

STATE FOREST NO 56, PARTIAL REVOCATION

Assembly's Resolution

Message from the Assembly requesting concurrence in the partial revocation of state forest No 56, laid on the Table of the Legislative Council on Friday, 24 October 2003, by command of His Excellency the Governor, further considered.

Motion to Concur

Resumed from 13 November 2003 on the following motion moved by Hon Tom Stephens (Minister for Local Government and Regional Development) -

That the proposal for the partial revocation of state forest No 56, laid on the Table of the Legislative Council on Friday, 24 October 2003, by command of His Excellency the Governor, be carried out.

HON GEORGE CASH (North Metropolitan) [8.56 pm]: In October last year the Legislative Assembly sent a message to the Legislative Council inviting it to agree to the partial revocation of state forest No 56, which revocation had been laid on the Table of the Legislative Assembly on 14 October 2003. The reason I mention that is that it is a pity that it has taken this long for this matter to come on for debate in the Legislative Council, because people in the area of Margaret River have been waiting for this matter to be resolved for a long time.

The proposition before the House is that it be agreed that an area of land of approximately 2 050 square metres, which links the north east corner of the Margaret River airstrip with the south west corner of a property known as lot 2 and which is part of state forest No 56, be revoked so that it can be incorporated into lot 2, and in due course be used to cater for a fly in, fly out tourist development on that property. I should also indicate that as part of the arrangements for the revocation of part of state forest No 56, the owner of lot 2, who is to acquire this 2 050 square metres, has agreed to provide an area of land in Nannup to be used as part of a state forest in the Nannup area. The property that has been offered is lot 3 of Nelson location No 28. It is an area of 9.4895 hectares and is located about 18 kilometres north west of Nannup, at the junction of Cundinup Road and Vasse Highway. Considerable work was done to determine whether lot 3 was suitable land for an exchange. It was found that lot 3 has a healthy, well-advanced regrowth forest and diverse flora with little weed infestation. The Conservation Commission of Western Australia, the Department for Planning and Infrastructure and the Department of Industry and Resources, as well as the Shires of Augusta-Margaret River and Nannup, have all endorsed the revocation and land exchange.

Just before Christmas last year I took the opportunity to visit this area of state forest No 56 to see the land intended to be part of the revocation. I took the opportunity to return to that area about eight weeks ago. That land appeared to be in exactly the same state as it was on my first visit. When I went there for the first time, the land appeared to be suitable for the purposes to which it will be put. The Opposition supports the revocation and believes it should be put in place as soon as possible. Equally, it believes that the land that is to be swapped for the 2 050 square metres that comprise state forest No 56 should be incorporated into the government estate as compensation for the loss of state forest. The Opposition supports the revocation.

HON CHRISTINE SHARP (South West) [9.02 pm]: I hope I am able to do justice to this subject. I was made aware that this debate was to be brought on this evening about two and a half minutes ago. Therefore, I do not have all my files with me in the Chamber. I am aware, of course, that this matter has been on the agenda for several weeks, but I was not aware it was going to be brought to the top of the list this evening. Having said that, I am very keen to speak on the matter. Although it deals with a very small area of land, the House faces quite a difficult decision this evening in determining the outcome of the proposed revocation.

I digress for a moment. The forest revocation links to a tourism development proposal in the Shire of Augusta-Margaret River - indeed, the development is to be on the outskirts of the town of Margaret River itself. The proposal is to build a resort of a type I had not come across before; namely, an air park resort. This involves people enjoying short-term accommodation for recreation and people arriving and leaving by aircraft. Therefore, instead of the classic holiday accommodation of a motel to which one drives a car, which is parked outside the room, where one enjoys a holiday, one hopes, this proposal is to fly to Margaret River, to taxi in the aircraft to the resort, to park the aircraft and then to be shown to the accommodation. That proposal involves a state forest revocation because the pocket of land that is the subject of the proposed aircraft resort is very close, but not completely adjacent, to the Margaret River airstrip. Between the developer's land and the airstrip proper is a narrow strip of state forest that is proposed to be national park. This little forest is in the way of the aircraft proposal. It is necessary for the proponent to gain control of that small patch of state forest, and to clear it, in order to bring that development into fruition.

When the developer first made the proposal, which is inextricably linked to the need to revoke state forest, I believe he approached the authorities and was told that no revocation would be considered to be acceptable

without some kind of conservation benefit in return to the State and to the state forest estate. Therefore, a proposal was made that supports this revocation motion in the nature of a land swap. In order that the proposal might go ahead, a small parcel of land is to be exchanged for a larger parcel of land in the shire of Nannup that has moderate conservation value.

The proposal to develop an air park resort at Margaret River is quite controversial locally. In fact, the proposal for this land swap that is an integral part of the forest revocation has been part of a petition tabled in this House. As a result of the short notice for this debate, I do not have at my fingertips the date of the petition and the number of its petitioners. However, it is on the records of the House. As with all petitions honourable members table in this House, that petition found itself on the desk of the Standing Committee on Environment and Public Affairs, which does its best to evaluate the merits of all petitions tabled in the House. The standing committee in processing that work has an informal working rule that it does not inquire into petitions tabled if they involve matters that will be determined by the more authoritative voice of the House itself, rather than a standing committee of the House. Therefore, that is a way of simply screening matters for the standing committee to adjust its workload to inquire into matters to make a useful contribution to the House process, rather than second-guessing important determinations of the House itself. However, when the petition was forwarded to the Standing Committee on Environment and Public Affairs, as is standard process - I believe the principal petitioner's name is Mr Kevin Bond - we were of the understanding that it was very unusual, if not a complete precedent, for a forest revocation motion that is before the House to be of a controversial nature. Normally forest revocations are not matters of great debate in the House. Therefore, this particular revocation singled itself out as appropriate for the attention of the Standing Committee on Environment and Public Affairs to provide advice to the House. The subcommittee that screens petitions - we call ourselves the petitions subcommittee - did a fair amount of background work on this proposal and we took that background information to the main body of the committee yesterday. It was our intent to suggest that the briefing that we provided to the full committee yesterday be tabled in the House to inform the House this week about the forest revocation matter. However, we ran into a technical problem at our meeting yesterday; namely, the committee could not report to the House in the way we intended to, which was to provide background information to the House rather than recommend to the House that it support or not support the revocation motion. On that basis, we have been unable to provide the gist of that research in the form of a tabled inquiry report. I regret that, because I think certain aspects of this revocation proposal would cause members to stop and think. I will touch on two of those reasons.

The first is that when Hon Tom Stephens introduced this motion as the minister representing the Minister for the Environment, he advised that the proposed revocation had widespread support and that it had the specific support of the Shire of Augusta-Margaret River. I inform the House this evening that, on the contrary, that revocation does not have the support of the Shire of Augusta-Margaret River. The minister did not mislead the House; rather, his information was relevant to the position of that shire before it was dissolved by the then Minister for Local Government and before commissioners were installed. Some time after that, a new shire council was elected. The support of the shire to which the minister referred in his speech when he advocated this motion to the House is, in fact, quite out-of-date by some years. That is important.

We have before us this evening a forest revocation motion. It is extremely unusual for a revocation to be contested in this way. As I have already indicated, it is extremely unusual for a revocation to be the subject of a petition to the House, and it is also unusual for a revocation to reach the point of being debated in the House when it is controversial. The Minister for Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries may have some insights that would be helpful on this issue. It is my understanding that the standard process with revocations as we debate them from time to time is that they are non-controversial. It is a process that has been through a substantial period of discussion and approval. Revocations go before the Minister for the Environment, the Conservation Commission of Western Australia and the local authority. In particular, the officers of the Department of Conservation and Land Management do not bring forward revocation matters in the general course of business if they are considered to be controversial or, as in this case, if they are supported or are integral to a commercial development proposal. It is my understanding that - again I look to the Minister for Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries to confirm whether this is his understanding - revocations serve a public purpose. Revocations take place from time to time. The last batch we considered in this House a couple of months ago related to the establishment of public infrastructure, such as the widening of a road or formalising a road alignment that had been used for many decades but the actual used road did not correspond to the alignment of the road that had been put in place by the lands department many years ago. Therefore, the revocation process would simply make the official lines on the map correspond with the real lines on the ground where the road might traverse state forest. There are other examples, such as the need to establish Water Corporation facilities that had to be close to public water supply areas. To my knowledge - certainly in the time that I have been a member of this place and involved in debates on forest revocations - not only is this the first time that a revocation has been controversial - probably the two are linked - but also it is the first time that a revocation has pursued private

commercial advantage. That is why it may be useful for the House at this point to stop and consider this matter. Perhaps we should decide whether we wish this evening to set a precedent that forest revocations become a rather different matter from what they have been in the past and whether we, as a community, should reorganise the boundaries of state forests in order to rationalise them for commercial advantage. We may decide that that is a good thing and that it is all to do with good development. I propose to the House, particularly from the perspective of government - this Government at the moment, or any Government - that Governments may prefer not to go down that path, because if we set a precedent this evening and turn revocations into matters of private gain, we may find that instead of the debates being simple and taking up half an hour of the House's time, they may become matters that take many hours. It may be argued that that is what the House is for and bring on the debate, and that would be quite a valid position.

On the basis of the precedent, it is my view that the House should determine to reject the revocation this evening. Therefore, on behalf of the Greens (WA), I do not support the revocation. In saying that I accept that, as Hon George Cash has pointed out, the land in the Shire of Nannup that is proposed to be made available to the Department of Conservation and Land Management to be incorporated into state forest instead is of greater area and is of acceptable conservation value. However, it is not on the outskirts of Margaret River; it is in the backblocks of Nannup, and if one happens to live in Margaret River that is an important distinction. It is not supported by many of the local people who will be affected by this proposal, and it is not supported by the shire council with which the adjacent development proposal rested in the past when the planning approvals were made. I do not feel comfortable with this issue, as I have in the past when supporting forest revocations. I have supported all the forest revocations that have come before us, although I have been concerned to speak about a couple of them. The last one involved an issue about whether it was appropriate for the state forest to be revoked to establish an industrial park at Denmark, but until this evening I have so far supported every revocation that has come before us. However, on the grounds that I have explained to members, it is most inappropriate that a state forest should be treated in a speculative manner, that it should be designated by a developer as being up for grabs, and that if the deal is good enough then that area can be made available, it can be cleared and can be used as an adjunct to a private development.

One of the things I love about Western Australia is that we have state forests and that they are almost a sacred institution in this place. A state forest is a pretty firm thing; it is as solid as the Parliament itself. Therefore, I would hate for it to become a political football and to somehow lose the solidity that it has represented for many generations of Western Australians. It is to the credit of those very early foresters going back to the original Forest Act 1919 that we have an estate of forests that will remain inviolate for generations to come. Although this is quite a small matter in terms of area and the number of trees involved, it would be incorrect for the House to support the revocation on the grounds of principle.

HON BARRY HOUSE (South West) [9.25 pm]: The purpose of this revocation is to free up a narrow corridor linking the Margaret River airstrip with a proposed air park development. In exchange for that narrow corridor, which will be wide enough to take aeroplanes, the proponent of this development has purchased a block of land near Cundinup towards Nannup and an exchange will take place. There has been a bit of local comment about this proposal for some time and it has also been sitting on our notice paper for some time.

On 14 November last year I presented a petition to the Parliament on behalf of a group of Margaret River residents who had come to me seeking advice on the process and asking how they should make their voice known to the Parliament of Western Australia. I advised them that one avenue was through a petition. Members may recall that the tabling of that petition was a little different, because I was advised right at the start - the year before last year - when I received the petition that the sessional orders did not allow for it. That was advice I got from the Clerk. So I kept the petition in my top drawer and, after the second reading explaining the revocation was made to this House, I presented it at the first opportunity. There is a bit of conjecture about that, because I missed the sitting the next morning. I was on the telephone taking a call from the main organiser of the petition and I missed being here at the beginning of the day's proceedings. I used members' statements time at the end of that day to table the petition. The petition, as with all petitions, ended up with the committee chaired by Hon Christine Sharp. All members table petitions in this House without making judgment on them. I informed the organiser of that petition that it was my job as a parliamentary representative, as a means of conduit through to the community and to the Parliament, to present the petition, but I did not necessarily agree with the petition or make any judgment on it. I am sure all members have been in a situation in which they have presented petitions of that nature. The petition duly went to the Standing Committee on Environment and Public Affairs chaired by Hon Christine Sharp on 14 November last year. I was obviously aware of many voices in the community expressing concern about this proposal and I was getting a mixed message from the community. Certainly a few people in the community were concerned that a lot of federal, state and local government funds and resources had been put into the Margaret River airstrip, as well as a lot of local community effort. There was also a great deal of interest from a number of quarters in the community in making more use of the airstrip. Some people in the community wanted to establish a hangar for their aircraft at the airstrip and so on. For whatever reason, a

school of thought developed in the community that the Margaret River airstrip was to solely service the Royal Flying Doctor Service, and nothing else. That was an unrealistic position. There was very vocal opposition to the airstrip in virtually all forms, apart from the group of people from the Royal Flying Doctor Service who came to me with the petition. I met with that group on, I think, 16 February this year at the house of one of the members of the group to listen to their concerns and to explain the process to them. I explained to them that the revocation was an order of the day on the daily agenda and that it would be brought on for debate at the Government's discretion in allocating its priorities. I also explained that the current vehicle before the Parliament through which they expressed their view was the petition, which I had tabled and which had been referred to the committee in the previous November. I understand that these people probably expressed their opinion to the committee. As the presenter of that petition, I was approached, as I am sure are all members, to express a view on that petition. The view I expressed is consistent with the view I have always had. If I were asked whether that is the best site for an airstrip in Margaret River, I would have to say no, because what can be done with the site is limited. The land at either end of the airstrip drops away very steeply. It is an old Department of Conservation and Land Management airstrip that has been sealed and developed to quite a nice standard, but there is no future in upgrading it. That site would not be used by anyone wanting to start from scratch and develop the best airstrip in Margaret River. Nevertheless, a lot of money was spent and a lot of work was done on that site to bring it up to the current standard. Currently, it is probably an adequate standard for the community, but who knows whether it will be adequate in the future.

The Augusta-Margaret River Shire Council bewilders me a little. It approved the process. The comments of Hon Christine Sharp are only partly right. When the minister explained the revocation in his speech, the motion on the books of the Augusta-Margaret River Shire Council was clearly supportive of the proposed development. Only subsequent to that have some individual councillors mounted a concerted campaign. They still hedge their bets a little. I think in March they passed a recommendation, which states -

That the proposed land swap presently before the state upper house not be supported by Council and a submission be drawn up to that effect, to be submitted if an enquiry is established by the Standing Committee.

I am not sure whether the standing committee ever received any communication from or was approached by the Augusta-Margaret River Shire Council. I do not know. As far as I am aware, it certainly did not make this position public. I was not notified of it by the council; I found out. The recommendation goes on to say -

Further, that legal advice be sought on the feasibility of rescinding the original approval for the Airpark.

The Augusta-Margaret River Shire Council is not unequivocally backing away from its previous position, because it knows that legally it may not be able to do so. A corporate position is held by a body, regardless of a change in personnel. Obviously some individual councillors do not like the current proposal, but the corporate position may well be different legally.

My question to the people I met with and the Augusta-Margaret River Shire Council was: if that site is not the best site for the airstrip, what is being done about seeking a better site? I asked whether a new site had been proposed and whether it was proposed that the Augusta-Margaret River airstrip would be relocated. The council has established an airport advisory committee, which seems to have rather limited representation from the community. I have heard nothing to indicate that the Augusta-Margaret River Shire Council is proposing to relocate that airport to a better site. If it were proposing to relocate it, I could see some point in hesitating to agree to this revocation motion. If there were a proposal to relocate the airport, why would it want to put in an airpark at which planes would not be able to land in the future? However, currently that is not the case. The Augusta-Margaret River Shire Council still supports that site for its airport, even though in my mind it is very unrealistic and restrictive in what it considers to be appropriate aircraft activity. People must expect some aircraft activity around an airport. It is not reasonable to say that only the Royal Flying Doctor Service can land at the airport.

I am disappointed that the committee chaired by Hon Christine Sharp has not investigated this matter and produced a report. It has had four or five months to do something. That may have cleared the air on some of these issues. However, we are now faced with this debate. In those terms I can do nothing but support the revocation motion, because the proposal is still a reasonable proposal in terms of airport activity. Madam Deputy President, you would know the area as well as I. It is a little perplexing when there is some difference of opinion in the community about proposed activities that have led to the proposal for revocation and a subsequent land exchange. In general terms, I do not think the Parliament should be frightened of discussing and debating some of these land exchange proposals in the future. Although Hon Christine Sharp considers state forests to be sacred, state forests initially were set aside for forestry activities. They were dedicated to forestry activities initially and then they became multipurpose pieces of land that catered for water catchment, beekeeping and a host of other things, as well as forestry activities and timber cutting. People can now do anything in a state

forest, except cut timber. For many people who are of the view of Hon Christine Sharp and others, the term “state forest” represents, I am sure, national park. The term “national park” has the connotation that such an area should be devoid of people. Quite frankly, that is an unrealistic proposition. It is not good management, and it is a trend that I believe has gone too far in this State. When there are small opportunities for pieces of state forest to be adjusted in this way to enhance a facility and some development that will improve the tourist infrastructure of a place like Margaret River, I believe that on balance, despite the known opposition, I must support it.

HON KIM CHANCE (Agricultural - Leader of the House) [9.41 pm]: I thank all members for providing the House with their views on this matter. It is clearly an interesting and complex issue, as are so many that go on around the State. I am in an unusual role, because my colleague the Minister for Local Government and Regional Development, who is in the Chamber, has voice problems. He has asked me if I would mind managing this particular item of business.

First, may I thank Hon George Cash who very accurately described the proposition. I do not think that any other member cared to go over the detail of the proposition again because it was so well described. Hon George Cash also noted, without paraphrasing him, that the arrival of this business in the Chamber has been a long time coming. I think the motion was introduced to this House on Thursday, 13 November 2003, which is going back a bit. As members have listened to the various points of view and the progress of changes of position and complexities at both local and broader levels, I believe that they have been able to understand why it has taken so long. Certainly from my point of view of having an opportunity of bringing this business on for discussion on a number of occasions, the Government was also under some pressure to get the matter resolved. Because of the changing position that I could see, I wanted to make sure that everybody was happy before we brought the matter on for discussion. This is the last week of the session. We are about to go into a long winter break. I briefly discussed this matter a few days ago with Hon Barry House, as one of the local members. It is important that we get this matter resolved before the House goes into the long winter recess, because people have been left waiting for a long time. I apologise if my bringing the matter on tonight has discommoded the committee. I was asked last week not to bring it on until this week to enable the committee’s deliberations to conclude. However, as happens, other matters intervened and made it impossible for it to be completed in time.

I turn now to the matters raised by Hon Christine Sharp, who was the first to advise the House that this is not a simple proposition but a complex matter. She made the point that the purpose of the proposed excision is to enable a novel tourism land use, certainly one that she had not heard of before and one that I must say that I had not heard of before. I am sure such uses exist somewhere else, but I am not aware of any in Western Australia. It is the concept of an air park that involves accommodation and permits people to fly into Margaret River and then taxi to the accommodation unit, which is an interesting and novel proposition.

The key issue raised by Hon Christine Sharp is the revocations themselves, their history and their place in the order of things. She made the point very strongly that this is a proposed revocation for the purpose of a private infrastructure development, rather than a public infrastructure development, and then, allied with that, it is a matter of some controversy, whereas forest revocations are generally non-contentious. She asked me if I could confirm that those two matters are correct. I could only say that in my experience, yes, forest revocations are normally non-contentious. I have not dealt with many or been around many, but it seems to me that they fall into that generally non-contentious area and the purpose for revocation, in my experience, is usually for public infrastructure purposes.

However, as far as I can tell, nothing in the prescribed process prevents revocation for a private purpose. I do not know, but I very much doubt, that a precedent has been created insofar as the proposed revocation sets aside land for a private purpose. I think it is unlikely, but nothing in the Conservation and Land Management Act 1984 seems to prevent it. Under section 9 of the Act, land dedicated to state forest may be revoked in whole or in part in the following manner: the Governor shall cause to be laid on the Table of each House of Parliament a proposal for such revocation, or if a resolution is passed by each House that the proposal be carried out, the Governor shall by order published in the *Government Gazette* revoke the dedication. That is pretty bare-boned stuff and quite clear-cut. It does not give us any indication, as far as I can divine, of the purpose of the revocation, nor does it go into any description other than laying out the bare bones of the process. However, the revocation is in line with the process as outlined in section 9 of that Act.

I think there is a need to look at the proposition on its merits, acknowledging all the issues that have been raised. I will be addressing the points raised by Hon Barry House in a moment, because he has picked up a wholly different issue and I think a very interesting one. The area that is revoked is very small at only 2 050 square metres, and it is some distance from the Margaret River town site; it is in fact some 2.5 kilometres from the town site. We now understand that there is no net loss; indeed there is a significant net gain to the conservation estate, with some 9.8 hectares being swapped for the 2 050 square metres.

The issue of the shire's view of life has been raised. I will go into this again later, but we need to understand that the shire has its own application approval process, as has any local government authority, which stands quite separate from what we are doing here tonight. Our decision in this place will not in any way impede the local government authority's proper jurisdiction. Finally on that issue, although Hon Barry House has covered it, the proposition is not about a new airport; it is simply about the development of an apron way that will connect the airstrip to the accommodation units. If it were an issue about the establishment of a new airport, which would raise all of the issues that are created by airports, such as fire, noise and a number of other matters, it might be a different matter altogether. However, the issue is about the use of an existing airstrip, albeit that may mean an increased use of the airstrip. Indeed, the whole purpose of it is that it will cause an increase in the use of the airstrip. That is what takes me now to the matters raised by Hon Barry House.

Hon Barry House made the point that the proponent had purchased land for the purpose of exchange. The proponent deliberately bought land to enable an exchange to be offered on the advice of the appropriate authorities. Hon Barry House also spoke of the process that led to the presentation of his petition and his consultation with the petitioners in his electorate. I thank Hon Barry House for correcting the record on the position of the Shire of Augusta-Margaret River at the time the motion for the proposed revocation was introduced to this House, as that is also one of the complexities of this matter.

The real issue of interest that Hon Barry House raised relates to the impact of the proposition; that is the whole question. It is not a question about simply 2 000 square metres of forest, because that question is reasonably answered by the net gain to the conservation estate. It is an issue about the impact of a new tourism development on the amenity and possibly the safety of other people and all the things that people are concerned about whenever they deal with additional infrastructure use. It is a sad fact of life. We can have sympathy with both points of view without being nimbys or antidevelopment people. I have sympathy for people who choose a particular lifestyle and a place to carry out that lifestyle, and then see that lifestyle impeded by other people's enjoyment of the area, whether it be through the use of recreational vehicles, aircraft, agriculture, mining or whatever. We are all familiar with issues of this kind. I am not, therefore, diminishing anyone's point of view. The point that Hon Barry House made, which helped us to think very clearly, was that Margaret River is now an area with an economy fundamentally built around tourism. My friends in agriculture will argue that it is an economy built around wine and others in sport will argue that it is an economy built around surfing. Wine and surfing are just two parts of one issue, and that issue is tourism. Margaret River is a tourist-based economy and I must say a very successful one.

However, nothing comes without a cost. If we are to enjoy the economic benefits of tourism, if we are to enjoy the great opportunities that tourism gives young people and if we are to enjoy the huge economic benefits that the Margaret River region has had as a result of tourism, we need not look too far back. The older ones among us, such as Hon Paddy Embry, will clearly remember when we could not give land away at Margaret River. A farm manager who lived just north of me said that after he retired he would probably buy a 400 or 500-acre block at Margaret River. When I asked, "Why Margaret River, Mr Stephens?" he said, "It is the only place I can afford to go." That has changed a bit! His 400 or 500 acres is now probably worth about \$15 million, and good luck to him and to his descendants. However, to get that economic benefit, we give away things. One thing we give away sometimes is the quiet enjoyment of our land. This is an issue in which we can have sympathy for both sides.

I am grateful for the support that has been given by the majority of members, although the voice that Hon Chrissy Sharp expressed in this place was a serious voice. We need to find a balance, and I guess our job as legislators, along with the Shire of Augusta-Margaret River and other shires in the same situation, is to help find the balance that can exist between the benefits of tourism, or any other kind of industry for that matter, and its costs. However, no benefits come without cost.

I thank honourable members for their contribution. I am extremely grateful, notwithstanding that this matter has been around for some time, that time has been found in this last week of the session to enable this matter to be concluded. It is a matter of great importance and needed to be finalised, and I am happy that we have done that.

Question put and a division taken with the following result -

Extract from *Hansard*
[COUNCIL - Tuesday, 29 June 2004]
p4462b-4468a

Hon George Cash; Hon Dr Chrissy Sharp; Hon Barry House; Hon Kim Chance

Ayes (22)

Hon George Cash	Hon Adele Farina	Hon Robyn McSweeney	Hon Tom Stephens
Hon Kim Chance	Hon John Fischer	Hon Norman Moore	Hon Bill Stretch
Hon Murray Criddle	Hon Jon Ford	Hon Simon O'Brien	Hon Ken Travers
Hon Bruce Donaldson	Hon Peter Foss	Hon Louise Pratt	Hon Kate Doust (<i>Teller</i>)
Hon Sue Ellery	Hon Nick Griffiths	Hon Ljiljana Ravlich	
Hon Paddy Embry	Hon Barry House	Hon Barbara Scott	

Noes (3)

Hon Dee Margetts	Hon Christine Sharp	Hon Jim Scott (<i>Teller</i>)
------------------	---------------------	---------------------------------

Question thus passed.

House adjourned at 10.00 pm
