

**CONSERVATION AND LAND MANAGEMENT AMENDMENT BILL 1999**

*Third Reading*

**HON M.J. CRIDDLE** (Agricultural - Minister for Transport) [2.35 pm]: I move -

That the Bill be now read a third time.

**HON J.A. COWDELL** (South West) [2.35 pm]: At the start of the committee stage, I observed that the Opposition would seek to amend the Bill in a number of ways. I indicated some of the ways in which we thought the Bill could be improved considerably. I will not go through all those proposed amendments. Suffice to say, I indicated to the House -

With respect to the forest management plans and the role of other ministers, on the Supplementary Notice Paper there are at least two alternative regimes, and three if members count the regime which prevails in the unamended Bill. The Opposition will define those more closely when we reach those clauses.

I dealt with the regimes, one of which we considered through the amendments proposed by Hon Norm Kelly. We did not consider a similar variant in amendments proposed by Hon Christine Sharp. I continued -

The crunch amendments pertain to clause 27, which clause requires the agreement of the Minister for Forest Products to forest management plans. This power has been perceived as effectively a veto power. The Government may indeed take comfort from the support of Hon Mark Nevill for the maintenance of clause 27. If the Government receives the comfort it is looking for - the support on the floor of the Chamber - and maintains clause 27 as it is, that will be the end of this Bill;

That is from our perspective. I continued -

If we founder with regard to some alteration of clause 27, it is the view of the Australian Labor Party that the Bill should not proceed and it will vote against the Bill at the third reading.

In line with those comments, we will do so now.

I also note the maintenance of the name CALM, which we opposed. In the amendments with which we have just dealt, Hon Mark Nevill has saved the name but not the empire. As Hon Christine Sharp observed, maybe it is better that the name remain, because the retitled Department of Conservation would have indicated a new start when there has been none. The Australian Labor Party does not oppose the splitting of CALM and the formation of the Forest Products Commission, but it opposes some of the measures contained in this Bill, particularly the processes involved in the formulation of forest management plans, as I pointed out in respect of clause 27. That opposition now necessitates opposing the third reading of the Bill and we do so.

**HON CHRISTINE SHARP** (South West) [2.40 pm]: When I spoke on these Bills during the second reading debate, I discussed how the support from the Greens (WA) for the Bills to separate the Department of Conservation and Land Management was conditional on the passage of at least the more critical of the amendments that were proposed. As we are all aware, those amendments have not succeeded. Although it was never critical that all of the amendments should succeed, there were some critical areas where the operation of these Bills entirely fell down. Basically the paramountcy of the Environment portfolio was not protected under the Bills' provisions. I am convinced that it will be enormously difficult for the State to implement ecologically sustainable management without the Environment portfolio having a paramount power under the Bills' provisions.

The Bills have failed to provide a strong and effective watchdog in the Conservation Commission. For example, the Conservation Commission has no control over the leasing of the 20 million hectares of land that is vested in it. That means that it basically cannot control the myriad activities within those lands although some of the activities can have quite significant impacts on the environment, such as the provision of water resources for public water supplies or the development of tourism resorts. They are the two most prominent examples of why the Conservation Commission would need control over leases.

By dint of the failure of the amendments, the Conservation Commission has also not been given the power to have a public role in the sense of being able to publish widely on matters of public interest within its sphere of responsibility. Perhaps most importantly, although these are Bills to separate CALM, the provisions require the Conservation Commission to act jointly in anything pertaining to management plans. That requirement robs the Conservation Commission of the ability to be an independent watchdog.

The Forest Products Bill does not have a strong objects clause that inserts throughout the operation of the Bill the principles that we believe are extremely important to nature conservation in this State - ecologically sustainable

Hon Murray Criddle; Hon John Cowdell; Hon Dr Chrissy Sharp; Hon Norm Kelly; Hon Mark Nevill; Hon Bill Stretch; Hon Peter Foss

---

development, the precautionary principle, intergenerational equity and the role of Aboriginal people in land management. Therefore the Greens (WA) will reject this Bill at the end of the third reading debate.

We will oppose the Bills to separate CALM with enormous regret because I have always hoped that these Bills would be an opportunity to significantly resolve the conflict over forest management. The degree of conflict over that area of state administration has been so severe that I thought it would be in everybody's interests to attempt to steadfastly resolve the conflict. When the Bills were originally mooted the Minister for the Environment made a quite extraordinary attempt to win a consensus approach to them. It was to her credit that she organised meetings with all parties represented in this Parliament and with the conservation movement to discuss the provisions that were to be drafted into the Bills. However, somewhere along the way between those amicable discussions and the introduction of the Bills - via some heated debate in the Cabinet, I suppose - the provisions of the Bills have changed significantly. One can see woven through them the significant influence of the Forest Products portfolio.

I thought that it would have been worthwhile for all of us, including the Government, to put in place a system for the administration of our conservation estate with a very high level of public credibility. I thought that it would be in the Government's interests particularly to deliver a system of administration with public credibility. I suppose the Government was prepared to face that issue politically, and undoubtedly will be facing it at the ballot boxes in a while. However, for those of us who are passionate about this issue, it is regrettable that we have lost the opportunity to take a big step forward. All I have asked from the Minister for the Environment, the Premier and the minister carrying the debate in this place is not that we put in place a system that has everything the Greens (WA) would like to see but that we put in place a system with an overall integrity that would provide it with widespread public credibility. The Bills have failed in that regard.

Because I have worked a lot on these Bills, more than on any others since I have been in this place, I have been struck by my limitations in not having a legal background. I hope that my legal interpretation of how these Bills will work and how the administrative system will operate and what it will mean is wrong. I hope that the claims of the Government are correct and that the Bills will be an important step forward. From a layperson's perspective I do not think that interpretation is right, but I hope that I am wrong.

This morning I attended some sessions at the National Environmental Law Association conference in Fremantle. A theme of one of the papers was that laws are secondary in many ways to the mindset of the administration and that if we do not apply our laws with commitment - many of our statutes are not applied with vigour and commitment - it does not matter how good the laws are, they will fall down. I heard that this morning from Dr Gerry Bates from the New South Wales Environmental Protection Authority, who is one of the leading authorities on environmental law in this country. I thought his argument about the mindset of the administration could perhaps be turned on its head. One could say that getting the law right does not mean that the law will be applied with great commitment, but if we get the law wrong, it follows that if perhaps the mindset is right, progress can still be made. I feel that the process of this legislation has promoted an enormous amount of analysis and reflection in the minds of the officers of CALM about how the ramifications of their legislation have flowed into certain policy priorities over the past 15 years.

The controversy surrounding that issue and this and its associated Bill has possibly given rise to a change in the mindset of the department. That is why I told Hon Mark Nevill that I had mixed feelings about his amendment to retain the former name. As Hon John Cowdell said, I was reluctant to see the name change as I did not want to give the impression that something satisfactory would occur, and a name change could have backfired. However, the name change could have facilitated that human process, which is always beyond the reach of the law; that is, the mindset of the administrative system could have effectively changed with the new name. That is why the name issue has been particularly difficult. It is symbolic and, whether we like it or not, symbols are important in determining how we think.

This legislation is core business for the Greens (WA). I have managed to annoy the Attorney General with great frequency during discussions on this Bill. He has referred continually to my piousness or whatever. I have really believed everything I have said on these Bills, which is probably why it has annoyed the Attorney General greatly.

We are at the end of an awful lot of hard work. I acknowledge the Clerk, who has given me an enormous amount of help because of inadequacies in my legal understanding. It is a pity that this result has been achieved. Although this has been a controversial issue, it paradoxically offered the opportunity for all parties to come together to agree that fundamental change was needed. However, the Government lost its nerve at the last moment, and we are back to the usual stuff. With great regret, the Greens (WA) will oppose the Bill's third reading.

Hon Murray Criddle; Hon John Cowdell; Hon Dr Chrissy Sharp; Hon Norm Kelly; Hon Mark Nevill; Hon Bill Stretch; Hon Peter Foss

---

**HON NORM KELLY** (East Metropolitan) [2.53 pm]: The Australian Democrats will also oppose the third reading of the Conservation and Land Management Amendment Bill. If this Bill were to pass this House, it would establish a new administrative regime for the conservation of the State's natural resources which is not conducive to fixing the problems which have beset the Department of Conservation and Land Management over recent years. These problems have resulted from inadequacies in the CALM Act. If the Bill were defeated, we would retain the current Act, which the Democrats certainly do not support in the long term. Our policy is to support a split in the role of the Department of Conservation and Land Management, but not in the manner proposed in the Government's legislation.

The Bill contains a number of problems, not the least of which is that it fails to recognise the need for the traditional owners of the land to have a stronger say in the management of our natural resources. As has been mentioned, the amended form of section 60 of the CALM Act will also be fraught with problems in interpretation. The Democrats believe that section 60 was the linchpin to debate on this Bill.

The Minister for Forest Products will have too much power in the process of establishing forest management plans. The Democrats believe that a conservation minister should be paramount, rather than a resource development minister, in establishing forest management plans. Open-ended forest management plans could apply beyond their original terms, resulting in the continuance of outdated logging practices and contracts.

The Bill provides limited scope for ecologically sustainable development and ecologically sustainable forest management principles. Ministerial direction to the Conservation Commission will be possible under the Bill. The Executive Director of the Department of Conservation and Land Management will be able to participate in the Conservation Commission's meetings, which is unsatisfactory in the eyes of the Australian Democrats.

I am particularly concerned about how the Government has introduced and sought to pass this legislation. Since the Bill's appearance in Parliament in November last year, the Government has shown a total lack of genuine consultation. I never expected all the policy positions or amendments proposed by the Democrats to be accommodated by the Government; nevertheless, I am very disappointed that throughout the process, the Government has not genuinely entered into proper consultation or negotiation. This was evident in the Government's stated belief that this legislation was not needed in the first place. The Bill will simply allay a "perceived" conflict of interest in the Department of Conservation and Land Management. The Government has been consistent in stating that there is no conflict of interest in the current CALM Act. Following the passage of this Bill, conflicts of interest will remain with CALM's commercial activities, such as tourism development. The failure to engage in genuine negotiations and consultation is reflected in the fact that although the Government was willing to change the name from the Department of Conservation and Land Management to the Department of Conservation to signify some change, and to send a message to the Western Australian community that the Government is fully aware of the stigma attached to CALM, it used the political expediency in the extra vote from Hon Mark Nevill to retain the name of the Department of Conservation and Land Management. I agree with Hon Christine Sharp that perhaps, in light of the powers contained in the new version of the Act, it is important that CALM's name be retained. No significant change will be made to the CALM of old with the passage of this legislation.

I am disappointed about the way the Minister for Forest Products, Hon Paul Omodei, has tried to engage himself in this new area of his responsibilities. This was highlighted in a media release that he put out, in conjunction with the Minister for the Environment, on 27 June, in which he misrepresented the report that had been tabled by the Standing Committee on Ecologically Sustainable Development after we had investigated certain aspects of this Bill and the Forest Products Bill. When we inquired into this Bill, we were aware that there would be enormous difficulty in reaching a unanimous decision on many issues, and rather than make a list of recommendations by way of a majority vote, which I am sure would have occurred on a lot of occasions, we believed it would be of greater use to the House to present both sides of the argument and leave it to the House to decide. However, it is interesting that in that media release, the Minister for Forest Products conveniently took only one side of the argument and said that was the ESD committee's position. That was a blatant misrepresentation, and I hope the minister will not carry on with that in his interpretation of the new CALM Act.

The Australian Democrats still support the separation of CALM's activities. If this Bill is defeated, we are well aware that an urgent need will still exist for legislative reform of CALM. One reason that the Democrats will be opposing this Bill is that we believe the passage of this legislation will delay the reforms that are required to enable CALM to work in the best interests of this State. There will be an election in the next six months or so. If this Bill is defeated and the coalition Government is re-elected, it will be imperative that it revise this legislation and enter into genuine consultation and negotiation, unlike the way it entered into the consultation and negotiation on this Bill, and bring about further reforms. The Australian Democrats do not expect that all of our desired amendments will be carried, but there is a need for more substantial change than appears in this version of the Bill. Alternatively, if an ALP Government is elected, that Government should not be hamstrung

Hon Murray Criddle; Hon John Cowdell; Hon Dr Chrissy Sharp; Hon Norm Kelly; Hon Mark Nevill; Hon Bill Stretch; Hon Peter Foss

---

by a recently established administrative set-up and feel obligated to let it run its course for a certain time before bringing about further upheaval by making further administrative changes. It is accepted that it takes a couple of years for any new government administration to bed down and function in the best possible way. It would be counterproductive in the long-term to pass this Bill at this time, and even if this Bill did pass through the Parliament, it could legitimately be argued that a certain period should be allowed to elapse to allow this new body to be established and function.

It is now four or five months since the Government advertised for expressions of interest for membership of the Conservation Commission and the Forest Products Commission. CALM officers have been relocated to the forest products division and are ready to move to the new Forest Products Commission. The Government has set this in train in the expectation that this Bill and the Forest Products Bill will be passed by this Parliament. I urge the Government to reconsider this matter; and, for the reasons that I have outlined, the Australian Democrats oppose this Bill.

**HON MARK NEVILL** (Mining and Pastoral) [3.04 pm]: This Bill is absolutely unnecessary. It is just an exercise of appeasing a lot of people who have an ideological view about the commercial use of native timbers. Less than 30 per cent of our native forest is used for timber production, and that small part of the forest is managed according to the best forestry standards that can be found anywhere in Australia. Many people from all over the world come to this State to look at our forestry and silvicultural practices. There is no doubt that those practices can be improved. However, there has been a campaign of misinformation to get a message across to the public that these forests are not being well managed. This Government is trying to dismantle a department that has managed our forests in an integrated way and has brought together conservation, fire management and all the other factors that are involved in forest management. This Government is trying, via these two Bills, to move to a system where we will have four departments where previously we had one, and those departments will all need to rely on the consolidated fund for a handout every year, because they will not generate income internally.

The reason that is given for this change is that there is a conflict of interest. I have exposed that phoney argument on a number of occasions. CALM has never set the allowable cut. CALM is given that cut by the minister, on the advice of the EPA and about 20 different commissions and authorities that have examined our forests in the past 20 years, and the minister and the Government set that cut on that independent legal advice. Once CALM has been allocated a certain cut from the areas that are preserved by this Parliament for forestry, it manages that cut in what I consider to be an exemplary way. I toured CALM's logging operations on a number of occasions when I was a member of the Labor Party, and when some of the most severe critics of CALM in the Labor Party had the opportunity of questioning CALM to get the information and the figures, they did not put up any arguments about the silvicultural practices that they were observing. I have also been to these areas without CALM.

I believe that because of this campaign of misinformation, which has caused the public to believe that the forests are being managed badly, we are now having a campaign of appeasement, where we are giving a bit more and a bit more. During the debate yesterday, Hon Norm Kelly stated that the Democrats are opposed to any logging in native forests. There is no point our appeasing the Democrats. There is no common ground there. Some Greens support limited logging in native forests.

Others, like the Democrats, are totally opposed to the logging industry. They would rather see it go up in flames like the western half of the United States. The conservationists have gained so much control over the agenda that there is no forest management in those areas. They have wiped out the lot. In Western Australia in the next five to 15 years we will see large areas of our native forests and timber reserves wiped out by fire - more than will ever be wiped out by logging. The Greens (WA) and Australian Democrats want to set up a department that will have no conservation ethic to run forestry.

Hon Norm Kelly: I do not know how you get that out of what I said.

Hon MARK NEVILL: We have different views. I do not live in the metropolitan area. I visit these areas. Members opposite are obsessed with the Department of Conservation and Land Management. CALM does more than regulate small blocks of forest in the south west. It covers the whole State. Members opposite seem to think that CALM's credibility and capacity to do the job is based on what happens in a small area of the south west forest. CALM is much bigger than that. I have not found anyone in my electorate who criticises CALM the way members opposite do. I do not know where they are getting their messages from. I know that there are people who think like members opposite but they are a small proportion of the public. I do not know what Geoff Gallop and Kim Beazley promised Kevin Edwards, the Builders=Labourers, Painters and Plasterers Union) and the Transport Workers Union to vote for closing down the forestry industry. I was dumbfounded, absolutely

Hon Murray Criddle; Hon John Cowdell; Hon Dr Chrissy Sharp; Hon Norm Kelly; Hon Mark Nevill; Hon Bill Stretch; Hon Peter Foss

---

gobsmacked, when those good blokes who represent blue collar workers decided to vote for Geoff Gallop's agenda on the forests. The leader of the Labor Party has a bit of a brain.

Hon Simon O'Brien: Hon Ken Travers already had the bumper stickers printed.

Hon MARK NEVILL: Hon Ken Travers is a loyal member of the left like Hon Tom Helm.

This is an absolute waste of money. We will have no guaranteed funding for CALM, and if there is a change of Government the ALP will be battling to -

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon W.N. Stretch): Hon Christine Sharp should be aware that she should not interject, and certainly not from a seat other than her own.

Hon MARK NEVILL: The electoral bushfire that was following this issue has almost died to an ember. It has about the same status as the no aircraft noise policy in the United States. I will shout all members to a drink if Liberals for Forests get more than 3 per cent of the vote.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: What drink?

Hon MARK NEVILL: It is rude and against parliamentary rules to interject on the speaker.

We would never have arrived at this situation of public misinformation if not for the massive campaign that *The West Australian* ran on this forest issue. I do not believe the conservation movement won this argument. It was when *The West Australian* threw its resources behind the issue that public opinion changed. When we were seeing a picture of a clear-felled forest - without a picture of a regrowth forest next to it - and chainsaws being used every night on ABC Television there was bound to be a shift in public opinion. That is what happened.

Hon Christine Sharp: *The West Australian* got involved because the Environmental Protection Authority was worried.

Hon MARK NEVILL: *The West Australian* sees how many newspapers were sold on the previous day's headline before it decides what to run. If sales are up they run with the same story. One of reasons the fire has gone out of this debate is that the bogymen, Dr Syd Shea, has gone. I am disappointed that someone like Syd Shea is not running for the upper House in the south west. He would clean up Hon Christine Sharp. He would have her on toast, and I will tell members why.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I do not mind some interjections but they are getting out of hand. Members should settle down.

Hon MARK NEVILL: If Syd Shea won that seat he would not employ Hon Christine Sharp as his electoral officer or in any other capacity.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: If Hon Mark Nevill addresses his remarks to the Chair we will make better progress.

Hon MARK NEVILL: By voting against these two Bills Hon Christine Sharp is agreeing with my position that the name "CALM" should be restored. I thank her for that sentiment. It has taken a long time to realise that a name is only a name, and that it is what behind it that matters. Changing the name of CALM to the Department of Conservation is a gratuitous waste of taxpayers' money. The splitting of CALM would never be enough for the Greens and Democrats, because there is another dimension to this debate. That is why I have always been angry at the appeasement policy run by the Minister for the Environment. At the end of the day the Greens and the Democrats need an election issue. I have always felt that no matter what happened they would find some reason to say that this was not a good enough solution. Their main argument is that they cannot accept that the Minister for Conservation has a veto over whatever happens in forestry. They claim that because a decision must be made by agreement, somehow the Minister for Forest Products has the veto. The Minister for Forest Products cannot do anything without the agreement of the Minister for Conservation. That is a convenient argument to achieve what they want - that is, the splitting of CALM. That is because they are more interested in having an issue for the next election. The Greens have been successful in having a massive wind-back of logging in our native forests. They have had new reserves created. However, it is never enough. The Government must decide what it thinks the furphy is and not kept moving the line in the sand every time the headline in *The West Australian* bleats at them or the Channel 2 news shows another shot of a tree being cut down with a chainsaw. It needs to ignore that. This policy of appeasement gets the Government nowhere.

These Bills are absolutely unnecessary. They are a waste of money. They deserve to be defeated.

Hon Murray Criddle; Hon John Cowdell; Hon Dr Chrissy Sharp; Hon Norm Kelly; Hon Mark Nevill; Hon Bill Stretch; Hon Peter Foss

---

**HON PETER FOSS** (East Metropolitan - Attorney General) [3.19 pm]: I urge members to support this Bill. It is an attempt by the Government to arrive at a solution which is fair to all views in society. I do not agree with Hon Mark Nevill that nothing needed to be done. When I was Minister for the Environment I believed that the commissions needed some level of independence. CALM representatives should have been taken off the Conservation Commission and the Forest Commission. They should be given some support of their own. Beyond that, there was no need to divide below the purely policy-making decision level. I hope these Bills do not go too far in dividing the Department of Conservation and Land Management itself. It is important for CALM to continue to manage both the production forests and national parks and reserves. It would be ludicrous to separate the good work done by CALM officers which is split in a sensible way, depending on the seasons. It would be ludicrous to have different departments looking after national parks and forests when they are side-by-side and one would have to go past one to get to the other.

This Bill preserves the concept that CALM is responsible for the land and its management. The amendment brought by Hon Mark Nevill to retain the name is a good one as it indicates CALM's role - conservation and land management. It is interesting to hear the final criticism of the Bill on the basis that it did not represent a consensus. My understanding of Hon Christine Sharp's notion of consensus is that one either agrees totally with her or there is no consensus. All I can say is I am glad I am not married to her as it could be very dangerous!

Hon Kim Chance: I am sure that is mutual.

Hon PETER FOSS: I am reminded of Winston Churchill's remark when Lady Astor said to him, "If I were married to you, I would give you poison" and he said, "Madam, if I were married to you, I would drink it."

Hon Christine Sharp: I do not know why I have been relegated to the role of wife or electorate officer.

Hon PETER FOSS: I am just paying back Hon Christine Sharp for all the rude remarks she has made about consensus. The terrible thing about it is that when the Government agrees with Hon Mark Nevill we are accused of being pusillanimous, of buying votes in the Chamber and doing terrible things. However, if we agree with Hon Christine Sharp, we are reaching a warm and fuzzy consensus. No matter what we try to do and no matter what we offer to the Greens (WA), they always take it, put it under their belt and ask for something else. This Bill is a genuine effort to try to meet the requirements of society.

As Hon Mark Nevill pointed out, we knew that whatever we did, the Greens would say it was not enough. They said that by presenting this Bill we lost our heart and guts at the last minute. How can putting up a Bill and sticking by it mean that we have suddenly lost our guts? How can we be accused of showing a lack of resolution and courage when we stick by our principles? This Bill does not meet the needs of Hon Mark Nevill. He says it goes too far. Hon Christine Sharp says it does too little. How extraordinary! Some members believe this Bill goes too far and some believe it does not go far enough. Putting up such a Bill is somehow characterised as the Government having lost its courage. Consensus does not mean giving way to everything the Greens ask for. Consensus means that we try to obtain general acceptance. I know that the Greens will never agree to anything unless they stop everything from happening. That is the way it has always worked and that is the way it always will work. It is probably silly to believe that we will ever get any other result with the Greens because, as I said, they put everything we give them under their belt and ask for something else.

Hon Norm Kelly believes that all we will have is land covered in pine forests, blue gums, radiata pines and other pines. It might be a vision beautiful for him but it is not too good as far as I am concerned. As I said, I believe in native forests. Hon Christine Sharp avowedly says she believes in forestry and native forests and I admire her for that. I do not believe too many other Greens would say that, as the conditions they put on everything would result in having to leave every bit of native timber alone. The Labor Party is never quite sure what it means as it has done its usual deals with the union. One of these days we will find out what that really means. As Hon Simon O'Brien pointed out, we read the bumper stickers and hope that we can find out; probably that is the best way of finding out.

As always, the Labor Party tries to play both sides against the middle. To one lot of people they say, "We will look after you" and to another lot of people they say, "We will look after you." It is very easy to do that in Opposition as one can make all sorts of promises. One of the reasons people do not trust Governments is because they know that Governments must make decisions at some stage and many decisions are not approved of by all sides. That is the reality of being in government. The reality of this legislation is that it is a genuine attempt -

Hon Ken Travers interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon W.N. Stretch): Order! This is the third reading debate and I am sure the Attorney General is coming to a conclusion.

**Extract from *Hansard***  
[COUNCIL - Thursday, 7 September 2000]  
p869a-875a

Hon Murray Criddle; Hon John Cowdell; Hon Dr Chrissy Sharp; Hon Norm Kelly; Hon Mark Nevill; Hon Bill Stretch; Hon Peter Foss

---

Hon PETER FOSS: This Bill is a genuine attempt by the Government to produce legislation that meets the legitimate expectations of the community. It does not deal with matters such as the odium that has been heaped on CALM. I say heaped on it as it certainly does not arise from CALM itself. The fact is that the Green movement has always played the man. I have never known a group that has so foully besmirched someone's reputations merely because they happen to disagree with the views held by a particular person.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! Members should refrain from dealing with personalities and continue with the third reading debate.

Hon PETER FOSS: The Bill certainly does not deal with that issue and I do not believe it would be fair and appropriate to do so. The motion moved by Hon Mark Nevill to retain that name was a good motion. I am pleased that it was moved as CALM's reputation among thinking people and people in the north west who know what it is about, as Hon Mark Nevill mentioned, is very well respected and deserves to be well respected. It is an excellent name and we should not give in on that matter as it would be wrong of us to join in that unjustified, unfair and personally-based criticism of CALM.

I believe that the Bill, as it has come through the committee stage, has improved and I have great pleasure in supporting the Bill and urging everyone else to vote in favour of it.

Question put and a division taken with the following result -

Ayes (14)

Hon M.J. Criddle	Hon Peter Foss	Hon Mark Nevill	Hon Derrick Tomlinson
Hon Dexter Davies	Hon Ray Halligan	Hon M.D. Nixon	Hon Muriel Patterson
Hon B.K. Donaldson	Hon Murray Montgomery	Hon Simon O'Brien	<i>(Teller)</i>
Hon Max Evans	Hon N.F. Moore	Hon W.N. Stretch	

Noes (13)

Hon Kim Chance	Hon Helen Hodgson	Hon Christine Sharp	Hon E.R.J. Dermer <i>(Teller)</i>
Hon J.A. Cowdell	Hon Norm Kelly	Hon Tom Stephens	
Hon G.T. Giffard	Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich	Hon Ken Travers	
Hon N.D. Griffiths	Hon J.A. Scott	Hon Giz Watson	

---

Pairs

Hon Barry House	Hon Cheryl Davenport
Hon B.M. Scott	Hon Tom Helm
Hon Greg Smith	Hon Bob Thomas

Question thus passed.

Bill read a third time and returned to the Assembly with amendments.