

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT (OUT-OF-CONTROL GATHERINGS) BILL 2012

Second Reading

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

HON MICHAEL MISCHIN (North Metropolitan — Attorney General) [5.08 pm] — in reply: As I have indicated, despite the considerable criticism that has been made of this bill during the course of the debate, no changes or improvements to the bill have been mentioned that the government could consider, and nor has anything been pointed out that is not satisfactory about the scheme that is proposed. I also note the criticism that was made—it is a little difficult to follow—by some speakers about how the government had rushed into this legislation without adequate consultation, and that it was a response made in haste; yet I am aware that previously the opposition had been urging the government to take action in respect of this particular social ill.

As I indicated, I will not be going through all the rhetoric that has been advanced on this bill. Some of what has been said about this bill is of marginal relevance. In fact, some of what has been said would have been of more relevance had the title of this bill been the criminal law amendment (persecuting children for having parties) bill. But it is not that. This bill is aimed at out-of-control gatherings, however those gatherings may arise. The bill is focused on two aspects of that. The first is the breaking up of mobs. One of the fundamentals to controlling crowds that are out of control, and riotous behaviour, is to contain and then to break up that particular gathering. The second is to provide some additional powers to the police to be able to enter onto private property to try to stifle these sorts of gatherings when the origins of those gatherings are on private property and when rights of entry are not available to the police under ordinary legal principles, because, as a general principle, police can also be restrained by trespass laws, so the bill tries to address that aspect of this social ill.

Dealing with some of the specific matters that have been raised, several speakers, including Hon Kate Doust, Hon Giz Watson, Hon Linda Savage and others, made mention of social media. The bill does not address that aspect. How one deals with social media that are used for inappropriate purposes is a complex area in itself. It is something that we all need to learn to manage. Its inappropriate use can have serious consequences. It is not something that legislation will necessarily be able to address, let alone legislation that is focused on out-of-control gatherings. Given the nature of social media, in particular the ease of sending messages en masse, it makes it difficult for police or any other body to monitor and manage every notification of a gathering. Police do respond to intelligence received about particular gatherings on social media. The proposed section 75B offence includes a person who organises a gathering that becomes an out-of-control gathering. “Organise” is a broad term; it includes those who advertise or promote the gathering on social media, as well as in any other form of media.

Hon Kate Doust and other speakers raised the question of whether there has been any sort of analysis of the types of individuals who have participated and created problems in these sorts of matters over time. Judging by the number of out-of-control gatherings being reported in the media, it would appear that the preponderance of such gatherings is a social phenomenon that young adults and juveniles in particular are involved in, not only in Western Australia, but also in other Australian jurisdictions and around the world.

I note that Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm mentioned the situation in rural areas. It does not appear that those sorts of gatherings are a particular problem in rural areas. Isolated instances may be dealt with quite adequately by the police with their current resources in those areas. Plainly, the question of resourcing is one that is relevant to the policing of these sorts of problems. However, until now the problem seems not to have been a problem of resources but, rather, powers to be able to break up such gatherings in an effective and efficient manner. We have had a number of reports, of course, over the past several months of these sorts of gatherings at which police have managed to turn out in force and have been the subject of assaults and misbehaviour and the target for rock and bottle throwing and the like. So, it is not a question of a lack of resources; the resources are there to deal with it. The question is how one has the most effective use of police powers and the powers necessary to nip the problem in the bud, and I have mentioned the two major focuses of the legislation.

An issue raised by several speakers was: should the legislation address the issue of secondary supply of alcohol to juveniles? Pursuant to section 178 of the Liquor Control Act 1988, a review of the Liquor Control Act is due, and the issue of secondary provision of alcohol to juveniles will be considered as part of the review of that act. The explanatory memorandum for this bill notes that one form of conduct that could be prescribed for the purposes of proposed section 75A(1)(b)(xiv) is some kind of restriction in that regard, but it depends on what occurs with the Liquor Control Act review. Plainly, the bill is focused on providing specific powers to address the problem of out-of-control antisocial gatherings that are causing, as Hon Ken Travers has identified, fear and alarm in the community, and a breach of the peace that needs to be brought under control quickly and effectively. Although other influences such as the use of drugs, the use of alcohol and the like may contribute to

these sorts of events, the focus of the bill is quite specific, and other bills, and amendments to other bills, may very well be necessary to address by-products of, or contributing factors to, this sort of antisocial behaviour.

A question was raised as to whether there are examples of other gatherings that may be prescribed by regulations. There is none at this stage. The provision, however, will allow the legislation to remain contemporary to cater for emerging issues when a rapid legislative response is required. It is important to note that this capacity to prescribe is a capacity to prevent the legislation applying to certain forms of gathering rather than applying to certain forms of gathering. At the moment there are restrictions on its application to legitimate gatherings for industrial or political action, and the purpose of the regulations is to allow further types of gatherings to be prescribed in order to limit the scope of its application rather than expand its scope.

Hon Alison Xamon and others asked about what may be considered reasonable steps to be taken by organisers of events that might eventually become out-of-control gatherings. Under the legislation, there is a defence to those who have taken reasonable steps to prevent that from happening. It is up to the court to decide what amounts to reasonable steps, depending on the circumstances of each case. The question of whether all households can afford security guards has been raised. That is only one factor that may be taken into account in the circumstances. It is not a requirement that security personnel be engaged for every party. That would be a nonsense, and that is not the case. Courts would be expected to apply a commonsense test and consider what steps, if any, would be considered reasonable in the circumstances to prevent the gathering becoming an out-of-control gathering. That may be, for example, from the level of the organiser who finds that their party is being gatecrashed, giving early notification to the police that trespassers are in their house who will not leave peaceably, thereby alerting the police at a very early stage. It may involve taking other steps such as not sending out invitations at large via Facebook or other forms of social media.

Importantly, the explanatory memorandum makes it clear that it is not necessarily the case that any steps will be necessary; it depends on the circumstances and what commonsense guides those who are trying to prevent a gathering from getting out of control to do, as opposed to some of the events that we have witnessed over the past several months for which it seems to be the objective to make the gathering an enormous one that cannot be satisfactorily controlled. The Piara Waters gathering is a classic example of one that the organisers set out to make a gathering that would be uncontrollable, and quite relished the fact that they were able to. If that is the case, they will have to take the consequences as organisers of those gatherings. The legislation does, however, list some examples of things that may commonly amount to reasonable steps, including, importantly, requesting attendance of police, as I have mentioned, but it is not meant to be exhaustive or conclusive; it is indicative or educative.

As to the particular scenario that was put forward by Hon Alison Xamon, the steps that may be reasonable for her to take for her daughter's birthday party would depend on her knowledge of her daughter, the sort of social connections her daughter has, the way the event is advertised and things of that nature.

Hon Adele Farina: It's not a lot of guidance to provide parents, is it?

Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN: An element of commonsense is required and, as I understood, Hon Alison Xamon referred to certain United Nations conventions that provide the right for parents to advise and instruct their children. A Liberal-National government would tend to agree that people ought to be able to use their commonsense rather than have to go to a statute to work out what commonsense means, but perhaps others take a different view of that.

Hon Giz Watson made the comment that the only thing new in the bill is that it allows police to recoup some costs; that is not the case at all. A reading of the bill will reveal how it extends the powers that are available in order to plug gaps in the current law. As to the recouping of expenses, it is up to the court to decide whether to make an order for an offender to pay to police reasonable costs that police have had to incur to maintain the peace. The actual costs will depend on the nature of the incident. I was asked whether I could give some generic examples of the costs, and perhaps I will use the Piara Waters incident on 5 February this year. I grant that it is an extreme example but it will give some indication of the costs involved. Something like over 1 000 guests were invited by the organisers but about 600 attended. It was a gathering held at a semi-rural property with a large shed—not the property of the organisers. Substantial damage was done to the property. The estimated cost for 94 officers plus four horses and two dogs came to \$9 571. I do not think that the presence of 94 officers demonstrates any shortage of resources on the part of WA Police to deal with these incidents if they have to. The estimated cost for the helicopter that provided some surveillance and assistance to the police is \$6 475 for three and a half hours' flight and work. The incident required the attendance of an inspector—three hours at \$59 an hour leading to \$177; a senior sergeant for six hours at \$48 an hour coming to \$288; and a senior constable, 59.5 hours at \$38 an hour coming to \$2 261. These are the rankings and of course there may have been several officers within each of those categories. The incident also required 72 hours of first-class constable time at \$35 an hour, coming to \$2 520; 86.5 hours of constable time at \$31 an hour coming to \$2 681.50; and 41.5 hours of

probationary constable time at \$30 an hour, coming to \$1 245. The approximate total, as I have indicated, is \$9 571. The average cost per mounted police or dog squad officer was \$179 an hour. The total cost involved for the police in that exercise was about \$16 000, and it does not seem unreasonable that the state ought to look to those who created the mischief to pay for it—or at least to try to look to them to pay for it.

Hon Adele Farina: Can I just clarify the 72 hours? That was not 72 hours to disperse the crowd.

Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN: No, it is a total of 72 hours of first-class constable time. There may have been several first-class constables at the scene for the duration of three hours, or however much it was.

A question was raised about the capacity of young persons to pay fines or costs. I think Hon Giz Watson, along with several others, raised that question. There is a similar capacity in the law for courts to order costs, such as in the Criminal Code for the offence of creating a false belief. The idea therefore of recovering costs for matters involving police time, effort and resources is not unknown to the law; otherwise, the principles of juvenile justice as set out in section 7 of the Young Offenders Act 1994 will apply when the court is deciding how to deal with a young offender. The principles set out there include that there should be special provision to ensure the fair treatment of young persons who have, or are alleged to have, committed offences; and that punishment of a young person for an offence should be designed so as to give the offender an opportunity to develop a sense of social responsibility and otherwise to develop in beneficial and socially acceptable ways. Therefore, there are already existing principles that are well known to the law for dealing with juveniles and those are not being abrogated or qualified by this legislation.

Also section 58 of the Young Offenders Act 1994 states —

If a young person is found guilty of an offence and a fine is imposed or the payment of compensation, restitution, or costs is ordered, the court, having regard to the financial circumstances of the young person and any person who is a responsible adult, may order that payment of the fine or other amount be made by the young person, by any person who is a responsible adult, or by any of them in such proportions as the court may determine.

Once again, it is covered by a statute that has been around for almost the last 20 years.

In respect of fines imposed, section 72 of the Young Offenders Act states —

- (1) A fine is not to be imposed under this Division or any other written law on a young person unless the court is satisfied, after making reasonable enquiry, that the person who is ordered to pay the fine, or any of it, has the means to pay either on demand or by instalments related to such means.
- (2) The court is to have regard to any order for the payment of compensation or restitution when considering the means of a person to pay a fine.

In terms of fines generally, section 53 of the Sentencing Act 1995 also requires the court to take into account a person's means when imposing fines on people. Once again, therefore, there is nothing particularly more onerous about this legislation than any other legislation.

Will the legislation result in young people who innocently get caught up in parties being picked up by police simply for being there? I think Hon Kate Doust raised that question, as did Hon Sally Talbot. They will face arrest only if they do not comply with the relevant order from a police officer. However, under the Children and Community Services Act 2004, police officers may take a child to a safe place to be held until a responsible adult can collect them. This occurs when a police officer believes there is a risk to the wellbeing of the child because of the nature of the place where the child is found, or the behaviour or the vulnerability of the child at that place, or for any other circumstances. If children are found in the vicinity of a serious out-of-control party, they may well be deemed at risk and detained. I am informed that the police would attempt to process the children at risk at the earliest opportunity. That may be at the station when they are taken back there, because the priority for the police would be to bring this mob under control and to deal with the consequences afterwards. I think the Commissioner of Police was alluding to part of that aspect in his open letter to the newspaper.

A question was raised about whether the new powers for police to enter private property and deal with out-of-control parties are necessary and desirable, and reference was made to a member of the Criminal Lawyers' Association, Mr Phil Urquhart, who said that they are unnecessary given the existing powers. There are deficiencies in the existing powers that need to be addressed, and that is why the legislation is being passed. Police do have a range of powers at the moment that permit police to enter private premises or otherwise control out-of-control gatherings, but none of these powers is a perfect fit for dealing with out-of-control gatherings because they were not designed for that purpose. Some of the current powers do have the ability to disperse and the like but they are fairly limited and there is no ability to hold organisers of these sorts of events accountable. I understand the police have, therefore, requested these sorts of powers. It is not a question of the government simply legislating for its own sake to make it look as though it is doing something; there is a purpose behind it.

The powers that the police need to exercise in out-of-control gatherings are required not only in public places, but also on private property.

It is a fundamental principle that every invasion of private property, even by police officers, is trespass unless the law gives specific authority for that course of action. Existing legislation does not provide the necessary offences, police powers and ancillary orders that are required for police to respond to out-of-control gatherings. By way of example, in offences under sections 63 and 64 of the Criminal Code, which relate to unlawful assembly and an order to disperse, the conduct of persons that we are experiencing at out-of-control gatherings may in fact not amount to an unlawful assembly. In those offences there is difficulty proving a common purpose, as opposed to a group of individuals with their own purpose who happen to be unruly and out of control in a particular place together.

[Interruption.]

Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN: I am flattered by the fanfare!

Hon Peter Collier: Sorry. I apologise.

Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN: I thank the Minister for Education for the applause! You can take some people anywhere!

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon Alyssa Hayden): Please continue.

Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN: There is no power under the current provisions to make ancillary orders in order to ensure there is compliance with a dispersal order. There is no express power to enter private premises to order dispersal, and it may be that the private property is the source of the problem where the gathering has originated and where it is flowing out into the streets. Dispersal under sections 63 and 64 of the Criminal Code must be undertaken within a reasonable period. They do not effectively deal with a situation in which people are flowing back and forth between public and private land, as I have indicated.

Sections 65 and 66 of the Criminal Code deal with riots and orders to disperse a riot. There is difficulty in proving the defence elements. For example, we need to prove that each accused person has taken place in a riot. Again, there is some element of common purpose involved. The conduct of persons at out-of-control gatherings may fall short of a riot. Back in the early 1990s there were cases in which the Court of Appeal dealt with questions of the applicability of the riot provisions and made certain rulings on the interpretation of those laws, which has prevented them from being effective ever since. There is no express power to enter private premises in order to require dispersal. There is no power to make any ancillary order and rioters have one hour to disperse. It is not immediate; that seems to defeat the objective if at two o'clock in the morning there are several hundred people milling around in a suburban street alarming neighbours and keeping them in fear for their property and safety.

Section 27 of the Criminal Investigation Act refers to move-on notices. Those are to be issued only to those in a public place or in a vehicle used for public transport. They are written and tailor-made for each individual. It is impractical, I would have thought, for a police officer to fill out a move-on notice to all or any significant number of a crowd that is throwing bottles and rocks at him and causing mayhem. So that does not seem to be a good fit.

Sections 79 to 83 of the Environmental Protection Act deal with noise abatement directions. That enables police to issue directions to occupiers and take measures to abate any unreasonable noise from that premises, but not all out-of-control gatherings will be characterised alone by unreasonable noise. It does not contain a dispersal power for mobs and crowds.

These examples illustrate that there are precedents for offences and powers akin to what is being proposed in the bill but that are not quite extensive enough to cover the field and accommodate the sort of problems that have been experienced recently by the police and by the residents who suffer from these things, to deal with out-of-control gatherings.

Questions were asked about how instructions will be given by a senior officer and be heard. There is always more than one officer in attendance to deal with these sorts of things. Loud hailers are used for oral orders and police officers repeat the orders as necessary and sometimes paraphrase as they disperse the crowd. It is not unknown for these sorts of things to be done in other circumstances and there is no reason to suppose it will not be effective under the legislation as proposed.

Was the Commissioner for Children and Young People consulted on the legislation? The commissioner has not provided a submission on the legislation and was not requested to do so. The legislation is not specifically targeted at juveniles. It does not in any way alter the Young Offenders Act and —

Hon Adele Farina interjected.

Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN: If the member listens, she might learn something. It does not specifically target juveniles and it does not in any way alter the Young Offenders Act or any existing legislation dealing with child offenders or children at risk. It accentuates and highlights the police's ability to deal with those situations.

The bill is not primarily about educating young people about the harm of out-of-control parties. I noticed that at least one speaker seemed to think that children and young people need specific education on the fact that they should not be vandalising cars or throwing bottles at people. If that is the level of education that we need to provide in legislation to prevent social evils and antisocial behaviour, it is a pretty sad sort of society. I would have thought just about everyone at a primary school level knows it is not a good thing to throw bottles at people. If so-called children and young people need to be educated, I think it is remarkable. That is not something that can be accommodated in the legislation anyway. It is for the school system and the like. I do not think that it is a particularly satisfactory response to a mob that instead of sending out the police to maintain order and disperse the mob, we send out a flying squad of teachers to pull in people and teach them that what they are doing is naughty: "Please don't do it. Perhaps we can workshop a solution together." As I mentioned, the bill is not about education. The bill is about allowing the police to have the powers necessary to break up a mob whether it is young people, young adults or old adults; it does not much matter.

I turn to the deterrent process. If the police have the powers to deal with these things effectively, that will flow through and it will become less attractive for people to think that they can organise these events and cause the problems that they cause.

Police who are required to deal with these sorts of events were consulted in the development of the legislation. It is important that the legislation is in a position to be used before the festive season, bearing in mind that when Parliament rises at the end of this year, it will not resume until after the election in March.

Reference was made to correspondence from the Youth Affairs Council of Western Australia. The Minister for Police provided a written response to the council's concerns and addressed each point that was made. I do not propose to go into the detail of that, but the Youth Affairs Council knows the minister's position on that.

The Youth Legal Service made a submission on the backlog of court cases, overcrowding in prisons and that there are already adequate legal provisions. If there were adequate provisions to deal with this sort of problem, there would not be a need for the legislation. Plainly, the police consider that they are unable to effectively do their job in dispersing these mobs and holding people to account for the mayhem that is caused without some enhancement of their powers in this regard.

If children or young people face arrest under this legislation in respect of the powers to disperse, it is because they will have refused to abide by an order of a police officer. When a police officer is faced with a potentially violent and chaotic situation, it is an entirely appropriate use of the juvenile justice system. The juvenile justice system is still in place. Police officers can still issue a caution. They can still refer a juvenile to a juvenile justice team or in extreme cases charge if necessary. There is no difference in how they will be dealt with under this legislation as opposed to if they are seen committing other offences at the scene of the disturbance. A police officer will still be required to consider whether it is appropriate to issue a caution or do a reference in accordance with the Young Offenders Act 1994. The legislation reflects the government's position that if a person, even a youth, participates in an out-of-control gathering and fails to disperse when ordered to do so, they should face the prospect of immediate arrest. Some so-called stakeholders and those who advocate for particular groups in society may disagree with that approach. So be it, but the government has a responsibility to do what is necessary to maintain the peace.

There is talk about the bill infringing articles of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child and so forth. This is brought up all the time. The government does not accept that those articles are infringed. One of the more risible suggestions was that if a responsible adult were arrested and imprisoned, we would deny the child the right to be looked after by its parents. I will bear that in mind next time I am dealing with parole for a convicted murderer who has killed the mother of his children; the fact that there is an overriding right somehow to have the parent on hand!

I refer to legal costs for innocent bystanders. If so-called innocent bystanders are, in fact, innocent bystanders and they comply with police directions, they will not be affected by the legislation.

Regarding an education program, Western Australia Police and the minister's office will coordinate a media campaign to draw attention to the legislation and associated measures once it is passed. Police have a section on their website that will be updated to provide information about the legislation, and we expect that there will be significant publicity about the fact that this legislation has passed and that the police now have the capacity to deal with these sorts of issues.

The question was raised about proposed section 38B(1)(e) under clause 7 of the bill in respect of assisting any other person to comply with an order, and whether it creates a positive duty. I think Hon Linda Savage asked several questions about that. It is correct that it creates a positive duty and that such a requirement is not unknown to the law at the moment. Section 176 of the Criminal Code creates an offence for a person to omit to assist a police officer in arresting any person or in preserving the peace, provided the person has been given reasonable notice that he or she is required to assist. Section 75(1)(o) of the Emergency Management Act 2005 provides that an authorised officer may during a state of emergency require a person to give reasonable help to exercise his or her powers under that act. Section 106 of the Rail Safety Act 2010 permits all rail safety officers to direct rail transport operators or workers to give them reasonable assistance. Section 15 of the Criminal Investigation Act 2006 would have effect in respect of such matters and provides that a police officer can authorise persons to assist in exercising powers. It also provides that, in situations in which section 15 of that act applies, any enactment that protects the person or the state from liability for the person's acts or omissions is to be taken to operate as if those acts or omissions included the person's acts or omissions. Therefore, those sorts of things are not unknown to law. In the event that a breach is charged the court will deal with, on its merits, the question of the capacity or otherwise of the person to be able to comply with orders.

Questions were raised about the number of people—12—at the gathering. An out-of-control gathering, in fact, contains four elements: the number of people required as a threshold; the conduct involved; the harm or the impact from the people's conduct; and various exclusionary provisions. Proposed new section 75A(1)(a) specifies the number element of 12 people as part of gathering. A gathering is an assembly or meeting of a crowd and it can occur in a private or public place or in a vehicle. The legislation is not directed at all gatherings; only those that come to be out of control. Twelve is usually the minimum number of people required in other Australian jurisdictions before an order to disperse can be given. It tallies with section 66 of the Criminal Code, which provides that 12 rioters is the minimum number required before police can order them to disperse. Twelve is an easy number for police to do a headcount in those circumstances. It is an arbitrary number in the sense that it could be three, 20 or 100, but given the difficulties when one is faced with something of urgency and necessity, 12 is a pretty reasonable number to be able to get a headcount. Operationally, where police attend incidents involving fewer than 12 people, they can be handled by the use of existing police powers, such as dispersal through a move-on notice, undertaking an arrest or summoning people, or dealing with disorderly conduct or otherwise. However, in situations in which the number of people and the conduct of those people is such that a more significant police response and enhanced powers to restore peace and order are required, 12 seems like a reasonable number. We can tweak it and make it 20, but it does not make much difference. That is only one of the several thresholds that are required to be satisfied before the processes under the legislation can be exercised.

That essentially deals with, I think, most of the matters of substance raised in the course of speakers' comments. The question of resources is a matter for the Commissioner of Police. As I have indicated, from previous examples I do not understand there to have been a problem with resources. In fact, the callouts to these events in the past seem to have indicated a very efficient and exemplary police response. It is a question of how to bring the mob under control once the police are there. In any event, the availability of resources in the city does not seem to be a problem. I do not think it is practical that one can station an army of police in every country town; most do not have this sort of difficulty. There were a lot of questions about hypothetical evidential issues, which are just that; evidential issues, by necessity, vary from case to case and one can argue all sorts of hypotheticals and get nowhere at the end. It would all depend on the circumstances. Laws are prepared not to cover every specific circumstance, but to set down basic standards of conduct, principles and statements of the powers that can be used to address those issues. It is pointless to go into what may amount to satisfactory evidence in cases that are hypothetical. Of course, the legislation would be kept under review to see its effectiveness. There is no guarantee that people will not attempt to breach the law.

The government is confident that the proposals it has put forward are a way of assisting police in the difficult task that they will be faced with, almost inevitably, I would have thought, over the next few months, and we will see how the legislation runs and improve it as necessary. The various underlying issues that have been raised are exactly that: they will have to be dealt with by other sources; not necessarily with legislation, but other strategies.

The Criminal Law Amendment (Out-of-Control Gatherings) Bill 2012 is an important addressing of demonstrated deficiencies in the current powers available to the authorities. I commend the bill to the house.

Question put and a division taken with the following result —

Extract from *Hansard*
[COUNCIL — Tuesday, 27 November 2012]
p8931b-8937a
Hon Michael Mischin; Hon Norman Moore

Ayes (27)

Hon Liz Behjat
Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm
Hon Helen Bullock
Hon Jim Chown
Hon Peter Collier
Hon Mia Davies
Hon Ed Dermer

Hon Kate Doust
Hon Wendy Duncan
Hon Phil Edman
Hon Brian Ellis
Hon Adele Farina
Hon Jon Ford
Hon Philip Gardiner

Hon Nick Goiran
Hon Nigel Hallett
Hon Alyssa Hayden
Hon Col Holt
Hon Robyn McSweeney
Hon Michael Mischin
Hon Norman Moore

Hon Helen Morton
Hon Simon O'Brien
Hon Linda Savage
Hon Sally Talbot
Hon Ken Travers
Hon Ken Baston (*Teller*)

Noes (4)

Hon Robin Chapple

Hon Lynn MacLaren

Hon Giz Watson

Hon Alison Xamon (*Teller*)

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

As to Committee Stage

On motion without notice by **Hon Norman Moore (Leader of the House)**, resolved —

That the committee stage of the bill be made an order of the day for a later stage of this day's sitting.

Question put and passed.

[Continued on page 8938.]