

Hon Dr Sally Talbot; President; Hon George Cash; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon Kim Chance; The Deputy President;
Hon Louise Pratt; Deputy President; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Giz Watson

CLIMATE CHANGE IN WESTERN AUSTRALIA

Amendment to Motion

Resumed from 24 August on the following motion moved by Hon Louise Pratt -

That this house calls on the federal government to provide the communities of Western Australia with the appropriate resources to deal with the likelihood of real and significant climate change, including -

- (a) the allocation of increased levels of research funding to address likely changes to Western Australia's climatic systems;
- (b) ratification of the Kyoto Protocol by the commonwealth which considers and addresses Western Australia's position as a resource-driven economy; and
- (c) programs of public education which address the likely need for future public adaptation and responses to climate change.

to which the following amendment was moved by Hon Paul Llewellyn -

- (1) Line 1 - To insert before "federal" -
state and
- (2) Line 1 - To insert after "government" -
(with the exception of paragraph (b))
- (3) Line 6 - To delete after "economy;" the word "and";
- (4) To insert after paragraph (c) the following new paragraphs -
 - (d) the establishment of greenhouse gas emission targets to reduce the carbon intensity of the Western Australian economy to 50 per cent of 2000 emissions by the year 2050;
 - (e) the establishment of a robust mandated renewable energy target to a level of 20 per cent by 2020; and
 - (f) the establishment of a mandated renewable energy target of six per cent to be achieved by 2010.

HON SALLY TALBOT (South West) [2.09 pm]: When my remarks on this motion were interrupted last week, I was drawing the attention of members to a very odd flip-flop situation that the Prime Minister appears to have got himself into. I will remind members of the scene I was setting by re-reading the statement made by the Prime Minister in 1997, in which he commented on the successful drawing to a close of the meetings that brought the Kyoto Protocol into being. He said -

We end the year having achieved this . . . absolutely stunning diplomatic success at the Kyoto conference. That was an extraordinary achievement, that Kyoto summit - an absolutely extraordinary achievement - and it was against all the odds . . . I mean, what we were able to do at Kyoto was, both, make a massive contribution to the world environmental effort to cut greenhouse gas emissions but also to protect Australian jobs.

I point out to members that the Prime Minister was not alone. He was not having a brainstorm when he said that. He was very ably supported by a number of his senior ministers, including the then federal Minister for Resources and Energy, Senator Parer, who said -

The Kyoto Protocol provides a sound basis for protecting Australia's export competitiveness and employment prospects in our minerals processing and energy export industries.

In 1997 the former Deputy Prime Minister, John Anderson, said -

The Kyoto agreement permitting Australia an 8% increase in emissions of 6 greenhouse gases by 2012 over 1990 levels will preserve the interests of farmers, miners, manufacturing industry and the economy in general.

Finally, Robert Hill, the then Minister for the Environment and Heritage, said -

. . . Australia, although accepting a demanding target at Kyoto, nevertheless got a fair target, and it is unlikely that any alternative international negotiation that could potentially subsume Kyoto in the future would give to Australia an opportunity that is as fair as we were able to negotiate in Kyoto.

Hon Dr Sally Talbot; President; Hon George Cash; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon Kim Chance; The Deputy President;
Hon Louise Pratt; Deputy President; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Giz Watson

It sounds pretty unequivocal to me that in 1997 the federal government was 100 per cent in favour of proceeding with the Kyoto Protocol and, indeed, was quite boastful about the fact that it had been able to bring about the protocol. However, there was some back-peddalling in June 2003, when the Prime Minister said to the Minerals Council of Australia -

... for us to sign the Protocol in its present form would, in the Government's continuing judgement, place unfair fetters on many industries, not least industries in your own sector ...

Senator Ian Campbell, who had taken over as Minister for the Environment and Heritage, agreed with the Prime Minister that some rapid back-peddalling was called for when he said -

Even with Russia's approval, emissions would be reduced by only one per cent. Until the protocol reduced emissions by 60 per cent, Australia would not accept it. [To do so] ... would be accepting the argument that you sign on to something that is half-hearted and not likely to deliver a good result.

The reason I draw these comments to the attention of honourable members is that although there was an all-out embracing of the Kyoto Protocol, there was a very rapid back-pedal some six years later. Yet, in December 2004 the Australian Greenhouse Office reported -

Australia is on track to achieve its target of limited greenhouse emissions to 108% of 1990 emissions over the period 2008-12, as agreed to at Kyoto.

The question I want to ask is: if the Prime Minister was correct in his predictions that we no longer needed the Kyoto Protocol, because it would not deliver the outcomes that would enable us to meet our target, by saying that if we were to meet the targets, it would put our domestic industries at a disadvantage, why did an instrumentality of the federal government state that Australia was on track to achieve its target? There is a dislocation in this chain of events somewhere. I think that the most coherent explanation is that it relates to this ideological obsession of the Prime Minister with the way he approaches environmental issues. He is adopting a kind of fundamentalist retreat from anything that might be tinged with green.

I will draw my comments to a close with some very brief comments about what the federal government has proposed in place of the ratification of the Kyoto Protocol; that is, the Asia-Pacific Partnership on Clean Development and Climate, which was announced in August 2005. It would be quite ingenuous of me to criticise the government for acknowledging that it has a responsibility to lead the way in addressing some of the problems that confront us as a result of climate change. However, there is no comparison between the new partnership pact and the Kyoto Protocol. The pact is an empty mechanism that simply will not deliver in a time frame that will make any significant difference. It contains no targets, it specifies no objectives and, probably most importantly, there is no funding. There is no mechanism for implementing meaningful action and there is a huge reliance on the technological fix. That brings me full circle to the substance of the motion moved by Hon Louise Pratt, which calls on the federal government to deal with the community and to devise strategies that will enable community members to take action that will significantly address some of the problems both in their own domestic situations and for the wellbeing of their community, the states, the nation and the world in general. I am very happy to have made a contribution to this debate. I will conclude my comments by repeating the specific paragraphs of the motion. It states -

That this house calls on the federal government to provide the communities of Western Australia with the appropriate resources to deal with the likelihood of real and significant climate change, including -

- (a) the allocation of increased levels of research funding to address likely changes to Western Australia's climatic systems;
- (b) ratification of the Kyoto Protocol by the commonwealth which considers and addresses Western Australia's position as a resource-driven economy; and
- (c) programs of public education which address the likely need for future public adaptation and responses to climate change.

The PRESIDENT: The question is that the words to be inserted be inserted. Before I give the call to Hon George Cash, I point out at this stage that the amendment to the motion is in four parts. When the house is asked to vote on the motion, I will put the questions separately.

HON GEORGE CASH (North Metropolitan) [2.19 pm]: About two weeks ago, Hon Louise Pratt moved her motion and spoke to it at some length. She was later followed by Hon Paul Llewellyn, Hon Murray Criddle and Hon Sally Talbot. I noted that, in their comments, Hon Louise Pratt and Hon Sally Talbot seemed to concentrate on the problem. They seemed to want to raise and highlight the problems that exist and to discuss the problem with the problems but at no time did they offer any positive solution or solutions to the many problems that

Hon Dr Sally Talbot; President; Hon George Cash; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon Kim Chance; The Deputy President;
Hon Louise Pratt; Deputy President; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Giz Watson

surround the climatic change that we now face on a global basis. The comments were based in negativity. For party political reasons, they decided that they wanted to attack the Prime Minister, Mr Howard. They failed to recognise what the current coalition government has done to try to combat the problems associated with climatic change over the past nine years. No credit whatsoever was given to those changes.

There was talk about the need to ratify the Kyoto Protocol. The Prime Minister has made it very clear on a number of occasions that the Kyoto Protocol sets various targets. He has also made it clear, as Hon Sally Talbot recognises, that although the federal government will not sign the Kyoto Protocol in a formal sense, it will still attempt to reach targets that were agreed to some years ago. It is interesting that, if our record to date is examined, the Australian Greenhouse Office's 2003 national greenhouse gas inventory reports that the national greenhouse emissions were, when the report was published, 101.1 per cent of 1990 levels. As the federal Minister for the Environment and Heritage, Hon Senator Ian Campbell, said only two months ago, the 2003 inventory shows us that we are on track to meet the Kyoto emissions target and that the figures tell us that the Howard government's \$1.8 billion national climate change strategy is working. Senator Campbell said that, without a strong approach, Australia's greenhouse gas emissions would be 125 per cent of 1990 levels by 2008-12.

There are many good things being done about the issues that confront the global climate problem. We should recognise those good things and try to build on them rather than take a negative attitude and try to imply that nothing is being done; that we are going backwards. One of the things that Mr Howard said is that to sign the Kyoto Protocol would disadvantage Australia by way of jobs in particular, and in general economic terms. The Prime Minister has pointed out on numerous occasions that the Kyoto Protocol does not include some of Australia's major competitors. We would be put at a competitive disadvantage if we were to sign the formal document. That has not stopped the Australian government from making it clear that it wants to achieve targets and do better. On a number of occasions, Mr Howard has been heard to talk about "beyond Kyoto". Beyond Kyoto means some particular things. It means that the federal government has been working in recent times on a new Asia-Pacific partnership on clean development and climate. On 28 July 2005, approximately one month ago, a joint announcement was made by Hon John Howard as Prime Minister, Hon Alexander Downer as Minister for Foreign Affairs, Hon Ian Macfarlane as Minister for Industry, Tourism and Resources and Hon Ian Campbell as Minister for the Environment and Heritage. It seemed to be a very significant step by the federal government. They made it clear that they were very pleased to announce that the United States, China, India, Japan, South Korea and Australia have agreed to form the Asia-Pacific partnership on clean development and climate. In itself, that partnership will bring together key developed and developing countries in the region to address the challenges of climate change, energy security and air pollution in a way that strives to encourage economic development and reduce poverty. I would have thought that they were fairly noble goals to strive for. To suggest that the current government is dragging its feet by not signing the formal Kyoto Protocol is to turn our backs on the real things that this government is doing. There are those in the community who will argue that the Kyoto Protocol is going to make great advances for those countries that have already signed up. It is interesting to note that our nearest neighbour, New Zealand, and one of our European trading partners, Germany, have just demanded that the countries quit the Kyoto Protocol as soon as possible. New Zealand argues that it was not told of the real cost to the New Zealand community. Germany also recognises that the cost is far in excess of what it was ever told at the time. That is not to say that both those countries will not strive to meet their targets. They say that they were misled about what the Kyoto Protocol was all about.

Only two days ago, in an article in *The Australian*, the Prime Minister made the point that he believed he had been vindicated over his opposition to the Kyoto Protocol after business groups in New Zealand and Germany demanded that their countries quit the agreement as soon as possible and join the Asia-Pacific pact. Interestingly, in New Zealand it was not just one or two businesses that were making the call; it was a coalition of 22 000 New Zealand businesses. They spoke under the auspices of the New Zealand Chambers of Commerce and Industry. They called on both parties in the upcoming New Zealand election to start talks on pulling out of the Kyoto Protocol by 2008, which, as I understand, is the earliest possible date for them to be able to do so. The chief executive of the Employers and Manufacturers Association of New Zealand, Mr Alasdair Thompson, said that compliance cost companies much more than the government predicted. It has been estimated that New Zealand may have to spend between \$600 million and \$1.2 billion to meet its Kyoto commitments on greenhouse gas emissions instead of gaining carbon credits. I make that point to say that all is not perfect in the Kyoto Protocol. However, that is not to say that it is not a step forward, because it is. It is good to see that Australia is currently on target to meeting the Kyoto Protocol targets without having formally signed up. I ask members to recognise the positive steps the government has taken and, in particular, recognise Australia's involvement in the Asia-Pacific partnership on clean development and climate. I also ask members to recognise the things that Australia can do to help itself and the developing countries in its region achieve greater targets in the future.

Hon Dr Sally Talbot; President; Hon George Cash; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon Kim Chance; The Deputy President;
Hon Louise Pratt; Deputy President; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Giz Watson

As I said earlier, the speeches of the two Labor members to whom I referred recited negative comments about the federal government's position on the climate. An honest and reasoned consideration of the direction in which the federal government has taken Australia over the past nine years would, on balance, put it well and truly to the fore. However, that fact was not recognised by the particular speakers to whom I referred.

Stepping outside the area of the environment, this morning I received a note about the increase in real wages in Australia, which goes along with our commitment to improve the environment. The federal government's assertion that real wages have risen by 14 per cent is, in fact, based on the Australian Bureau of Statistics average earnings measure, the results of which were published in its quarterly national accounts. The figures cover the nine-year period from March 1996 to March 2005. Data from the March quarter 2005 national accounts show that, since March 1996, average earnings have risen by 38 per cent in nominal terms. After taking into account the corresponding national accounts indicator of inflation, measured real wages across Australia have increased by 14.7 per cent under the coalition. I raise this point to highlight the fact that the comparable figure during the 13 years of the previous Labor government was a 1.2 per cent rise in real wages. Those figures are ABS figures. The Prime Minister and his team have been able to generate that type of growth while having regard for the climate.

If we look at Labor's policy on greenhouse gases - particularly federal Labor's policy - its approach to climatic change is to ratify the Kyoto Protocol, impose an emissions trading system and lift mandated renewable energy targets, notwithstanding the fact that that would mean a significant cost to jobs. Why does the government not produce a cost-benefit analysis of that proposition so that we can all be a part of that particular argument? The amendments moved by Hon Paul Llewellyn seek to increase mandated renewable energy targets. At the last election, state Labor's policy was to increase MRETs in Western Australia by up to six per cent. I ask Hon Louise Pratt and Hon Sally Talbot: will the government introduce legislation to achieve that objective? There is no hint of it doing so at the moment. There has been no cost-benefit analysis to show how much it will cost. Before we can decide whether to support that type of target, we want an informed public debate so that we are satisfied about the benefits or otherwise of that proposition. I have had the opportunity of speaking to the mover of the amendments, Hon Paul Llewellyn. I recognise his position on mandated renewable energy targets and support the general thrust of his argument. However, I indicated to him that the first test is for the government to tell us in this place whether it will introduce legislation to achieve what it promised in the run-up to the last state election. Without that legislation, the government's promise is nothing more than hot air.

In part, the amendments moved by Hon Paul Llewellyn read -

- (d) the establishment of greenhouse gas emission targets to reduce the carbon intensity of the Western Australian economy to 50 per cent of 2000 emissions by the year 2050;
- (e) the establishment of a robust mandated renewable energy target to a level of 20 per cent by 2020; and

We need an informed public debate on those issues. We must debate those issues in this Parliament. We would also like to see the statistics of the benefits or otherwise of those propositions. During yesterday's debate on the Electricity Corporations Bill, I pointed out that we were keen to achieve greater changes in renewable energy sources. However, that has to be done in a reasoned way. There may be opportunities to impose levies on users of fossil fuel in the generation of electricity. The revenue raised from that levy could, in due course, assist those who are working towards greater renewable energy sources. There are many opportunities. However, we have not been provided with the necessary information to properly consider and support the propositions that have been put forward.

I am disappointed in the argument that was put forward that all will be saved if Australia signs the Kyoto Protocol. That is not the case at all. Even without signing the protocol, Australia is meeting its targets. The federal coalition government has moved beyond the Kyoto Protocol. As I indicated earlier, it has already reached agreement with all the significant countries - the United States, China, India, Japan and South Korea - all of which have agreed to form the Asia-Pacific partnership on clean development and climate. It is almost a case of leaving the Kyoto Protocol behind, because Kyoto does not take into account its effect on certain countries. Russia recently ratified the Kyoto Protocol; however one should compare Russia's emissions with the targets that have been set for that country. We can compare that with the targets of Australia or the United States to determine whether it has been a fair and equitable proposition.

Hon Kim Chance: Russia also has a declining industrial base.

Hon GEORGE CASH: Quite so. There are other ways of attacking this very serious problem. The solutions to the problem of climate change cannot be found in the motion as it was put forward. Given that we do not have enough statistical data to justify support for Hon Paul Llewellyn's amendments, the opposition will be

Hon Dr Sally Talbot; President; Hon George Cash; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon Kim Chance; The Deputy President;
Hon Louise Pratt; Deputy President; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Giz Watson

required to vote against the motion. Further, we will vote against the motion on the basis that we believe that the federal government's commitment to the environment is genuine and can be proven. The government's commitment is reflected in the way that Australia has moved forward over the past nine years. It is based on the fact that it has committed billions of dollars to climatic change in the immediate region. Although more can be done, this motion is not the way to achieve a greater opportunity to address climatic needs.

HON RAY HALLIGAN (North Metropolitan) [2.40 pm]: I do not profess to know a great deal about climate; I leave that to the experts, bearing in mind the other definition for expert is "drip under pressure". Many of the experts cannot agree on an issue. I suggest that the same applies to a room full of lawyers and other professionals.

Hon Simon O'Brien: It would be less boring

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon RAY HALLIGAN: Did Hon Simon O'Brien say they were less boring?

Hon Simon O'Brien: I said nothing!

Hon RAY HALLIGAN: This issue has been around for some considerable time and an enormous amount has been written about it. I am sure that everyone wants to achieve the same end, although there are many different methods of reaching that end. Unfortunately, we do not have the past records we probably need to give some indication of what is likely to happen over the next 100 years. We can develop models, although the great majority of them would be based on supposition. Some facts could be used, but probably not enough. I am not suggesting we should not go down that path. I believe we need to do that, but we must consider a number of matters, not the least of which is the instruction to our farmers a number of years ago to chop down trees. We now know that that was not the right thing to do. They did it because they were instructed to do so. They are now trying to correct that situation by planting as many trees as possible. I do not know how much time should be spent planting trees before the damage is rectified. I am not sure that I have heard how long it might take.

I am sure that many things have been done in ignorance over the years. It is only with hindsight that we have acknowledged that things could have been done better. We have been using our natural materials - fossil fuels and the like - in copious quantities. How much time has been spent on major conflicts throughout the world - world wars etc - during the past 90 years? I suggest they have taken up well in excess of 12 per cent of that period. That is a considerable amount of time. During those conflicts, a great deal of our natural materials have been utilised. The majority of those materials were wasted because they did not produce anything other than greenhouse gases, and because they deprived future generations of resources that often take millions of years to regenerate. Hopefully, all those situations will be taken into account when deciding what should be done now and in future.

Other speakers have referred to what is happening in some relatively small countries. I have had some experience in Papua New Guinea in which, because of the greed of other countries, the indigenous people were encouraged to chop down their trees for the sake of the almighty dollar. I am not denying that money was involved. The difficulty was that even though the tropics provide a climate in which things grow very quickly, the chopping down of so many trees in Papua New Guinea, Brazil and many other countries in the tropical regions has not assisted with the problems associated with greenhouse gas emissions. The indigenous people themselves did not help in this regard. When they wanted to flush out game - in this case a small kangaroo called the Magani - they set fire to the undergrowth. They did this repeatedly, but not because they knew the undergrowth would regrow; I think it came down to survival. The point is that that burning contributed to greenhouse gases, as did the consequential depletion of the undergrowth and the trees. That type of burning is happening throughout the tropics; therefore, the people of these countries should understand the impact of their actions in relation to the issues before us today. I am reminded that when the dinosaurs disappeared, humans were not around. I mention that purely because people continually say that - I will not say mankind; I understand humankind is the politically correct term - humankind has been the cause of all these greenhouse gas problems. We do not have the records to prove that. There is no doubt in my mind that we have contributed to them. We need to be mindful of that and we need to do something about it. However, to say that we are the only contributor is wrong. I now understand - I hoped that the Leader of the House might have been able to tell me whether my comments were correct - that sheep and cows are being accused of being major contributors to greenhouse gases.

Hon Louise Pratt: Indeed, they are.

Hon RAY HALLIGAN: Where will those accusations end - with cane toads and bees? I have no doubt that many people and animals, and possibly even plants, contribute to greenhouse gas emissions. Is it just part of

Hon Dr Sally Talbot; President; Hon George Cash; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon Kim Chance; The Deputy President;
Hon Louise Pratt; Deputy President; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Giz Watson

evolution? As I said before, I have no doubt that we are contributing to them, but I am not sure to what extent. We can go overboard with our claims about our contribution. Some people have gone overboard in their remarks about the Kyoto Protocol. Hon George Cash has already explained why we in this country need to take not only a proactive role but also a very responsible role in our approach to this issue. I am sure that others see it in a similar light to something I mentioned yesterday; namely, smoking. Should we ban absolutely everything that causes a problem today? It would not be logical or rational to do that. We must work our way through these matters so that the way of life we enjoy can be retained. When necessary, we must bite the proverbial bullet and make changes, but they must be thought through. I place on record a fact sheet headed "Australia's action on climate change", which reads -

Australia is committing almost \$1 billion to addressing the threat posed by greenhouse. This level of expenditure, coupled with the commitments made by states and territories, places Australia among the leading nations addressing climate change.

Australia's domestic action encompasses a wide range of measures, both regulatory and voluntary, across all sectors and sources of greenhouse gases. Australia's world class infrastructure for monitoring, analysing and responding to climate change includes:

- The Mandatory Renewable Energy Target (MRET) -

That is something that Hon Paul Llewellyn has raised -

is a world first in creating a national renewable energy market that is backed by legislation. This market is expected to deliver enough renewable electricity per year by 2010 to meet the residential electricity needs of four million people.

It states -

- The \$400 million Greenhouse Gas Abatement Program is expected to deliver total savings equivalent to the annual emissions of over 2 million cars. The Program targets opportunities for large-scale, cost-effective and sustained abatement from a range of sectors.
- \$460 million in grants-related programs is being provided to encourage the commercialisation and deployment of renewable energy and alternative fuels.
- The Greenhouse Challenge program now includes over 700 business and industry bodies in greenhouse action, with members reporting significant annual savings.
- The National Carbon Accounting System assists in monitoring land use change and its impact on Australia's emissions. It is consistent with world's best practice in scientific methods and is tailored to Australia's unique environment.
- The Greenhouse Friendly certification program enables companies to obtain certification for products or services whose greenhouse emissions have been fully offset by greenhouse abatement activities.
- Australia has one of the largest Cities for Climate Change Protection Programs in the world, with nearly 150 local governments representing over 60% of Australia's population. This program allows local government to contribute to abating greenhouse gas emissions.
- Australia has mandatory labelling and minimum energy performance standards to drive energy efficiency improvement in appliances and equipment.

It goes on to say -

The National Greenhouse Strategy provides the strategic framework for advancing Australia's domestic greenhouse response and was developed by the Commonwealth and all State and Territory Governments.

I am not sure whether all members in this chamber agree with what I have just said. However, it seems to me that that is a pretty good effort so far. It may not necessarily be the best that could be done. As I said before, I do not have enough knowledge on this matter. However, it seems as though something is being done within any number of sectors throughout the community and in industries. I will certainly be very interested to know what other things members believe could and should be done within a given period to allow us to continue our current way of life, and provide us with the opportunity to assist other countries around the world to overcome many of the problems that they themselves are creating.

I will also mention some highlights of the federal coalition government's achievements. This document states -

Hon Dr Sally Talbot; President; Hon George Cash; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon Kim Chance; The Deputy President;
Hon Louise Pratt; Deputy President; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Giz Watson

Since it was elected in 1996 the Coalition Government has been delivering practical programmes with substantial and measurable achievements in cutting greenhouse gas emissions.

According to the document, those achievements are -

The Coalition has established truly whole of government approach to the environment through the Sustainable Environment Committee of Cabinet.

The Coalition has invested \$1.7 billion in an effective response to the global problem of climate change.

That is a very large amount indeed. It continues -

Australia is one of only five countries likely to reach their Kyoto emissions targets.

Australia is likely to reach its targets. It is all very well and good for countries to say they will abide by their targets, but who is checking on them? I suggest that many countries are unlikely to reach their initial targets, but Australia is one of five that are likely to do so.

It continues -

The Coalition's practical measures are expected to deliver annual greenhouse gas emissions abatement of 67 million tonnes by the end of the decade, equivalent to taking all of today's cars, trucks and buses off the road.

That is considerable. It continues -

The Coalition has established a greenhouse gas reduction strategy to take us beyond Kyoto with a \$500 million Low Emissions Technology Fund; \$100 million Renewable Energy Development Initiative; \$75 million Solar Cities Trial; \$20 million Advanced Energy Storage Technologies Fund and a \$14 million Wind Forecasting Program.

Again, I believe the federal coalition government is making enormous efforts in this area that it, like us, feels is so important.

Hon George Cash interjected.

Hon RAY HALLIGAN: That is certainly correct, Hon George Cash. It is making every effort. It is out there putting the money into it and making it happen, not just talking about it. The document goes on to state -

The Coalition has created, implemented and funded a national strategic plan to improve Australia's water quality and conserve water in our cities, regions, coasts and oceans.

The Coalition has created a nationwide partnership with State and Territory Governments to reverse the trends in salinity and improve water quality through the \$1.4 billion National Action Plan for Salinity and Water Quality.

Again, that is something that all states and territories should embrace.

Hon Kim Chance: We have, dollar for dollar.

Hon RAY HALLIGAN: I just said they should. Western Australia has done it. I hope all the states and territories have done so, because it is so important. All I am saying is that there is recognition, both federally and at a state level, that things need to be done. The federal government is certainly putting a lot of money into this area by creating these funds and initiatives to enable these things to be done.

The document continues -

The Coalition has provided the leadership to restore the environmental health to the River Murray, and invested to restore environmental flows to the River Murray.

Since 1996-97 the Coalition Government has committed close to \$1 billion to the Murray.

Finally, the paper states -

The Coalition has established, for the first time in Australia's history, a truly national framework for environment protection and biodiversity conservation under the *Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation (EPBC) Act*. The Act allows the Australian Government to demonstrate national leadership to complement the role of the States and Territories in delivering on-ground natural resource management. The EPBC Act has delivered substantially greater protection for matters of national environmental significance - nationally threatened species and ecological communities, World Heritage properties, National Heritage places, internationally important wetlands, internationally protected migratory species, the Commonwealth marine area and nuclear actions. Now any

Hon Dr Sally Talbot; President; Hon George Cash; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon Kim Chance; The Deputy President;
Hon Louise Pratt; Deputy President; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Giz Watson

development that could threaten our vulnerable or endangered species, or any environmental matter of national significance, must be referred to the Environment Minister for a rigorous environmental assessment.

That being the case, I am sure that members will agree that a great deal has been done in this area. There is no doubt - everyone will be in agreement - that monumental work needs to be done all over the world. It is incumbent upon all nations, including Australia, to ensure that the smaller countries do what they need to do to assist all other countries in overcoming these problems.

I refer to the original motion moved by Hon Louise Pratt. Paragraph (a) of the motion reads -

- (a) the allocation of increased levels of research funding to address likely changes to Western Australia's climatic systems;

I am sure all members agree with that. Certainly more research needs to be undertaken and that paragraph seeks increased levels of research funding to do that.

Paragraph (c) reads -

- (c) programs of public education which address the likely need for future public adaptation and responses to climate change.

Most definitely that should be done, particularly after the research has been undertaken. People will look for leadership and will ask what we should and should not do. The research needs to be done before we can go down that path; otherwise we will not know what to educate people about. There is already enough misinformation in the community. It would be illogical and irrational to go down the path of creating further problems for people who are not experts, such as me, who cannot agree on what direction we should take and who rely on others for that direction. A lot of the experts talk in generalities. We need to be more specific. The information needs to be in bite-sized chunks. It should be of sufficient quantity that people can take it on board, understand it and do something with it. If we pile too much information on people, they will experience information overload and we will get absolutely nowhere. If we go well beyond people's level of understanding, we will create exactly the same situation. There is no purpose in talking in what, to them, will be academic circles. We will lose them; whereas the opposite is what we are after. We are trying to get people to come on board and to understand the issue. It is important that the public education on this issue goes a lot further than the public education that has taken place on outcomes-based education.

Paragraph (b) of Hon Louise Pratt's motion reads -

- (b) ratification of the Kyoto Protocol by the Commonwealth which considers and addresses Western Australia's position as a resource driven economy; and

That is very narrow. Other members who have spoken in this debate have indicated that Australia is already going down a path that will provide a better outcome than that proposed by the Kyoto Protocol. That is not just the position of Australia; I understand that other countries think in a similar way to Australia. It is simply not the situation that just because there was a meeting and a number of countries, including many countries that will not meet their emission targets, agreed on a target that every country should meet -

Hon Louise Pratt: What is the target that we need to stop climate change?

Hon RAY HALLIGAN: I have been saying we need more research. I agree with the first paragraph of the motion; that is, that more funds be allocated for research. I do not deny that; I actually said it. The member must have been out of the chamber on urgent parliamentary business. It would have been to her benefit if she had been here listening to the debate. I have been saying that we need more research because things have been happening to our climate over thousands of years. I referred to the time of the dinosaurs, when something dramatic did happen. We were not here to see it and we were not here to record it and, for that reason, we certainly did not create it, but something did.

Hon Paul Llewellyn: The overwhelming evidence is that there is climate change; there are some dissentient voices and I am not saying that we should ignore them, but we should not rewrite the book because of them. We waited 40 or 50 years before we attacked salinity. That is the risk we take here. If we can take actions that are positive in their own right and have economic benefits in their own right, there is no reason that we should not act, but we should not act irresponsibly.

Hon RAY HALLIGAN: I agree wholeheartedly with the member. That is what I have been saying. Let us do it in a rational and logical fashion and not clutch at straws. People should not say, "You can't do that any more", then take out one of the links in the economic chain so that it will not be effective in the future.

Hon George Cash interjected.

Hon Dr Sally Talbot; President; Hon George Cash; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon Kim Chance; The Deputy President;
Hon Louise Pratt; Deputy President; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Giz Watson

Hon RAY HALLIGAN: Hon George Cash made a very good point. This should not be heaped onto the federal government. The federal government, as I explained, has encouraged state and territory governments to come on board with their programs.

Hon Sally Talbot interjected.

Hon George Cash: That is why we should be encouraging the Gallop government to do more.

Hon Sally Talbot: The motion calls on the federal government to do that.

Hon RAY HALLIGAN: It is okay for that to be in the motion. Does the member want me to move an amendment that says the state government should do more? They are words on a piece of paper. This is what we were talking about earlier, but members opposite have missed the point. It is not about talk; it is about action. The federal coalition government has provided the action - that is, the money - it has set up the committees and things are happening.

Hon Sally Talbot interjected.

Hon RAY HALLIGAN: I suggest that the member do a bit more research. The point is that things need to be done. We agree with that. Governments will be required to show leadership, to provide programs and to undertake research so we can determine what public education is required, rather than scare people by telling them what they cannot do because they created problems in the past. It does not necessarily equate that they will create the same problems in the future. There are many variables. I am more than prepared to listen to the arguments. Climate change is not my area of expertise and I am more than happy to listen to the experts. However, when members opposite try to convince me, I ask them to please do so in a logical and rational fashion so that I can understand. They should listen if I query what they are saying. I will not question them, because I do not know more than they do. However, I will query what they say and ask them to convince me that what they are suggesting is the correct approach.

Like Hon George Cash, I have difficulties with Hon Paul Llewellyn's amendment. We do not have enough information. To commit ourselves totally to this would be extremely difficult.

I have said my piece. I have concerns about the future. I believe that the federal coalition government has taken us a long way towards trying to find solutions to the problem. It requires state and territory governments as well as the federal government to work together, and they are doing that. We need people to look over their shoulders and point out those areas in which they believe sufficient work is not being undertaken. That is important. The fact that an individual or a group suggests that not enough is being done in one area does not mean everything else should be dropped and all the resources should be directed to that area. It needs to be thought through so that there is a balance. We do not want a seesaw situation in which we do not have the balance and one end is tipping up and the other is tipping down all the time because of these shifts in our thinking, policy and resources. We should undertake the research required. I do not know how many chances we will have. A lot of people will say that we will get one chance only and that we should make the best of it, but to do that we need to do the research and then move forward relatively slowly - only relatively. If we go forward too fast, we could create a seesaw situation and tip the balance the wrong way. As I say, this is not my area and I am prepared to listen to argument, but more people should come forward with alternate simple English explanations so that I can explain to others exactly what needs to be done. To continually say that we must meet the Kyoto Protocol is not enough. That tells me absolutely nothing because I do not know the protocols. I understand what they are trying to achieve, but I do not know what they are, and I would react to someone trying to force them upon me when I had all this other "evidence" to suggest that Australia is doing a far better job running parallel to the Kyoto Protocol. Some will agree and some will disagree, which is all the more reason for working together on this issue rather than trying to score political points. Far too much of that is happening, and all to the detriment of the community. As Hon Paul Llewellyn has said, we cannot continue to wait; we must do something now. I agree with him. When people try to score political points, invariably nothing is achieved. We should work together to try to overcome as many of these problems that have been created over the past 100 years as possible so that we can enjoy a far better life and, more importantly, provide something for our children and our grandchildren.

HON KIM CHANCE (Agricultural - Minister for Agriculture and Forestry) [3.15 pm]: I am not making the official government response on this occasion. I have been prompted to rise following the emergence during the debate of some issues to which I feel I need to make a contribution. I am mindful of the fact that this debate will end at 3.38 pm pursuant to the sessional orders.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon Graham Giffard): Yes, debate will be interrupted at that time.

Hon KIM CHANCE: I want to make sure that I leave time for Hon Louise Pratt to respond.

Hon Dr Sally Talbot; President; Hon George Cash; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon Kim Chance; The Deputy President;
Hon Louise Pratt; Deputy President; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Giz Watson

I support the motion. Specifically, I do not support the amendment. I will go through my reasons and structure my contribution accordingly. I do not support the amendment for three reasons, although only two are in any way substantive. I will go to the amendment first, particularly that part about linking the state with the commonwealth. I concede that the amendment contained an additional three paragraphs and I do not need to go into those issues; Hon Louise Pratt will deal with those. Linking the state with the commonwealth does not make a great deal of sense, based on the first three components of the substantive motion. Paragraph (a) states -

the allocation of increased levels of research funding to address likely changes to Western Australia's climatic systems;

Those words would be substantially affected by the amendment to link the state's responsibility with that area. My argument in that context is that the state is already fully engaged in this matter - fully engaged.

Hon George Cash: In that case there should be no reluctance to include the word "state".

Hon KIM CHANCE: No, because that implies that the state is not doing enough. I want to relate what my own department is doing in this area. It is not something that is all that well known, which is really my reason for taking this opportunity to speak.

I announced this by ministerial statement in this house. Two years ago, or a little less, I made a decision that the question of climate change was a serious threat to agriculture, allied to the enormous difficulty of getting any kind of forecasting reliability in the west coast climatic environment. East coast environments are relatively simple, because forecasters can basically work off the El Niño processes, which are quite reliable forecasting tools for the east coast. Trying to use El Niño and Southern Oscillation Index data to forecast west coast climate is a frustrating process. We know that the data is somehow relevant, but our agricultural product data - that is, from the south west corner of the state - links the highest production years to the worst El Niño years. I can see Hon Ken Baston nodding, because he knows that that is even more the case in the Gascoyne and Murchison regions with which he is familiar. However, even in the south west of the state the highest producing years tend to be those that are the worst El Niño years - the negative years. That data produces a positive response to a negative outcome, which makes it confusing and difficult for people to follow. We know that somehow there is a relevance; what we cannot find is how to analyse the data. One young man at the Department of Agriculture, Mr David Stephens, seems to be cracking the code, along with other people, including people from outside the department. Mr Mal Lamond actually started this process. We have such faith in the work that those people have done in understanding how we go about forecasting the climatic change effect on the west coast that we have funded that project to the extent of \$500 000 a year. Prior to that, David Stephens was carrying out this project in his own time. The funding of \$500 000 a year has been significant in that it has geared some very significant co-contributions from other parties, which is something that we did not expect. Therefore, the little program that used to run basically on David Stephens' goodwill is now funded to the extent of some \$1.3 million a year because of significant co-investment by other partners.

Hon Murray Criddle: Do you think progress has been made on that issue?

Hon KIM CHANCE: I think we are getting there.

Hon Murray Criddle: As a nervous farmer, you would understand my interest in it, and I wonder how you get the message across.

Hon KIM CHANCE: That is why I arranged for the honourable member to get, as published, hard copy versions of the output so that we can both have a better understanding of the issues. To directly answer the question, we are nowhere near where we need to be. All we feel is that, after groping around in the dark, we are starting to identify the issues that we need to understand.

I also recognise the significant contribution of the commonwealth government, through the Australian Greenhouse Office, which is a very significant contributor to that co-funding. This is a step in the right direction. I tell that story not to boast about what my department is doing in this area but so that people are informed that things are happening within departments - things that some members may not have heard of or that may not be in the forefront of their focus. I am sure other departments are doing similar work. For example, I am sure the Department of Conservation and Land Management is doing similar work in this area. It is a good thing that we have had this debate and provided opportunities for issues such as that to surface.

Paragraph (b) of the motion refers to the ratification of the Kyoto Protocol. The motion makes more sense than the amendment. Ratification is purely a matter for the commonwealth. Every state in Australia has indicated that it supports ratification of the Kyoto Protocol. As I said at the beginning of my speech, I am not the official government spokesperson. Although I support paragraph (b) of the motion, and I obviously support the government's position on ratification, I agree to some extent with some of the comments that have been made by

Hon Dr Sally Talbot; President; Hon George Cash; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon Kim Chance; The Deputy President;
Hon Louise Pratt; Deputy President; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Giz Watson

members opposite about the relevance of the Kyoto Protocol. The Kyoto Protocol deals only with a proportion of the world's industrial nations. Significantly, it does not deal with some of the worst polluters. It does not deal with China or India. Members who have visited either of those countries in the past decade will have some idea of the extent of atmospheric pollution that is being generated by those countries, particularly India. I also note with some irony that the Kyoto Protocol does not affect any of the Arabian gulf states. I am not sure on what basis, and surely not on the basis that they are developing nations. Will we say that the United Arab Emirates is still a developing nation? I do not think so.

Hon George Cash: That is the problem with painting the Kyoto Protocol with such a wide brush. That is why Mr Howard decided that we should take another path. We should achieve the Kyoto Protocol without formally signing it, but we should do better. We are asking for recognition by the government of the great achievements we have made.

Hon KIM CHANCE: I did indicate that my comments were in recognition of some of the issues that have been raised by members opposite. We need a global solution. I support the ratification of the Kyoto Protocol because I think that the developed industrial nations need to lead on this issue. That is what the Kyoto Protocol is all about; it is not that we could solve the problem in isolation from China and India, the major developing industrial nations, but that we could show the way.

Hon George Cash: New Zealand and Germany, which are both developed nations, now want out of it. That is the latest position.

Hon KIM CHANCE: That is an interesting point; I had not heard that before. I was also interested to watch Mr Putin's movements just prior to Russia's decision to ratify. It seemed to me that there was more of an economic trade-off between the deal he could do with the United States and the deal he could do with the European Union. He decided that the European Union was more significant to the future of the Russian Federation than the United States, which in itself was interesting politics.

Leaving that aside, we have a role in showing the way. The Kyoto Protocol is not the only way in which that will be done and it will not, in itself, be a final solution. However, it is the first time the world has taken responsibility for its actions in this way. An agreement of that nature, without the involvement of the United States and a country such as Australia, will be less effective than it would have been had the United States and Australia been a part of it. Having said that, the Kyoto Protocol is somewhat symbolic and iconic, rather than a solution in itself. I believe that ratification or non-ratification of the Kyoto Protocol and the success or failure of the Kyoto Protocol are of little significance, because an impetus is building around this issue. Although this impetus is environmental at the moment, it will shortly cease to be environmental. The kinetic energy that is driving this issue is commercial and it very clearly will be commercial. There are commercial constraints within the Kyoto Protocol, which, because of non-ratification, we are currently locked out of. I am talking about the area of international carbon trading. There are such other commercial drivers behind the issues we are dealing with that the non-ratification of the Kyoto Protocol can probably be seen only as a temporary aberration. The effective difference between ratification and non-ratification to a carbon trader operating out of Australia is anyone's guess. How long will it be before one rolls over the top of the other? My feeling is that it might be as short as one or two years. Carbon is currently trading in Europe for €30 a tonne. I will give members an idea of what that means for a plantation owner in Australia. At \$A30 a tonne - members can do their own conversion - the timber production of a plantation ceases to have any real commercial significance; in other words, all the decisions from that point on are predicated on the carbon trading asset.

Hon Paul Llewellyn: That means that the carbon values are worth more than the chips.

Hon KIM CHANCE: Yes. The timber outcomes cease to have any real significance. At €30 a tonne, there would be immense changes in our landscape now if we were allowed to take part in that trade, which we currently are not; we are locked out of that trade because we are not ratified. I do not know how long it will take for that commercial kinetic energy to roll over the top of the Kyoto Protocol, but I do not expect it to be a very long period. I think the Kyoto Protocol has already served its purpose. It is worthwhile to move a motion of this kind, which encourages the Australian government to say, "We are already compliant. What is wrong with staying out of it? Shouldn't we be setting an example to those countries that we deal with that can actually make a difference?" The matter referred to in paragraph (c) is already being led by the states; the commonwealth is playing little part in that.

HON LOUISE PRATT (East Metropolitan) [3.26 pm]: The amendment moved by Hon Paul Llewellyn asks for the establishment of a robust, mandated renewable energy target to a level of 20 per cent by 2020. It also asks for a mandated renewable energy target of six per cent to be achieved by 2010. The latter part of the amendment is already part of the government's election policy and will be addressed by the task force that has recently been appointed by the government to tackle energy sector greenhouse emissions. Logically, a mandated

Hon Dr Sally Talbot; President; Hon George Cash; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon Kim Chance; The Deputy President;
Hon Louise Pratt; Deputy President; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Giz Watson

renewable energy target of a hypothetical 20 per cent by 2020 could be considered; it certainly will not be ruled out. The task force will look at the implications of those sorts of proposals. The government is not in a position to pin itself down to supporting an amendment such as this. The task force will also investigate specifically the feasibility and implications of an economy having 50 per cent of 2000 emissions by 2050, what that would look like, and how it would be achieved. However, we cannot just willy-nilly set ourselves a target before we know what that journey will be and where it will take us, and how we will transform our economy and our social and economic practices to meet such a spectacular target, which is the kind of target that is required globally for us to make a real difference to climate change. Just briefly, those comments are quite specific to the amendment and why the thrust of it is supportable, but the government will not be supporting it.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon Graham Giffard): There being no further speakers on the amendment, we are required to put the amendments.

Hon PAUL LLEWELLYN: Are we putting the amendments one line at a time?

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: We will be putting them one line at a time. The house will need to determine essentially three questions.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: On a point of clarification of the questions that are to be put, may I suggest there are possibly four questions? I am looking at the business plan that contains the text of the proposed amendments. I note that you, Mr Deputy President, will put separately new paragraphs (d), (e) and (f). I think those are the three questions.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I had not explained what I was proposing to do. I propose to put new paragraphs (d), (e) and (f) as the third question on the amendments. Perhaps I will explain what I am proposing. I am proposing that the first question the house will consider is the question -

Line 1 - To insert before "federal" the words "state and".

If that is passed, we will move to the second question, which currently reads -

Line 1 - To insert after "government" the words "(with the exception of paragraph (b))".

The third question then before the house will be to insert after paragraph (c) new paragraphs (d), (e) and (f). That is how I propose to deal with the amendments. Do members now understand the question now before the house?

Hon GIZ WATSON: Just for further clarification, does that mean that new paragraph (d) will be put separately, for example, and then new paragraphs (e) and (f) will be put?

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I would be swayed by the mover of the motion, but it was my intention to move new paragraphs (d), (e) and (f) en bloc as the third question.

Hon PAUL LLEWELLYN: It would be preferable to deal with them all separately because, although members might think that, if we set a mandated target in new paragraph (e) of 20 per cent by 2020, it is not mutually exclusive to new paragraph (f), which has a target of six per cent by 2010, because six per cent by 2010 is along the way to the 20 per cent target.

Hon GEORGE CASH: Mr Deputy President, we agree with the idea of your putting the first question and the second question. We also agree to you dividing the amendment containing new paragraphs (d), (e) and (f) into three separate questions and our voting accordingly.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: That is the wish of the mover of the amendment. I will accept the wishes of the mover and deal with it in that way. There are now a number of questions. The first question is -

Line 1 - To insert before "federal" the words "state and".

Amendment put and passed.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Before I put the second question, I want to clarify with the mover of the amendment that the effect of passing this amendment would be for the motion to then read -

That this house calls on the state and federal government (with the exception of paragraph (b)) to provide the communities . . .

When the member moved the amendment, he made it very clear that the exception to paragraph (b) was an exception of the state government to paragraph (b) of the motion. It would seem to me that logically the insertion of the words "(with the exception of paragraph (b))" should be immediately after the word "state" and not "federal". Is that the point at which it should be inserted?

Hon PAUL LLEWELLYN: That is exactly right.

Extract from *Hansard*
[COUNCIL - Wednesday, 31 August 2005]
p4810b-4823a

Hon Dr Sally Talbot; President; Hon George Cash; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon Kim Chance; The Deputy President;
Hon Louise Pratt; Deputy President; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Giz Watson

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Hon Paul Llewellyn has moved -

Line 1 - To insert after the word “state” the words “(with the exception of paragraph (b))”.

Amendment put and passed.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: We now move to the third question, which is after paragraph (c), to insert paragraph (d) set out on the notice paper.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result -

Ayes (2)

Hon Paul Llewellyn

Hon Giz Watson (*Teller*)

Noes (25)

Hon Shelley Archer
Hon Ken Baston
Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm
Hon George Cash
(*Teller*)

Hon Murray Criddle
Hon Bruce Donaldson
Hon Sue Ellery
Hon Graham Giffard

Hon Norman Moore
Hon Helen Morton
Hon Simon O'Brien
Hon Louise Pratt

Hon Sally Talbot
Hon Donna Taylor
Hon Ken Travers
Hon Ed Dermer

Hon Vincent Catania
Hon Kim Chance
Hon Peter Collier

Hon Ray Halligan
Hon Barry House
Hon Sheila Mills

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich
Hon Margaret Rowe
Hon Barbara Scott

Amendment thus negated.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon Graham Giffard): We are now dealing with the part of Hon Paul Llewellyn's amendment that seeks to insert paragraph (e), which reads -

the establishment of a robust mandated renewable energy target to a level of 20 per cent by 2020; and

Question put and a division taken with the following result -

Ayes (2)

Hon Paul Llewellyn

Hon Giz Watson (*Teller*)

Noes (25)

Hon Shelley Archer
Hon Ken Baston
Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm
Hon George Cash
(*Teller*)

Hon Murray Criddle
Hon Bruce Donaldson
Hon Sue Ellery
Hon Graham Giffard

Hon Norman Moore
Hon Helen Morton
Hon Simon O'Brien
Hon Louise Pratt

Hon Sally Talbot
Hon Donna Taylor
Hon Ken Travers
Hon Ed Dermer

Hon Vincent Catania
Hon Kim Chance
Hon Peter Collier

Hon Ray Halligan
Hon Barry House
Hon Sheila Mills

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich
Hon Margaret Rowe
Hon Barbara Scott

Amendment thus negated.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: We are now dealing with the part of Hon Paul Llewellyn's amendment that seeks to insert paragraph (f), which reads -

the establishment of a mandated renewable energy target of six per cent to be achieved by 2010.

Question put and a division taken with the following result -

Extract from *Hansard*
[COUNCIL - Wednesday, 31 August 2005]
p4810b-4823a

Hon Dr Sally Talbot; President; Hon George Cash; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon Kim Chance; The Deputy President;
Hon Louise Pratt; Deputy President; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Giz Watson

Ayes (13)

Hon Shelley Archer
Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm
Hon Vincent Catania
Hon Kim Chance

Hon Sue Ellery
Hon Graham Giffard
Hon Paul Llewellyn
Hon Sheila Mills

Hon Louise Pratt
Hon Sally Talbot
Hon Ken Travers
Hon Giz Watson

Hon Ed Dermer (*Teller*)

Noes (12)

Hon Ken Baston
Hon George Cash
Hon Peter Collier
(*Teller*)

Hon Murray Criddle
Hon Ray Halligan
Hon Barry House

Hon Norman Moore
Hon Simon O'Brien
Hon Margaret Rowe

Hon Barbara Scott
Hon Donna Taylor
Hon Bruce Donaldson

Pairs

Hon Adele Farina
Hon Jon Ford
Hon Kate Doust
Hon Ljiljana Ravlich

Hon Robyn McSweeney
Hon Nigel Hallett
Hon Anthony Fels
Hon Helen Morton

Amendment thus passed.

Motion, as Amended

Point of Order

Hon GEORGE CASH: I ask that you, Mr Deputy President, divide the motion into three votes. If paragraphs (a) and (c) of the motion were put together, I do not believe that a division would be needed. However, a division may be required on paragraph (b), which is the ratification clause. I am asking that paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of Hon Louise Pratt's motion be divided to enable the question on (a) and (c) to be put together.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Does Hon Louise Pratt agree to proceed in that way?

Hon LOUISE PRATT: I am somewhat confused because the motion now includes part of the amendment. I am unclear whether Hon George Cash wants to separate the amendment from the way the motion has been moved.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! We have run out of time on this debate; therefore, I am required to put the vote forthwith. If Hon Louise Pratt agrees to proceed in that way, I can accommodate that, but she has indicated that she does not favour that. My inclination is to put the vote on the motion, as amended.

Hon GEORGE CASH: I think I have made my point and it is recorded in *Hansard*. If you put the motion, as amended, Mr Deputy President, we on this side will vote against it but we will not divide; we have made our point.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: My expectation is that, ordinarily, the opposition would simply move to delete paragraph (b) but we have run out of time.

Hon LOUISE PRATT: Time permitting, I am happy for that request to be accommodated. I was unclear about the incorporation of the amendments.

Debate Resumed

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I understand the first vote is on the preamble and paragraphs (a) and (c). I will have to include new paragraph (d) in that. Do members understand what is to be voted on?

Hon Kim Chance: It is paragraphs (a), (c) and what was (f).

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Yes. The question is that the motion as amended, other than paragraph (b), be agreed to.

Question put and passed.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The question now is that paragraph (b) be agreed to.

Question put and a division taken with the following result -

Extract from *Hansard*
[COUNCIL - Wednesday, 31 August 2005]
p4810b-4823a

Hon Dr Sally Talbot; President; Hon George Cash; Hon Ray Halligan; Hon Kim Chance; The Deputy President;
Hon Louise Pratt; Deputy President; Hon Paul Llewellyn; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Giz Watson

Ayes (13)

Hon Shelley Archer
Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm
Hon Vincent Catania
Hon Kim Chance

Hon Sue Ellery
Hon Graham Giffard
Hon Paul Llewellyn
Hon Sheila Mills

Hon Louise Pratt
Hon Sally Talbot
Hon Ken Travers
Hon Giz Watson

Hon Ed Dermer (*Teller*)

Noes (12)

Hon Ken Baston
Hon George Cash
Hon Peter Collier
(*Teller*)

Hon Murray Criddle
Hon Ray Halligan
Hon Barry House

Hon Norman Moore
Hon Simon O'Brien
Hon Margaret Rowe

Hon Barbara Scott
Hon Donna Taylor
Hon Bruce Donaldson

Pairs

Hon Adele Farina
Hon Jon Ford
Hon Kate Doust
Hon Ljiljana Ravlich

Hon Robyn McSweeney
Hon Nigel Hallett
Hon Anthony Fels
Hon Helen Morton

Question (motion, as amended) thus passed.