not released.

- (1) What are the case numbers and/or other factors that will trigger level 2 restrictions?
- (2) On or around what date will the restrictions be implemented?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

I thank the member for the question.

(1)–(2) The modelling she is referring to has been released publicly and is currently up on the website, but I will table it for the Leader of the Opposition to look at. The health advice upon which we acted, provided by the Chief Health Officer, has also been released publicly, but I will table it here for members to look at as well.

[See papers [962](#) and [963](#).]

Mr M. McGOWAN: Obviously, level 2 restrictions are something that we are reluctant to head towards. We currently have what are called level 1 restrictions in place. That is the two-square-metre rule, some restrictions on gatherings in the homes, restrictions on public gatherings and a reduction in the number of people attending events such as football games, stadia, concerts, theatres or things of that nature, which is similar to what has been put in place in the eastern states, although perhaps not as severe. The reason it is not as severe as some of the restrictions in some of the eastern states is that we have extremely high levels of vaccination. We are now at rates of around 99 per cent first dose, around 96 per cent double dose and approaching 60 per cent third dose. By delaying the border reopening, we have been able to get to those very high levels of third-dose vaccination and also very high levels of children's vaccination, prior to having a major seeding event in Western Australia. That is the position. As I said, we are reluctant to head towards the level 2 restrictions, which is the four-square-metre rule, but we will continue to monitor. The thing about COVID is making hard and fast decisions, and setting dates and times and so forth can often be influenced by circumstances. That is why it is ill-advised to be too prescriptive, because circumstances can change.

CORONAVIRUS — RESTRICTIONS

53. Ms M.J. DAVIES to the Premier:

I have a supplementary question. Why did it take the Premier five days to release the Omicron modelling after making the announcement to reopen the borders that he based on that data?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

I received the advice this morning, so we have released the advice. That is what we have done. This is the first parliamentary sitting day. Being accountable to Parliament is actually important, so we have released it here in Parliament. I think it has been published on the Health website or some other website today already. That is what has occurred.

The opposition is always looking for things to criticise. It is always looking for things to undermine. It never stops. It has jumped on the anti-mandate bandwagon now. It has jumped on the anti-vax bandwagon. It has undermined our efforts in relation to borders.

Dr D.J. Honey interjected.

Mr M. McGOWAN: You are! You are out there joining with these people out there marching around, screaming and yelling, coming up with all sorts of conspiracy theories. The opposition is out there backing them now.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members!

Mr M. McGOWAN: You have no principles.

Ms L. Mettam interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party!

Mr M. McGOWAN: The whole way through this extraordinary set of events, which we have been through over the last two years, all the opposition has done is criticise and undermine. I compare you with an actual quality opposition, which is the South Australian opposition, who did not do that. It actually said to the people of South Australia, "We want to be constructive and work with the government." What did you do? All you did and all you continue to do is undermine and criticise, and you go so far as to join the anti-vax and anti-mandate crowd who are out there making threats and intimidation. That is what you do. You, the Liberal and Nationals WA opposition, are a disgrace to this state the way you act!

CORONAVIRUS — INTERSTATE BORDER RESTRICTIONS

54. Ms S.E. WINTON to the Premier:

I refer to the state government's response to the Omicron outbreak and the safe and responsible full reopening of Western Australia's border. Can the Premier outline to the house what the short delay in the border reopening has meant for the state's preparedness in dealing with the increase in Omicron cases?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

I thank the member for Wanneroo for the question.

Obviously, delaying the full reopening of the border by a month was a difficult decision. It caused some disruption and inconvenience to some people in our community, but it has also saved a great many lives of Western Australians. Several members interjected.

Mr M. McGOWAN: There you go again! There are the Liberal and National Parties again undermining our efforts to save Western Australian lives.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members!

Mr M. McGOWAN: It is no wonder there are only three of you, because of the way you act. If you are concerned about your status in Parliament and your status in the community, you need to look in the mirror as to how you act.

Ms L. Mettam interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party!

Mr M. McGOWAN: What we have tried to do through our measures and what is verifiably true is we have saved a great deal of Western Australian lives. It was the right call. It ensured that before we open the borders, we are going to have very high levels of third-dose vaccination. As members will see from the modelling, that was crucial to having a good outcome. What we have also avoided, that the other states have been through, is months upon months upon months, if not years, of shocking disruption. What people have seen in the east is a huge increase in cases, deaths and hospitalisations. They have seen the mass furloughing of staff; they have seen large number of businesses having to shut. They have seen huge lines outside testing clinics and shortages of tests. It would have been a huge unforced error had we opened on 5 February, in light of what was occurring with the Omicron outbreak, particularly because of our relatively low third-dose vaccination rate at that point in time. When we announced the delay on 20 January, our third-dose rate was at about 25 per cent. Today, it is at 58.3 per cent and climbing rapidly. On top of that, our dosage levels for five to 11-year-olds have tripled from 13 per cent on 20 January to 46.9 per cent today, growing rapidly as well. That means an additional 78 000 Western Australian children have had the opportunity to receive some protection.

Today is the one-year anniversary of the vaccination program that started last year with the phase 1a healthcare workforce. Our first-dose rate is now more than 98 per cent of Western Australians. Our second-dose rate is 95.7 per cent and our third-dose rate is 58.3 per cent. A number of people out there said that we would not get to 90 per cent. Some underminers out there said that we would not get to 90 per cent, in particular the Western Australian Liberal Party. Now, we are approaching 100 per cent first dose and some of the highest vaccination rates in the world because the government did what it had to do. We took the steps and made the decisions that had to be made, against some opposition, in particular from the Liberals and Nationals WA.

In relation to that, given the very high rate of vaccination, we are able to relax our hard border settings on 3 March. By that day, we expect that we will have a third-dose rate of 70 per cent and a first-dose rate for children from five to 11 years of 65 per cent. This puts our state in the strongest position and is virtually unique in the world, before we have widespread coverage of COVID in our community. We are able to open our border sensibly and responsibly, and we did not make a deliberate decision to seed the virus into Western Australia, unlike South Australia and Tasmania that made a deliberate decision to seed the virus with a large number of their population not third-dose vaccinated. Come 3 March, I can guarantee that our border will be fully reopened. This is the right step forward for Western Australia. We can do it because Western Australians have done the right thing by getting vaccinated; they have done the right thing, despite the scare campaigns of the Liberals and Nationals. Our hospitals are ready. Our workforce is ready. We have large rates of vaccination in our state and I am sure that Western Australia is ready.

ATTORNEY GENERAL — MASK WEARING

55. Dr D.J. HONEY to the Premier:

Noting reports on the under siege Attorney General disregarding the government's own public health mandate by failing to wear a mask in Broome Cathedral earlier this month, I ask: how is it excusable for the highest law officer in Western Australia to flout his own government's measures?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

I will explain the situation to the house so that people understand what occurred. The Attorney General went to Broome and whilst he was there he attended the funeral of a relative, someone that he had known throughout most of his life or at least the last 45 years. It was a sad event. When he was outside the church, he was mixing with mourners, as you do, and was not wearing a mask because it is not required outside a church because it is outside. At the last moment, he was invited to be a pallbearer. He had a mask in his pocket but when he took the handle of the coffin, he inadvertently did not put the mask on. He walked through the church and sat down. He was advised at some point that he had not put a mask on. He does not recall it exactly, but he forgot to put his mask on. He is not perfect; I am not perfect; you are not perfect: people do make mistakes, particularly in a situation in which they might be teary and quite upset by the circumstances. People out there do make mistakes. I know that lots of people will do this. I suspect that if I walk around Parliament at some point in time, I will see people who have forgotten to put a mask on. Does that mean that there should be a royal commission into it? I do not think so. What I do think is that we need to do our best to comply with the rules and the laws. The Attorney General knows that and we all know that. The Attorney General volunteered to pay a fine, which he has done, to atone for the mistake he made.

ATTORNEY GENERAL — MASK WEARING

56. Dr D.J. HONEY to the Premier:

I have a supplementary question. How many times will the Premier be called upon to cover for the appalling judgement of his Attorney General?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

Honestly, is this the best the Liberals and Nationals can do? I explained the situation to you. He was at the funeral of a relative and he inadvertently forgot to put on a mask when he walked through the church carrying a coffin. Is that where you want to go? Is that as low as you want to go to pursue that? I suppose we could follow everyone around with a camera to see when, at some point in time, they do not put their mask on when they walk into a building or something. What we are asking the Western Australian community and members of Parliament to do is to do the right thing and wear masks and exhibit the right amount of social responsibility at all times. I am not perfect; I cannot guarantee that at some point in time I will not make a mistake. I cannot guarantee that any one of you will not make a mistake. If you want to follow people around and take photos of them not wearing a mask when they exit a toilet, go into a building or something of that nature, that is up to you.

The Attorney General is an excellent Attorney General with a record of achievement that is incredibly substantial. His work ethic and drive to achieve is, in my experience of Attorneys General, unsurpassed. He has a desire to serve the community that, again, I have never seen before in an Attorney General. He is quite an accomplished person in his role but on one occasion at a funeral he inadvertently did not wear a mask and when it was pointed out to him, he put a mask on.

CORONAVIRUS — PUBLIC HEALTH AND SOCIAL MEASURES

57. Ms H.M. BEAZLEY to the Minister for Health:

I refer to the state government's commitment to minimising the overall impact of Omicron on the Western Australian community.

- (1) Can the minister update the house on what public health and social measures have been put in place to respond to the predicted increase in Omicron cases?
- (2) Can the minister outline to the house how these measures will help manage the surge of Omicron in our community and keep Western Australians safe?

Ms A. SANDERSON replied:

I thank the member for Victoria Park for her question.

(1)-(2) I am happy to speak to the house on the important measures that we have put in place to keep Western Australians safe. One of the most important measures has been our vaccination program. We know that high rates of vaccination and a third dose in particular will provide the best possible protection against Omicron. It was only on 22 February 2021—a year ago—that the first frontline worker, a hotel quarantine nurse, received her first dose of Pfizer vaccine. Since then, we have administered 5.6 million COVID-19 vaccinations at hundreds of state clinics and GPs, pharmacies and other health services across WA and in some of the most regional and remote areas in the world. It is an incredible testament to the work of our Vaccine Commander, the Department of Health officials and the public health unit in their response and agility to provide vaccinations to everyone. More than 95 per cent of Western Australians over the age of 18 have had two vaccinations and 58.5 per cent have received their third dose. This is one of the highest vaccination rates in the world and it could not have been achieved without those frontline workers. I thank them for their commitment and effort. We know that the booster dose gives the best possible protection.

The other very important measures that were implemented from yesterday are the level 1 public health and social measures across Perth, Peel, the south west, the wheatbelt, the great southern and Pilbara regions. They include home gathering limits, private outdoor gathering limits, the two-square-metre rule for hospitality and cultural venues, a 75 per cent capacity for seated entertainment venues and so on and so forth. These are really important measures to keep people safe and they have been nothing but undermined by the opposition, who consistently complains about them. I saw a press release from Hon Dr Steve Thomas complaining about the public health and social measures that will keep hospitalisations low and people safe. It is astounding that the opposition continues to do that. It has undermined our approach from the beginning, whether in vaccinations or public health measures. Members of the opposition have undermined them from the beginning and have consistently contradicted themselves as well. In their media release, the opposition alliance, as they call themselves —

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leader of the Liberal Party!

Ms A. SANDERSON: The media release of 20 February is a logical mess. It is illogical; in their own media statement, members opposite contradict themselves. First they concede that mandates work —

“Mandates were brought in to rapidly increase uptake of the vaccine and we have achieved this at very high rates.”

Then members opposite concede that the mandate was working to get booster rates up and that WA was on track for very high booster rates, but then they say that it is not clear at all that they serve a purpose any longer. We are at under 60 per cent with our third dose; we still have to increase our booster rates. There is consistent undermining from the opposition. Our public health and social measures and our high vaccination rates are the things that will keep us safe and protect our community. I call on the opposition to stop undermining them.

CHILD AND ADOLESCENT HEALTH SERVICE BOARD

58. Ms L. METTAM to the Minister for Health:

I refer to the report in today's *The West Australian* that the minister has issued a show-cause notice for the board of the Child and Adolescent Health Service. Given the hospital budget, policy and the employment of the CEO are all decisions of the department that the Minister for Health runs, what responsibility will the minister take for the failings at CAHS or will this board be the scapegoat as it was for the last failed Minister for Health?

Ms A. SANDERSON replied:

That is another outstanding show of ignorance from the member for Vasse on how the health system works. Under the legislation passed by the Liberal–National government, there is a clear framework for the governance of health service providers. The director general employs the chief executive. The Public Sector Management Act does not

allow for ministers to employ directly public servants. That is an important separation. The role of the minister is to appoint the board and the board chair. I am working closely, hand in hand, with the board chair, in whom I have enormous faith, to make sure that the board provides the governance and leadership that is required in the organisation and fulfils its obligation. That is absolutely the minister taking responsibility.

Dr D.J. Honey interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leader of the Liberal Party!

Ms A. SANDERSON: What I will not be doing is cheap political pointscoring on such an important issue. I will not be doing that. There have been a number of reports over the last few days that have certainly been misrepresenting the attempts by the board and the hospital to put in place the mechanisms and strategies required to improve outcomes for patients. All that has happened from members of the opposition is they have attacked them for those efforts. They have attacked the hospital and attacked the board for those efforts. They are the right efforts. They will drive the organisation in the right direction. Sometimes the board and staff have to have a hard conversation to steer the ship, and that is what they are doing. They are steering the ship. My priority as minister is to ensure the appropriate governance over that ship to ensure we have the right outcomes for patients and their parents.

CHILD AND ADOLESCENT HEALTH SERVICE BOARD

59. Ms L. METTAM to the Minister for Health:

I have a supplementary question. What failures will the minister take responsibility for in the health portfolio, a portfolio that has gone from crisis to crisis under the McGowan government?

Ms S. Winton interjected.

Ms L. Mettam interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You have asked the question.

Ms A. SANDERSON replied:

I will tell you what I will not do, Mr Deputy Speaker. I will not be looking for human tragedy to exploit for political purposes. I will not do that. I will not do that and that is what the member for Vasse does. She exploits human tragedy and grieving parents to deliver her own message.

Several members interjected.

Ms A. SANDERSON: That is what happened on the weekend and the member for Vasse knows that. Exploiting —

Ms L. Mettam interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Vasse.

Ms A. SANDERSON: We know what happened on Sunday. We know what happened on Sunday and so do you. You looked very uncomfortable, member, and so you should.

POLICE — OPERATION REGIONAL SHIELD — KIMBERLEY

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Kimberley, I see you and assume you are seeking the call. The member for Kimberley has the call.

60. Ms D.G. D'ANNA to the Minister for Police:

I refer to the McGowan Labor government's commitment to address the challenges in the regions. Can the minister update the house on the outcomes of Operation Regional Shield and outline how this operation is targeting antisocial criminal offending and broader challenges in the Kimberley?

Mr P. PAPALIA replied:

Member, you are looking good on the big screen! I thank the member for the question. I also thank her for the incredible leadership that she demonstrates in the Kimberley. As members know, we travelled there last week and I was witness to the respect and esteem with which the member is viewed right across communities in several towns, but I know it is right across the Kimberley. It is incredibly impressive to see such a powerful voice for the Kimberley, who is normally resident here in the chamber, but up there today.

The Premier acknowledged in his address to Parliament that some of the challenges we are confronting in the Kimberley and the Pilbara are multi-generational in nature. They have been generated over decades, if not more, of disadvantage and impoverishment. The consequences are challenges that we confront that will not be solved with one simple solution, that will not be done in a short period, but will require a significant effort by all tiers of government, local communities, non-government organisations and individuals right across the regions to assist in rectifying the challenges that people confront in their daily lives, particularly juvenile offending.

We went to the Kimberley to announce part of the response of government that the Premier referred to in his speech—that is, the police response, Operation Regional Shield, which is a capability. It is effectively a model that can be applied

anywhere in the regions, and it constitutes a range of capabilities and capacity that can be taken and adapted, and sent to a particular region at any time, to confront and deal with an acute challenge and assist local authorities in overcoming that challenge and moving forward. That is what we did in Broome last Wednesday with Deputy Commissioner Col Blanch and the member for Kimberley. We told the people about the comprehensive commitment by the Western Australia Police Force to tackle juvenile crime, particularly in the subdistrict of Broome at the moment, but right across the Kimberley in due course. Some of the resources that are being deployed include the Police Air Wing, including fixed-wing and remotely piloted aircraft systems—what we all call drones—and the pilots necessary to operate them; the regional operations group; additional ROG officers with two specialist transport vehicles; a regional investigation unit, including specialist investigators and technology specialists from our technology crime unit, which is supported by cutting-edge technology; our forensic division, which has deployed people up there with equipment that enables forensics to be employed in the field in the Kimberley; as well as a general purpose dog and handler from the canine unit. There are many other specialist capabilities that we will not reveal, but we will ensure that there is an enhanced response to the crime challenges that confront the community out there.

In response to what has happened, I can report that there has been an immediate reduction in crime across Broome. In the week that the operation has been underway, we have seen more than a 63 per cent reduction in some of the crimes. For example, for selected offences against property, which are the crimes that are most concerning, last week there were five burglaries and in the week before there were some 24 burglaries in Broome. There have been no vehicle thefts since the morning of 14 February, and, in the time shortly prior to that, there were some four in that week. As a result of the outstanding work by the Western Australia Police Force, there have been 18 arrests resulting in 36 charges and six summonses.

There is another element to this. Police are engaging with young people who are at risk. If they find children out in the streets at night who might be at risk, or in the daytime who should be in school but are not, they are taking duty of care for them and ensuring that they are either returned to a safe place or returned safely to the police station. I can tell members that 83 children were escorted by police in this fashion.

It is an incredible response by police. It is having immediate returns for the community and increasing the safety of everybody, including the young people involved. This is only one part of the Premier's announced response. As indicated in his speech to Parliament, there will be a four-pronged response. It will include policing, which will be ongoing. Regional Shield will be deployed wherever it is required in the state on an ongoing basis. There is also a commitment to roll out the Target 120 program across the Kimberley and the Pilbara. That will mean the benefits of that program will be delivered to towns other than Kununurra, where it is currently operating. There is also a commitment to an on-country sentencing option as an alternative to incarcerating children in Banksia Hill Detention Centre in Perth. Finally, a fund will also be created to enable communities to come forward with their own proposals to address community safety right across the Kimberley and apply for funding to implement community driven responses.

It is a wonderful thing to see the member for Kimberley in action. I am sorry she is not here, but I am glad that she is up there, representing her community right on the ground and making sure that we all know what is going on in the Kimberley.

PERTH CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL — AISHWARYA ASWATH

61. Ms L. METTAM to the Minister for Health:

I refer to the tragic death of Aishwarya Aswath and the McGowan government's response to implementing the recommendations of the independent inquiry into Perth Children's Hospital.

- (1) Why did the minister cancel her meeting with Aishwarya's parents last Friday?
- (2) When will this meeting now occur?

Ms A. SANDERSON replied:

- (1)-(2) The member is on very tenuous ground.

Ms L. Mettam: According to you.

Ms A. SANDERSON: I will explain. The family requested directly that my meeting be postponed because they wanted to meet with me without a particular representative. Would you like me to continue? You are quite extraordinary in your grubbiness, quite frankly.

Ms M.J. Davies: Just answer the question.

Ms A. SANDERSON: I just did, Leader of the Opposition.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition!

Several members interjected.

Ms A. SANDERSON: I just did. I just answered the question.

Several members interjected.

Point of Order

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: Deputy Speaker, the minister is attempting to answer a question and is being continuously interrupted and is not seeking interruptions.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Leader of the House. There is no point of order. The minister shall respond without being interrupted.

Questions without Notice Resumed

Ms A. SANDERSON: I intend to support the family to find a peaceful, quiet resolution to the pain and grief that they have experienced over the last 12 months with the death of their daughter. As the minister and their local member, that is what I will do. I will not be scratching around and looking to use people for my own political purposes, which is exactly what the member did last weekend. We know what happened. I would caution the member for Vasse about whom she interacts with and how she conducts herself in relation to the family. I am not going to expose personal and private conversations in Parliament because I respect them and their privacy. I will conduct those meetings in a private capacity, as they have requested.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party, a question without preamble, thank you.

PERTH CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL — AISHWARYA ASWATH

62. Ms L. METTAM to the Minister for Health:

I have a supplementary question. Given that engaging in healing dialogue with the family is a key recommendation of the inquiry, why did the parents say otherwise to me on Sunday regarding that meeting?

Several members interjected.

Ms A. SANDERSON replied:

Is that even in order, Deputy Speaker?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, the question is a hypothetical sort of question, asking the minister to give an answer to something she was not party to the conversation about. But I will give the minister the opportunity to respond, if she would like.

Ms A. SANDERSON: Deputy Speaker, I do not intend to respond any further about private conversations had with that family. It is inappropriate for any side of the chamber to use it in Parliament and it reflects very poorly on the member for Vasse.

METRONET — ARMADALE RAIL LINE

63. Mr H.T. JONES to the Minister for Transport:

I refer to the McGowan Labor government's record investment in job-creating transport projects, including the delivery of Metronet.

- (1) Can the minister update the house on the work underway to remove level crossings along the Armadale line and outline what this project will mean for those in my community?
- (2) Can the minister update the house on the delivery of other Metronet projects throughout the south-eastern corridor, including the Byford rail extension and the Thornlie–Cockburn Link?

Ms R. SAFFIOTTI replied:

I thank the member for Darling Range for the question.

- (1)-(2) Over the weekend, I was joined by the Premier, the federal member for Canning and the members for Victoria Park, Cannington, Armadale and Darling Range to announce our plan for the Armadale rail line transformation. Nearly \$2 billion will be spent to upgrade the Armadale rail line. There will be many different work fronts and benefits. Throughout Victoria Park and Cannington, five level crossings will be removed. For example, the boom gates at the level crossing at Wharf Street are currently down for about 25 minutes an hour, and will be down for more than 45 minutes an hour over the next decade if we do not do something about it. Welshpool Road is a major key connecting road in that area and it has a significant level crossing that causes delays. We will remove five level crossings and build four new train stations at Queens Park, Cannington, Oats Street and Carlisle. Of course, we are working in the Beckenham–Kenwick area as we integrate the new Thornlie–Cockburn Link into Beckenham. Again, there will be more services for people in the Canning Vale–Thornlie area.

The member will be very pleased to know that we are extending the rail line by about eight kilometres to Byford and that there will be a brand new Byford train station in the middle of the town centre. We are

working with the shire on how we can activate that entire area. We are also rebuilding the Armadale train station to elevate the train station and we are removing another seven level crossings throughout the Armadale region. There will be enormous benefits. Of course, this means that there will be less congestion and newer and safer train stations. It means we will have the ability to have more integrated land use adjacent to those train stations. It also means that people will have a much safer journey, and I think that is very important.

Members, we are spending \$2 billion. It will be an incredible outcome. We will close that rail line for up to 18 months, so we will consult with the community about alternative bus and other services. For example, the member for Armadale has raised the ability for Armadale and Byford residents to connect through to Cockburn along Armadale Road due to the enormous work we have undertaken to improve Armadale Road and create that new bridge. There will be other options linking into the new Forrestfield–Airport Link and new dedicated express services to make sure that those residents have connections. We apologise for that disruption, but this is a transformation that has not happened on that line. I know that the people in the south-east corridor understand that this government is investing in that corridor and in their suburbs like no other government ever has.

**MINISTERIAL TASKFORCE INTO PUBLIC MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES FOR INFANTS,
CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENTS AGED 0–18 YEARS IN WESTERN AUSTRALIA**

64. Ms L. METTAM to the Minister for Mental Health:

I refer to the ministerial task force into public mental health services for infants, children and adolescents in WA that was established following the review into the tragic death of Kate Savage. Given that it was completed in November, when will the report be tabled and implemented?

Ms A. SANDERSON replied:

First of all, I want to congratulate the members of the task force on an outstanding report. It really is an outstanding report. It is a thorough, thoughtful, well-put-together body of work by a task force led by Robyn Kruk and appointed by former Minister for Mental Health Hon Roger Cook. It really is an outstanding piece of work. It was provided to the government in November. We have been working through the recommendations and it will go to cabinet imminently and will be released shortly thereafter. I have written to members of the task force thanking them for their work and committing to implementing the recommendations and also to providing briefings to the parents of Kate Savage, the Chief Psychiatrist and so on before it is publicly announced. That is the appropriate process and that is the process that I will undertake. I am absolutely committed to implementing the recommendations of that task force.

**MINISTERIAL TASKFORCE INTO PUBLIC MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES FOR INFANTS,
CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENTS AGED 0–18 YEARS IN WESTERN AUSTRALIA**

65. Ms L. METTAM to the Minister for Mental Health:

I have a supplementary question. Given the seriousness of this issue, why is the government not acting with more urgency, and when will the Savage family have the answers they deserve?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: One question, member.

Ms A. SANDERSON replied:

This government acted very quickly and, certainly under the previous minister, requested that the Chief Psychiatrist undertake an investigation into the specific circumstances surrounding Kate Savage's tragic death and the significant concerns that her family had around the treatment and relationship with them as parents. That was a good investigation that provided really practical recommendations that are in the process of being implemented now. We have also provided a significant funding increase to community public mental health services, in particular youth mental health services and the child and adolescent mental health service, to allow them to see more young people and their families.

On top of the Chief Psychiatrist's work, understanding and acknowledging that this is an area that is challenged by an increase in demand across the world and a shortfall in workforce across the world, these issues are complex and take time to work through. If it was a matter of just providing a huge bucket of money to immediately fix the problem, members can be assured that that is what would have happened. This is not one of those problems, member for Vasse. This is a complex and challenging area that I do not expect the member will be able to fully grapple with.

The task force undertook really thorough work and reform. It consulted, and people with lived experience informed the recommendations. It will provide five years of reform, including immediate remediation. That needs to be put in place when the task force report is announced, and that is what we are doing. This is a huge amount of work that this government is undertaking. I am committed to prioritising it, as the Minister for Mental Health. The McGowan government continues to provide record funding for mental health services in Western Australia.

HOUSING DIVERSITY PIPELINE

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Southern River, I see you are seeking the call.

66. Mr T.J. HEALY to the Minister for Housing:

I refer to the McGowan Labor government's efforts to unlock more land across the state in order to boost the supply of houses, in particular social and affordable housing.

- (1) Can the minister outline to the house how the housing diversity pipeline announced last week will help increase both housing supply and diversity?
- (2) Can the minister advise the house how this program will support local jobs in the housing construction industry?

Mr J.N. CAREY replied:

I want to thank the member for his question. I say to the member: you need some more lighting there. A selfie light might assist you—one of those halo lights!

(1)–(2) I am deeply proud to have worked over the last year with the Minister for Planning to create the housing diversity pipeline. This work builds on major investment in our housing and land sectors. We announced a record injection of \$875 million into social housing and \$2.1 billion in the next four years to deliver 3 300 new homes. We also announced the \$116 million Regional Land Booster program, which to date has released 400 residential and industrial lots in the regions. Now, as a part of our reform agenda and as part of our work on trying to accelerate the delivery of social and affordable housing, but also looking to the future, we have created the housing diversity pipeline.

At the heart of this is a very simple proposition; that is, that government in all times will have land that is lazy or surplus to government needs. There is a real opportunity for us to leverage from that land to create affordable and social housing supply into the future. What we have done over the past year is get into the nitty-gritty and identify 12 key sites—10 in the metro area and two in the regions. These are sites that are well accessible, close to public transport and in activity corridors. We are going out to the market and saying to developers, community housing providers and super funds, “What can you do with this land in a flexible arrangement? What social and affordable housing return can you deliver?” It could be ground leases. It could be a joint development. It could be that the state does make a contribution from our social housing fund. What we are trying to do is look beyond this boom. We have 27 000 housing approvals—4 000 in the regions. We are in extraordinary times. We do have a heated construction sector. But what we know is that we have to look beyond the boom and create a pipeline of work into future years, and this will do it. It will take probably two years to go through the processes to get this land released, but in that time we are looking for interesting propositions that will create not only meaningful jobs, but also new social and affordable housing across metro and regional Western Australia.

CORONAVIRUS — VACCINATIONS — BOTTLE SHOPS

67. Ms M.J. DAVIES to the Premier:

I note the advice sent to the Premier from the Chief Health Officer regarding the removal of the requirement for proof of vaccination in bottle shops posted on the website today, dated Tuesday, 22 February, and the time was 10.45 am. Did the Premier have written advice relating specifically to bottle shops to hand on or before Friday when he made the announcement about removing that requirement or was he just making the rules up as he went along?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

On Friday, we had a meeting of what is called the State Disaster Council/the state emergency committee of cabinet—it has two names—and at that meeting there was a discussion about a range of things, including the arrangements around the removal of what is termed the hard border on 3 March. At that meeting, there was a discussion about bottle shops, and the decision was made about bottle shops following verbal advice from the Chief Health Officer at that meeting. The Chief Health Officer's advice was that the average interaction in a bottle shop is somewhere in the vicinity of three minutes, as opposed to other venues where people might go for a considerable period; for instance, we come here, we show our proof of vaccination and we are in here for hours upon hours on end. You go into a restaurant, cafe or bar, you could well be in there for half an hour, an hour, two hours, five hours or whatever it might be, but the average interaction in a bottle shop is very, very short. Therefore, as part of our evolving policies on these matters, the decision was made that proof of vaccination in bottle shops would no longer be required.

It may well be that other things will change. It is one of those things. Over the last two years, we have had to make many decisions and change policies as time goes by based upon the circumstances that we face. Today, the written advice, following on from the verbal advice, was received and I think it has been published and I think the member just referred to it.

CORONAVIRUS — VACCINATIONS — BOTTLE SHOPS

68. Ms M.J. DAVIES to the Premier:

I have a supplementary question. If the decision was made on Friday, why then does the email that has been posted today on the website note that further advice was being provided to government?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

It says further to the initial advice on 18 February. Friday was 18 February. I will explain it to the Leader of the Opposition again. We had a meeting of the State Disaster Council. The State Disaster Council comprises a range of ministers and senior public servants. We had a discussion that went for perhaps two hours. We do this all the time. Just so members opposite understand that when it comes to COVID, I and the former Minister for Health, the current health minister and some other ministers sometimes meet daily about these issues in the morning, for hours. We go over issues and make important announcements.

Ms M.J. Davies interjected.

Mr M. McGOWAN: I just want to explain to you how government works under my government. We actually consider matters at length and we meet daily. I am on the road early and I get home late at night because that is what you do when you are dealing with a pandemic—right? That is what we have done over the course of the last two years in order to resolve these issues and keep Western Australia in the best position in the entire world. There is nowhere that has had a better outcome than in Western Australia, because we have gone through the processes and put in place the policies and the requirements that have worked for our circumstances. We are prepared to do the work, bring in the public servants, work with industry and come up with resolutions and measures that actually work across government. That is what occurs.

As I said to the member, I had a conversation at the meeting on Friday morning about bottle shops. I do not know what the member is trying to allege turns on this. We changed the policy, as I said, because the interaction in a bottle shop is three minutes on average, so the policy was not considered to be required. There may be more things that change over time. I want to remind you all: had we not put in place the mandates and the proof of vaccination, we would now be languishing somewhere in the 70 or 80 per cent vaccination rate across Western Australia. That is where we would be because we did not have the mass outbreaks of Melbourne, Sydney, and other states of Australia. The mass outbreaks drive vaccination rates; that is what they do. Over there, the commonwealth government—Scott Morrison's government—gave more vaccines to New South Wales and Victoria per capita than it gave to Western Australia because they had the mass outbreaks. They needed to get the people of western Sydney and western Melbourne vaccinated. I understood that. I said that I agreed with that. That was obviously the case. But do not criticise us for not having the same rate of vaccination that they had at the same point in time. We did not have the mass supply of vaccines and we did not have the mass outbreaks, so what did we do? We took a different pathway. We mandated that large parts of the workforce provide proof of vaccination. Now, you criticise that. I have seen your comments in the press. I have heard you in the Parliament. I have heard you attacking that day in, day out. You join with those people who are marching around Elizabeth Quay and camping down at Langley Park. Those sorts of people are the people who are now your base. That crowd appears to be the Liberal and National Parties' base. The crowd that is out there threatening my life appears to be your base. Now, if that is the road you want to go down, that is your choice. Our choice is to do the right thing by the people of Western Australia—to get the vax rates up, make sure we have the rules in place and work hard to protect the people of this state.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is the end of question time.

TWO ROCKS MARINA — REDEVELOPMENT

Petition

MR J.R. QUIGLEY (Butler — Attorney General) [3.00 pm]: I have a petition that reads —

To the Honourable the Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled.

We, the undersigned, say

A Development Application currently lodged with the City of Wanneroo (DA 2021/1797) proposes a Woolworths shopping centre complex in the Two Rocks Marina Zone on the former site of Atlantis Marine Park, within approximately 50m of the King Neptune Statue. This area holds immense historical value as the former site of Atlantis Marine Park, an America's Cup challenge training ground, the home of the Birdman Rally and a Bond Corporation construction marvel.

The proposed development is subject to the Yanchep—Two Rocks District Structure Plan No.43 (ASP 43) and the Two Rocks Town Centre Agreed Structure Plan No. 70 (ASP 70). ASP 43 and ASP 70 fail to adequately respond to the recognised tourism and historical value which the development site and surrounding Marina Zone Area hold for Two Rocks and for the greater state of Western Australia in general.

The Development Application is strongly opposed by the community, with over 1100 submissions in opposition of the proposed development lodged during the short public consultation period.

Now we ask the Legislative Assembly that: —

1. the Minister for Planning review ASP 43 and ASP70 to incorporate the recognised tourism and historical value of the Two Rocks Marina Zone; and
2. the Minister for Heritage review and assess the current heritage status of King Neptune and the surrounding Two Rocks Marina area.

The petition has been signed as being in order by the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly and contains 1 103 signatures.
[See petition 25.]

FINANCE LEGISLATION AMENDMENT (EMERGENCY RELIEF) BILL 2021

Assent

Message from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the bill.

PAPERS TABLED

Papers were tabled and ordered to lie upon the table of the house.

JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE COMMISSIONER FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE

*Third Report — The merits of appointing a commissioner for Aboriginal children and young people —
Government Response — Statement by Deputy Speaker*

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr S.J. Price) [3.04 pm]: In relation to the recommendations contained in the report of the Joint Standing Committee on the Commissioner for Children and Young People titled *The merits of appointing a commissioner for Aboriginal children and young people*, which was tabled on 18 November 2021, no response has been received from the Attorney General by the required time.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY — CORONAVIRUS — MANDATORY VACCINATION

Notice of Motion

Mr D.A. Templeman (Leader of the House) gave notice that at the next sitting of the house he would move —

To respond to the emergence of the Omicron strain of COVID in Western Australia, and further to the resolution of the Legislative Assembly on 24 November 2021, as requested by the Presiding Officers —

(1) Members must —

- (a) have provided proof of their first and second COVID-19 vaccine doses, or proof of a valid exemption, to the Clerk by 31 January 2022; and
- (b) provide proof of a booster COVID-19 vaccine dose, or proof of a valid exemption, to the Clerk by 6 May 2022.

(2) If any member has not complied —

- (a) with paragraph (1)(a), the Clerk will, immediately after the house passes this resolution, report the details of the noncompliance, including the identity of the member, or members, to the house; or
- (b) with paragraph (1)(b), the Clerk will report the details of the noncompliance, including the identity of the member, or members, to the house, on the first sitting day after 6 May 2022.

(3) Unless otherwise ordered, any member who has not complied with the requirements —

- (a) set out in paragraph (1)(a); or
- (b) set out in paragraph (1)(b),

is determined to have failed to comply with an order of the house and therefore is suspended from attending the chamber, Parliament House and the Legislative Assembly Committee Office until, and including, the second sitting day following the winter recess.

(4) If a member who is suspended under paragraph (3) provides —

- (a) in the case of failure to comply with paragraph (1)(a)—proof of their first and second COVID-19 vaccine doses, or proof of a valid exemption, to the Clerk; or
- (b) in the case of failure to comply with paragraph (1)(b)—proof of their booster COVID-19 vaccine dose, or proof of a valid exemption, to the Clerk,

their suspension is immediately lifted, and the Clerk will report that fact, including the name of the member, to the house on the next sitting day.

(5) For the purposes of this resolution —

- (a) “COVID-19 vaccine” means a vaccine to protect a person against SARS-CoV-2 that has been registered or provisionally registered by the Therapeutic Goods Administration;
- (b) “proof of their first and second COVID-19 vaccine doses” and “proof of a booster COVID-19 vaccine dose” means forms of evidence approved by the Chief Health Officer; and
- (c) “proof of a valid exemption” means forms of evidence approved by the Chief Health Officer.

(6) The Clerk —

- (a) must, other than what is contemplated by this resolution, ensure all information provided under this resolution remains confidential and is stored securely; and
- (b) must destroy all information provided under this resolution at the end of the session or an earlier time determined by the house.

(7) The house may agree to further resolutions to vary or amend this resolution.

RAILWAY (METRONET) AMENDMENT BILL 2022

Notice of Motion to Introduce

Notice of motion given by **Ms R. Saffioti (Minister for Transport)**.

CORONAVIRUS — MANDATORY VACCINATION — REVIEW

Notice of Motion

Ms M.J. Davies (Leader of the Opposition) gave notice that at the next sitting of the house she would move —

That this house calls on the government to expedite a review of vaccination mandates to ensure all mandates remain proportionate and reasonable responses to the public health risks faced by Western Australians.

ELECTRICITY NETWORKS — MAINTENANCE

Notice of Motion

Dr D.J. Honey (Leader of the Liberal Party) gave notice that at the next sitting of the house he would move —

That this house condemns the McGowan Labor government’s failure to properly maintain state-owned electricity networks, leading to major blackouts across Western Australia and inflicting hardship and financial loss on thousands of Western Australians.

MINISTER FOR INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION — PERFORMANCE

Notice of Motion

Mr P.J. Rundle gave notice that at the next sitting of the house he would move —

That this house condemns the Minister for International Education’s failure to protect the \$2 billion international education sector, placing at risk the welfare of students and more than 12 000 jobs whilst tarnishing the state’s reputation.

MINISTER FOR EDUCATION AND TRAINING — PERFORMANCE

Notice of Motion

Mr P.J. Rundle gave notice that at the next sitting of the house he would move —

That this house condemns the Minister for Education and Training’s breach of Western Australians’ trust by plunging families, teachers and school communities into a state of chaos and confusion ahead of the 2022 school year.

CORONAVIRUS — INTERSTATE BORDER RESTRICTIONS

Matter of Public Interest

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr S.J. Price) informed the Assembly that he was in receipt within the prescribed time of a letter from the Leader of the Opposition seeking to debate a matter of public interest.

[In compliance with standing orders, at least five members rose in their places.]

MS M.J. DAVIES (Central Wheatbelt — Leader of the Opposition) [3.10 pm]: I move —

That this house calls on the Premier to provide an ironclad guarantee that the state border will be fully open to interstate and overseas visitors from 3 March 2022, subject to travellers complying with appropriate state and federal government entry approvals and health controls.

I would think that this is a motion that the government could easily agree to. Before I talk about this motion, I want to deal with some of the accusations that the Premier made during question time, particularly that the National and Liberal Parties are courting the anti-vaccination cohort in our state. That could not be further from the truth. I absolutely without question put on the record today that we have not sought to seek the support of the anti-vaccination group that exists in Western Australia and across the nation. We have been very supportive of what the government has been doing to drive up this state's vaccination rates. That includes promoting vaccination clinics, encouraging people to get vaccinated, and doing everything we can in our communities to ensure that people are taking responsibility for the health of not only themselves and their family, but also the community.

The Premier thinks it is okay to stand in this place and say that we should not be asking reasonable questions about the fact that rather than release information, he is keeping that information close to his chest so that nobody has any idea about what he is using to make decisions about the lives and livelihoods of the people of this state. It is entirely reasonable that we ask those questions.

I want to refer to documents that were uploaded onto the Parliament of Western Australia website at 2.30 pm today. I do not want to be cynical, but I know the Premier held a press conference earlier today and ducked and weaved to try to avoid answering whether information on the Omicron modelling and related documentation would be released today or tomorrow. That information was uploaded at 2.30 pm, after the start of question time. An email was included with that information. That email is very specific. It is dated Tuesday, 22 February 2022, at 10.45 am, and is from Andrew Robertson, the Chief Health Officer, to the Premier. The email is very specific about the announcement that was made on Friday about the removal of the proof-of-vaccination restrictions for bottle shops. I add that the email also refers to some of the questions that were raised by the opposition and the media over the weekend around the requirements for ongoing mandates and restrictions in pubs, bars and restaurants.

More work needs to be done on that particular piece of information that has been uploaded. I absolutely reject what the Premier said during question time—namely, that we are courting the anti-vaccination lobby. That could not be further from the truth. We have tried to support the government when reasonable restrictions have been put in place and health advice has been provided to support those decisions. We have asked questions about the modelling, the data and the information that the Premier is using to make those decisions. We have done that so that we can do our job as the opposition. That is why last year, we asked the question: when will a decision be made about the border reopening? That started last year. The Premier made the decision that the border would be reopened on 5 February. He told the community that is what would happen, and we started preparing our health system and encouraging people to get vaccinated, and businesses started to plan.

On 20 January, the Premier made the decision that the border reopening would be deferred. That was based on the fact that the Chief Health Officer had said that we need to increase the rate of third vaccinations, and also provide more opportunities for children to be vaccinated. He said also that we were watching the levels of infection in the eastern states. That is fine. The decision to delay the border reopening was announced on 20 January. However, there was then a void of information about the booster vaccination rate that this state was seeking to reach, the trigger that the state was hoping to achieve with the vaccination rate for children, and the magical rate in the eastern states that would allow us to put all those things together and come up with a new reopening date. That question was asked again and again. The Premier and the Minister for Health refused again and again to provide information and advice.

We were left in limbo. That is essentially where we were until Friday of last week. The Premier and the Minister for Health had refused to answer question after question in Parliament about those very matters. The Premier then announced last Friday that we finally had a date of 3 March that we could work towards. We say to this house today that that must be an ironclad guarantee. The Premier must provide certainty to the community and to families and businesses that are working towards the date of 3 March. We do not want another period of limbo. We do not want the challenges that we have been facing faced over the last few weeks while the Premier and his government have failed to provide any information or indication about the data, the science and the modelling that they are using to make decisions that impact our lives and livelihoods.

Despite the claims from the government—I went through this last week—the opposition has supported many of the measures that have been put in place to manage COVID-19. We agreed to the passage of legislation at the height of the pandemic when there was serious panic in the community. We encouraged our constituents to get vaccinated and get their booster. We supported the mandates when they were accompanied by health advice. We did that along with the community. A pact and a level of trust had been built up between the government and the community over the past two years that if we all did that, we would be given a date when we could transition to living with COVID and reopen our border. We, along with the community, depended on the Premier adhering to the health advice. We expected honesty and transparency in those decisions. However, after the decision was made on 20 January, there was no transparency. There was simply a void of information. We do not deserve the hyperbole. We do not deserve the spin. When I say “we”, I do not mean just the opposition. We have thick skin. That is our job. I mean the people of Western Australia. We deserve facts. We do not deserve spin. I can tell members that the Premier's performance on 20 January, on prime-time television, was the spin machine in full flight.

We saw that again today in question time. The Premier cannot get through a question time without making it all about him. It is a bitter pill for those in the community who have been working hard to try to continue to keep people employed, and to make plans for when our border will reopen, that on 20 January they were left in limbo. The reopening date was deferred, and in its place we had a complete void. We were given no details about the data that the government would be relying upon. The Minister for Health was asked whether she would consider using information or advice from somebody the government already knew. I think the gentleman's name is Professor George Milne. He had previously provided modelling on the Delta strain. That was dismissed as being nothing more than advice from a mathematician. It would appear that it was good enough the first time around but not good enough this time.

The opposition pointed out that when the Chief Health Officer's advice was provided before 20 January, it raised several questions. For the period between then and Friday last week, there was absolutely no answer on waning immunity, what would happen if the community was exposed to Omicron peaking at the same time as our flu season or what would happen to workforce recruitment if the border were closed indefinitely? We know that our hospitals are under pressure. We know that this government has had to consider that because it wasted time over the last two years—in fact, probably longer than that because of the challenges in resourcing staff for our hospitals well before the pandemic arrived in Western Australia. The Premier failed to answer any of those questions put by the media before Parliament returned, and then when Parliament returned last week, he failed to answer the questions put to him directly by the opposition. It is sneaky and secretive and it does nothing to build trust in a community that has been let down by this Premier since that day.

We do not wash away the fact that the Premier and his government built an enormous amount of trust in the community for its management of the pandemic over the first two years; that is not what we are talking about. Since 20 January, this government has reverted to that spin, secrecy and hyperbole and it smacks of almost *Yes Minister*. I think that the government spent all last week avoiding questions about when the border would reopen, when the modelling would be provided and what data would be used so that it could have its press conference on Friday and release all that information. The health minister actually talked about that health modelling in the press conference on Friday, but she still did not release the information. She gave us the Cliff's notes of the Omicron modelling, but did not provide the detail or the data. It left us wondering over another weekend whether the government's response on the restrictions that came in on Monday had been proportionate and reasonable and whether the borders will reopen on 3 March. That is the question. Will the Premier and the government support this motion and give the people of Western Australia that ironclad guarantee—so those in the tourism industry, those running businesses, those in regional Western Australia and our families can get on with planning to live with COVID? They have done the hard work. That is what we ask for today. The date is essential. It is a marker for the government to rebuild its relationship with the state, the nation and the rest of the world.

I have to say that there has been more than enough commentary in national and state media that goes to the rift between this government and business and the international sector, which was highlighted by the member for Roe and the shadow Minister for Education and Training, and the challenges we face from a reputational point of view. There is no shortage of those comments. Although I concede that it is not unusual for a Premier from Western Australia to be parochial about Western Australia, what we have seen over the last two years is a Premier who has deliberately antagonised other states and deliberately played on the fears of others —

Several members interjected.

Ms M.J. DAVIES: Deliberately! Members opposite have made an art form of alienating and provoking anyone outside the state over the last two years, and it will come back to bite us. That delay to open borders on 5 February did damage to our reputation —

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members!

Ms M.J. DAVIES: — off the back of being locked away. It was the straw that broke the camel's back and that is why the Premier cannot walk away from 3 March.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members!

Ms M.J. DAVIES: This is why we need a concerted effort to re-engage with our interstate and international markets, and why some of the surplus this government has amassed needs to be directed into campaigns to prove that we are open for business and we will stay open for business. Our recruitment of health workers must be turbocharged because we will need every single worker we can get our hands on. Given that the peak in the eastern states is passing and their hospital workforce is likely to face a less challenging environment, good luck encouraging them to come over here and deal with the peak in Western Australia when we have told everyone that we have been closed for business for two years. We have alienated and created challenges for this government and it needs to address this posthaste.

Finally, the Premier should do away with the gimmick of staying in quarantine for seven days when he returns from over east. If there is a rule for the rest of Western Australia, there is a rule for the Premier. I cannot understand why the Premier insists on quarantining for seven days. It is a gimmick and it is grandstanding and it is not necessary! If it is necessary, it would be necessary for everyone to do the same—and that is why these rules are so confusing.

Ms S. Winton interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member!

Ms M.J. DAVIES: We have had messages that have caused chaos and confusion—flip-flopping and changing rules. The government needs to get on and give an ironclad guarantee for us to return to transition to living with COVID, opening our borders and providing some certainty for the people of Western Australia. They deserve that. They have done the hard work. It is very simple, Premier: vote for the motion and provide that ironclad guarantee that 3 March is the date that we will reopen.

DR D.J. HONEY (Cottesloe — Leader of the Liberal Party) [3.25 pm]: Thank you very much, Deputy Speaker — Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members!

Dr D.J. HONEY: Most of the time the member for Baldivis behaves responsibly in this place, but sometimes he undoes himself to appeal to the peanut gallery. In relation to appealing to the peanut gallery, when you are the Premier of Western Australia, you have a special responsibility to be honest.

Ms S. Winton interjected.

Dr D.J. HONEY: We can get smart alec comments from the member for Wanneroo—I do not expect anything better from her—but I expect the Premier of this state to be honest. The Premier knows that we have never given any support or sustenance to the anti-vaxxers. He knows that. He knows that to a person on this side that we have said that every person in Western Australia should get vaccinated. The Premier said today that we supported people attacking his family. What a disgrace! I and other members of this chamber have made it very clear that we find that behaviour abhorrent. Premier, that is below you! You should be a statesperson in this chamber and to the people of Western Australia. When you stoop to those levels, you stoop to the same level as other members of this chamber who may be stuck on the backbench for the rest of their careers. You are the Premier and you have a duty to be honest in this place. Our job is to challenge you, to question your decisions and to make sure that they are in the best interests of the people of Western Australia.

When the Premier announced the opening date on 18 February, there was scepticism across the whole community. This is why we have brought this motion before the house. I will read a little quote from an interviewee on the ABC. I am sure that the Premier and others saw the interview. When the interviewee was asked about the opening date, they said, “To be honest, it’s a case of I’ll believe it when I see it because, much like the 5 February reopening, I am still kind of sceptical. To be honest, it’ll be nice because I have family overseas, but I am not betting a whole lot on it.” That encapsulates the matter. This was a solicited comment but from a young person who was interviewed by the ABC. Why? It was because this Premier broke the trust of, and the social contract that he had with, the people of Western Australia when he reneged on the 5 February date that we supported. We said to the Premier that we supported him having that date. He broke the social contract with the people of Western Australia, and that is why his popularity is plunging. I know that the Premier is driven by the polls; that is very clear.

Let us go back to whether we can trust this Premier. On 23 November 2021, I asked the Premier a question in Parliament about vaccination rates and whether we would achieve the rates required. I said to the Premier then, and to others in response, that I would congratulate this government if it achieved the desired vaccination rates, and I have publicly —

A government member: You said we’d never make it.

Dr D.J. HONEY: Member, that is untrue. Why do you come into this place and tell untruths?

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members!

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Wanneroo, the mask still does not help. Order, member for Baldivis! Carry on, Leader of the Liberal Party.

Dr D.J. HONEY: Thank you very much.

Members have a duty to come into this place and to be honest—or at least make their best effort to be honest, but it is clearly very hard for some members opposite. As I say, I expect the Premier to have a standard that is above that of backbenchers who will spend their entire career there. After I asked the Premier that question, I asked a supplementary question —

Is there any risk that a requirement for a third vaccination dose will delay the border opening?

This is the Premier's response—in mocking tones, I might say—

I have explained this many times, and I ask the member to listen. We said that we would set a date in late January—early February. Once that date is set, that is the date, so that will be locked in. I have explained that to the member many, many times. It would be great if he listened in question time.

That is the Premier and his ironclad guarantee, back when he said it. Members wonder why people no longer believe the date and why we brought this motion to this chamber. That is why, because back then the Premier, in his ridiculing tone, said to me in this chamber that that was locked in. Clearly, it was not. I will not go through the Chief Health Officer's advice on 18 January, but anyone who reads that advice will see why we had to open on 5 February.

Ms S. Winton interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Wanneroo!

Dr D.J. HONEY: On 12 December 2021, in a media announcement on the 5 February opening date, Premier Mark McGowan said—

“This is a date that some in the community have been waiting to hear for a long time,” he said.

“Many have family abroad that they have been unable to see for nearly two years. I am sure this date will be a cause of relief and celebration.

...

“I am confident that this is the right time and the right way to take this important step.

During that press conference, the Premier dismissed any questions that were asked. Journalist Gary Adshead impressed the Premier and asked whether we will open on 5 February. The Premier replied, “Yes. As I have said repeatedly, the plan is to open on February 5.” Gary Adshead continued, “The plan is, but are you going to open on February 5?” The Premier said, “Well, I have answered your question once again.” Then on 20 January, we had the backflip by the Premier. On 20 January, the Premier said that the opening would be delayed to some unspecified date. Premier McGowan said—

“Unfortunately, the world changed in December; Omicron arrived,” ...

“Omicron is a whole new ball game.

“We can’t just shut our eyes and hope that it is different.”

Importantly, he said—

“The aim is to get it [the third dose vaccination rate] up above at least 80 per cent, perhaps 90 per cent,” ...

That is what the Premier said when he made that decision to delay the border opening.

What are the facts? The facts are that it appears this decision was not based on medical advice at all, but based on polling. We know that there was a change.org petition with 40 000 signatures. We know that this government polls every week. We know that it polls before it makes major decisions, because the polling goes wide and we get the questions. We then heard the government announcement a few days later about what it was going to do. We know at that stage that the poll, published in *The West Australian*, stated that 71 per cent of Western Australians agreed with keeping the border open.

Several members interjected.

Dr D.J. HONEY: What does the polling tell the minister now?

Let us test the facts of what the Premier said at that press conference. In fact, Omicron was first detected in South Africa on 24 November, not December. Two days later, on 26 November, the World Health Organization said that Omicron was a variant of concern. National cabinet met and discussed the characteristics of Omicron. It said that it was much more contagious, but likely less virulent, and we had our first cases in Australia on 9 December. In fact, when the date was set, the Premier already knew about Omicron, and the characteristics of Omicron were already known about in Australia.

On 18 February, we had the announcement of the reopening date of 3 March. Premier McGowan said—

... “the virus is already here and we cannot stop its spread”, with the state set to reach a peak of 10,000 new cases a day by the end of March.

...

“There comes a point where the border is redundant, because we’ll already have the growth of cases here ...

Remember that previously the Premier said that he would set that 3 March date when our third-dose vaccination rate reached 80 or 90 per cent. At the current pace, the prediction is that WA is on track to reach a third-dose

rate of only 70 per cent by 3 March. It is not the 80 or 90 per cent hurdle that we were told was in the medical advice. It is what we have been told all along. I can tell members why. Members wonder why we are sometimes sceptical about medical advice. We are sceptical when medical advice arrives days after the Premier makes a statement and when the Premier tells us that he will not set that border opening date until the third-dose rate reaches 80 or 90 per cent, based on health advice. Somehow that magically changes in a relative handful of days and suddenly it is okay to reach a date when we are likely to reach a third-dose vaccination rate of only 70 per cent.

What is it based on? Is it based on health advice or is it based on more polling? We know from polling that the majority of Western Australians support opening the border. That is the simple fact. It has changed dramatically over a relatively short time. That is the fact. What is driving this new date? Is it a cheap political stunt? Is it that the polling has been done and the Premier is desperate not to be unpopular or have his popularity go even further while still at impressive heights? We all recognise it on our side. Is it a new poll that came out?

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members!

Dr D.J. HONEY: The reality is that the Premier broke the social contract he had with the people of Western Australia. The people of Western Australia did everything that was asked of them. Western Australia has easily the most compliant population in the whole of Australia in supporting that, and has given overwhelming and strong support for what the Premier asked for, and the Premier broke that contract. That is why we want the Premier to make the commitment in this chamber that he will stick to that 3 March date. It is because many people in Western Australia are concerned that, should another poll come out or should some other factor occur that is not to do with the health of Western Australians, he will renege on that date as well.

MR P.J. RUNDLE (Roe) [3.37 pm]: I also support the Leader of the Opposition's motion asking the Premier to provide his ironclad guarantee that the border will reopen on 3 March. I remember on the night of 20 January, I was in a meeting with about eight other people, and they were in an absolute state of shock when that announcement came through. They could not believe that the Premier had backflipped on that announcement. To be honest, I think the Premier is feeling bad because all of last week and again today, as demonstrated by the Dorothy Dixer asked by the member for Wanneroo, he was once again trying to justify the decision. We have seen it. Every day since Parliament has started, the Premier has been trying to justify his decision and trying to make himself feel better because he has let the people of Western Australia down.

The international student sector is one area that I have to emphasise, because the Premier and the Minister for Education and Training met with the vice-chancellors upstairs in November last year. Everything was going to be great from the first semester of 2022: "We will give you our ironclad guarantee that it is going to happen." Then we had the date set in December, with all the international students ready to go. On 20 January, the Premier let down not only the students, but also those universities. The damage from this decision will take years to get over. We will never know the financial and emotional cost. From talking to the vice-chancellors, we know about the worry they have about the mental health of their international students. Some of those students are now almost too frightened to book their next flight in case there is another backflip. The Minister for International Education announced the packages today, after the damage has been done, but I can honestly say that it will take years to get over the reputational damage to not only our international education sector, but also the business sector. Business leaders are moving east. It is easier for them to fly internationally than it is to fly back to WA.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members!

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: I can absolutely guarantee the same thing will occur in the international education sector. Once they start leaving, they will not come back, and we will see that happen over the next couple of years. It will take many years for the sector to recover. It is the same as what happened after the Premier's regional migration scheme announcement; the damage that that did for two to three years was immeasurable.

I briefly want to mention sport. The Premier has said repeatedly that sport is not a priority. I can assure the Premier that sport is big business. So many teams have had the rug pulled out from under them. They are worried about another backflip, which is why we want an ironclad guarantee so that they can start planning again and working towards the season ahead.

Families from over east and overseas who were planning to come in on 5 February enrolled their children in primary and secondary schools. The government's backflip not only up-ended work opportunities, but also severely impeded some of those families' plans for the education of their children. I also want to mention how the community has set up its own Facebook page for health information and isolation rules with an updated spreadsheet on exposure sites. That Facebook page has 36 000 members because people are not getting the information from this government. The Premier said on television the other night, "Everything's going really well; we've had two great years". I can tell the Premier that while his salary arrives every week, it does not for those businesses.

MR M. McGOWAN (Rockingham — Premier) [3.41 pm]: I have a few points to make in response. Firstly, I will explain to members opposite again why the date for the full reopening of the interstate border moved. The reason the date moved was the spread of Omicron and what it was doing to the eastern states. They had hospitalisation rates of around 5 000 people and hundreds of people in intensive care with Omicron. That had not occurred on 13 December when we announced the date. On 13 December, when I announced the date, that had not occurred. When I announced the date, I was very clear—I will explain to members opposite again like I explain it to the media every time they say it—when I said that the date was subject to there being an emergency or a catastrophe. That is what I said at the press conference. With what I said at the press conference and in the other communications I had with everyone across Western Australia, it was very clear that it was subject to an emergency or a catastrophe.

From 13 December up until 20 January, case numbers in the eastern states grew exponentially. They had tens of thousands—in fact, some states had up to 40 000 or so—cases a day, with mass hospitalisation rates, incredible lines at testing clinics, mass disruption, furloughing in the community, a huge number of people absent from work and large numbers of people dying—dying in Australia. That was something we had not seen since 1919. That was the circumstance we faced. On 20 January, we received advice that we should change position and that is what we did. We basically delayed, in effect, the border reopening for a month.

What has occurred in that month? We have had a huge increase in third-dose vaccinations—indeed, a massive increase in third-dose vaccinations. We had around 25 per cent or thereabouts on 20 January and we expect that rate to exceed 70 per cent by 3 March. Secondly, there has been a massive increase—at least a tripling at this point in time—of the vaccination rate of children because of our decision. Thirdly, the eastern states have come off the peak of infection. I will explain that to members opposite again. Between 20 January and 5 February, there was mass infection in the eastern states. Opening the borders when there was mass infection would have meant that the seeding event in Western Australia would have been far higher and larger, which would have been incredibly difficult and disruptive for us to manage and a larger number of people would have died. Those were the circumstances we faced.

Finally—I think this is a very relevant consideration—if we had just blithely opened the borders when we had virtually no cases here, we would have been deliberately infecting the people of our state. That would have been a conscious decision of the government. The South Australian and Tasmanian governments deliberately infected the people of their state with an illness that can be deadly. That is what they did. The South Australian government did that. The Tasmanian government did that. We decided not to do that. I did not want that on my conscience at the height of the pandemic in the east when we had low third-dose rates of vaccination because I did not want to see Western Australians die in large numbers. I know that in some circles it now seems unfashionable to not want to see a large number of people die. It seems unfashionable to say that you want people to survive and that you do not want hundreds of people dying on your conscience. But I do not. That is why we took the decision that we took.

It was a catastrophe and an emergency. In my lifetime, I cannot remember anything like what was occurring in the eastern states. I cannot remember anything in my lifetime that compares with what was occurring in the eastern states in December and January. It was worse than what occurred in Victoria in 2020, which had us all terrified. The rates of COVID cases and the number of people in hospital dying across the eastern states were worse because the Omicron variant changed everything. We were not aware of the extent of what it would do on 13 December. I did not know that; no-one knew that. It only came into existence in what, late November. It was about two or three weeks old at that point. As the Prime Minister of Australia, Scott Morrison, said “Omicron is a game changer.” It was completely different. He told us at national cabinet that Omicron was like a completely new virus; it was a completely different thing because of its transmissibility. It was not as severe but its transmissibility was extreme. That was the circumstance that we faced. As I have said on many occasions, faced with the same facts and the same information, and knowing of the mass campaign that would be run against me for making that decision, I would make exactly the same decision again because I actually want to save Western Australian lives. I want to save our hospitals. If we can avoid it, I do not want large numbers of people getting very, very sick and straining for breath. These are actually important things, and I find it extraordinary that some people blithely ignore them. In any event, that is the decision we took, for better or worse. It has meant that people’s travel plans have been disrupted by a little bit less than a month, but it has also meant that we have saved many lives and prevented a great many people from getting very, very ill.

Queensland opened its border in basically the same circumstance as we would have done on 5 February and since the start of this year, 470 people in that state have died. South Australia did the same thing and 168 people in that state have died since the start of this year. That is what occurred. They deliberately took the decision to open. We deliberately did not take that decision and I will be proud of that when I am out of this place. We did the right thing to save lives, particularly the lives of older people and immunocompromised people. I am proud of that decision because people are alive who would not otherwise be alive if not for the decision taken by the government of Western Australia. As I said, the South Australian and Tasmanian governments and other governments around Australia took a different decision and in those states a large number of people are now dead. That is my point of view. I actually value human life.

In relation to the opposition's arguments, opposition members asked why we took these decisions. We tabled the advice today; it is on the website. The reasons why we settled on 3 March have been released for all to see. It is all there for members opposite to read. Members opposite say, "Where's the evidence?", but I have gone through this for two years. Members of the Liberal Party march in here and say, "Where's the evidence? Where's the advice?" We have tabled it before they say it, but they do not seem to notice it is sitting there. We release it to members opposite online and in Parliament, but even after we release it, they come in here and say, "Where's the information?" It is a really strange phenomenon. Liza Harvey used to do it all the time. She used to march in here and say, "I want the evidence!" and we had given it to her in questions on notice, on the website and I had handed it to her from the table here, but she would come in and say, "Where's the evidence?" It is a strange phenomenon that it is the most basic of things the Liberal Party and National Party members do not seem to understand. The advice is there. We have tabled it. It is there for the opposition to see why we landed on the date of 3 March for reopening the state. It is there. The modelling is there. The advice is there. As the advice points out, by 3 March there will not be much point to an interstate border anymore. We had a case come in on 2 January, from Tasmania, a couple of hours or maybe a day before we closed the border to Tasmania, from quarantine—I think it might have even been in a motor vehicle from the airport—and it spread to someone else. Omicron got into the community that way. Now it is out there and we have 250 or thereabouts cases reported in the community today. We cannot stop it. We have eliminated COVID five or six times now. I remember Gladys Berejiklian always saying that Delta was too hard to eliminate. I think we eliminated it twice, did we not? She was saying that it was impossible to eliminate, but Omicron is a different beast from Delta, as the Prime Minister said, so we could not eliminate it. It is already in the community. When we bring down the border, the border will basically be out of date because Omicron is already in the community.

I might remind all members that the border has stood us in good stead, as has the international border. The critics—the national press in particular, based in Sydney—do not seem to realise when they criticise borders that we have an international border. We have had one now for two years. They do not criticise that one. They only criticise the state ones. Had it not been for our border arrangement that kept out the virus, we would not have kept all our industries open and continued pumping massive amounts of revenue into the commonwealth, which the commonwealth then gave to New South Wales and Victoria. That is what occurred. What did New South Wales get in pandemic payments recently? It was \$8 billion or \$10 billion, or thereabouts, and Victoria somewhere a bit less than that, but something like that. Where do members think that money comes from? It comes from states like this that stayed open when the other states were closed. That is where it came from.

We have tabled the advice. We have tabled the modelling. It is all there for members opposite to see how we landed on 3 March. In my view, the advice is there and the modelling is there, but it is pretty much common sense. Our vaccination rate will be over 70 per cent. Our children's vaccination rate will be at 65 per cent or thereabouts, from memory. We will already have widespread cases of COVID-19 in the community, so the border will no longer be effective. That is what the modelling and advice says, but that is common sense. I think most people on this side of the house can understand that. It is basic common sense.

On the opposition's arguments that somehow they have not done the things I referred to earlier, I will take members through a few of them. The anti-mandate protesters and the anti-proof-of-vaccination protesters are out there. They gathered down the road from my house the other day. They drove up and down in front of it, scowling, yelling and swearing, doing different things. They are the sorts of things that some of this crowd are doing. All I would say to members of the Liberal and National Parties, which were once great parties in this state, is that they should not dog whistle to them. I have a quote from Peter Collier from 15 February on the anti-COVID-19 vaccine protests at Parliament—Peter Collier, the most powerful man in the Liberal Party. Do members remember the big protest that was around the building last week? He said this, and I quote —

I can understand why people are frustrated. I can understand why people are disillusioned. I can understand, quite frankly, why some people are angry.

He said that to a media crew. What is that saying? It is not rejecting the protesters. It is sucking up to them. That is sucking up to them. That is what that is doing. When the Leader of the Liberal Party in this house says no-one has ever said anything to support them and no-one has ever given them any understanding or support, that is completely and utterly false. Mr Collier, the man who runs the Liberal Party, the head of "The Clan" who they are all frightened of, that is what he said. It was a cheap shot to the journalists to suck up to those people out there who are behaving in the way that they are.

On mandatory vaccinations, on 20 October 2021, after I announced the mandates, the Leader of the Opposition said, according to my notes —

Disappointing that it's come to this for the community and I have great concerns that it may also cause greater resistance in the community.

Our strong preference would be you would do absently everything to get people over the line in a voluntary capacity.

In other words, it is criticism of what we did. That is what that is. I will explain it to members again. Several members interjected.

Mr M. McGOWAN: When you do not have widespread —

Dr D.J. Honey interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leader of the Liberal Party!

Mr M. McGOWAN: I am speaking, thank you, and I did not interrupt you. When you do not have widespread coverage of the virus in your state, getting people vaccinated is hard. It is hard, which is why we did what we had to do. When the Leader of the Opposition says things like that, once again, as she did with the motion moved earlier in this house, she is undermining the efforts we are making to ensure that our mandatory vaccination program has bipartisan support. That is what she is doing.

Dr D.J. Honey interjected.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Please; no-one listens to you. You are going to be the Leader of the Liberal Party for a couple more months. Just act with dignity.

Opposition members are saying they never said any of those things about the vaccination program. Members of the Liberal and National Parties are saying they never said it was never going to work. I quote the Leader of the Liberal Party on 9 October 2021 from his speech at the Liberal Party state conference —

There are no significant jurisdictions in the world that have achieved that level of vaccination and we know, given the appallingly low level of vaccination in Western Australia, that we will not achieve 90 per cent until sometime a long distance into next year, probably into the second part of next year.

We are now at around 98 per cent first dose, around 96 per cent second dose and we are approaching 70 per cent third dose by 3 March.

Dr D.J. Honey interjected.

Mr M. McGOWAN: That is what you said. We put in place these programs and all the Leader of the Liberal Party did, nonetheless, is say that to the Liberal Party state conference—I am sure they were so impressed.

Dr D.J. Honey interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leader of the Liberal Party!

Mr M. McGOWAN: Hang on, you come in here and say that you backed us the whole way along; you have not. Several members interjected.

Mr M. McGOWAN: You have not. Then we have —

Dr D.J. Honey interjected.

Mr M. McGOWAN: You have not.

Dr D.J. Honey: We have.

Mr M. McGOWAN: I just quoted to you. That is the thing about the Liberal and National Parties. I can quote directly what members opposite said and then they deny; they do not even deny they said it, they just deny it! It is an odd thing that they do. When I quote to them what they say, they just deny it and start verballing. It is a direct quote from the Leader of the Liberal Party's speech to the Liberal Party conference. At least someone listened.

I will then go to opposition members saying they would never have criticised the government on the borders, even though they have, at length. From 10 November 2021, I want to quote the Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party —

We have stated consistently that if that date had to change, the WA community would overwhelmingly support it and it understood that that may be the case and it may have to change if the health advice required it.

The Deputy Premier, then Minister for Health, then said —

... the member for Vasse says, "Set a date, and if you need to change it, that is fine; we will not critique you or anything like that," quite frankly, that is absolutely laughable. The member for Vasse must think that we just came down in the last shower of rain if she thinks we think that she is not going to criticise us every step of the way.

The Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party, the member for Vasse, responded, "I wouldn't." In other words, all we have copped is criticism ever since, even though members opposite said that they would not do that.

The Leader of the Opposition knows better. On 19 October 2021, she said —

It needs to put a date. People in Western Australia will understand if that date needs to be moved ...

...

I think the Premier needs to trust the people of Western Australia. We have been living with this situation and watching what has happened in other states; we understand that there will always be riders on these plans—these dates ... We understand the unpredictability of the disease we are facing, but the Premier need not fear that the public will not understand that the settings in any plan may be only indicative.

That is what she said, but then she attacks us every day because, in order to save lives, we moved the date. That is what she did and that is what she does. Honestly! It is unbelievable—the way she acts.

I will not even go near the support the opposition has provided to a certain gentleman in the High Court.

A member interjected.

Mr M. McGOWAN: I will not because Liza Harvey is not here. When she was the Leader of the Liberal Party, she was out there supporting that challenge. She is not here, so I will not mention it. In light of the fact that she is not here, I will not mention that the Liberal Party was supportive of that. I will not mention what the Prime Minister, Christian Porter and everyone else had to say about those issues. But that is the truth of it.

On other issues, I remember that the member for Roe was out there saying that we would not be able to staff schools. We have—in the middle of a pandemic. He said that it would be terrible in schools. We have had the least amount of disruption or closures of any state in Australia over the course of this year. Queensland shut all its schools for two weeks. Nearly 2 000 schools were shut for two weeks. We had one public school close for one day—my God! That is what has occurred in Western Australia. The Liberal and National Parties have undermined us the entire way along. When I quote it to members, they deny it. That probably says something about them rather than about the quotes.

Finally, as I said in question time, we guarantee that 3 March will be the opening date, but it is because we already have COVID in the community and we cannot get rid of it now and because we will have a high third-dose vaccination level, which will save many lives in Western Australia due to the conscious decision that this government took.

Ms A. SANDERSON (Morley — Minister for Health) [4.02 pm]: I rise to speak to the motion moved by the opposition. I want to start by addressing some of the claims made by the Leader of the Opposition in her contribution. She couched those claims as the opposition, not as an individual member in this place, so let us look at some of the claims that she made about how opposition members have conducted themselves in managing this pandemic. The first claim was that they have never courted the votes of the anti-vax movement and have supported the vaccine mandates when supported by the health advice. Let us look at the member for Vasse's tweet on 18 February. It states —

With nearly 99% of the eligible popn now vax, current mandates are becoming unnecessarily vindictive, inconsistent & costly for small biz. The McGowan Govt doesn't enforce mandates at Dumas House. Mandates should be fair & in step w Fed Health advice.

So she clearly has no regard for the state health advice.

The member for Vasse has also claimed that Michael Darby, a known anti-vaxxer and COVID conspiracist, is her hero. That is the kind of support that the Leader of the Opposition is linking herself with. That is her colleague she is joining with in managing this pandemic.

A member interjected.

Ms A. SANDERSON: They are the actual words that were said, member.

The next claim was that they had been encouraging people to go to vaccination clinics and get vaccinated. Again, in the last two months of 2021, the member for Vasse did not make a single attempt to encourage people to get vaccinated, despite the fact that we had announced the border opening. In January, there was one social media link to the government's Roll Up For WA website. On 24 January, she even wrote an op-ed, undermining our attempts to get people to take the virus seriously and claiming that it was just like the flu and that people die of the flu anyway. The thrust of her op-ed was that that is okay and that we should just let the virus in because people die anyway. In it, she says —

ABS data shows 1671 people died in Australia due to COVID between January 2020 and October 2021.

She also says that with the Omicron variant, the average age was 83 years and 71 per cent had pre-existing conditions. So that is all right then! That is fine; they can die! Older people who are over 70 years of age can die, and if someone has a pre-existing condition, that is just the cost of doing business, according to the opposition health spokesperson!

Mr P. Papalia: Shameful.

Ms A. SANDERSON: It is utterly shameful! We know that there were more deaths from COVID in the first 34 days of this year than there were in the entire preceding months of the pandemic.

The member for Vasse interjected on the Premier in question time when he said that the lives of hundreds of people have been saved by the decision to defer the date and she asked how many lives have been saved. How many does

it take? I ask the Leader of the Opposition: how many lives is okay to sacrifice to COVID? The member obviously has in her head a number for the people it is okay to allow to die and that is why she has consistently undermined the things that have worked in keeping people safe. Those things are the vaccination mandates, the hard border and the public health social measures. They are all things that have kept us safe.

David Honey, the member for Cottesloe and Leader of the Liberal Party, said at the Liberal Party conference in 2021, which I think the Premier talked about, the following —

... we will not achieve 90 per cent until sometime a long distance into next year, probably into the second part of next year.

We have; we are at over 95 per cent, yet he had no faith that the community would do that.

The other claim made by the Leader of the Opposition was that it supported reasonable restrictions when there is health advice to support it. Hon Dr Steve Thomas referred in his media release this morning to public health social measures and said that the latest changes had continued a general theme of ignorance or contempt from the McGowan government towards business operations. David Honey, the member for Cottesloe, immediately claimed that he was sceptical of the health advice.

The next one was that there must be an ironclad guarantee. The Premier was very, very clear: barring a catastrophe or an emergency, that date would stick. In our view, thousands of people dying is a catastrophe and an emergency, and that is why I will move an amendment to the motion.

Amendment to Motion

Ms A. SANDERSON: I move —

That all words after the word “house” be deleted and the following be inserted —

acknowledges the Premier’s guarantee, as confirmed in question time today, that the state border will open to interstate and overseas visitors from 3 March 2022 and supports the delay to Western Australia’s full reopening that has enabled much higher vaccination rates to be achieved across the state, especially the rates of third doses

MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan — Minister for Transport) [4.08 pm]: What we have seen again today is the Liberal and National Parties playing politics with the pandemic, which they have done constantly over the past two years. I do not know where the opposition was over Christmas time, when those scenes were unfolding over east and we saw the exponential growth of COVID in the community, the rush on hospitals and the significant number of deaths that occurred throughout those states. I do not know where opposition members were. Obviously, they were hibernating, because they were not aware of what happened over there.

There were some words that opposition members did not use today. They did not use the words “vulnerable people”. They did not talk about deaths or the elderly, because they have turned their backs on the vulnerable people of Western Australia. Everything that this government has done has been to make sure that we protect the entire community—the vulnerable, the elderly and people who need our help and support—and that is what we have done. Again, I do not know to whom the Leader of the Liberal Party was talking —

Dr D.J. Honey interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I did not interject on you! You turned your back on the Western Australian community. The Leader of the Opposition said that our Premier is too Western Australian and that he supports Western Australia too much. She backed the eastern states commentators against the Premier of this state. Members of the Nationals WA, who have made their entire reason for being to create division between metropolitan and regional WA, are now criticising the Premier for being too Western Australian. We do not accept that criticism.

The member for Roe stood up and said, “Sport is big business.” I tell members: sport is about community, and I am proud that my kids got to play community sport for the last two years. I am proud that my kids got to go to school for the last two years, compared with everybody else in this nation. To turn your back and ignore that is an insult to Western Australia. Sport is not big business; sport is about making sure that our kids get to play. The Premier and the Minister for Health are doing everything possible to ensure that we limit the negative impact of COVID and deaths in our community. I am very proud. We can look all those people in the community in the eye, knowing that we have done everything possible to save their lives, to protect the economy and to make sure that Western Australians can go about their business. The idea that members opposite side with the anti-vaxxers and those who are threatening the lives of the Premier, his children and his wife is disgusting. It makes us sick.

Several members interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: That is what you are doing! You are appealing to those who are threatening the lives of the Premier, his kids and his wife, and that is disgusting.

Division

Amendment (deletion of words) put and a division taken, the Acting Speaker (David Scaife) casting his vote with the ayes, with the following result —

Ayes (40)

| | | | |
|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|
| Mr G. Baker | Ms M.J. Hammat | Mr S.A. Millman | Mr D.A.E. Scaife |
| Ms L.L. Baker | Mr M. Hughes | Mr Y. Mubarakai | Ms J.J. Shaw |
| Ms H.M. Beazley | Mr W.J. Johnston | Ms L.A. Munday | Mrs J.M.C. Stojkovski |
| Dr A.D. Buti | Mr H.T. Jones | Mrs L.M. O'Malley | Dr K. Stratton |
| Mr J.N. Carey | Mr D.J. Kelly | Mr P. Papalia | Mr C.J. Tallentire |
| Mrs R.M.J. Clarke | Ms A.E. Kent | Mr S.J. Price | Mr P.C. Tinley |
| Ms C.M. Collins | Mr P. Lilburne | Mr D.T. Punch | Ms C.M. Tonkin |
| Mr R.H. Cook | Mr M. McGowan | Mr J.R. Quigley | Mr R.R. Whitby |
| Mr M.J. Folkard | Ms S.F. McGurk | Ms R. Saffioti | Ms S.E. Winton |
| Ms K.E. Giddens | Mr D.R. Michael | Ms A. Sanderson | Ms C.M. Rowe (<i>Teller</i>) |

Noes (5)

| | | |
|----------------|--------------|----------------------------------|
| Ms M.J. Davies | Mr R.S. Love | Mr P.J. Rundle (<i>Teller</i>) |
| Dr D.J. Honey | Ms L. Mettam | |

Amendment thus passed.

Amendment (insertion of words) put and passed.

Motion, as Amended

Question put and passed.

FIREARMS AMENDMENT BILL 2021

Second Reading

Resumed from 24 November 2021.

MS L. METTAM (Vasse — Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party) [4.17 pm]: I rise as the lead speaker in the Legislative Assembly on the Firearms Amendment Bill. The opposition has some concerns about this bill, but we will not be opposing it. We will certainly be supporting what this bill seeks to achieve, and we will potentially be supporting this bill once some issues are resolved. Some professional shooting groups and the agricultural industry are seeking some clarification on the bill, and we hope that we will be able to fully support this bill when it goes through the Legislative Council.

From the outset, we support what this bill seeks to achieve. There is no doubt that the Western Australia Police Force should be commended for the outstanding work that it has undertaken in keeping our community safe. WA police are certainly challenged by their task to try to cut down outlaw motorcycle gangs, issues surrounding firearms and certainly the issues that this bill seeks to address, and they deserve to be commended. As I stated, we have since received some feedback from a number of registered firearm groups, whether from the farming industry or the Sporting Shooters Association of Western Australia, who would like some clarity on some of the definitions in the bill and some of its unintended consequences.

An extraordinary incident was witnessed by the WA public in December 2020, when a single bullet tore through the air at Perth Motorplex in the city's south amid a roar of spectators and engines. The assassination of bikie boss Nick Martin certainly sent shockwaves throughout the WA community. In response, police officers within Taskforce Ravello apprehended and charged the criminal involved, who was subsequently convicted of the murder. Those officers need to be commended for the outstanding work they did in the face of such a horrific and violent incident, which, as I stated, sent shockwaves throughout the WA community.

There is no doubt that the WA Police Force has the support of all sides of this chamber. We will certainly endeavour to ensure that the police have the tools they require to undertake the outstanding job they do in the community. In the face of that incident in December 2020, it is understood that 100 officers were assigned to the massive effort of Taskforce Ravello. They successfully raided the clubhouses and homes of gang members and their associates. There were 102 charges laid against individuals for 267 offences, and more than 50 firearms were seized. That was an extraordinary event.

The intent of this legislation is to encourage people to get out of gangs or get out of WA. The opposition needs clarity on how or the extent to which this will be achieved without creating unintended consequences. The purpose of this bill is to amend the Firearms Act 1973 and make consequential and related amendments to other acts, such as the Criminal Organisations Control Act 2012, the Prohibited Behaviour Orders Act 2010, the Restraining Orders Act 1997, the Children and Community Services Act, the Court Security and Custodial Services Act and the Prisons Act 1981. This bill will introduce provisions for firearm prohibition orders and firearms technology, offences aimed at tackling

the illegal manufacture of firearms, and a permanent general amnesty under the Firearms Act 1973. It will also increase the penalties for the stealing of firearms and the possession of stolen firearms, and modernise out-of-date definitions within the act.

A number of key stakeholders were consulted on the bill, but we also understand that a number of other organisations did not feel that they were fairly consulted on the bill. I know that some of my colleagues have heard from some organisations, such as the Sporting Shooters Association of WA and other Western Australian industry groups, that have raised some concerns about what this legislation will mean for lawfully registered firearm owners who are just trying to undertake lawful activities. Although we have been advised that licensed firearm owners and those not engaged in any unlawful activity will have nothing to be concerned about with this bill, issues have been raised by shooting groups and the farming sector around what this proposed legislation could lead to in light of the lack of consultation on it. One industry group raised concerns that the legislation does not distinguish between what is considered to be a repair to a licensed firearm and what would be considered normal maintenance. To quote one organisation —

It seems that licensed firearms owners will now have to take their firearms to a licensed repairer for routine maintenance tasks which they now lawfully do themselves. This is like forcing a motor vehicle owner to go to a qualified mechanic to change a car tyre.

It was talking about simplistic repairs.

A government member: Are you able to tell us which organisations?

Ms L. METTAM: It was a couple of organisations, which I will be able to clarify. One was the Sporting Shooters Association of WA. They raised that the consequences for gun owners in regional and rural WA, such as farmers, will be far-reaching, given that they often have to travel considerable distances to towns where licensed businesses could carry out those repairs. This could be a costly task when the level of maintenance is, in the scale of things, very minor. Section 19(4) of the existing act outlines the offence for unlawfully repairing a firearm or ammunition, which carries a penalty of five years' imprisonment. However, the bill will delete section 19(4) from the act and replace it with proposed section 23AD, "Unauthorised repair of firearms and other things", which carries a penalty of imprisonment for 14 years. We were told that the WA Police Force has no intention of amending the bill. It advised that licensed firearm owners might want more clarity on which maintenance activities they will be able to do on their own firearms without it constituting a repair under the legislation. We were told that this information will be updated on the WA Police Force website to provide guidance to licensed firearm owners. Some assurance has been given by the WA Police Force about what that will mean, which will obviously be of some comfort to these lawful groups, but we would like some clarity and confirmation of that from the minister.

Concerns have also been raised that repairs or even maintenance will have to go through an approval process with the police commissioner. In the same vein, there are concerns about the potential for the reloading of ammunition to be an offence. Another industry group said that clarity around this point is critical, given this is a common, everyday activity that licensed firearm owners undertake. The WA Police Force has advised that section 16(1)(a) specifies that a licence holder is entitled to possess, carry and lawfully use ammunition from a firearm. That is the information that we have been provided with by the WA Police Force through that briefing. WA police also confirmed that this will cover reloading.

The other question that has been raised is whether it is the intent of this bill to criminalise the reloading of ammunition by licensed firearm owners in the state of Western Australia. On behalf of those who have contacted opposition members, we would like some clarification on that.

In relation to firearms technology offences, this bill will make it illegal to possess or use firearms technology to manufacture plastic 3D firearms. WAPOL advises that it will be targeting those incidents that we hear about of people manufacturing firearms in backyard sheds through the use of 3D technology. It is certainly a worthy endeavour to give police the power to crack down on this level of activity, which can, obviously, lead to some serious offences. The consistent issue that has been raised by a number of people who have looked at this legislation is the potential for unintended capture. Proposed section 23AF is headed "Participating in unauthorised manufacture, repair or dealing in firearms and other things." A "thing" includes any number of the equipment that is commonly found in home workshops. I am flagging this ahead of the minister's response, and also ahead of consideration in detail, but questions have been raised about how firearms technology manufacture offences will be applied to manuals and magazines. Firearms manuals could contain instructions for repair and technical drawings that could fall under the definition of "firearms technology". The people who have raised concerns with us are seeking some more clarity around that issue as well.

I understand that the illegal manufacturing component of the bill arose from a national agreement through the Ministerial Council for Police and Emergency Management in October 2018. New South Wales and Western Australia are the only states that have developed bills to specifically enact the agreement; however, it is expected that all other states will update their legislation in the future. Questions have been asked about how that will work, and we will raise that in consideration in detail.

Peter Heggie from the Shooters Union of Australia WA has stated —

“It’s not just about the firearm prohibition orders. Some of the concerns we have are things like making a simple repair to your firearm could actually fall you foul of the law under this new belt ...

...

“If we take for example a farmer who lives 2000 kilometers away from the local gunsmith—if they need to replace a trigger that they need on their firearm for pest control, technically under this new bill that is now illegal ...

He also fears people without guns could be targeted by the law.

“Say for instance if you have grandad’s ‘book of military firearms’ and it’s got schematics of old World War Two rifles in there—under this bill ... you’ve just become a criminal ...

I am flagging with the minister the issues that have been raised as part of getting feedback from industry groups. They highlighted that if there had been more of a consultation process, some of these issues might have been addressed.

From the outset, we certainly support the intent of this bill. There are some issues that need clarification. We look forward to going through that process in consideration in detail, and, importantly, in the other place, where the shadow Minister for Police will be leading that debate.

I would like to take the opportunity to thank WA Police Force and the minister’s advisers for their support in ensuring that the opposition had the time to be briefed on this piece of legislation. Many of the concerns raised have received some clarity from WA Police Force. There certainly has been some feedback that people with concerns would like to hear that clarity from the minister as well.

I will leave my comments there. I am sure that other people would like to speak to this bill. I will finish by stating that what this bill seeks to achieve by cracking down on the possession of firearms by outlaw motorcycle gangs is a very worthy objective, and we will certainly not get in the way of the government in that endeavour. I will leave my comments there.

MR M.J. FOLKARD (Burns Beach) [4.35 pm]: I rise to speak on the Firearms Amendment Bill 2021. For those who do not know, I was a police officer for a long time before I came into this place. I have seized thousands of firearms. I have been shot at. I have been to countless events at which firearms have been discharged. I have chased armed offenders throughout the state. When it comes to firearms and this particular piece of law reform, I am absolutely in favour of it.

In Western Australia, firearms law reform is not new. The original Firearms Act was proclaimed in 1973. I believe it was a Labor government that brought that piece of legislation before the Parliament. The Western Australian firearms laws of 1973 were seen as the toughest in the world, let alone Australia. Western Australia was the only state that licensed the owner of the firearm. We were also the only state that licensed the firearm. We were the only state that required the owner of a firearm to demonstrate a genuine need to have that firearm. The last part of our law was that as a condition of a firearms licence, the owner of a firearm had to have an appropriate area in which to use that particular firearm. What does that mean? I will simplify it. A person could not use a large bore firearm or a long arm if they had a small property of only a couple of acres. A good example would be a calibre similar to a .308, which is similar in size to a military round, when they had basically nothing more than a couple of thousand square metres of land on which they could use it; it was not appropriate, and it should not take place. The police force at that time, in its wisdom, would refuse to grant those types of licences. In my early days as a constable, we used to spend hours checking firearms licences and comparing them with properties to see whether those properties were suited to the calibres of those firearms. We would physically visit those properties and interview the owners. We would then go back and check with the firearms licence owners, because we would often find that numerous large landholders would sign letters for people in exchange for a carton of beer so that those people would be able to use those firearms on their properties. That was wrong, so we had to tidy that stuff up.

Back in the days when I was a young constable, the firearms legislation made it almost impossible for a person to own a military style firearm. Western Australia was the only state in the country where it was near on impossible for a person to own what was referred to as a pistol grip. That is because there was virtually no justification or need for people to have such a firearm. I was out there enforcing these laws. But in 1996, the Port Arthur massacre occurred. That changed firearms laws and firearms culture within this country. I am not a fan of John Howard, but he was responsible for the modernisation or, for want of a better term, the removal of fully automatic firearms from our community. When he first started this process after the massacre at Port Arthur, he tried to create a national firearms register. Western Australia nearly turned its back on him because at the time our laws were seen as the best in the country. As a result of our stance in that environment, the national laws basically replicated the Western Australian firearms legislation. The key to that success was the gun buyback scheme. I will talk more about that later.

In 1997, there were approximately 1.2 million licensed firearm holders in the community. In 2020, there were about 870 000 licensed firearm holders, which is a reduction of around 330 000 licensed holders since 1997. In the

community, we had about 6.5 firearms per 100 people, and now we have got it down to 3.4 firearms per 100 people. That is a good thing, having had the wretched things pointed at me far too many times. Any firearm that we can remove from the community is a good thing.

The Firearms Amendment Bill 2021 continues on with the firearms amnesty; that is brilliant. People often find firearms after having had the misfortune of going through a deceased person's estate. They then hand them into the police station for correct disposal. I have had families produce firearms at the police station when they feel that granddad has become too—what is the word?—old, and everyone is happy for those firearms to be removed from his possession. I have had some interesting firearms produced at the station. One of the old guys came into the police station with a Lewis gun that he had found hidden in the back shed. For those who know of it, the Lewis gun is a famous machine gun from the First World War, let alone the Second World War. He also brought in the associated ammunition. That happened years ago when I was a young constable at Subiaco.

Approximately 3.5 million firearms are still out in the Australian community. In 1997, this figure was only 3.2 million. The only reason I can put that down to is possibly the growth in the population, but we have fewer licensed firearm owners now than we had back then. What concerns me is that approximately 260 000 unregistered firearms are still out in the community; that is a lot. I actually think that that number has been under-reported significantly. My experience when we had the gun buyback scheme, as I was one of the officers involved in recovering a heap of firearms during those times, was that when we went to a residence to make an inquiry about firearms, we would often find a firearm that was not licensed. I suggest that the number of unregistered firearms in the community may be as high as 500 000. They could be stolen, unlawful or whatever, but they would not be on any register that I know of. From my research, the exact number of licensed firearms in the Australian community as at 2020 is 3 778 025. I do not care what anyone says; that is a lot.

Howard's reforms worked. He introduced a ban on the importation, ownership, sale, resale, possession and manufacturing of all self-loading rifles, whether military or not. The ban also included all self-loading pump action shotguns and all self-loading rim-fire rifles and pistols. For those who are not firearms enthusiasts, a rim-fire rifle is basically a smaller version of a .22-calibre gun and centre-fire rifles have a larger calibre, but all automatic guns were banned—the best thing he ever did. The brilliance of the scheme was a temporary increase to the Medicare levy. Howard actually came up with a way for people to hand back their firearms and be compensated.

When I was working at Eucla, one of our jobs was to go up to the mission country. I can remember going up to the Ngaanyatjarra Lands north of Rawlinna and collecting all the firearms and doing the paperwork et cetera. This young Aboriginal fella turned up and he had this firearm and, I kid you not, it was basically a firearm wired to a stick. I thought that there is no way known that this could work. He goes, "Yes, boss. This is as good as with anyone else." I thought he must be kidding me. We used to have these little statues that were steel cut-outs of chickens and I paced one out at about 50 metres. He fired three shots at it and he made that little cut-out dance with virtually a homemade firearm. Under the buyback scheme, we managed to find him \$300 for that firearm, and I still laugh about it to this day. That scheme changed the culture within this country. In the 20 years prior to the Port Arthur massacre, there were 13 mass shootings in Australia. Since those firearms reforms, we have had none.

I can remember working on the highways out near the Nullarbor. We used to seize that many firearms out there that it was scary. Just after the buyback scheme started, we pulled over this Queensland couple who were towing a caravan. The wife looked a bit uncomfortable; I could read her body language. Being the inquisitive young copper I was, I looked in the car and saw a spent cartridge case sitting on the back seat. I thought, "Hmmm." I got him to open up his caravan and I went into the back of it. The bed folded up like a cantilever and sitting under the bed were six firearms. I found a .22-calibre that had a silencer, another .22-calibre handgun and a big long rifle—it was a massive firearm. Sitting beside that he had an SKS rifle. Those from the military will know what I am talking about. For the non-gun people here, in easy language it is a semiautomatic version of the AK-47. It had a folding bayonet on the end of it and beside it was a drum magazine that could fit 1 000 rounds. This was a firearm that one would never want to see in the community. I can remember joking to him and I said, "Why have you got that?" He turned around and said to me that it was for protection and self-preservation. I looked at him and said, "Mate, are there screaming hordes out here? Is there something that I need to know?" He said it was to protect him and his wife, but I seized every one of those rifles. I remember going back to the station and this guy turned up and said, "I am licensed to hold", and I said, "You're not licensed to hold that firearm, champ, and you're not licensed to have that magazine for it. That has been illegal, and definitely in Western Australia, for years." But he was still adamant. He fought the court process, and we won, and I can remember taking the firearms back to Perth. We used to take them into the firearms branch where there was a huge guillotine at the back. The firearms were chopped up—as they should have been. That was great. But I digress.

I referred to those mass shootings, and the American National Rifle Association. The NRA still makes stuff up and attacks that figure. The firearms reform in this country makes us world leaders. Western Australia has had this legislation as far back as 1972, but I do not remember any significant reforms since then. If there have been, I do not remember them coming through, but WA has a record of good firearm reform. However, we have fallen a little behind and have not kept up with the trends of the day. This bill is arguably the most significant reform to the

Firearms Act since 1974. It will introduce firearms prohibition orders, and I will talk to those a bit later. It will enhance provisions for the manufacture of firearms, including firearms and the modern technology that can be used. I think that is an excellent, outstanding progression. It will increase penalties for the possession of stolen firearms; that is overdue. It will also introduce a “firing a firearm to cause fear” provision. I suggest that will be very good in the drive-by space. In recent times, there was a shooting incident at the Mindarie Marina involving bikies. The individuals involved have been apprehended and they are probably still before the courts. I like the idea of increased penalties in that space.

Will these reforms stop outlaw motorcycle gangs? The illicit drug industry in this country is worth over \$15 billion. No, I do not think it will stop outlaw motorcycle gangs in that space, but this legislation dovetails into the consorting laws that our great Attorney General put before us. Will it make it harder for them to do business? Absolutely, yes. OMCGs are about power. My experience is that when that power is taken away, they cry like little babies and behave like little sooks in a playground.

[Member's time extended.]

Mr M.J. FOLKARD: I worked years ago in the vehicle crime unit. I remember a task to pull over a vehicle that had been acting suspiciously in the Girrawheen area. We followed him, and I remember coming down Wanneroo Road onto Newcastle Street. In my memory, there was an old horse supply shop. Anyway, he came off Wanneroo Road or Charles Street, wherever it was, and we forced him off the road as only vehicle crime unit drivers could do. We were very good at what we did. I remember that we forced him into the car park. I remember going up to the vehicle and as I approached the side of the vehicle I remember seeing this stainless steel thing. It was a gun. I remember the guy reaching for it. Firearms instructors will love this. They all use the old phrase, “secure, stun and separate” when dealing with your own firearm or anyone else’s. If you can achieve that, then happy days. I remember this guy reaching for his firearm and I reached in through his window, grabbed the firearm, threw it out the window and at the same time stunned the individual and separated it out. I then drew my firearm and removed him from the vehicle. It turns out it was a Desert Eagle handgun. It was a cannon. Looking at the vehicle further, the guy had a set of numberplates. He had a button inside the car that he could hit and the numberplates would roll over and change. Sitting in the back seat of the car was a brick. “Brick” is an old phrase that druggies would use—maybe the Attorney General may add to this at another time—and was how they used to trade their drugs. A brick would be about \$250 000 in cash. It would be taped up so that it could be seen, and that is how they used to trade large quantities of drugs. I never found out whether he was going to purchase or whether he had purchased. All I know is he had this hand cannon in the front seat of his car while he was driving around. It was an interesting day at the office!

This bill introduces firearm protection orders. Someone of a commander rank could approve the order and that will stop a person from being anywhere near any part of a firearm or gun. I love it. If this gives the organised crime community a hard time, happy days. It will empower our anti-consorting laws by stopping the associations. If a person goes anywhere near a firearm, good doogs. The next thing the legislation will do is improve and strengthen penalties, with 14 years’ prison or \$75 000. That is one year less than a capital sentence, which is 15 years. That is, or used to be, the minimum penalty for murder.

The bill will also deal with the illegal manufacturer of firearms. A firearm can be made these days using a 3D printer. I will not go into the details of that, because if people listen to my speech, they may be stupid enough to attempt to do it. This bill will outlaw the software needed to make these firearms. It will also allow a non-warrant examination of computers or allied equipment to gather evidence to make sure that good prosecutions are done. Because it can make this stuff, 3D printing is frightening. People can actually make firearms depending on the quality of the printer, and we may have problems detecting the firearms made.

The bill will introduce greater penalties for the possession of stolen firearms—happy days—and significant penalties if the possession of those firearms are in circumstances of aggravation, with again 14 years’ prison, just shy of the capital crime of 15 years. That is where this stuff sits.

I have a couple of concerns about the bill, but I will not go into them. The McGowan government has given our police officers ballistic vests. We never used to have them. When police are out there working on the roads, and as young coppers, the last thing they wanted to wear was a visibility vest because of the number of firearms we were seizing back in those days. There is a round out there called a “cop killer”. It is designed to pierce ballistic vests. There may be a way for this legislation to deal with that; I do not know. But they call them cop killers because these rounds shoot straight through those ballistic vests. They may be in this bill; I do not know. I will wait for the Attorney General’s response. The other one that the bill does not refer to are flechette rounds. These are a firearm round that strip the flesh when they hit the body. They are horrific. They are outlawed in every modern society. The United Nations finds them abhorrent. But guess what? They can still be bought in America. They can still be purchased over there. I am hoping, and am certain, that there are ways to deal with them in the bill, because I know that they are outlawed coming into the country, but I am concerned about the possession of them, because they are a deadset thing.

I spoke earlier about some of the shooting industry's concerns and where it sits with all this stuff. Two of them were approached by the Shooting Industry Foundation of Australia through some correspondence and I have read their concerns. They are in support of the act, which I think is good. I am certain that the police force will work through the concerns about the actual mechanics of how the act works in relation to maintenance, as they worked through concerns about the firearms buyback scheme in the past. This is not new. This skill is within the agency. It has done this before with the firearms buyback. I suggest that the way WA police handled the firearms buyback scheme and this modernisation of the Firearms Act will be again a credit to them. That is their business. They are professional in that space.

I am sure that the police will work through the concerns about licence holders, possessing parts et cetera. Everyone forgets that it is a privilege to have a firearm. It is a privilege to be a licensed firearm holder. With that privilege comes obligations. Those obligations mean that the licensee is responsible for every part of the firearm they are licensed to own. Every firearm that is removed from our community is a good thing, because unless someone is a professional or has a serious hobby, I do not see the need to have them.

I thank the minister for this excellent piece of legislation that is modernising the environment. I hope we see a change in the organised crime and outlaw motorcycle gang environment, because they are running riot with their firearms at the moment. Every time they use them, our great police force locks them up, so with some good penalties we will put a few more of them away. I thank you for your time.

MR V.A. CATANIA (North West Central) [5.02 pm]: It was great to hear some of those war stories from the member for Burns Beach, but it would be interesting to see whether those stats that he provided are verified. If he is saying that there are all these unlicensed guns out there, what has the Western Australia Police Force been doing? I think the member has to be careful with the facts—unverified facts—that he is trying to present here in this house —

Mr M.J. Folkard interjected.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: — when around 90 000 law-abiding licensed firearm holders in this state do the right thing. The opposition supports the crackdown on outlaw motorcycle gangs. In his second reading speech on the Firearms Amendment Bill 2021, the Minister for Police said —

The Firearms Amendment Bill 2021 includes significant reforms that advance the McGowan government's commitment to community safety and combating serious and organised crime in Western Australia. These new laws target criminals and other dangerous people's access to, and possession of, firearms. The reforms aim to take firearms, including handguns, out of their hands and off our streets.

He said the legislation will target serious organised crime. If the government were really concerned about crime, it would not have taken 12 months to act on the crime that is occurring in the Kimberley. No action has been taken against the crime that is occurring in Carnarvon, Meekatharra or Newman. When we hear the government saying it is getting tough on crime, it is all smoke and mirrors and targets law-abiding citizens. It targets people who have licences for firearms because they need to use firearms in their daily role—pastoralists, farmers, roo-shooters and people with plantations who need to deal with vermin. It targets people who use firearms in sporting competitions. We have seen the police use legislation to their own advantage to target those law-abiding citizens who are licensed gun holders in my community. I know they have been targeted by the police using an interpretation of the legislation to benefit their cause. I do not know what that cause is.

The member for Burns Beach has said it: one gun in the community is one gun too many. That is a glass-half-empty approach to firearms in Western Australia, because there is a need. As I outlined, there is a need for our farmers and pastoralists and those in businesses to target vermin in agricultural areas. There is a need. There are sporting clubs in communities throughout Western Australia. Members, it is all very well to say we should not have guns in our community, but there is a need. We have legislation that is grey and targets law-abiding citizens. We have seen that with what has happened with the ability to transport firearms and ammunition around regional WA; it does not exist. It puts lives at risk when dealers have to drive hundreds, if not thousands, of kilometres to move stock because of this government's refusal to allow ammunition and guns to be transported by couriers, Australia Post or other means. It is okay to have ammunition and guns in the back of a car going from Perth to Carnarvon on a regular basis because there is a need for ammunition in our community.

I will be interested to see what percentage of law-abiding citizens who have firearm licences actually commit crimes. The Minister for Police is tough on crime and bikies, but he is not very tough on crime in regional areas. Over the past 12 months, we have seen the government's inaction on crime. It would be nice to know how many firearms owners break the law, if the minister can provide that information.

But members, I have a letter from the Shooting Industry Foundation of Australia, which has concerns as well —

Mr P. Papalia interjected.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: Shooting Industry Foundation of Australia.

Mr P. Papalia interjected.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: Yes, but it raises some very important points that are backed by the Sporting Shooters' Association of Australia, of which I must declare I am a proud member. I am a proud member of the Sporting Shooters' Association of Australia. The letter from SIFA reads —

Licensed firearms holders will now require approval from WA Police for possessing firearms parts such as interchangeable stocks and replacement triggers, which have lawfully been held by these licensed holders so they can replace these items to keep firearms in safe working condition.

It will be interesting to see what the local police think. Local police who are at their wit's end dealing with crime will have to check whether the maintenance on a firearm is lawful. It will be interesting to see what police say about that. I know that local police do not really want to deal with firearms issues because they are too busy. I want to know whether the minister is referring to local police, because what if someone is several hundred or a thousand kilometres from a town with a police station? Does that person have to travel all that way to the police? Will they go into the police station and present this firearm and the police will go, "What do you want me to do with that? I do not know much about guns"? That is what will happen. It will be interesting to see how the minister will allow for this new piece of legislation, which will become law because the government has the overwhelming numbers and will put this through without too many questions. I think the government maybe has one amendment.

We hear a lot about the co-design of legislation—it is the new buzzword—yet we are not having any co-design with a very important industry. As I said, there are nearly 90 000 licensed firearms holders in this state. That is a very significant number of people. Why did the government not sit down and co-design legislation that is realistic—not fanciful and not grey. It should not allow for the interpretation of the police in the licensing department to make decisions, knowing that if someone has an issue and they want to take it further, often we hear reports of, "We've got deeper pockets!" What often happens is that the deeper pockets win, not allowing a law-abiding firearm owner to challenge what police describe as a firearm that they should not have. The law is quite specific, but it is interpreted in different ways for many situations, including licensing firearms. I am not having a crack at the police here. I am questioning —

Mr P. Papalia interjected.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: You are incompetent, minister, anyway. I am not talking to you. I do not want any interjections, Acting Speaker, because the minister is quite incompetent.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms A.E. Kent): Member for North West Central, maybe you can direct your comments through the chair, rather than —

Mr V.A. CATANIA: I would be happy to.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: The interpretation of the police in firearms licensing will have major consequences. The majority of police find some of the decisions that are made quite amazing. I am talking about local police under this legislation being put in a position to be able to make decisions about whether a firearm has been altered, repaired or maintained in a particular way. That is going to create more pressure for local police. The incompetent Minister for Police keeps shaking his head; perhaps he can stand up and explain that to everyone.

The letter continues and states that licensed firearms holders will need to gain WA police approval for every part of a licensed firearm that requires replacement. This will obviously add further red tape for firearms that are rendered unusable for an extended period. How is that going to work? Given the level of crime that is occurring in Western Australia, police are busy dealing with day-to-day operations. The letter also states that there has been no information from the WA police on what the process will be to gain an approval for replacement parts, particularly on how long this process will take and how much it will cost. As I said, police cannot operate with the current workload, let alone adding this other layer of bureaucracy. It seems that the customisation of firearms for legitimate purposes, such as competitive shooting, will become illegal under this legislation. The letter says that this will have a significant impact on the industry. That is so true. The differences in laws between states causes problems for competitors coming over to Western Australia. This will constrain these people who are part of a big industry. It is a tourism industry as well. We have a station called Ella Valla station—I know the minister knows about it—which has been targeted by the police who want to close down its range. The range holds international shooting events; people come there to shoot on the station, which is 80 kilometres south of Carnarvon. It is a tourism drawcard. People come there to be able to shoot their weapons, which are legal, and spend time in the region. It is a tourism drawcard, yet these processes will create further red tape. I think that will start to hamper, yet again, the sport of competitive shooting for people who come to Western Australia from the east coast.

The letter continues and states that the legislation will not distinguish between what is considered to be a repair to a licensed firearm and what is considered normal maintenance. Firearms parts will have to be replaced by a licensed repairer rather than a licensed firearm holder themselves. As the minister may be aware—I am sure he is—for new firearms, licensed firearm owners have the ability to repair and clean their firearm, but under this proposed legislation, they will have to go to a licensed repairer. For people on stations or farms that are very far away, firearms are needed to be able to carry out normal daily activities. When something goes wrong with a gun, people cannot always take it to a licensed repairer; rather, they fix it themselves, which they are able to do with many new firearms.

Another question that the letter has raised is that there have not been any transitional arrangements outlined for licensed firearm holders who possess firearm parts and other items that are currently unregulated but will become regulated when this legislation comes into effect. Will licensed firearm owners require retrospective approval from WA police for those items or will they be expected to surrender them? If they are to surrender them, will there be any compensation? It is also unclear whether the legislation will permit licensed firearm holders to reload and permit the production of the reloader's own components, such as casting lead bullets. This is critical for the industry, given that most licensed shooters would already reload their own ammunition and possess the equipment that is required to do so. It is very common. It would be a very costly exercise if they were to purchase bullets every time they used them. Often, people, especially at sporting shooting clubs, collect their casings and reload them to save money. They also balance their firearms for the competition they are facing. They look at what amount of gunpowder suits an individual's handgun or rifle. These are the questions that the minister needs to answer because they will have a huge effect on our law-abiding licensed firearm owners.

The definition of firearms technology has the potential for significant unintended capture. It is critical that licensed firearm owners can still access and possess the necessary information such as drawings or instructions when disassembling a firearm part for cleaning and for reference data when loading ammunition to ensure that the loads are safe and do not exceed industry specifications. The legislation will also prohibit licensed repairers from repairing firearms from outside Western Australia, as they will repair only those firearms licensed under this legislation. This is a restraint on trade and will have significant impact on the industry, especially on competition.

Questions were raised by the opposition at a briefing and the answer was generally that licensed firearm owners who are not doing anything illegal have nothing to worry about. Many law-abiding firearm owners have continued down the path of doing what is legal and what is right by being able to manage their firearms. This legislation will make a lot of law-abiding firearm owners do things that are against the law, simply because it is not realistic. We have not had a co-design process in which the government has sat down with the Sporting Shooters' Association or the Western Australian Firearm Traders Association to understand the distances faced by people in regional Western Australia, and their need to have firearms simply because they are part of their tools of trade. Members forget that firearms are the tools of trade for pastoralists, farmers, vermin control businesses, individuals and so forth. Also, sporting shooters are a large part of the social fabric in regional communities.

I hope the minister takes some of his own advice and questions what has been put in front of him by the police, to make sure that this legislation reflects reality and does not put law-abiding firearm owners in the same category as outlaw motorcycle gangs. That is the portrayal he is putting out there in the community. It is not correct. He should also not put more pressure on police to deal with these mundane exercises. Let them do their job to catch real criminals in the community—something for which he perhaps needs to provide more police in areas other than those he chooses for political expediency. How about the minister resolves some crime issues in Western Australia before he starts targeting law-abiding firearm owners?

MR D.A.E. SCAIFE (Cockburn) [5.21 pm]: What an absolutely despicable contribution to the debate on the Firearms Amendment Bill 2021 that we have just had to sit through from the member for North West Central. A national bipartisan approach to firearms control has existed for more than two decades, yet the member for North West Central thinks that just because he can make a point, he should make a point. It might be nice for once for him to actually think about the consequences and the meaning of what he is saying before he says it. I certainly picked up on one thing he said; I know that the Minister for Police did as well. He came straight out of the gate and undermined the Western Australia Police Force in his contribution. That is absolutely shameful! This is the same member who comes in here and complains day after day about crime throughout the country and pretends that he is somehow on the side of WA police. Nothing could be further from the truth, and he is absolutely showing his true colours today. I would say to all members of the WA police: this is the true face of the member for North West Central. He will use any issue if it suits his political agenda. If it is expedient to him, no issue is too sacred or too serious. No issue that has enjoyed bipartisan national support, elevated to the level of Prime Ministers of this country, both Liberal and Labor, for many years, is too big for this member to use for his own cynical purposes. He literally said in this debate that WA police use gun laws to their own advantage. He implied that the WA police misapplied the laws and used them for ulterior purposes. I will be frank about what that means. It means that the member for North West Central has alleged that WA police are involved in deliberate, corrupt behaviour. He said on *Hansard* —

Mr V.A. Catania interjected.

Mr D.A.E. SCAIFE: They are your words; you will have to own them! The reason that you, member for North West Central, are piping up is that you know that you stuffed up. You know that the mask slipped.

Point of Order

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: I am trying to listen the debate, but I cannot hear over the stupid interjections of the member for North West Central.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms A.E. Kent): Member for Cockburn, are you inviting interjections?

Mr V.A. CATANIA: Clearly, that was a stupid point of order raised by the Attorney General.

The ACTING SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Debate Resumed

Mr D.A.E. SCAIFE: I am more than happy to take interjections from the member for North West Central, because the reason he is piping up is that he knows the mask slipped. He knows that he showed his true colours and he was caught out. He pretends to be a friend of the WA police, but he said in this chamber in a debate on a bill of national significance that the WA police are out there misusing the law for their own benefit. It is an absolutely shameful performance from the member for North West Central! He always thinks he is the best performer on the opposition side, but he should absolutely watch out for himself because he is truly his own worst enemy on this stuff.

Mr P. Papalia: He hasn't got a lot to hide behind.

Mr D.A.E. SCAIFE: That is true—he has to be the best of six. The point is well made, minister.

It is just extraordinary that we had a contribution from the member for Vasse that, although I did not agree with all of it, was relatively moderate in nature. She deliberately chose her words carefully, and expressed that the opposition will support this bill. That could not be told from the member for North West Central's contribution. Anyone listening to him would think that the opposition intends to oppose this bill and efforts to crack down on outlaw motorcycle gangs and —

A member: Terrorists!

Mr D.A.E. SCAIFE: Terrorists—I will get to that because it goes to the same language we heard earlier today in this chamber and we have heard time and again from this opposition. They are apologists for outlaw motorcycle gangs and people who involve themselves in aggressive and violent behaviour. We have seen it in the anti-vaccination movement, and we have seen it today from the member for North West Central.

Going back to the point about the member for Vasse's comments, it makes sense that the member for North West Central undermines the police in this chamber, because he also undermines the member for Vasse. The member for Vasse identified herself as the lead speaker for the opposition on this matter, and she set out in quite careful words the opposition's position. It bore no resemblance to what the member for North West Central had to say.

Mr P. Papalia: They're not on the same team.

Mr D.A.E. SCAIFE: They are not on the same team and that is the truth. This opposition calls itself an alliance, but I do not think that word means what they think it means is all I will say on that. You are supposed to work together, guys. You are supposed to be on the same team, and quite clearly you are not. It is absolutely despicable for the member for North West Central to come in here and undermine the Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party, which is not the official opposition now, but is the alternative party of government. I can assure the member for North West Central that although the Nationals might have become the official opposition through mistakes of history, it will never be the governing majority party of a coalition government; that is for sure. The member has shown that he should not be trusted with being the major party in a governing coalition as well, because he will use any issue to score cheap political points.

The member for North West Central was caught out by the Minister for Police as well because he was quoting concerns raised by the Shooting Industry Foundation of Australia, which is not a Western Australian representative group. It is an east coast lobby group engaged in a national campaign against the national agreement that was reached by governments of all political stripes across the commonwealth, state and territory levels. The member has given voice to its concerns when it does not have a legitimate voice in Western Australia. It is despicable, but not surprising, to hear members of the Liberal and National coalition opposition giving voice to the concerns of the eastern states. Time and again, they have prioritised the views of east coast lobby groups and east coast commentators on the pandemic, and now on sensible gun control as well. I too, like every other member in this place, was approached by the Shooting Industry Foundation of Australia, and I think it should be put on the record that we were approached by a lobbyist. When I get lobbied by other organisations, I get lobbied generally speaking directly by them. If it is Alzheimer's Australia or any other organisation, they approach directly. However, in this case, this organisation had the managing partner of a Perth consultant lobbying firm approach members of Parliament in this place. This is clearly a well-organised, well-resourced campaign against gun control. It is reminiscent, minister—that is right—of the tactics of the National Rifle Association in America. It is absolutely disgraceful that the member for North West Central comes into this place and speaks on this bill pretending to be on the side of law-abiding gun owners, when really he is putting forward the views of a narrow, moneyed, corporatised, well-organised, well-resourced group of people who do not have a legitimate voice in Western Australia. It is an absolute shame that we had to listen to that.

I will conclude shortly, but I want to make the point that this bill is very important. It is a bill, as I said, that has been elevated at a national level. It is part of a long-running bipartisan approach that has been taken by major political parties to gun control in this country. A lot of people give credit to John Howard for these reforms and,

by all means, I do as well. But do members know who I really give credit to? I give credit to Tim Fischer, who was the Deputy Prime Minister at the time and Leader of the National Party. To put it bluntly, it was a little bit easier for John Howard, as the then member for Bennelong and Leader of the Liberal Party, which gets the majority of its electoral support in urban areas, to make a call on gun control. It was much, much harder for Tim Fischer, the then Leader of the National Party, a political party that draws support primarily from the regions where there are likely to be more law-abiding gun owners than in any other part of the country due to farming, agricultural activities and the need to hunt vermin and the like. He stood shoulder to shoulder with John Howard, as Prime Minister at the time, and, really, it was Tim Fischer's support that got those laws over the line, because he was the one who had to do the really hard work. I want to put on the record my support for the late Tim Fischer when he was Deputy Prime Minister in making that brave move.

I want to make the point that sometimes these debates can seem a little bit far removed from people, but the increase in gun crime is a real issue that our communities have had to deal with lately and that has been seen in a few different ways. The first, of course, which was raised by the member for Vasse, was the assassination of Nick Martin at the Perth Motorplex, which was an absolutely horrific event. It is unimaginable to have a professional assassination carried out essentially in the backyard of my communities in Cockburn. There was also a large gun theft only three years ago in my own electorate in Yangebup, which is the suburb that I live in. There is a light industrial area behind where I live, with a gun retailer who stores guns at their premises, and there was a very sophisticated operation in 2019, clearly by organised criminals. They cut through the concrete wall from the shop next door and stole well over 1 000 firearms or something of the like. It brings home that this is an issue of national importance that has local effects as well, and we always have to improve our gun-control laws and make sure that they are up to date. One way that this bill will do that is in relation to the changes in technology in firearms manufacturing, particularly the rise of 3D printers and the like. I am very pleased to see the provisions in the bill that will crack down on people owning schematics and electronic diagrams that are used for the manufacturing of firearms. All I would say to the member for North West Central is that if he says that he is here only on behalf of law-abiding gun owners, I cannot imagine what a law-abiding gun owner needs to have a schematic for 3D printing a weapon for. There is literally no reason. The member for North West Central attacks this bill, despite the fact that it has those provisions that clearly can be directed only towards people who are engaged in convert and criminal activity.

This is a very good bill. It will modernise our gun-control laws. It will impose higher penalties. It will keep up to speed with the latest developments in technology. It was an absolute shame to see the member for North West Central lower the tone of the debate in the way that he did. I trust that we will not see a repeat of that from any further speakers from the opposition. I would certainly be disappointed if we did see that. There are ways to raise issues and questions without engaging in a political speech designed to undermine the Western Australia Police Force and without essentially being an apologist for organised crime and undermining his own colleagues in the National Party.

MR P. LILBURNE (Carine) [5.35 pm]: It is my privilege today to support the Firearms Amendment Bill brought forward by the McGowan Labor state government to crack down on the illegal possession and/or manufacturer of firearms in Western Australia. The Minister for Police, Paul Papalia, CSC, MLA, introduced into state Parliament in November 2021 legislation to give the Western Australia Police Force new powers to get guns out of the hands of criminals and off the streets. The Firearms Amendment Bill 2021 is central to the new legislation and the firearms prohibition order, or FPO. It is designed to target bikies and other serious organised crime figures. Under the scheme, police will be able to ban anyone reasonably suspected of posing a threat to the community from holding a gun licence or from living in a house where guns are stored. Once an FPO has been served on a person, police will have the power to stop and search that person and anyone in their company at any time, as well as enter their home, car or workplace at any time to search for illegal firearms. Those people found to be in breach of an FPO could face jail terms of up to 14 years and fines of up to \$75 000.

In a recent study in the *Medical Journal of Australia* titled “Gun violence in Australia, 2002–2016: a cohort study”, published online on 27 September 2021, the author highlighted some of the effects of gun-related violence. The results of the study showed that in New South Wales, for example, firearm-related injuries were recorded for around 2 390 people, of which 36 per cent were caused by assault alone. This dreadful figure needs to be curbed by proactive state governments like that of which I am a part.

In a media release on 18 October 2018, James Cook University Associate Professor Richard Franklin confirmed that a major global report confirms the number of gun-related homicides, suicides and accidents had been falling in Australia after the introduction of anti-gun laws, and that the effect of such tough laws is similar elsewhere. Professor Richard Franklin joined hundreds of academics and organisations around the world to produce a report that looked at firearms deaths outside of war zones between 1990 and 2016. I quote —

“In Australia we went from 614 firearm deaths in 1990 to 274 in 2016. That’s a fall from 3.4 deaths per 100,000 people to 1 per 100,000 people in 2016,” he said.

Dr Franklin said that the Australian National Firearms Agreement, enacted following the murder of 35 people in Tasmania in 1996 by a lone gunman armed with high-powered weapons, has been closely linked with declines in firearm deaths in Australia.

The police minister said in his press release of Wednesday, 24 November 2021 —

“These reforms are part of our ongoing focus on disrupting organised crime and there will be more to come.”

The social impact of drug abuse on community life by organised criminal syndicates is an area of concern to me as a father, a teacher and a member of this Parliament of Western Australia. Organised crime facilitates and produces drug abuse problems in our society. Drug abuse is often accompanied by a devastating social impact upon community life. My speech will focus on the adverse effect of drug abuse on industry, education and training, and the family, as well as on its contribution to violence, crime, financial problems, housing problems, homelessness and vagrancy. The economic costs of drug abuse associated with organised crime is staggering. Approximately \$120 billion is lost in productivity, mainly due to labour participation costs, participation in drug abuse treatment, incarceration and premature death. There is also \$11 billion in healthcare costs for drug treatment and drug-related medical consequences. This legislation goes some way towards solving these problems.

The Western Australian government develops plans and strategies, funds programs and research, and works with other organisations to help reduce the harmful effects of drugs and firearms in our community. The Western Australian McGowan government provides funding to research centres to make sure it has the data it needs to make better decisions. The initiatives and programs that assist include the National Alcohol and Other Drugs Hotline, the Alcohol and Other Drugs Knowledge Centre initiative, the local drug action team program, the Positive Choices initiative and the Drug Help campaign. The McGowan government’s goal is to reduce drug-related activity by participating in committees and groups involved in these areas and, of course, creating legislation that cracks down on organised crime.

School Drug Education and Road Aware, or SDERA, is the WA government’s primary drug and road safety education strategy for all government and non-government schools and early childhood services. SDERA aims to prevent road-related injuries and the harms of drug use in children and young people. One such campaign run by SDERA is the Be Ready campaign, which attempts to inform children of the importance of good choices and facing challenges positively and proactively. The strategy hopes to build resilience within young people and encourage leadership amongst groups and individuals. Building resilience in communities is a key element of the SDERA strategy of the Western Australian government. The program highlights that young people can develop a sense of control by setting small goals and working towards them each day. It outlines the importance of walking away from a difficult situation or location if the child is feeling stressed, pressured or angry with someone or an incident. Importantly, by walking away from a pressured situation, the child gets some time to decide what is the best action to do and, then, to do it. My favourite part of the program is the talk strategy, which encourages that a problem shared is a problem halved. Encouraging trust and effective communication channels between children, parents, the police, trusted adults and teachers is a crucial mechanism that children need to be taught. For example, the SDERA strategy gives guidance to year 7 students on enhancing coping skills for when they are exposed to stresses and life difficulties. Worksheets and group activities highlight the importance of communication with parents, police, responsible adults and teachers. If young people feel trapped by their circumstances, the strategy suggests the advantages of talking to a counsellor on a helpline or in a youth support service.

The SDERA program divides drugs into four main categories depending on their effect on a person’s central nervous system, be they depressants, stimulants, hallucinogens or multi-action chemicals. The provision of information by suitably qualified personnel within an educational setting helps to facilitate effective group learning in a fear-free environment. During my teaching career, I had the privilege of teaching these programs to students under my care whilst employed in the education department of Western Australia. My implementation of this strategy was highlighted by my opinion that a safe and trusting learning environment must exist prior to these strategies being instigated. It is my experience that children seek accurate and truthful information from teachers and police. For example, I was asked by the principal of a school at which I taught to teach health education to a class of year 7 students. The principal said that the student cohort at the school trusted me as a teacher, and the students knew that my classroom environment was a safe one in which to ask questions about these types of topics.

The SDERA strategy also highlights to young people in schools the importance of first aid. Learning the basics of first aid, such as DRSABCD, can help people cope with an emergency that might be linked with drug use. Students are taught and reminded to look for dangers, think about and action the best response, send someone to help, ensure the airway is clear of obstruction and that breathing is normalised, apply CPR if needed and, finally, use defibrillation if required.

The Western Australia Police Force highlights on its various social media platforms the problems the agency encounters daily with drugs in our community generated from organised crime. Alcohol and drugs have a significant impact on the community and on the frontline resources of the Western Australia Police Force. The police encounter a range of drug-related problems, including the possession, trafficking, cultivation and manufacture of drugs. Research shows that drug users commit property crime not only to generate income but also when under the influence of drug intoxication. Police confront violent crime, assault, family violence, sexual assault, drink-driving and drug-driving. There are also dangers to police from clandestine labs, violence and needlestick injuries, as highlighted by the member for Burns Beach.

If anyone is concerned that a friend believes that their drink has been spiked or drugged, they should stay with that person and seek medical attention. It is important that they contact the police on these occasions, especially if a robbery or assault has occurred. It is critical that children are taught to have that level of trust in our police.

I would like to conclude with an extended quote from an article by Jenny Mouzos published in the Australian Institute of Criminology's publication *Trends and issues in crime and criminal justice*, number 198. The article is headed "Firearm-related morbidity in Australia, 1994–95 to 1998–99", and reads —

While there has been a declining trend in firearm-related hospital separations in Australia, this does not imply that we should reduce our efforts towards minimising the mishandling of firearms in our community. There are still too many Australians who are injured and require hospitalisation as a result of the misuse of a firearm. The yearly monitoring of both firearm morbidity and mortality rates in Australia by the Australian Institute of Criminology is essential to gauge the level of firearm-related injuries and the possible effect of strategies incorporated into the Australian regulatory regime.

I thoroughly support the McGowan state government's legislation to crackdown on the illegal possession and/or manufacture of firearms in Western Australia.

MR S.A. MILLMAN (Mount Lawley — Parliamentary Secretary) [5.49 pm]: I rise to make a brief contribution to the debate on the Firearms Amendment Bill 2021. This is the latest in a long line of legislation that has been brought before this Parliament and the fortieth Parliament by a McGowan government that is committed to effective reform in the area of law and order. Once again, the Minister for Police and the Attorney General are working in concert to tackle the law and order issues that confront our community and our society and putting that at the centre of the work that they do. They formulate and bring to this Parliament, entirely appropriately, legislation that is designed to assist our hardworking WA Police Force in its efforts to tackle outlaw motorcycle gangs. This is not the first time that this minister and the Attorney General have worked in concert to achieve this laudable aim. This bill is the latest and one of the most effective examples of that.

Other members have spoken at length about the importance and effect of this legislation. I want to pick up where the member for Cockburn left off. I listened to the contribution of the member for Vasse and, subsequently, the member for North West Central. I was surprised and amazed, and then shocked and dismayed, that the member for Vasse could so clearly and unambiguously, and sensibly, articulate the opposition's position, which is supportive of this legislation, but with some reservations, only to have the member for North West Central, her comrade in the alliance, come in and completely undermine both her position and the work that has been done by the WA Police Force and the Minister for Police. That was a shameful display by the member for North West Central. It does him no credit and it does this debate no service.

All the members who have spoken in this debate have touched on how fortunate we are in Australia to have a situation whereby because of the actions that were taken by the conservative federal government in the mid-1990s, we do not have the same level of gun violence that is experienced in jurisdictions such as the United States. That does not absolve us of the obligation to make sure that we continue to update our legislative framework to ensure that it is contemporary, modern and responsive to the new challenges that we are being presented with.

Last year, I spoke about some legislation that had been introduced by the Attorney General, the Sentencing Legislation Amendment (Persons Linked to Terrorism) Bill. During that contribution, I talked about something that I would like to touch on again today—that is, the rise of right-wing extremism and the threat that it poses to civil society, law and order, and general peace and civility.

I want to quote from a number of articles that touch on this issue. The reason this issue is more relevant today than it has ever been is that we are seeing the insidious effect of social media and the peddling of extreme right-wing ideology, piggybacking on the anti-COVID sentiment that has been fomented by people like Clive Palmer and Craig Kelly, to undermine the efforts of governments worldwide to impose sensible vaccine mandates and encourage vaccination throughout their communities. I was very heartened to hear the clear and unambiguous statement by the Leader of the Opposition during question time today when she said that she supports vaccine mandates. She said that everyone in this chamber—I think she chose her words wisely—supports vaccine mandates. However, I have this question for the Leader of the Opposition: What about those in the other chamber? What about those like Hon Nick Goiran, who talks about informed consent and does everything he can to undermine what this government is trying to do to put in place the safest possible system to protect the lives and livelihoods of Western Australians in front of the global pandemic?

A member interjected.

Mr S.A. MILLMAN: We have all been vaccinated!

It is this blatant attempt by elements within conservative politics in Australia to play nice with the far right and to cultivate the anti-vaxxers as a source of votes. As the Premier said today, is this the new base of the Liberal and National Parties in Western Australia? If it is, they can say goodbye to the people of Mount Lawley ever voting for the Liberal Party again. The people of Mount Lawley and the people of Churchlands will not stand for this sort

of behaviour. They know exactly why the McGowan government has put in place the public health and social measures. They see the extraordinary success of our policy on vaccine mandates. There is not a jurisdiction in the world that comes close to Western Australia in the number of people who have been vaccinated in such a short period of time. That is because of the policies that have been put in place by the McGowan government. Those policies enjoy the overwhelming support of the vast majority of the population and, happily, it seems that they also enjoy the support of the Leader of the Opposition. I just wish she was capable of demonstrating greater leadership in her so-called alliance and could bring some of her recalcitrant backbench and shadow minister members to heel and get them to express the same sensible sentiment. That starts with the member for North West Central. What an absolute disgrace! He is giving comfort and succour to those people who are seeking to undermine our democratic institutions.

I want to bring all these points together by going a little bit back in time. I want to go back to a time that we have all forgotten, a time pre-COVID that we may remember, because it was during the presidency of Donald Trump. I want to quote from an opinion article in *The Guardian* of 7 August 2019. The author of the article is Michael Fuchs. He is a senior fellow at the Center for American Progress and a former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs. This article is headed “The American right wing is enabling a dual crisis: gun violence and white supremacy”. When we are talking about gun control measures, it is worth seeing exactly what sort of beneficial effects these measures will have for the community. The author says

The increasingly intertwined threat posed by gun violence and white nationalist terrorists is real, evil and deadly—and it is being enabled and encouraged by Donald Trump and the right wing that he has emboldened and embraced.

Gun violence —

This is pre-COVID —

is the deadliest violent threat facing America today. The Centers for Disease Control reported 39,773 deaths by firearm in 2017. And while it pales in comparison with the gun epidemic, white nationalist terrorism is a growing threat made more deadly by the availability of guns. The Anti-Defamation League —

That is an organisation that tackles anti-Semitism in the United States —

noted that of the 50 deaths caused by domestic extremists in 2018, “white supremacists were responsible for the great majority of the killings”.

If this many Americans were killed in a war or foreign terror attack, the US government would be in crisis mode. The President would be convening meetings of the cabinet and state and local officials. Congress would be rushing legislation through the door quicker than legislators could read the bills. The media would cover the issue as religiously as it covers Trump’s tweets.

And yet, these issues hardly register in national policy debates, and the reason is the American right wing.

For a long time, the right wing have thumped their chests in an attempt to show how tough they are on national security ...

Perhaps the right wing feels the need to show how “tough” they are because they know they are aiding and abetting a genuine national security threat. —

I am quoting from the article, but I will return to this point, because it is a point that I raised in the contribution that I referred to earlier about the Sentencing Legislation Amendment (Persons Linked to Terrorism) Bill —

The systematic rightwing effort to make it easier to access guns, alongside policies and rhetoric that spew racism and bigotry, make the rightwing enablers of mass murder and inspirations to white nationalist terrorism.

Ask just about any expert, law enforcement official, or national security professional who is focused on the issue and they will tell you that commonsense gun-violence-prevention legislation can significantly reduce gun violence.

That is precisely—these are my words; I am no longer quoting from the article—what this legislation is. This is commonsense gun violence prevention legislation. This is legislation that is targeted at one of the most insidious groups in our society—outlaw motorcycle gangs—yet the member for North West Central stood and criticised this legislation. It is inexplicable.

For the purposes of *Hansard*, I am returning to quote from the article, which continues —

A glance at other countries with stricter gun laws and virtually no gun violence confirms this fact. And yet, the right wing is not only opposed to these laws that would save lives—it has been working for years to make it easier for Americans to obtain assault weapons.

While guns kill tens of thousands every year, white nationalists are using them more and more to carry out their terrorist attacks. —

I am quoting the article, which in turn quotes *The New York Times* —

A New York Times report showed how murders by white nationalists are not only growing around the world—they are also becoming more and more connected. —

Members will recall the contributions from the members for Hillarys and Cockburn during the sentencing legislation debate. The member for Hillarys talked about the tragic massacre in Christchurch and the member for Cockburn talked about the tragic massacre in Norway, both of which were right-wing extremist terrorist attacks carried out as a result of readily available access to firearms. The article continues —

And the right wing in the United States are helping these terrorists by leading the way with hateful, racist language and policies that terrorists cite in explaining their murderous acts.

Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.00 pm

Mr S.A. MILLMAN: Before the break, I was quoting an opinion article from *The Guardian* titled “The American right wing is enabling a dual crisis: gun violence and white supremacy”. It quotes from an article in *The New York Times*. It states —

While guns kill tens of thousands every year, white nationalists are using them more and more to carry out their terrorist attacks. A New York Times report showed how murders by white nationalists are not only growing around the world—they are also becoming more and more connected. And the right wing in the United States are helping these terrorists by leading the way with hateful, racist language and policies that terrorists cite in explaining their murderous acts.

I refer members to the contributions made by the members for Cockburn and Hillarys late last year when we were debating the Sentencing Legislation Amendment (Persons Linked to Terrorism) Bill 2021. The author of the article continues —

While some think this shouldn’t be a political issue, it is. It is because the killers are telling us it’s political in their manifestos. It’s political because progress—getting legislation passed—requires politics. And it’s political because it is overwhelmingly one side of the political spectrum that is fueling the threat.

The author concludes —

But until they change, let everyone make clear that the actions of the right wing are undermining the safety and security of the American people and enabling mass murderers. We can’t beat around the bush any more with pleasantries and thoughts and prayers.

Members will be aware that was written in the pre-COVID Trump era. I will move forward, but will continue to reference the American political debate, by referring to an article by Matt Ford in *The New Republic* of 29 October, which was post-Trump and in the midst of the COVID era. Bearing in mind the previous point was about the rise of right-wing extremism and right-wing terrorism, Mr Ford’s article is headed “The right’s embrace of political violence is escalating”. If the warnings were not stark enough in 2019, they are particularly stark now in the wake of the United States Capitol riots in January 2021 and also in light of the opinion expressed by Mr Ford. His article starts —

Charlie Kirk, the prominent leader of the right-wing Turning Point USA group, fielded a disturbing question from an audience member at an event in Idaho earlier this week. “At this point, we’re living under corporate and medical fascism,” the audience member told Kirk. “This is tyranny. When do we get to use the guns? ...

Kirk, perhaps recognizing the optics of the moment, immediately told the audience member that he was “going to denounce that.” He then expressed sympathy for the underlying sentiment and blamed an unspecified “them” for inciting it. “Because you’re playing into all their plans, and they’re trying to make you do this,” Kirk said. “They are trying to provoke you and everyone here. They are trying to make you do something that will be violent that will justify a takeover of your freedoms and liberties, the likes of which we have never seen.”

The troubling thing is that this captured in blunt terms what a good amount of the conservative discourse on political violence … sounds like these days … Republican elected officials, falsely tell their fellow conservatives that America is on the verge of an irreversible shift into tyranny and authoritarianism …

The article goes on —

In recent years, that normalization of political violence has seeped into other aspects of right-wing discourse. Conservative media outlets celebrated figures like Kyle Rittenhouse, who shot and killed two people in Kenosha, Wisconsin, during last year’s civil unrest, as well as a Missouri couple who brandished guns at Black Lives Matter protesters who marched through their gated community. Former President Donald Trump himself had issued his own threats of bloodshed last summer, writing on Twitter at one point that “when the looting starts, the shooting starts,” …

...

While many conservative figures invoke the American Revolution, those references often appear to be a means of legitimizing acts of violence. Ali Alexander, a right-wing activist who organized some of the “Stop the Steal” rallies in D.C. on January 6, often made the same comparison in the weeks ahead of the inauguration ...

He said that invoking 1776 as a violent reaction is always an option. The article continues —

Barely disguised intimations of violent resistance aren’t limited to the 2020 election or to false claims of election fraud. Mark Levin, a popular conservative radio host, complained last month that vaccine mandates ... amounted to “incremental tyranny” ...

The link that I have been trying to make is that the right wing is now using sensible public health measures, the sorts of public health measures that have delivered a vaccination rate that is the best in the world, to be an “incremental tyranny”. They then take that and expand it as a justification for violence. The article continues —

This hasn’t stopped right-wing pundits from denouncing a relatively modest testing-mandate proposal as something far more insidious. “Joe Biden’s weaponization of OSHA to force all companies ... to ... mandate vaccines or test their employees ... is tyrannical,” ...

This is the language that the right wing is using. “They’re using vaccine mandates and other big government policies to destroy your rights and freedoms”, the right-wingers say. The article continues —

“When do we get to use the guns?” is a shocking question for any American who values civil peace or free government or the rule of law—or just happens to oppose murder, really ... The query is the culmination of years of inflammatory right-wing rhetoric and the tacit embrace of violence as a political tool by a disturbing number of conservative politicians.

I will come back to that point before I conclude my contribution.

[Member’s time extended.]

Mr S.A. MILLMAN: I have been referring to the right-wing movement in the United States because it operates as a beacon for right-wing extremists in Australia, but I will now bring the debate back to Australian shores. I will now quote an opinion piece by Andrew Leigh, who members will know is a member of the House of Representatives. Mr Leigh wrote an article titled “Australian conservatives took on gun control. It worked” for *The Washington Post* in October 2017. It states —

Australia experienced its deadliest mass shooting in 1996 after Martin Bryant killed 35 people in and around the Port Arthur tourist site. Twelve days later—before all the victims had been laid to rest—Australia’s police ministers met and unanimously agreed on measures to tighten licensing and registration requirements, restrict access to semiautomatic weapons and limit sales.

The national government coordinated a buyback program, which paid market prices for guns that were handed back. Over the next year, more than 600,000 firearms—about one in five of all guns in Australia—were handed into police stations. Given the harrowing loss of life in the United States to gun violence, it’s worth understanding the impact of these reforms.

Did the Australian buyback stop gun massacres? Following the tragic mass shooting in Las Vegas this week, some have dismissed Australia’s buyback as ineffective, asserting that mass shootings were too rare in Australia prior to the buyback to show any clear evidence of progress.

... that is not correct. Australia experienced an average of one mass shooting—defined as the killing of five or more victims in one incident—per year in the decade prior to 1996. In the decade after, no mass shootings took place. The chance of this being due to luck alone is less than 1 in 100.

But most gun victims don’t die in mass shootings. The person most likely to kill you with a gun is yourself, followed by your spouse and other household members. After the Australian reforms, I —

That is, the author Andrew Leigh —

set out with Wilfrid Laurier University economist Christine Neill to analyze how the reforms impacted gun homicides and suicides.

We first looked at national trends and found that the rate of gun deaths had been falling ... prior to 1996 ... that the reforms had caused the death rate to fall ... faster.

In a second study, we then looked across states, to see whether those places where more firearms were bought back also experienced a larger drop in gun deaths. We found a clear pattern: The greatest drop in guns per person occurred in Tasmania, which also saw the biggest fall in firearms suicide. The smallest reduction in the firearms ownership rate was in Canberra, which also saw the smallest drop ...

Overall, we estimated that the Australian firearms reforms of 1996 save around 200 lives per year ... Given that the buyback had a one-off cost of around half a billion Australian dollars, this makes it one of the most cost-effective public health measures in Australia’s history.

At the time that we published our research, I was an economics professor at the Australian National University.

This is Andrew Leigh who today sits in the Australian House of Representatives as a member of the opposition Labor Party. This quote is important —

It isn't in my partisan interest to praise the results of the 1996 reforms; although my party supported them, they would not have happened without the leadership of conservative Prime Minister John Howard —

The member for Cockburn made this point eloquently —

and his deputy Tim Fischer. Their reforms saved lives, but they paid an electoral price during the 1998 election ...

The article continues —

Australia still has an active shooting culture. My morning run sometimes takes me past both the rifle range and the handgun club. When there are too many kangaroos in the bush behind my house, the government calls in the shooters to cull the numbers.

But what we don't have is a culture in which loaded guns are kept in bedside tables, stowed in gloveboxes and tucked into the waistbands of young men out on a Saturday night. On a per-person basis, the United States has a gun ownership rate that is seven times higher than Australia's and a gun death rate that is 11 times higher.

How did Australia manage to act quickly and save thousands of lives? Leadership.

I am going to come back to that point. I want to finish my story. That was Andrew Leigh's article of October 2017. I want bring us up to date within the Australian geographical context with an article of 16 August 2021, published in the midst of COVID. I refer to an opinion piece in *The Sydney Morning Herald* by Associate Professor Debra Smith, who is a researcher on violent political movements at Victoria University; Lise Waldek and Dr Julian Droogan, who are researchers in terrorism and violent extremism at Macquarie University; and Dr Muhammad Iqbal, who is an industry research fellow at Victoria University. The article is titled "Right-wing extremism weaponises democracy against itself", and reads —

The recent national exposé on right-wing extremists seeking to achieve radical political change through violence parallels ASIO's warning of a national escalation in right-wing extremism. These extremists' commitment to paramilitary training and, especially, a desire to acquire weapons should worry us all.

...

Collectively, we have conducted comprehensive research into right-wing extremism in Australia. We identified two distinct yet connected threats posed by this growing movement ...

The first is a creeping threat to our social fabric arising from a strategy of "playing the long game". This means shifting the parameters of acceptable political and social discourse to a point where it challenges political and social norms —

For example, vaccinating yourself against a virulent disease —

most importantly our acceptance of a diverse and functioning multicultural democracy. The promotion of white supremacy and rejection of equality clearly leads to the end of a democratic Australia as we know it. This end-state, they believe, can be accelerated by undermining trust in democratic institutions and exploiting cracks in social cohesion —

I emphasise this point —

including the current tensions caused by COVID-19.

The second threat is that of real-world violence perpetrated by armed extremists. As we saw in the Christchurch terrorist attack, there are individuals who celebrate and advocate the use of violence to promote their cause, undermine trust in social and governmental institutions, and achieve eventual revolution ...

It is clear from our research that right-wing extremists are opportunistic. They routinely seek to appropriate conservative political narratives —

That is the language around freedom or informed consent, as the shadow Attorney General has intimated in his social media posts —

and beliefs to provide a facade of legitimacy for their radical political agenda ...

Right-wing extremist movements take their cues from the opportunities provided by the increasing reliance on hyper-polarised political debate. When our leaders use dog-whistle politics to construct certain sections of Australian society as perennial outsiders, they send messages of legitimacy to right-wing extremists and provide them with political opportunity to present themselves as a realistic alternative to the mainstream. Consistently, Islamic leaders have called out the misappropriation of their faith by violent extremist groups such as Al-Qaeda and Islamic State.

I emphasise the next point —

It is the responsibility of conservative leaders to do the same now that right-wing extremists are gaining ground and seeking to pervert conservative values for radical violence.

I will finish on this point. I heard the Leader of the Opposition during question time explain in animated terms that she is not an anti-vaxxer. She clearly and unambiguously stated that she is in favour of vaccination and she wants everyone in Western Australia to get vaccinated. I genuinely believe that that is her firmly held personal view. I believe that she believes in the efficacy of vaccines. The trouble is that these commentators, these experts, are calling for leadership. The Leader of the Opposition is the leader of the state opposition, so as long as members of her so-called alliance thumb their noses, as they do, at mandates, border controls and all the public health and safety measures that this government is trying to put in place—those efforts to keep the people of Western Australia safe—it exposes the nobleness of her words but the hollowness of her actions. Her noble words are hollow for as long as she does not pull those members into line. Leadership requires her to publicly rebuke those members of the Liberal Party and the Nationals WA who continue to thumb their noses and criticise and undermine the legitimate steps that the McGowan government has taken to protect the health, safety and wellbeing of the people of Western Australia. I have a tip for the Leader of the Opposition. When she starts to pull these people into line, she can start with the scandalous contribution from the member for North West Central. She can tell him that what he did is entirely inappropriate and undermines our efforts to keep people safe not only from COVID, but also gun violence. Unlike the member for North West Central, I wholeheartedly support the efforts of the Western Australia Police Force in tackling gun violence and the Minister for Police for bringing this legislation before Parliament. I congratulate the minister for keeping the community of Western Australia safe. Thank you.

MR P.C. TINLEY (Willagee) [7.16 pm]: I want to make some remarks on the Firearms Amendment Bill 2021. I congratulate the government for following through on its, and most sensible Western Australians', long-held position on the control of some of the most lethal things in our community. It is not just the guns, but also those people who would wield them for ambitions or objectives that are not in the interests of the community.

We have been advised through various channels that there are an estimated 260 000 unregistered firearms in this country. That is a lot of firearms. I wager that, like my experience, the vast majority of those unregistered firearms have fallen out of use and are sitting in various places—houses, farms and so on—and are no longer in active circulation. They are nonetheless lethal weapons that are being left unattended. I was one of those people. As a young soldier, I had a few weapons. Obviously they were always maintained in the armoury, but they fell out of registration. They were always properly housed. People lose interest in them, like they do with most other passing hobbies, and they move on. They were handed in in the first amnesty under then Prime Minister Howard, and that was the end of that. It was an easy way to get rid of them.

A lot of people who have unregistered firearms know where there are, but just leave them there because they do not know how to dispose of them properly and they are too frightened to hand them in, fearing some form of sanction. That is not the case with the standing arrangements around the gun amnesty identified in this bill. It is a very significant piece of legislation that will allow us to attend to gun safety in terms of the volume of guns and weapons in the community. The notes I have been given state that during the period of July last to December this year the Western Australia Police Force received a total of 901 firearms under the amnesty. There were 71 handguns, which is worrying because they are more dangerous; 165 shotguns; and 665 rifles and associated parts—not to mention a whole bunch of ammunition, too, I am advised. That stands testament to a great piece of public policy that allows us to get more weapons out of people's hands.

This bill is not about gun safety or public safety in the direct context of gun ownership in that they are used, locked and housed correctly and licensed and registered. This bill will provide a structure and piece of architecture to fight criminals and organised crime. That is what it is about. The amendments to the firearms act will arm police—pardon the pun—with the capacity to apply both the consorting orders and firearm prohibition orders. They will work in tandem because, let us face it, quite frankly, an FPO or anything else would not necessarily deter an outlaw bikie.

This is not about deterrence. This is about providing the Western Australia Police Force with the wherewithal, through connected sections of state acts, to work together to tackle organised crime. We often focus on bikies as the most visible part of organised crime, but there is a much more insidious group that makes them look like amateurs in the organised crime community. This group operates in a grey zone in and out of our borders—international and regional. We will defeat those various organisations, and some of the perpetrators of international crime, by working with our regional police force and the regional intelligence community.

The origins of this bill go way back. This bill intersects with Australian National Security's *National Counter-Terrorism Plan*. The bill will not only allow us to attack organised crime and secret terrorist organisations, but will assist in providing another layer, if you like, in our fight against terror. Terrorism has not gone away. The idea of terrorism has taken a backseat as the global COVID pandemic rips through the world, but terrorism is still present. There are still people out there in Al-Qaeda and Taliban-sponsored organisations in places like Afghanistan, and they are coming back into power. It is important that this country defends itself in a way that allows it to identify and neutralise threats.

This amendment bill came about as a result of an incident that people might remember that occurred way back in 2014. On 8.30 am on 15 December 2014, Man Haron Monis walked in the Lindt Café on the corner of Martin Place and Phillip Street in the heart of Sydney's commercial district. Shortly thereafter, he produced a gun and ordered that customers and staff be locked inside as hostages. After a stand-off lasting around 17 hours, the siege ended in gunfire and three people died: two hostages and Monis himself. Several of the other hostages sustained injuries. There were hundreds of rounds of gunfire exchanged in the assault on that cafe and, as a result, there was concern amongst security organisations about the reaction of the security forces, the state government and the federal government in that siege situation.

In 2014, people might recall that the national security threat level was extremely high. The Australian Security Intelligence Organisation's own threat assessment was that a terrorist attack was likely. There was an atmosphere of extreme threat. It was some years after 9/11 but there was still an underlying current of concern. Having 260 000 firearms in the community makes for sober contemplation of them ending up in the hands of a person like Monis. We all know that Mr Monis suffered significant mental health issues. It was sad to see that some people co-opted this tragedy on the basis of some sort of ethnic stereotyping of Monis as being part of a terrorist organisation, but they came through it. The recommendations of a joint inquiry by the New South Wales and federal governments identified several recommendations that related to the justice system, immigration and the intelligence community. Recommendation 6 on firearms is important to note. The report reads —

6. The Commonwealth, States and Territories should simplify the regulation of the legal firearms market through an update of the technical elements of the National Firearms Agreement.
7. CrimTrac, in cooperation with Commonwealth and State Police and law enforcement agencies, should prioritise bringing the National Firearms Interface into operation by the end of 2015.

I am not convinced that nationally this has been properly integrated and that CrimTrac is doing what it was intended to do. Again, it is a challenge for the Federation of Australia to bring that all to book and make sure that the recommendation delivers the sorts of things it ought to do to allow the operational level of the police force and other security forces to engage with each other. The report continues —

8. States and Territories' police forces should conduct an urgent audit of their firearms data holdings before the National Firearms Interface is operational where this has not already occurred.

Again, I am not convinced that all the states and territories have made a full-throated commitment to make sure that the database is as comprehensive as it can be. The report continues —

9. The Commonwealth and the States and Territories should give further consideration to measures to deal with illegal firearms.

That is where this inquiry's recommendation falls neatly in with this bill. Monis was a licensed firearm holder for one period, so he was known to the authorities and he was not deemed a threat. This shows that the casual interaction between Monis and a firearm "can have devastating consequences", as it did in this case. The report states —

Monis entered Martin Place with a pump action shotgun. It was short, having been sawn off at the barrel and at the end. The Coroner has announced that his inquiry will examine in detail the gun used by Monis. On the information available to the Review, it appears that the firearm used by Monis may have entered Australia lawfully and became a 'grey market' firearm when not returned as part of the 1996 National Buy Back program.

Monis was at no time issued a firearms licence, and at no time did he legally own or import a firearm. He did hold a security guard licence from 1997 to 2000 which would have allowed him to carry a pistol while on duty ... Relevant laws were subsequently changed and from 1 July 1997, Monis would have no longer been able to carry a pistol in his capacity as a security guard.

That was incidental and irrelevant to the inquiry. The report continues —

Through its considerations of the issues in this area, the Review has identified shortcomings in the accuracy and consistency of firearms data in Australia.

I again go back to the point about cooperation between the states and the commonwealth. It continues —

The Review recommends that State and Territory police forces should conduct an urgent audit of their firearms data holdings ...

The Review understands that Monis used an illegal firearm. The Australian Crime Commission has advised there are in the order of 250,000 illegal firearms in Australia. The Review recommends that the Commonwealth and the States and Territories should give further consideration to measures to deal with illegal firearms.

We saw the devastating consequences of somebody who is motivated, in this case through significant mental health challenges, of course, and comes in casual contact with an illegal weapon from that grey market area, as mentioned in the report. We have found this in our own state, but principally a litany of recent break-and-enter offences and

police actions have identified a significant number of people who in any other set of circumstances may well go on to do something quite devastating. One of the most ribald ones, if you like, was the gun store heist in Yangebup, which found 100 weapons that were stolen from a Claremont firearms dealer. Those are the types of weapons that end up in the grey market or the black market, whichever way it is described, and gives criminals the opportunity to use them.

As other members have said, the other important aspect of this amendment bill relates to the updating of technology. From international terrorist organisation activities, we know about the advent of ceramic guns—or ones from non-metallic sources—that are 3D-printed. They cannot be detected by X-ray and a range of different technologies, so it is important that we head off the use of not just their hardware but software. This amendment bill deals with that.

My final comment on this bill is to always give a nod to civil liberties that we as a community have to give up. The idea of unfettered gun ownership is a thing of the past, for very good reason, not least for community safety but for the crime and terrorism that they might feed. That also relates to how we attend to the war on terror. This is a contiguous piece to that and follows from the 9/11 attack. In Australia, like everywhere else, we have had significant changes to our way of life. Sixty-one different amendments to laws or laws have been enacted that have restricted the citizens of Australia since 9/11. In some ways, we could say that terrorism has had an impact on us. It has changed the way we live and view the world. In some ways, it has made us adapt to fear. Fear is the one thing that terrorists always want to instil in us, hence the word “terror” because it creates an uncertainty and foments a great deal of anxiety, particularly towards the government of the day and the established order that a civil society provides. Terrorism is a scourge. It is the acid of a community. We have to continue to do the sorts of things we do. We are constantly weighing up the liberties of the individual citizens of Australia and the safety of the whole nation. As members who spoke before me said—they made direct reference to this—terrorism finds parallels in the current global pandemic. Governments all around the world are making decisions on the basis of the greater good. They are enacting policies in the best interests of what they think will keep the majority of people safe. Western Australia has an enviable record of doing that because of the leadership of this government, the strength of the public sector that has supported it and the compliance of a community in Western Australia that gets it and is open to the leadership that has been provided, keeping us safe and making sure that we are making the best possible decisions that are in support of everyone in our community, not just those who feel that their civil liberties are so impinged that it warrants them to take drastic action. God forbid, as we have seen some very angry protesters here, they should take such action as putting a firearm in their hands to make a point. With those remarks, thank you, Acting Speaker.

MS S.E. WINTON (Wanneroo — Parliamentary Secretary) [7.31 pm]: I, too, rise to make a short contribution to the Firearms Amendment Bill 2021. Prior to the dinner break, I very much enjoyed the contribution from the member for Cockburn. I do not know where the member for North West Central is, but I am sure he is pretty bruised and battered as he got slapped around quite a bit. It is a shame that he can come in here and carry on but when he gets called to order, he does not have the ticker to sit and listen to the debate.

During my contribution to the Firearms Amendment Bill 2021, I want to take the opportunity to highlight the McGowan Labor government’s commitment to community safety in all its forms. Since coming into government in 2017, we have made safety of the community a priority. Whether it be through supporting and properly resourcing our hardworking police officers, through the challenging but essential work of breaking the cycle of disadvantage and desperation that fuels crime, through supporting Western Australians to feel safe in their homes—in particular, our seniors—or taking an unapologetic tough stance on organised crime, the McGowan government has always made community safety one of its key priorities and continues to. This legislation is a critical part of that commitment to our community. Our community supports our stance as it gives our police officers important new powers to get guns out of the hands of criminals and off the streets.

This bill essentially comes out of 17 recommendations that were made as part of the Law Reform Commission review, which was tabled in Parliament in November 2016. The four key reforms are: the firearm prohibition orders; the illegal manufacture of firearms; importantly, increased penalties for certain firearm offences; and the permanent firearms amnesty. This bill builds on other measures we have put in place, such as the anti-consorting legislation that passed through Parliament late last year.

We are now giving police the further tools that they need to disrupt the activities of bikies and organised crime. Under this legislation, police will be able to ban anyone who is reasonably suspected of posing a threat to the community from holding a gun licence or from living in a house where guns are stored. These firearm prohibition orders have worked effectively in other jurisdictions. I particularly note that other members highlighted that this is a national bipartisan approach, something that the member for North West Central failed to acknowledge or realise. It is squarely aimed at sending a strong message to those involved in gun crime and the illegal gun trade. It has paid dividends in other jurisdictions around Australia where such laws have been enacted.

The second key part of the bill refers to the illegal manufacture of firearms. The Western Australia Police Force comes across incidents of illegal manufacture of firearms on almost a weekly basis. As part of the briefing we received, we learnt that there are many examples of police coming across the illegal manufacturing of firearms in

our community. I will not go through those examples. People in my community are well aware of many examples that they read about in the media. The provisions being introduced by this bill, particularly those relating to the illegal manufacture and unauthorised use of firearms technology, will provide—this is important—greater scope for charges and enforcement action when police come across those instances.

A particular incident occurred at the end of 2020, I think. I am not sure of the date but I remember it really well because it shocked the community. I am talking about when the president of the Rebels Motorcycle Club was publicly executed at the Perth Motorplex in Kwinana in front of hundreds of people. I think that was a real awakening for some people in the community. Sometimes we get a little desensitised when we occasionally hear news of a drive-by shooting or people being arrested with firearms, but this took organised crime and the brazenness of it to a whole new level. Everyone can imagine being out in public at one of hundreds of events that occur in Perth every day and be right in the middle of such a brutal, cowardly and outrageous act that most of us would want to see only on television, yet it happened in Perth. I commend the police for their swift work on that investigation. These laws are really important to make sure that we do not see those kinds of events happening in Perth anymore.

The third aspect of the bill that I want to mention relates to increased penalties, which will be very welcomed by the community. They reflect the severity of these offences that are being committed and the expectations our community has of penalising such acts. I wanted to highlight these increases to my community. For theft of a firearm, the penalty will rise to 10 years' imprisonment. Interestingly, 132 firearms were stolen from July to December 2021, which amounts to about five firearms a week. The second penalty increase relates to being in possession of a stolen firearm. The penalty will increase from three years to seven years. Thirdly, in circumstances in which a person fires a gun to cause fear—that has happened recently, particularly in the northern suburbs—the penalty will increase from seven years and a \$12 000 fine to seven years and a \$36 000 fine.

The last part of the bill, which is really important—various members mentioned it—relates to a permanent firearms amnesty. The member for Willagee gave us the statistics of how many unlicensed firearms are in our community. He rightly pointed out that there is not necessarily a sinister reason for that, but they create a danger when left lying around in the community. I found the statistics that he mentioned particularly interesting. Last time the police held an amnesty, in July last year, 71 handguns, 165 shotguns, 665 rifles and nearly 30 000 rounds of ammunition were handed in. Having a permanent firearms amnesty that supports the agreement reached by all ministers nationally to introduce a national amnesty is a really important move for our state. This tough stance is what our community expects, and the Firearms Amendment Bill 2021 will strengthen the Western Australia Police Force's enforcement activities to combat serious and organised crime as part of this government's determination to disrupt and dismantle bikie gangs and organised crime.

Our commitment to support our police force is unrivalled. Members will remember that last year we passed the landmark Police Amendment (Compensation Scheme) Bill 2021. For more than a century, medically retired WA police officers who suffered a work-related injury or illness did not have a compensation scheme. When we talk about organised crime, we cannot do so without acknowledging the work of our police officers. They now have a proper compensation scheme; it is quite amazing that it took that long, but the McGowan Labor government delivered it to our police officers. Police officers who can no longer serve our community due to work-related injury or illness now have certainty that they and their families will receive financial support on top of their post-service medical benefits.

Of course, the formation of that historic legislation came about under a previous Minister for Police, the member for Midland. She definitely left a strong legacy with her commitment to her portfolio and the people who serve us. During her time as police minister, she was also very interested in community safety. I was very happy to host her at a community safety forum we held in Wanneroo. Our current Minister for Police is continuing strongly where she left off. I am very grateful that soon after he became minister, he made it a priority to visit all the police stations around the state, and I know that the officers at the Wanneroo Police Station appreciated his efforts in coming and seeing them to talk to them in person. The minister knows that we have a fantastic police station in Wanneroo, and the work they do on our behalf is extraordinary and very much appreciated. To Senior Sergeant Mo Livingstone and all the team, I thank you on behalf of the residents of Wanneroo. I have a wonderful relationship with Mo and all his officers, and they are fantastic in supporting our community—not only in tackling crime, but also in doing important work in the prevention of crime and working with youth in the area. I look forward to working with Wanneroo police to host our new Minister for Police at a future forum in Wanneroo when time permits.

My community has also responded really positively to the government's announcement of the return of the safety and security rebate for our seniors. WA Seniors Card holders can once again claim a \$400 rebate to assist with the purchase and installation of home security equipment. This is a \$12 million program, delivering on the McGowan government's election commitment to enhance community safety and resilience as part of the 2022 state budget. I recently held a forum for the seniors at Belgrave Park Village. My electorate officers and I provided support and information on the ServiceWA app and, very importantly, detailed information on tapping into the safety and security rebate. I want to publicly acknowledge and thank Sergeant Adam Bulloch from the Wanneroo Police Station, who joined us and provided his insights and advice to the seniors on the specific kinds of products and devices that are most useful for residents, to keep them safe in their homes. That was just fantastic.

As members will be aware, the rebate is available to all our seniors for the purchase and installation of devices such as home alarms, CCTV systems and a range of other devices that make people's homes safer, build resilience and create a stronger community. Quite often when the McGowan government has announced the return of this rebate, some local people have suggested that it was a Liberal–National government initiative. It might have been, but that government abolished it and took it away from seniors in 2015. In common with many other local members, I am very proud that seniors are taking up this rebate in droves, to assist them in feeling safe in their homes.

I want to spend a couple of minutes highlighting another aspect of my community. I listen to my community and residents, whether through forums, chatting in my office or out on the street, or at various community events. I also speak very often with the local police and the City of Wanneroo, which also plays a very important partnership role with the police in community safety. We need to support our police to allow them to support us. Mo highlighted to me that CCTV surveillance is an increasingly important tool used by our police. These are state-of-the-art mobile units that enable WA Police to view live footage, and they provide the capacity for police to communicate remotely through built-in speakers. The solar-powered units also include high-resolution numberplate recognition cameras. This improves road safety, because they allow police to identify offending vehicles. Mo has been very generous with his time in actually showing me footage and how these systems work so that police can play their very important role in keeping our communities safe. Another important aspect of these CCTV units is that they are mobile, so they can be deployed in hotspots throughout the community when the police or the City of Wanneroo receive complaints about antisocial behaviour. I am very proud to have delivered on my election commitment of \$100 000 to the City of Wanneroo to deploy these new mobile CCTV units to enhance the security and safety of our community.

I recently met with the Mayor of the City of Wanneroo, Tracey Roberts, and Sergeant Mo to have a look at how the CCTV units were operating in Banksia Grove. My community is really happy with this election commitment and we certainly want many, many more of them in our community. A previous speaker mentioned how outstanding Mayor Tracey Roberts is for our local community. I very much concur with that. She will be an awesome member for Pearce, I must say. She has served for nearly 13 years, since 2011, at the City of Wanneroo, as both councillor and mayor, and I cannot help but compare her with the Liberal Party's candidate for the seat of Pearce; we might want to refer to them as a serial candidate.

[Member's time extended.]

Ms S.E. WINTON: I have worked very closely with the City of Wanneroo for a very long time, not just on community safety but on many other issues, whether it is delivering on community spaces for scouts, supporting local road projects or providing upgrades to sporting facilities in the community. I will be very pleased to potentially have the opportunity to work with Tracey Roberts in her new capacity as our federal voice in Canberra.

The McGowan government's commitment to our police force is well demonstrated and continues. It is also reflected in our budget, unlike that of the opposition, which repeatedly cut the police budget. Our budget saw record investment in our frontline police force to the tune of \$1.686 billion in 2021–22. That is quite phenomenal. Additionally, of course, there is capital investment of over \$80 million to make sure that we refurbish and expand our police stations. In October 2020, we pledged to recruit an additional 950 police officers over four years. I think that the Minister for Police goes to more police graduation ceremonies than we go to high school graduations at the moment, which is fantastic. That is a phenomenal achievement, given the historic low unemployment we have in this state at the moment, and shows the success of the state government's Let's Join Forces campaign, which has resulted in record numbers of people applying to join the police force. It is a massive investment in police, which will result in an unprecedented 15 per cent expansion of WA's police force over the next four years—the biggest in history.

The McGowan government is committed to making WA a safer place to live by putting more police on the streets. Very importantly, it is not only putting more police on the beat, but also actually supporting frontline police operations by providing the equipment that the police need to do their jobs effectively. Through this legislation we are also providing the police with the legal tools they need to tackle the scourge that is organised crime. I commend the police for the work they do, I commend the minister for bringing this bill to the house, and I, along with all the residents of Wanneroo, support this bill that will keep Western Australians safe.

MR C.J. TALLENTIRE (Thornlie) [7.51 pm]: I rise to speak on the Firearms Amendment Bill 2021. I offer my full-throated support for it and commend the Minister for Police on bringing it to this place. I come to this debate with a strong knowledge of the relevance of firearms in certain circumstances. I am not a gun naive at all. I can recall my first gun experience as a youngster. I can remember almost a primal instinct being awakened when I think I was hunting rabbits or pheasants or something in the UK. As I walked along a ridge, I can still remember almost every rock, flower and plant along the trail. It is very interesting how in some part of the subconscious, that notion of being a hunter was awakened by that particular pursuit. It is an interesting thing. That is a little bit of my personal history.

Members would not believe it: back in 2015 when I was the shadow Minister for Environment and we had a Liberal–National government, there was a campaign to allow shooting in national parks, or at least in state forests. That campaign was moving along and we were very taking a very strong position against it; in fact, we managed to make it so hard for the government that it did not go with it in the end. Thankfully, we were able to win. There was

a funny thing. I was a little more fresh-faced in 2015 than I am now. There was an article—if members would pardon the pun, almost a hit job—done on me in the national *Sporting Shooter* magazine. It included a big photo of me, using one of my campaign photos at the time, not at all photoshopped. I have to read this out to the house. The article was doing some analysis on our Labor position, and it rightly stated that we totally opposed the extension of what we were calling hobby hunters. We rightly pointed out that it was a very expensive and ineffective method for controlling feral pests. It was part of the Liberal–National government’s argument that allowing access to national parks would control some feral animals. The article stated —

For his part Chris Tallentire, who doesn’t look like he has ever even been outside let alone hunting or fishing, says that claims of the conservation benefits of hunting are ‘rubbish’ and that rec hunters on public [land] would require “extensive supervision”.

I wonder whether this debate might rekindle that sense of animosity that *Sporting Shooter* has towards me. I do not really understand why it would have wanted to attack me so personally as to say that I did not look like I had ever been outside. It might have done a little bit of checking on the matter to know about my outdoor recreational pursuits. In fact, I would hazard to say that I spend far more time outside than any recreational shooter, I reckon! Anyway, we could always do that analysis and use my Strava account on my bike to make the comparison.

Like other members have said, one of the issues that came up in that debate in 2015, which was the last time I really put my mind to this whole issue of gun control, was that extremely rare moment in Australian political history when I actually found myself in full support of what the then Prime Minister did back in 1996 after the Port Arthur massacre—the National Firearms Agreement. That is something that we achieved as a nation. I heard the member for Mount Lawley actually quantify in human lives and other metrics how much of a benefit that has been to our country. That was absolutely essential. However, other countries, especially the United States, are always looking around for ways to chip away at anything they perceive as gun control.

I heard other members mention it and I also received a letter from a lobbying firm expressing a few details and quibbles about the legislation. Members, do not doubt it: that is a tactic of the National Rifle Association in the US. It is a tactic of all the pro-gun lobbyists to just go quiet for a moment but then keep chipping away, come back, suddenly put on a gun show down at Claremont Showground, as we had a couple of years ago, and just keep trying to roll back any controls that are there. That is what they will do at any given moment. This was really well documented. Members might recall an Al Jazeera documentary by a wonderful journalist at Al Jazeera called Peter Charley and an amazing man called Rodger Muller. Rodger Muller went undercover for three years. He created a fictitious organisation called Gun Rights Australia. The documentary that Al Jazeera put together called *How to Sell a Massacre* was first aired in March 2019. It told this story with lots of hidden camera usage. Rodger Muller, who was an actor and then became a journalist, pretended to be the head of Gun Rights Australia. I have to say, he really looked the part. He had the right sort of somewhat overweight look, with his Akubra, and he had what I have to say was a National Party look about him. He fitted exactly what you would expect from a Gun Rights Australia chief. He then went to the US and made contact with the National Rifle Association. He became a confidant of members of the NRA, and they saw that if they could possibly help Australia roll back our level of gun control, that would then be a means for them to counter arguments that they were continually getting—they would still be getting them today—saying, “Look at the gun controls in Australia and how effective they have been.” I suppose that was why the chiefs at the NRA were so happy to entertain Rodger Muller when he went into their organisation in a clandestine way, pretending to be the head of Gun Rights Australia. Then the story got even crazier, because Rodger Muller managed to win the confidence of One Nation’s Pauline Hanson, James Ashby and a fellow called Steve Dickson. These people from One Nation thought, “Right, we can get money out of the NRA to fund our campaign.” They were over there telling the National Rifle Association chiefs, “If you give us \$10 million, we think that we can win a couple of seats. Give us \$20 million and we can definitely win and then we’ll have the balance of power in the reps and we’ll probably have it in the Senate already. We’ll be able to change the gun laws in Australia and you’ll see people out there in Australia with guns again and so you’ll no longer be threatened by this argument that you’ve got to watch out because the gun laws in Australia are working.” The One Nation team and Gun Rights Australia were trying to say that they could solve the problem the NRA had and that they could help the NRA win against the argument that Australia is actually a safer place because of the gun controls brought in since 1996.

I give that as some background to my position on this legislation. I will point out a few local things I have noticed. It absolutely amazes me when I travel along Albany Highway in Bedfordale and pass the Southern Districts Rifle Club and see on the median strip—the dual carriageway—the rifle club’s sign that says visitors welcome. Maybe visitors are welcome and then there is a very careful selection process. This is a rifle club. That sign suggests to me that almost anyone could rock up and say they want to fire off a few rounds. I find that quite frightening. Perhaps my concerns are not justified and perhaps that when people go in and say they are visiting because they noticed the sign saying visitors welcome, they are put through an intensive grilling. I know that most of the Sporting Shooters’ Association of Australia membership are very careful about how they store their guns. One of the ways people can access guns is through a gun club and the guns are locked up at the club, but it worries me that it seems so open.

It has to be said that the Sporting Shooters' Association of Australia does very well out of this state. I recall back in the time of the Barnett government in this place when a peppercorn rent agreement was put through so that the SSAA could access state forest 65. It more or less got free land for its gun club. I am sure it has a strong membership body and that they are all upright citizens who very carefully manage their recreational activity of target shooting, I think, primarily. I imagine that is what it is. They have access to state land for, if I recall correctly, a humble sum of money. They are just a few things I wanted to point out.

I want to pick up on some reports that have probably been addressed about the findings in the report. I heard the member for Burns Beach talk about the time when to get a gun licence, people had to say where they were going to shoot. Family members who were property owners encountered situations when someone who they barely knew at all would say, "Perhaps you could do me a favour and when I sign my gun licence application, you could say that I'm allowed to shoot on your property and in that way I can get my gun licence." If people proved they had a property, they could get a gun licence, often for legitimate reasons. But if they could not do that, a property letter, as it was called, was a way to get around it. One set of statistics on this showed that about two or three rural properties of a couple of thousand hectares had hundreds of people attributing their licence for their permission to shoot on the property. I am sure we have well and truly moved on from that. I know there were some problems around the nature in which the gun register was kept and around gun licensing.

I recall, again in 2015, because I had quite strong interest in this matter, asking some questions. I wanted to make a comparison because members would think that it was logical that if a gun owner was ever issued with a violence restraining order, we would want to take the gun off them and not have them maintaining gun ownership. I was very keen to see whether there were any statistics on how many firearms owners had had violence restraining orders taken out against them and what percentage of the population that equated to. However, it was not possible at the time to get that information. I was told that it was not a given that someone who was issued with a violence restraining order would automatically have the gun taken away. I will quote the response from Minister Harvey, as she was at the time, who said —

"A court making a violence restraining order against a person may order that, for the term set by the court or until a court orders to the contrary, the person be disqualified from holding any licence ..."

A court making a violence restraining order against a person "may" order that the person be disqualified. It seems that was the problem with getting that information from the gun register. It was an interesting point.

The general message is that we have to continue to advance gun laws as technology advances to make sure that people who can manufacture guns illegally cannot get away with it. We must ensure that we do not go down the route of American-style gun culture. I recall an ABC journalist, Andrew O'Connor, being particularly upset that I would suggest that if we were to allow more shooting in the conservation estate, effectively, that was taking a step further towards American-style gun culture. I think there is a connection between that very strong tradition that exists in the US around hunting, especially in some communities, and their connection with the NRA and the political manipulation that the NRA engages in and the rise of Donald Trump and right-wing politics in the US. There is definitely a connection. We have to avoid at all costs the danger of creating a US-style gun culture because it is incredibly dangerous. We can be incredibly proud that on the global stage we are seen as a shining example of what can be achieved when a country has good, sensible gun controls. I thank the minister for bringing this legislation forward because it is a continuation of our journey towards strict gun control. It is adapting to the new circumstances and to the realisation—other members have touched on this—that when a family member of a deceased estate finds a gun in a cupboard, there is a permanent amnesty so that the guns can be handed in efficiently and without any qualms. I value that provision in this legislation.

I began by saying that I have a historic connection to gun use. I am very aware of farming circumstances. I have been on pastoral leases when a sheep is ill or flyblown and know that people would not get a vet out to deal with that. I can understand using a gun as a veterinary tool.

[Member's time extended.]

Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE: I can understand that in those circumstances there is the necessity for a firearm. I do not see that this legislation constrains the use of firearms by professionals who need them. I have not seen it yet, but I believe the topic of *Four Corners* last night was the brumbies in Kosciuszko National Park. That is an interesting situation in which conservationists are asking for the brumbies to be culled. I understand that that is the situation. Members might be able to correct be, but perhaps those who are more National Party inclined are arguing for the preservation of the brumbies in Kosciuszko National Park.

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE: There is definitely a National Party connection, yes. I will not profess to have a strong understanding of the impact of brumbies in Kosciuszko National Park. People love horses as well, so I can understand that there could be an alliance between the National Party and animal welfare people on this issue. That could be very interesting.

My point is that professional shooters need to be employed from time to time when there is a feral animal problem. In the south west, piglets have been released into areas of state forest so that people can go in and shoot those piglets. We have had those sorts of anomalies. There is a complexity around a lot of those arguments that are sometimes used to justify the prevalence of firearms in rural communities. We have to be very clear that people need to be highly trained professionals and they need to have the justifications properly lined up before they are able to use their guns.

I want to conclude by saying that the police officers whom I meet at the Gosnells and Canning Vale Police Stations are the guys and girls, men and women, who are out in the community day in and day out, pulling over vehicles. I imagine that there is always a degree of apprehension, because they never know whether someone will pull out a gun on them at some stage. That is something that they accept as professionals. They live with that fear. They do a fabulous job. They deal with the challenges of their job incredibly well. I am very lucky to have such able police officers in my electorate. I think this legislation is a further way in which we as a Parliament can ensure that we have the best and most up-to-date legislation to help reduce the risk of police officers encountering illegally manufactured and maintained guns. This piece of legislation will help make their jobs a little less risky. For that reason, along with all the others that I have mentioned, I absolutely commend this bill to the house and again thank the Minister for Police for bringing it forward.

MS H.M. BEAZLEY (Victoria Park) [8.12 pm]: I am pleased to rise today—I will take off this mask as I present—to speak in support of the McGowan government's Firearms Amendment Bill 2021. I congratulate the Minister for Police, Hon Paul Papalia, for all the work involved in bringing this important bill to Parliament.

Australia remains an example to the world on the necessity for careful and strict gun control. Most Australians know that Australia's gun laws were toughened and tightened after the Port Arthur massacre on 28 April 1996. As a result of this massacre, 35 people were killed and many others were injured. The lives of those many others—families, friends and those who cared for the wounded—remain terribly affected 26 years on. Just three months before Port Arthur, a gun was used by a man in Hillcrest, Queensland, to murder six members of his family and himself. Two years before that, in 1994, 70 Australians were victims of intentional killing by means of a firearm. It has been 26 years since the Port Arthur massacre. In looking at massacres only in which multiple people die in a single incident, in the 26 years since Port Arthur, 46 people in Australia have died by guns in massacres. In the 26 years prior to, and including Port Arthur, 118 people in Australia died by guns in massacres. Gun control works.

The Firearms Amendment Bill 2021 is designed to keep Western Australians safe and to hopefully save lives that we do not even know yet have been saved. The Firearms Amendment Bill introduces a suite of amendments to tackle serious and organised crime and offending that involves, or may involve, firearms, including domestic violence. The bill proposes to make four key reforms. The first is the introduction of firearms prohibition orders. The second is the prohibition of illegal manufacture of firearms, including the introduction of firearms technology offences. The third is to increase the penalties for certain firearms offences relating to stolen firearms and firing a gun in a way that causes fear. The fourth is the introduction of a permanent firearms amnesty.

The most significant of these reforms is the introduction of firearms prohibition orders, or FPOs. Five other Australian jurisdictions currently have FPO schemes in place—New South Wales, the Northern Territory, South Australia, Victoria and Tasmania. Although I know that this reform is being brought in to target outlaw motorcycle gangs and serious organised crime in Western Australia, it will also have very strong implications for those on various terrorist and other watchlists and people known to police due to family and domestic violence.

Under the FPO scheme, the Commissioner of Police or their delegate will be able to make an FPO against anyone if satisfied of any of the following: that possession of a firearm by the person will likely result in undue danger to life or property; that a person is not a fit and proper person to possess a firearm; or that it is otherwise in the public interest to make an FPO against the person. Once served with an FPO, a person will become a prohibited person. This means that they will be subject to a number of conditions, such as being banned from holding a firearms licence or from living in a house in which firearms are stored. Other important conditions include that all licence permits, approvals and authorisations issued to a prohibited person under the Firearms Act will be revoked. The prohibited person must surrender all firearms, parts and ammunition. The prohibited person will be prohibited from acquiring, possessing or using firearms, major firearms parts, prohibited firearm accessories and ammunition. The prohibited person will be prohibited from entering or remaining at certain places, including places at which firearms are repaired, manufactured or sold. This will extend to shooting ranges. The prohibited person will be prohibited from associating with persons in possession of a firearm, parts or ammunition. There is a lot of prohibition in there!

Hefty and deterrent penalties will apply to persons who break any of these conditions. These penalties are commensurate with the severity of the offence. For instance, failure to surrender firearms will result in imprisonment for seven years and a fine of \$35 000, with this penalty increasing to imprisonment for 14 years and a fine of \$75 000 if the firearm or part is related to a handgun or prohibited firearm.

The bill will also introduce a number of police powers to support the enforcement of FPOs. This includes stop-and-search abilities on the prohibited person and a person who is in their company, and the ability to enter

and search any place occupied by, or under the control of, the prohibited person, including any vehicle. FPOs will give police powers to get guns out of the hands of criminals and off the streets. I, for one, am relieved by this measure. In the suburbs of my electorate of Victoria Park, in 2021, there were a total of 25 firearms offences. Most of these offences were for possessing a firearm, and, thankfully, these figures were down from those of the previous year. I am also thankful that police were able to prosecute possession before the firearm was used. I congratulate my local police on such great work, and I know that our local police stations have benefited from our government's increased funding to police.

As a local member, I am helping too many victims of domestic violence who are continuing to live in fear for their lives and the lives of their children, even after they have successfully left their partner, let alone when they are in the grips of terror at home. The proactive nature of these new FPOs will, I hope, give a substantial number of domestic violence victims and survivors a measure of confidence that the perpetrator of violence against them may not be able to access a firearm. The bill will insert new offences for the illegal manufacture of firearms so that a person who unlawfully manufactures, repairs or deals in a firearm, a major firearm part, a prohibited firearm accessory or ammunition will be committing a crime. These provisions are intended to target and disrupt the business model used by those who manufacture firearms and all those associated with the illegal manufacture, repair and dealing of firearms. There are also new offences related to firearms technology, including making it illegal to manufacture 3D plastic firearms, with anyone caught doing so facing a maximum 14 years in jail. A maximum 10-year jail penalty will also apply to anyone caught in possession of instructions or plans on how to make them. As other members noted, there is no good reason to have instructions on how to make a gun, and 3D printers can manufacture fully functional plastic firearms that are capable of firing live bullets. They can also produce functional key components for semiautomatic assault rifles and fully automatic machine guns and handguns. I do not know about other members, but I find that terrifying. This type of technology, which has been on the rise in America, has thankfully been infrequently observed in Western Australia to date. But more recently and worryingly, there has been an increase in these devices being observed. Needless to say, I am very pleased that the McGowan Labor government is staying ahead of this very worrying trend and is amending legislation now to outlaw these devices for those uses. New provisions are also being made to target those involved in the backyard manufacture of traditional firearms, major firearms parts and ammunition.

A key reform of this bill will increase the penalties for certain firearm-related offences to better reflect the severity of those offences. That includes increased penalties for firing a gun in a way that causes fear. Recently, there have been shootings of guns that have caused fear, particularly drive-by shootings. Drive-by shootings are commonly linked to outlaw motorcycle gangs. In the past 12 months, there have been at least three incidents in which outlaw motorcycle gang members have fired shots into premises owned by rival gangs or those who owe debts. This included firing shots into homes in suburban streets. The bill will amend the relevant section of the Firearms Act to increase the penalty for the discharging of any firearm or shot bullet, missile or other projectile from a firearm in a manner that causes fear—that is, drive-by shootings. Currently, that is deemed only a simple offence and the penalty is imprisonment for three years or a fine of \$12 000. The bill will appropriately elevate that offence to a crime and increase the penalty to imprisonment for seven years and a fine of \$36 000. Penalties will also increase for being in possession of a stolen or unlawfully obtained firearm. It will trigger a situation in which special circumstances will apply and the penalty will rise from seven years' imprisonment to 10 years.

The most notorious firearms thefts relate to coordinated attacks on commercial firearm dealers. Over the last five years, there have been three highly organised attacks on commercial firearm dealers; at least two of those three incidents have been linked to outlaw motorcycle gangs. The attacks resulted in hundreds of handguns and rifles being stolen to be sold and used in further serious criminal activity.

This leads me to the fourth major amendment of the Firearms Amendment Bill 2021—a permanent firearms amnesty. The amendments in the bill support the agreement made by police ministers across Australia to introduce a national permanent firearms amnesty from 1 July 2021. Although the amnesty is national, arrangements for the surrender of firearms and parts will be managed by individual states and territories. The amnesty amendments in the bill provide a framework to enact the national amnesty. These amendments mean that members of the WA community will be able to hand in any unlicensed firearm, major firearm part, prohibited firearm accessory, sound suppresser and ammunition without fear of prosecution. Providing the community with the opportunity to surrender firearms is an important part of ensuring unlicensed firearms do not end up in the hands of criminals. The WA Police Force has previously seen great success in amnesties. During the 2017 national firearms amnesty, approximately 57 000 unlicensed firearms were surrendered across Australia. More than 1 200 of those were surrendered in Western Australia. During the last six months of 2021, WA police received a total of 901 firearms under amnesty. They included 71 handguns, 165 shotguns and 685 rifles and parts. In addition, almost 30 000 rounds of ammunition were surrendered as part of that amnesty. I shudder to think of the damage and heartache that could have been caused by those guns and ammunition if used maliciously.

I am very pleased to be part of a McGowan government that is strengthening penalties around the manufacture of firearms and those recklessly and unlawfully discharging firearms. I am also relieved that this bill allows the WA police to take proactive measures to help to ensure that those who pose a threat to the community do not have

lawful access to firearms and that we are getting ahead of the technology curve by ensuring there is no loophole that would allow those with malicious intent to use 3D printers and the like to manufacture guns and ammunition. These reforms are part of the McGowan government's ongoing focus on disrupting organised crime and protecting our community, whether it is people living on a suburban street who have experienced a nearby drive-by shooting and know that fear or a victim or survivor of domestic violence who needs all the possible tools available to them to ensure that the perpetrator of violence cannot access firearms.

The events at Port Arthur 26 years ago focused the attention of all Australians on whether and how such occurrences could be prevented. The tightened gun laws that followed were remarkable, given the backlash that gun safety experts and politicians received during that time at the mere suggestion of reform. Nonetheless, those reforms got through and positioned Australia as a model standard in gun control. On that note, many MPs mentioned former Prime Minister John Howard and rightly commended him for his leadership on this issue and the National Firearms Agreement. I agree with the member for Cockburn, who particularly highlighted the support and leadership of former Deputy Prime Minister and Leader of the National Party the late Hon Tim Fischer. I would like to add one more name in leadership at that time—the current Governor, His Excellency Kim Beazley, AC.

A member interjected.

Ms H.M. BEAZLEY: Exactly! In 1996, the Governor was the federal Labor opposition leader and John Howard was the newly minted Prime Minister who had assumed office only six weeks before the Port Arthur massacre. His Excellency Hon Kim Beazley approached the Prime Minister to encourage strong gun control and offered his and the Labor Party's support for such. The Prime Minister pursued that reform and was able to do so with the confidence of bipartisan support, as was the Deputy Prime Minister Tim Fischer. All major parties got together to save lives. I hope the same will happen here, despite the fearmongering of the member for North West Central earlier today.

It is our responsibility as decision-makers in this place that the intent of that National Firearms Agreement in 1996 and the will of the community from that point on is not eroded, that we maintain tough gun control and are proactive in trying to ensure that guns do not end up in criminal hands and in the hands of those with malicious intent. Gun control is not just about mass shootings, which are comparatively rare. Gun control is also about violence prevention in general, which is what this bill seeks to do in a very comprehensive and fulsome manner, and I am proud to support it. I commend the Firearms Amendment Bill to the house and again congratulate the Minister for Police, Hon Paul Papalia, on presenting this important bill to the house and guiding its passage.

MS C.M. COLLINS (Hillary) [8.28 pm]: I, too, rise to make a contribution to the Firearms Amendment Bill 2021 and to give my full support to it. As we have heard tonight, 17 recommendations from the Law Reform Commission review of the Firearms Act in 2016 are incorporated in the bill before the house today. The main purpose of this much-needed review of the Firearms Act is to address the increasing frequency of interactions with criminal gun owners by our police force. All other states and territories already have some sort of firearms prohibition order scheme in place. They have recognised the need for the introduction of stronger and more wideranging firearms prohibition orders for the protection of their citizens.

The most significant of the key reforms is the introduction of new part 8, "Firearms prohibition orders", in clause 53. This scheme is designed to specifically target members of outlaw motorcycle gangs, other serious organised crime figures and those who pose threats to community safety. The foreword to the Law Reform Commission's report on its review of the Firearms Act, which was tabled in 2016, states —

Firearms have continued to be at the forefront of community attention, particularly as a result of reports of tragic mass shootings elsewhere in the world as well as reports of criminal activities in our own backyard. Scarcely a day goes past without firearms being mentioned in daily news bulletins.

Six years on, this legislation is more relevant. I am confident that the firearms prohibition order scheme will be broadly supported in the wider community. The review will give the Commissioner of Police or their delegate the power to issue an FPO against anyone they believe to be closely associated with, or actively involved with, anyone in illegal possession of a firearm that could likely result in undue danger to life or property in the community. It will also, therefore, allow the commissioner or their delegate to identify a person as not being fit or proper to possess a firearm and for whom it is in the public interest to make an FPO against. Once served with an FPO, a person will be banned from holding a firearms licence or residing in a house where firearms are stored or associating with any organisation or business concerned with firearms. This will not only give the police greater powers, but also instil a greater confidence in the community that police can, additionally, force such prohibited persons to surrender all firearms, parts and ammunition.

The intent of this review is therefore twofold: to remove firearms out of the hands of criminals and outlaw motorcycle gangs, and to remove the ability to manufacture, alter or adapt any illegal firearms in circulation. Our own daily newspaper, *The West Australian*, regularly publishes articles on illegal firearm activities in and around the suburbs of metropolitan Perth and in regional Western Australia. We read stories of violent and bloody turf wars between rival gangs and criminals. If we take a snapshot of articles in *The West Australian* relating to illegal firearm activity

since the murder of Rebels boss Nick Martin on 12 December 2020 at the Perth Motorplex, we see that they are both an indication of the growth of these gun-related crimes and also a reflection of the fear and anxiety being felt in the community. Bloody turf wars and violent power struggles between gangs have no place in this state. I printed a number of articles from *The West Australian* that have headlines like “Shotgun slaying”, “Another suburban murder”, “Wrong man shot dead in home—a case of mistaken identity”, “Twin shooting charges”, “Cops probe drive-by shootings”. The articles appeared in the paper over a short period.

Importantly, at least three well-organised break-ins to licensed gun dealerships in Perth and across the state in 2021 resulted in several hundred firearms of all calibres and designs entering the illegal gun market. Additionally, multiple police raids have uncovered numerous backyard firearms manufacturers and tool shops capable of adapting and converting stolen or unlicensed firearms for an apparently flourishing black market. There is ample evidence of the evolving skill set of those involved in this illegal gun racket. Along with guns, police are finding more and more evidence of internet downloads of detailed technical blueprints and instructions on how to repair and construct guns, and how to adapt them from semiautomatic to fully automatic. What is even more mind-blowing to me is that 3D printers are capable of printing vital components for and even whole guns. People are using this sophisticated technology. I have a 3D printer at home. My partner prints small miniatures that he uses when playing *Dungeons and Dragons*. We know that 3D printers are necessary in the medical world and have been a wonderful technology for making prosthetic limbs and so forth, but in this case they are being weaponised.

In most cases, those arrested have clear connections with or are members of outlaw motorcycle gangs and often have parallel or secondary evidence of involvement in the illegal drug trade. Members, these people police have to contend with on a daily basis are not simply gun enthusiasts. The review before us addresses the concerns of legitimate gun dealers that it may impede their ability to repair guns for their customers. However, there are ample protective provisions and clarification in the wording of the review to minimise any impacts on the legitimate business of licensed gun dealers and responsible gun owners. The sole intention of this review is, therefore, to strengthen the range of strict penalties on those who wish to live outside the established gun laws in this state already.

Additionally, the FPOs, together with clause 60, will insert a permanent amnesty into the Firearms Act. This will provide a framework to enable members of the Western Australian community to hand in any unlicensed firearms in their possession without fear of prosecution. This will also include any firearm parts, prohibited accessories, sound suppressers or silencers and ammunition. Madam Acting Speaker, providing the community with the opportunity to surrender firearms is an important part of keeping unlicensed firearms out of the hands of criminals. Today we heard many members in this house speak about the actions of former Prime Minister of Australia Hon John Howard and, as the member for Cockburn mentioned, former Deputy Prime Minister the late Tim Fischer. They received plaudits for introducing a national amnesty and buyback scheme after the Port Arthur massacre in 1996. That temporary amnesty proved very successful. During the 2017 national amnesty, 57 000 unlicensed firearms were surrendered across Australia. The WA Police Force has also recorded great success in previous temporary amnesties, with 1 242 surrendered in WA. More recently from July 2021 until December 2021, the Western Australia Police Force received a total of 901 firearms under an amnesty. It therefore goes without debate that the legally vetted gun-owning community and the Australian public in general are fully supportive of control measures by the police.

Two of the key reforms of this bill that I have addressed, the FPO and the permanent firearms amnesty, will complement the broader suite of legislative reform being brought in. I am confident that law-abiding Western Australians will welcome anything that disrupts and dismantles the activities of outlaw motorcycle gangs and serious organised crime figures. This bill will make WA the most hostile jurisdiction for these groups to pursue their criminal activities. It should be noted that the criminal subculture of illegal guns does not exist in a vacuum. The use of these illegal weapons and the bloody impacts from the use of these illegal weapons is not confined to just members of the criminal underworld. The growing number of so-called random drive-by shootings we are now witnessing on quite a regular basis do not discriminate between criminals and innocent citizens. It is time to stop this violent culture.

The member for Wanneroo in her contribution mentioned her election commitment to fund mobile closed-circuit television cameras. The member inspired me and the member for Joondalup, Emily Hamilton, to give a similar commitment to the City of Joondalup for \$150 000 to purchase mobile CCTV cameras that can capture all sorts of antisocial behaviour on the roads with plate-recognition technology. That, coupled with this bill, will be an excellent start to stamping out some of this illegal activity. I commend the bill to the house.

MR P.J. RUNDLE (Roe) [8.40 pm]: I take this opportunity tonight to make a brief contribution in light of a few issues on this bill that have been brought up with me. Firstly, as stated by our lead speaker, the member for Vasse, the opposition will not oppose the bill, which is very important. We understand the general intent of the bill. Our job is to question some of the unintended consequences on behalf of licensed firearm holders, gun repairers and the like, of which I am one. I have a firearms licence. As the member for Thornlie pointed out, when one is farming, a firearm is occasionally required for vermin control and, unfortunately, stock that has to be put down. Most farmers have to go through that situation. I certainly support the general intent of the legislation.

I will clarify some points for the Minister for Energy, while he is present. I, too, saw last night’s *Four Corners* program on brumbies in Kosciusko National Park. It was quite an interesting program. As the minister pointed out,

it presented both sides of the argument. There was a National Party connection to a group of people who were concerned about the destruction of the brumbies in Kosciusko National Park. There were varying descriptions about the number of brumbies in the park, ranging anywhere from 2 000 to 18 000 and up to 20 000. That was the first disparity between the parties. It was interesting because the former National Party member had links to Parliament, where he had, over time, managed to get legislation introduced regarding the culling of the brumbies. He had gathered a band of people with a like interest. On the other side was the federal Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment and the environmental lobby. From looking at some of the aerial photographs, I could see how the brumbies had destroyed quite a bit of the undergrowth and a lot of the trees in the park, and eroded the creek lines where they obviously came along to drink, jump over and the like. It was interesting to hear both sides of the argument and, in some ways, people were aligning in a way that I would not normally have expected.

Mr W.J. Johnston: My brother is a farmer in New South Wales. He is now in New England, and I can tell you that he does not vote National. I must point out he may not vote Labor either. He farmed at Adaminaby, which is obviously in the high country, before he went to his current location. He has great sympathy for the high country horsemen. Whenever I talk to him, he raises both the issue of the cattle and brumbies. It is interesting that the feral cattle got to the tablelands before white people because they escaped from the farmers on the coast and found their way over the mountains into that territory before the white people arrived. There is a long history of those beasts in that area, so I understand the angst of the high country cattlemen and horsemen. However, it is very clear that those animals are doing a lot of damage. Those guys are saying, “Well, you’re getting rid of the horses, but what are you doing about the skiers?” Their perspective is that skiers do as much damage as animals. The skiers damage themselves when they drive their cars too fast on Monaro Highway. There needs to be a solution and I do not know that just letting the brumbies roam is the solution, but because of my own personal connection, I have a clear understanding of the cultural issues involved with the brumbies.

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: Thank you, minister. I found it really interesting to hear the different sides to the argument and, unusually, the different people involved in the different sides. I thought that was quite informative. I am sure the minister will convince his brother to see the light.

Mr W.J. Johnston: He is on the farmers’ side. He’s helped a number of Independents run against Barnaby!

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: I am sure it will be a subject that will be front of mind for quite a while. It is almost like the kangaroo population in the south west of WA. We are getting to the point where, apart from panelbeaters, a lot of people are concerned about the number of kangaroos there. It is becoming a real issue. It is amazing how quickly the kangaroo numbers build up in the south west, and we can also see that with the exponential increase in the number of brumbies in Kosciusko National Park.

One of the other things I will comment on is that, by coincidence, on the weekend I saw the film *Nitram*, which was about Martin Bryant. I was concerned about the way he was able to acquire an artillery of weapons in a fairly easy fashion at that time. From what some other members have said tonight, I understand that John Howard’s gun amnesty resulted in guns being handed in, including in WA. In Australia, we have a much better track record than the likes of the United States, where guns feature a little too much for my liking.

The intent of this legislation is good and, as I said, the opposition will not oppose the bill. From our perspective, we will make most of our comments at the consideration in detail stage and will ask questions on behalf of various licensed firearm holders, gun repairers and sporting shooters associations. There are not many gun repairers left around the state, and distance is a real issue in pastoral areas and places that are a bit further away from the metropolitan area. I know of only one or two genuine gun repairers in my electorate. Some of these issues relate to the distance that people have to travel to get their guns repaired or maintained. We will be asking questions about some of those issues during consideration in detail.

Some concerning statements have been relayed back to us. One of those statements is that licensed firearm holders have nothing to worry about. I always have concerns when those sorts of statements are made. From the information that I have received, I believe that more work should have been done on the drafting of the legislation. I always worry when I look at legislation and we have a minister, as occurred with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Bill, who keeps saying, “It’s no problem; we’ll sort it out in the regulations.” It really worries me what will come out in the regulations. At the moment, we do not know what will be in the regulations. I would be very comfortable if the Legislative Council referred the bill to a committee.

Mr P. Papalia: How many firearms have you got?

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: I have two.

Mr P. Papalia: When was the last time you had either of them repaired?

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: I believe that a small repair was done on the .22 about four years ago. To be honest, I am not a big fan of guns.

Mr P. Papalia: I get the thing about distance from repair, but I don’t think people get them repaired that frequently. So, I’m not sure how big an issue it is.

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: Minister, we have just heard the overriding concerns of the industry. We will certainly be asking those questions during consideration in detail. As I said, my real concern is whether there has been enough consultation. Will there be unintended consequences for the shooting fraternity? As I said, a comment was made that licensed firearm holders will not be impacted. That probably remains to be seen. A lot of it always comes back to interpretation by the police and whoever at the time when the legislation comes in. I will be looking for the minister to provide more clarity in relation to the ambiguity about definitions, and the ammunition side of it. I see that an amendment came in this morning related to ammunition and so on. I look forward to the minister clarifying that amendment.

The minister also mentioned maintenance and repair. There is a difference between someone like me, who rarely uses my guns in the gun cabinet, compared with a sporting shooter, a clay target shooter or someone who puts a lot of rounds through their gun and might need their stock or the trigger replaced or whatever. That is the difference. A lot of people around the state use their guns on a regular basis. That is why I am here; it is about unintended consequences for the regular users.

Over the last couple of years, I understand that 81 430 firearms licences were held by people. Of those, 61 687 of those licences include multiple guns. There is certainly a large contingent. People deserve to have answers. As I said, there are interchangeable stocks and triggers that have been lawfully held by repairers or licensed firearms holders. How will it play out if someone at the back of Leonora breaks the stock on their gun and they need it repaired? I have concerns about what I think is probably the potential for some pretty heavy-duty bureaucracy when licensed firearms holders will have to gain WA police approval for every part of a licensed firearm that requires replacement. Will the licensed firearm holder require retrospective approval for holding parts or will they have to surrender them? I have heard previous speakers talking about the surrender of firearms and the like. Will compensation be payable for the surrender of those firearms? I understand that this scenario will play out. I will ask the minister whether there will be compensation. We will outline that during consideration in detail. I worry about the people who have several firearms. If they surrender some or all of them, what are the government's plans for compensating them? That will be an interesting element.

I agree with the provisions in the bill relating to 3D printing and the like. I fully understand the implications of what can occur when backyard operators, bikie gangs and so forth manufacture those weapons. I will also be seeking clarity on how this legislation affects people who genuinely have manuals, diagrams, videos et cetera who are genuine licence holders. How will that play out? Will they be picked up in the legislation? Repairers will also fall within that scenario.

There is a genuine intent from the government and I understand where the minister is coming from. We certainly will not be opposing the bill. As I said, the unintended consequences are the real concern for me. There are only a few firearms repairers and dealers around the state. We have also seen issues with the transport of firearms, which has created difficulties for various licensed firearm holders throughout the state. The member for Vasse, the member for Moore, whom I know is interested, the member for Central Wheatbelt, the member for North West Central and I will be taking the opportunity to clarify many of these things.

[Member's time extended.]

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: We have asked questions of the WA police and have tried to get some clarity. We had an interesting response about the difference between manufacture and repair when we tried to clarify whether the repair of ammunition is a component of the repair offence. It will not be a component. The WA Police Force said it will be updating the information on the website to provide guidance. That is good, but I would like some clarity right here at the table. I certainly look forward to having that opportunity. I will be interested to see how the issues of compensation, maintenance and repair, reloading and ammunition, as per the amendment that the minister lodged this morning of which we received notice, plays out. I certainly understand the intent of the bill. I will not be opposing its general intent. I will leave my contribution there. We may have extra speakers. If not, we will certainly be well and truly present during consideration in detail.

MS J.J. SHAW (Swan Hills — Parliamentary Secretary) [8.59 pm]: I also would like to make a contribution to the debate on the Firearms Amendment Bill 2021 this evening. I note that the legislation is intended to target outlaw motorcycle gangs and other serious organised crime figures and persons who pose a threat to community safety, but I would also like to discuss this evening the unintended outcomes that could potentially flow from the passage of this bill. I refer to not only the potential outcomes raised by the member for Roe, which have also been raised by constituents of mine, but also some other outcomes that I will get to. I know there is a bit of interest in this bill in my electorate, so for the benefit of those who may watch the footage or read the *Hansard*—they may be sleepless, who knows?—I would like to quickly run through the key features of the bill, and then I will discuss the concerns of my constituents and, as I say, some of the potential unintended outcomes of the bill.

The four key reforms contained in this bill relate to firearms prohibition orders; the illegal manufacture of firearms, including firearms technology offences; increased penalties for certain firearms offences relating to stolen firearms and firing a gun in a way that causes fear; and provisions for a permanent firearms amnesty. The first aspect of the

bill is the most significant, and that is the institution of a new firearms prohibition order scheme. The intent of that is to target members of outlaw motorcycle gangs, and it complements a broader suite of legislative reforms instituted by this government that aim to disrupt and dismantle these motorcycle gangs and organised crime more broadly in Western Australia, and make it the most hostile jurisdiction for these groups to pursue their criminal activities.

The first part of the reform was the Criminal Law (Unlawful Consorting and Prohibited Insignia) Act, which was passed last year. This legislation builds on that legislation, making it harder for outlaw motorcycle gang members and members of other organised crime groups to access firearms. Under the firearms prohibition order scheme, the Commissioner of Police or their delegate, ranking commander or above, will be able to make a firearms prohibition order against anyone if they are satisfied of any of the following—this is an important point, and I will return to it later on this evening: firstly, if the possession of a firearm by a person will likely result in undue danger to life or property; secondly, if the person is not a fit and proper person to possess a firearm; and thirdly, it is otherwise in the public interest to make an FPO against the person. The police then have a number of powers to support the service of an FPO. Once served with an FPO, a person becomes a prohibited person and is subject to a range of conditions. They are banned from holding firearms licences or living in a house where firearms are stored. They have to surrender all their firearms, parts and ammunition, and they are not able to acquire, possess or use firearms, major firearms parts or prohibited firearms accessories and ammunition. They are not able to enter or remain in certain places, including places where firearms are repaired, manufactured and sold; this extends to shooting ranges and paintball clubs, and we have quite a few of them in the seat of Swan Hills. They are also prohibited from associating with persons in the possession of a firearm, parts or ammunition. There are a number of offences associated with failing to comply with an FPO that have a range of significant consequences, including jail terms of up to 14 years, and financial penalties of up to \$75 000. That is really quite a considerable increase in the consequences for undertaking these sorts of prohibited activities.

The second aspect of the legislation relates to two new divisions targeted at disrupting the unauthorised manufacture of firearms. There is a division 3 set of offences relating to manufacture, repair and dealing in firearms and other things; and a division 4 set of offences relating to firearms technology. The division 3 provisions aim to encompass all persons involved in the manufacture, repair and dealing of unauthorised firearms, major firearms parts and prohibited firearms accessories and ammunition, and it is basically intended to target the business model used by those who manufacture firearms, and all those associated with their illegal manufacture, repair and dealing.

The division 4 provisions introduce the concept of firearms technology. Including firearms technologies is essential to this bill, enabling police to keep up with the new ways in which illegal firearms are manufactured. This increasingly includes the use of technologies such as 3D printers. It is actually quite interesting to read about the use of 3D printers in this regard. They are able to manufacture plastic fully functional firearms capable of firing live bullets. They also produce functional key components for firearms, including semiautomatic assault rifles and fully automatic machine guns and handguns.

I am trying to remember; there was a movie I saw many years ago that I think had Billy Bob Thornton in it, and he built a plastic gun and assassinated a President. I am sure it was Billy Bob Thornton; anyway, it was quite interesting, because he had to pass through all the metal detectors, and because the guns were made of plastic they were completely undetectable. Obviously, guns need to be detectable, but really, we should not be able to manufacture them in our backyards. That is quite a considerable, and growing, problem in Western Australia. Their manufacture has been infrequent to date, but it is increasing. In fact, when I did my research I was really interested to discover their prevalence. In June last year, a backyard 3D printing set-up was uncovered, down the road from my nan's. That was quite a surprise to me. Quite a significant number of weapons were seized. It just goes to show that this stuff is happening, and that we need to institute provisions to control it.

As I said, once these amendments have been introduced, WA police will be able to respond to the illegal use of these devices and prevent them from becoming more common. The definition of “firearms technology” is important to run through, because it is one of the issues that my constituents have raised with me. Firearms technology is defined in the bill to include digital or electronic technical drawings, plans, software or instructions, including printed hard copies for the design, manufacture or repair of a firearm or major firearm part, prohibited firearm, accessory or ammunition.

The bill will introduce three specific offences relating to unauthorised activity regarding firearms technology: the unauthorised possession of that technology, the creation or development of the technology, and the dissemination of the technology. The penalty for those offences is imprisonment for 10 years, and the summary conviction penalty is imprisonment for three years. There are a number of exceptions, and I will be interested to understand how they operate.

The third aspect of the legislation is increased penalties for firearms-related offences in order to better reflect the severity of these offences and to target the serious organised crime groups often linked to the types of offending. The penalties are being increased relating to the theft of a firearm, being in possession of a stolen firearm, and offences relating to circumstances in which a person fires a gun to cause fear. It has been just terrible to see those incidents in Perth.

The final aspect is the establishment, under clause 60, of a permanent firearms amnesty. This will support agreements made by police ministers across Australia to introduce a permanent national firearms amnesty from 1 July 2021. That is a really important provision and will really encourage the community to surrender firearms. As many other members have noted, that will help ensure that unlicensed firearms ended up in the hands of criminals. There have been some very successful previous amnesties. Under the 2017 national firearms amnesty, 57 000 unlicensed firearms were surrendered across Australia, with 1 242 firearms surrendered in Western Australia.

The members for Roe and Vasse talked about the indirect outworkings of this bill, and that is something that has been raised by my constituents. The seat of Swan Hills is the largest seat in the metropolitan area by both geographical area and population. I have a 20-square-kilometre area of Ellenbrook, which is highly urbanised, and another 1 500 square kilometres of space that has broadacre farming, rural residential living and rural lifestyle properties. A lot of people in the hills part of my electorate are farmers and, indeed, sporting shooters. I also have the Swan Valley in my electorate, and many people there undertake pest eradication programs—shooting programs—of rainbow lorikeets, to try to control their strike on grapes. The provisions relating to the utilisation of guns are actually very relevant in Swan Hills. I did not realise this until very recently, being a person who has never actually held a gun, but I have certainly learnt quite a bit about it, and I would like to thank the current Mayor of the City of Swan, David Lucas, for enlightening me. I know that David Lucas, as a former police officer, has a great interest in this area and has indeed advocated to me.

One of the things that Mayor Lucas raised is the definition of “firearms technology” and the inclusion of hard copies of drawings, plans and software. He said that there are many responsible gun owners who own manuals, paraphernalia and old magazines. He showed me some magazines from the 1980s and some really quite complex, technical drawings detailing the different parts of the guns and how to care for them. He said, “Look, Jess, I’m very concerned that this legislation will make my possession of these magazines illegal, so I’m very interested to understand how the exceptions that are outlined in the bill will apply in such circumstances.” People have also raised concerns with me about responsible gun owners’ ability to repair and maintain their firearms. Other members have raised that, and I am sure it will come up at the consideration in detail stage.

They are the sort of indirect outcomes that have been raised, but there are others that I want to speak about. They are the positive indirect outcomes that are perhaps not front of mind as we consider this bill but I think should be—that is, the impact that this legislation will potentially have on measures to meaningfully tackle family and domestic violence. As I have mentioned before, under proposed part 8 of the legislation, the criteria by which the Commissioner of Police or their delegate can make a firearms prohibition order are that he or she must be satisfied that possession of a firearm by the person will likely result in undue danger to life or property, that the person is not a fit and proper person to possess a firearm, or that it is otherwise in the public interest to make a firearms protection order against the person. There are measures currently available for the control of firearms in domestic violence situations and it is important that we acknowledge that, but one of the things we talked about in our briefing on the bill is the potential for this act to be an additional tool available to WA police to control access to firearms, particularly in light of the criteria that I have just outlined.

Without doubt, we have a problem with family and domestic violence in Western Australia. It is an issue in the cities, the suburbs and the regions. In 2021, two-thirds—about 63 per cent—of assaults in WA reported to police were family and domestic violence-related, with eight FDV-related homicides last calendar year. One in five Western Australian women reported experiencing partner violence since the age of 15. One in five Australians believe domestic violence is a normal reaction to stress and that sometimes a woman can make a man so angry he hits her without meaning, and one in three Australians believe that if a woman does not leave her abusive partner, then she is responsible for the violence continuing. In my own electorate, family and domestic violence is a very real issue. The most recent data that I have available from WA police shows that in 2019–20 there were a total of 3 970 family and domestic violence incidents reports in the Midland district, in which my electorate sits, which is the third highest in the metropolitan region.

The McGowan government has taken unprecedented action to address FDV in the state, investing an additional \$126 million since coming into government to keep victims safe, hold perpetrators to account and stop violence against women before it starts. Our key achievements include appointing our first ever Minister for Prevention of Family and Domestic Violence. Having been appointed her parliamentary secretary, being in that job for a few weeks now and watching the way that she operates, I know that she is wholly committed to ensuring that we have a sustained whole-of-government focus on implementing effective systemic changes to stop violence against women. Under her leadership, we have introduced *Path to safety: Western Australia’s 10-year strategy to reduce family and domestic violence 2020–2030*, which outlines the steps that this government will take to build safer communities.

Alongside our unprecedented investment of \$126 million over the past five years, the McGowan government has made significant progress, including investing more in community-based services, including two new women’s refuges; establishing our first FDV one-stop hubs, making it much easier for women experiencing violence to come forward and seek help; and implementing significant and progressive family violence legislation reform to keep perpetrators accountable and to better protect victim survivors. That includes shuttle conferencing so that victims do not have to face their abusers, and amending the Residential Tenancies Act to make it easier for victims to leave

abusive environments or to make security upgrades to properties. We have increased the capacity of systems to identify and respond to family and domestic violence, including training for frontline police and introducing antenatal screening in hospitals. We have prioritised raising awareness of the drivers of violence so that we can stop it before it starts, including implementing the Respectful Relationships program in schools and introducing the highly successful annual 16 Days in WA campaign to stop violence against women. The McGowan government has committed over \$60 million this term to continue building on these achievements by expanding programs to support survivors, tighten legal protections and drive collective community and government action to stop violence against women. These are great steps forward, but I believe that this legislation could be another part of the tool kit available particularly to WA police to address the scourge of family and domestic violence, because it is without doubt a fact that firearms play an insidious role in FDV.

The World Health Organization shows that the United States—it is well known—has the western world's worst homicide rate, with about five persons killed per 100 000 people, compared with just over one person per 100 000 in Western Australia, and 50 per cent of murders in the United States involve guns. Disturbingly, American women are six times more likely to be killed in a domestic violence incident if a gun is present at the time, and every month in the United States an average of 70 women are shot and killed by an intimate partner. According to the US anti-gun organisation Everytown for Gun Safety, nearly one million women alive today have reported being shot or shot at by intimate partners, and 4.5 million women have reported being threatened with a gun by an intimate partner.

[Member's time extended.]

Ms J.J. SHAW: Everytown also notes that the effects of firearms in the hands of an abuser extends far beyond the intimate relationship itself. They affect the children who witness or live with it, family members, co-workers and the law enforcement officers who have to respond to it. It observes that guns further exacerbate the power and control dynamic used by abusers to inflict emotional abuse and exert coercive control over their victims.

I have been reading some of the literature on this topic. I read *The Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law Online*, volume 49, issue 4, dated 1 December 2021. It contains an article called "Domestic Violence, Firearms, and Mass Shootings", written by Liza Gold. Obviously, she observes much of the commentary in the US around gun control concerns mass shootings. When people think about mass shootings, we often think of an incident with multiple fatalities and a lone gunman who opens fire on random people in a public space. Domestic homicides involving intimate partners and other family members confined to a residence are often not considered or counted as mass shootings, but if we think about that type of crime, between 2009 and 2018, at least 54 per cent of mass shootings in the United States, defined as shootings in which more than three people are killed in one event, were related to domestic or family violence. The article notes —

... domestic homicide often extends to additional victims linked to the primary perpetrator or victim, either through a preexisting relationship or through physical proximity to the violence.

The article references earlier studies that demonstrate that firearm use is associated with increasing instances of multiple homicide victimisation, especially in domestic situations. The study finds —

Prohibiting firearm access for those with a history of domestic violence has proved effective in reducing rates of intimate partner homicide. This suggests that, in the context of domestic violence, identifying additional areas where prohibition might decrease access to firearms and effectively enforcing restrictions that already exist may also decrease mass shootings, both inside and outside the home.

There have also been studies into this aspect of violence in Australia. In an article published in September 2001 in *The Medical Journal of Australia* titled "Gun violence in Australia, 2002–2016: a cohort study" found that undoubtedly men are the major victims of gun-related crime in Australia. However, in Australia, the injured person was a female for one in 10 firearm assaults. The article notes —

Domestic and family violence is a major health and welfare problem in Australia, and the risk of domestic partner violence escalating to homicide is 11 times as high in households with access to firearms.

It is considerably higher in the US, but it is still 11 times higher in Australia. Similarly, the Women's Legal Service Queensland, quoting a range of sources, states —

2. Gun use in domestic violence homicide is still common

Gunshot wounds are the third most common cause of death for Australian victims of domestic homicide.

Something that I think the Nationals WA should have regard to in particular, is that —

4. Rural, regional and remote women are at increased risk

Higher rates of gun ownership in non-urban communities is a serious concern of survivors of domestic and family violence and increases "women's vulnerability to serious harm and death".

This is an issue for not only metropolitan women, but also regional women. It is important that we are all alive to those risks.

The work done by the Women's Legal Service Queensland also notes —

5. Access to firearms is associated with more serious domestic violence
Women whose abusers use or threaten to use a weapon are 20 times more likely to be killed.
Violent intimate partners who have access to firearms engage in more severe domestic violence than those who do not.

There is a clear link between firearms and domestic violence. Currently in Australia, only 11 per cent of domestic violent homicides involve guns, but that is far too many. In the United States, where the gun laws are much more liberal, the figure is 50 per cent. The Women's Legal Service Queensland found —

Female gun homicides significantly declined in Australia after 1996 gun law reforms

It was interesting to look at the graphs that detailed that. I found a couple of other articles that discuss the same matter. Members can see in the charts that there was a dip in male-related gun homicides, but there was a marked dip in female-related homicides following the 1996 gun reforms. Other members this evening have spoken about what a key moment in time those reforms were and about the remarkable bipartisanship at the time. It is good that today we have seen the same level of bipartisanship from the opposition indicating its support for the bill, obviously, subject to nutting out some of the issues that my constituents have raised with me.

I believe this legislation represents another step forward in gun reform. Let us hope that a positive indirect benefit of this is that it adds yet another string to WA Police Force's bow and assists the police to further address family and domestic violence. As I said, the criteria by which the police commissioner or the commissioner's delegate can make a firearms prohibition order are that he or she must be satisfied that the possession of a firearm by the person will likely result in undue danger to life or property, that the person is not a fit and proper person to possess a firearm, and that it is otherwise in the public interest to make a firearm prohibition order against the person. I argue that that those criteria apply in many a family and domestic violence situation.

This legislation is, no doubt, a great step forward in addressing outlaw motorcycle gangs. I know that is a real priority of the minister and the Attorney General. In addition to those existing measures that we have available to us to address the risks posed by firearms in family and domestic violence situations, let us hope that these measures can also be utilised in our ongoing efforts to tackle family and domestic violence.

Debate adjourned, on motion by **Ms C.M. Rowe**.

COURTS LEGISLATION AMENDMENT (MAGISTRATES) BILL 2021

Returned

Bill returned from the Council without amendment.

House adjourned at 9.25 pm

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Questions and answers are as supplied to Hansard.

HOSPITALS AND HEALTH CAMPUSES — MOORE ELECTORATE

339. Mr R.S. Love to the Minister for Health:

I refer to hospitals in Northampton, Mullewa, Morawa, Three Springs, Moora, Dalwallinu, Wongan-Ballidu and to health centres in Dongara, Jurien Bay, Leeman, Lancelin and Chittering, and I ask:

- (a) What is the required Full Time Equivalent (FTE) of all nursing and ancillary staff at each centre;
- (b) What is the current staffing level at each;
- (c) How many positions are filled by short term recruitment through agencies;
- (d) Does each centre have a plan in place to assess and treat patients suffering from COVID 19; and
- (e) What extra resources will be provided at each centre in the event of a Covid outbreak in the area served by that centre or hospital?

Ms A. Sanderson replied:

(a)–(b) Hospitals

| Northampton | (a) Budgeted FTE | (b) Current FTE (Oct Actuals) |
|---------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Nursing & Midwifery | 12.49 | 11.74 |
| Ancillary Staff | 8.67 | 8.87 |
| Total | 21.16 | 20.61 |

| Mullewa | (a) Budgeted FTE | (b) Current FTE (Oct Actuals) |
|---------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Nursing & Midwifery | 5.80 | 8.92 |
| Ancillary Staff | 5.76 | 9.59 |
| Total | 11.56 | 18.51 |

| Morawa | (a) Budgeted FTE | (b) Current FTE (Oct Actuals) |
|---------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Nursing & Midwifery | 10.20 | 10.90 |
| Ancillary Staff | 8.53 | 8.32 |
| Total | 18.73 | 19.22 |

| North Midlands (Three Springs) | (a) Budgeted FTE | (b) Current FTE (Oct Actuals) |
|---|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Nursing & Midwifery | 9.16 | 5.55 |
| Ancillary Staff | 9.30 | 5.00 |
| Total | 18.46 | 10.55 |

| Moora | (a) Budgeted FTE | (b) Current FTE (Oct Actuals) |
|------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Nursing Services | 16.90 | 18.70 |
| Ancillary Staff | 19.00 | 18.90 |
| Total | 35.90 | 37.60 |

| Dalwallinu | (a) Budgeted FTE | (b) Current FTE (Oct Actuals) |
|-------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Nursing Services | 11.20 | 11.00 |
| Ancillary Staff | 9.10 | 10.00 |
| Total | 20.30 | 21.00 |

| Wongan | (a) Budgeted FTE | (b) Current FTE (Oct Actuals) |
|------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Nursing Services | 12.70 | 10.50 |
| Ancillary Staff | 9.70 | 11.70 |
| Total | 22.40 | 22.20 |

Health Centres

| Dongara | (a) Budgeted FTE | (b) Current FTE (Oct Actuals) |
|---------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Nursing & Midwifery | 11.86 | 19.39 |
| Ancillary Staff | 14.75 | 14.01 |
| Total | 26.61 | 33.40 |

| Jurien Bay | (a) Budgeted FTE | (b) Current FTE (Oct Actuals) |
|-------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Nursing Services | 5.80 | 10.00 |
| Ancillary Staff | 3.00 | 4.20 |
| Total | 8.80 | 14.20 |

| Leeman | (a) Budgeted FTE | (b) Current FTE (Oct Actuals) | Comments |
|---------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| NA | N/A | N/A | Silver Chain WA provides this service. |

| Lancelin | (a) Budgeted FTE | (b) Current FTE (Oct Actuals) | Comments |
|-----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| NA | NA | N/A | Silver Chain WA provides this service. WACHS Wheatbelt provides visiting child health & school health services |

| Chittering | (a) Budgeted FTE | (b) Current FTE (Oct Actuals) | Comments |
|-------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| N/A | N/A | N/A | WACHS provides visiting Child Health & allied health services. |

- (c) The contracting of Agency nursing staff is not specifically tied to vacant positions when comparing Budgeted FTE to Current FTE. The engagement of these staff often encompasses short term leave cover; cover during recruitment processes and the need to meet local demand requirements.
 - (d) Yes, this can be confirmed for all sites other than Chittering Health Centre, which is a private service not operated by WA Health. WA Health sites (including those contracted to Silver Chain at Lancelin and Leeman) have plans in place to assess and treat patients suffering from COVID.
 - (e) WACHS will deploy available staff and resources according to community service priorities. This may include the redeployment of workforce, provision of consumables (including Personal Protective Equipment, swabs), and capabilities (mobile testing).
-

