

**ORDER OF BUSINESS - ANIMAL WELFARE BILL 2001**

*Motion*

**HON NORMAN MOORE** (Mining and Pastoral - Leader of the Opposition) [10.10 am]: I move -

That the order of the day for the Animal Welfare Bill 2001 be made the first order of the day for Tuesday, 12 November 2002.

This motion has been put on the Notice Paper to ensure that the Animal Welfare Bill is dealt with by this House. It is the Animal Welfare Bill 2001, which means it has been here for a long time. I think it might have been placed on the Notice Paper in September of last year.

I acknowledge that it is the Government's business to decide which particular legislation it deals with and in what order. I generally have the view that it is not the Opposition's business to determine what Bills are debated and when, but what has been irritating me for some time is the notion being put out by the Government that the Opposition is delaying the Animal Welfare Bill in the Legislative Council. That particular spin has been put out by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Premier, Mark McGowan, the member for Rockingham. Even Hon Tom Stephens may have mentioned on the odd occasion that the reason the Bill had not progressed was that the Opposition in the Legislative Council was holding up the Bill.

I have therefore decided to take the initiative and give the Government a chance to debate the legislation and to indicate to the Government that the Opposition is prepared to do that as early as next Tuesday. To put to rest any notion that the Opposition is in any way holding this Bill up, I am seeking to proceed down this path. Whether the House agrees with this motion is entirely up to the House, but this is an attempt to ensure that the Bill is dealt with and to put to rest the myth that has been spread by the Government that somehow or other the Opposition is not supporting this Bill. That is why I move the motion. It would mean that after the Address-in-Reply debate next Tuesday, we would deal with this Bill. I indicate to the Government that this side of the House will deal with it expeditiously.

**HON KIM CHANCE** (Agricultural - Leader of the House) [10.13 am]: May I congratulate the Leader of the Opposition for bringing this very worthwhile motion forward for the deliberation of the House. When we were on the opposition benches, there were occasions when we attempted to use either Standing Order No 127 or No 128. Generally speaking, the then Leader of the House took the view that it was an inappropriate thing to do and that the management of the House was properly the province of the Government, and specifically the Leader of the House. I always listened intently to those arguments, but I never really supported them. Consequently, we kept on trying to use the device of Standing Order No 127 or No 128.

I sincerely believe that while, in principle, the Government should control the flow and management of business in the House, it is somehow undemocratic to deny other members of the House the opportunity, through the proper use of standing orders, to have some say on the way in which the business should be prioritised and dealt with. I am looking directly at Hon Dee Margetts. I have always held that view and I hold it consistently now. That is why I have congratulated the Leader of the Opposition.

Hon Norman Moore: That is understood absolutely. I would not have moved this motion had your government members not said that we were holding the Bill up.

Hon KIM CHANCE: I am sure that the same argument drove us when we did the same thing.

I am talking about a matter of principle. I not only welcome the use of the device of Standing Orders Nos 127 and 128, but also encourage their future use by members other than government members, because I genuinely believe that all members in a democratic House should have the opportunity, through the proper use of standing orders, to play some part in the arrangement of business before the House.

I also congratulate the Leader of the Opposition for moving this motion for another reason; that is, I appreciate his genuine concern that the Animal Welfare Bill has been on our Notice Paper for a long time and has not been dealt with. It is important legislation. It was subject to an undertaking from the Government while in opposition to have it passed within a time frame that has now expired. I certainly appreciate the fact that we are being held to account for that undertaking. The passage of the Bill is necessary for a range of interests of a large number of people, and the animals, of course, which cannot speak in this place and which do not vote and get direct representation. Their interests also need to be considered.

Consequently, the Government will support this motion or a variation of the same, subject to one small amendment.

*Amendment to Motion*

Hon Norman Moore; Hon Kim Chance; Hon Jim Scott; Hon Murray Criddle; President; Hon Peter Foss; Hon Giz Watson; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Ray Halligan

---

Hon KIM CHANCE: I move -

To insert after the date "2002" -

subject however to the Railway (Jandakot to Perth) Bill 2002 having passed the House before that date

This is an entirely reasonable alternative. The Government has indicated to the House that it is keen to get on with the Animal Welfare Bill. It is prepared to deal with it as the first item of business on Tuesday. We have asked that one Bill, which has already been debated in this place for the past two days, be carried - we have a whole day in which to do it today - prior to the beginning of the debate on the Animal Welfare Bill. It is a perfectly reasonable request, which I believe everybody will understand. I hope the House will be prepared to support the amendment.

**HON JIM SCOTT** (South Metropolitan) [10.17 am]: I am also happy to support Hon Norman Moore's motion. I am not too sure whether he expected our support.

Hon Norman Moore: Unfortunately, I have no railway stations to offer you. I will have to take my chance on the balance of the argument.

Hon JIM SCOTT: Hon Norman Moore does not have to offer anything.

The Greens (WA) office has been lobbied fairly heavily by people who have said that members of the Legislative Council were somehow holding up the Bill. I guess we assumed that this was because the Government was diverting the flak by saying that somebody else was holding the Bill up. That is a guess and not for sure. This is a nicely ironic way in which to move on. Everybody will have an opportunity to show that they want to deal with this Bill, which has been hanging around for probably a decade. It is not before time that it should come on, so I support the motion.

**HON MURRAY CRIDDLE** (Agricultural) [10.18 am]: I assume that we are debating the amendment.

The PRESIDENT: We are debating the amendment.

Hon MURRAY CRIDDLE: I bear in mind what Hon Jim Scott said last night; that is, that he had made arrangements, a deal or whatever one likes to call it, and that we were expecting to have a reasonable debate on what is already turning out to be \$1.7 billion of expenditure, on the figures that the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure has given. That is based on the deals that are coming out.

Hon Dee Margetts: You are speaking on the wrong motion. This is a motion on the Animal Welfare Bill.

Hon MURRAY CRIDDLE: I want to debate the amendment.

The PRESIDENT: The member is in order speaking to the amendment. He can of course also refer to the principal motion in this debate.

Hon MURRAY CRIDDLE: That is exactly right.

We are dealing with a major financial burden on the State, which is being added to by all sorts of agreements that are coming out. There has been no clarification whatsoever of what will happen when the route involves tunnelling and the like on the freeway. If there is to be reduced debate at this stage, we will obtain no knowledge of what arrangements will be put in place for the railway. Of course I want to see the Animal Welfare Bill debated, but I also want to see this place debate the Railway (Jandakot to Perth) Bill 2002. I understood the Leader of the House to say that there would be a full and frank debate on the rail Bill when it got to the committee stage. At least we could tease something out at the committee stage.

Hon Kim Chance: We have wasted two days on a referral motion.

Hon MURRAY CRIDDLE: The Leader of the House said that we would have a full and frank debate on the rail Bill.

Hon Kim Chance: Let us get into it and off the referral motion on which you have been wasting time.

Hon MURRAY CRIDDLE: If the Leader of the House gets the mob over there to vote with him, we will not get a debate at all. That is the issue.

Hon Graham Giffard interjected.

Hon MURRAY CRIDDLE: The parliamentary secretary would not know the first thing about it.

Hon Kim Chance: There are three clauses in the Bill.

Hon Norman Moore; Hon Kim Chance; Hon Jim Scott; Hon Murray Criddle; President; Hon Peter Foss; Hon Giz Watson; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Ray Halligan

---

Hon MURRAY CRIDDLE: There are three clauses in it and \$1.5 billion to \$1.7 billion worth of responsibility for the State. It is absolutely ridiculous. With the motion hanging on this amendment, there is no way in the wide world that I will support it.

**HON PETER FOSS** (East Metropolitan) [10.19 am]: I oppose the amendment and support the original motion. I oppose the amendment because it reveals the Government for what it is doing. It loves putting through its contentious legislation and then blaming the Opposition, One Nation and the Greens (WA) for the fact that it cannot organise its business. That is the reality of the matter; it cannot organise its business. It blames everyone else for it, and it will continue to blame everyone else for it unless we defeat this amendment and put the original motion.

Hon Kim Chance: This is about organising business.

Hon PETER FOSS: No, it is not. I am disappointed in the attitude shown by the Greens, because I believe we must deal with another motion before we deal with the Railway (Jandakot to Perth) Bill. I am not prepared to deal with that Bill until I have some facts. I have been very patient in asking for facts. I want to know how the original decision was made and how it has been costed. I do not think that is an unreasonable request. When I raised the issue in the House the other day, the Leader of the House said that he would try to get it for me the next morning. I have not heard anything more from him, so it sounds as though the situation is as it always was.

Hon Kim Chance: No; I think we have those figures now.

Hon PETER FOSS: I still do not have them. I have been asking for that information continuously. I do not think it is an unreasonable question. I have been asking the Government to tell me how it made the decision to go this way. I am open to persuasion. I do not think this is a political matter on which we cannot agree. I want to know how the Government arrived at the figures, because they look to me to be extremely rubbery. I would like to see some firmness. The Government wants us to deal with the railway Bill; yet it is still not able to give us what I believe is the fundamental information we need before we can discuss it.

This matter is about a bit of good organisation. If the Government has that information, we as a Parliament are entitled to it. If it has that information, we are entitled to it in good time to read it, digest it and understand it prior to deciding to debate a mere three clauses. The Bill is not about the three clauses; it is about the proposition behind it. We do not have that basic information. I have been patiently asking for it for months. I have not jumped up and down. I asked for it during the estimates hearings, I gave notice of it during the estimates hearings, I wrote to the Chairman of Committees, and I put a notice of motion on the Notice Paper. What has the Government done to give me legitimately requested information? Nothing.

Hon Kim Chance: I would have to check with the parliamentary secretary, but when I had an update with him yesterday, he said that figures were in an advanced stage of preparation.

Hon PETER FOSS: It is in an advanced stage! We are in an advanced stage of being asked to vote on three clauses and the Government is in an advanced stage of giving us the information we need to vote on it!

Hon Kim Chance: I undertook to respond to your request only a day ago.

Hon PETER FOSS: I know. However, I gave notice of that motion on 13 August. When were the estimates hearings held, during which I asked the questions? They were held well before that. Nearly five months later the Government is in an advanced stage of giving me an answer; yet we are being asked to be in an advanced stage of giving the Government a rubber stamp to go ahead with it! Why on earth should we debate a Bill when the Government cannot even give me the figures and the information that we legitimately need to make a decision? I do not think I am being unreasonable. I think I have been a model of patience. The questions that I asked were perfectly proper questions. They ask what the Government had before it when it made the decision, how that has changed since then and what are the figures for all these things.

I will be quite frank with the Leader of the House. Just this week his minister said that she is still working on the budget cost for these things. She tabled a report in the other House. We waited months and we got a slightly altered version of a report that was released in 1998, with a few nice words in it. I am getting the distinct impression - maybe I am wrong - that the minister does not know what she is doing. She does not know the figures and she did not have much to go on. I might be wrong, and there is a very easy way to show that I am wrong - show me the facts. The reason I am getting more and more suspicious is that I have asked and asked and still I have not received an answer. I hope the Greens (WA) take a similar view. I have been reasonable about this. I have asked questions. I did not interfere with the estimates committee hearings. I did not kick up a stink then and say that I gave notice of these questions and I want an answer now. I did not jump up and down. I let everyone have an opportunity to ask questions during the hearings. I put a notice of motion on the Notice

Hon Norman Moore; Hon Kim Chance; Hon Jim Scott; Hon Murray Criddle; President; Hon Peter Foss; Hon Giz Watson; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Ray Halligan

---

Paper. I have sat here and waited for the motion to come up the list. I have not jumped up and down about it. I thought I would get this information before we were asked to debate the Bill.

Hon Ken Travers: You have.

Hon PETER FOSS: No, I have not. I have been sitting here waiting patiently. Only because this Bill has come forward am I saying that there is an order of events. I will sit here and wait patiently while the Bill comes through, but as soon as the Government starts pushing it through as urgent, I will ask about the information I asked for six months ago. The Government has introduced this Bill and now it says that it is urgent. What about the notice of motion I gave five months ago? What about the questions I asked during the estimates hearings six months ago? When do I get an answer to those questions? The Government cannot have it both ways. It cannot say that the Bill is urgent but that the necessary information that goes before it is not. It just does not work that way.

Hon Bill Stretch interjected.

Hon PETER FOSS: Yes, it is PICL. The Government will get itself in a pickle. I genuinely care for Western Australia. I genuinely care for public transport in Western Australia. I want the right decision to be made. I can take political advantage of the Government's making a total stuff up of this railway, but I do not want to, not because I do not want to have the Government thrown out but because I do not think that is in the best interests of Western Australia. We must get it right. I accept the criticisms of Hon Jim Scott about some of the things we did while in government. I think the railway extension from Rockingham to Mandurah was extremely difficult to justify, except as a political decision. I will be quite frank with members; it was a political decision and I admit that.

Hon Ken Travers: You never said that at the time.

Hon PETER FOSS: Has the member heard of cabinet solidarity? Members are meant to shut up and not say that, but that was my view.

Hon Ken Travers: That lasts forever. You are not supposed to dob on your mates now, are you?

Hon PETER FOSS: The member might have noticed that at this stage we are not in government. Has he seen that?

Several members interjected.

Hon PETER FOSS: The rest of the decision was a perfectly good one. It was well worked out with lots of consultation. I do not happen to agree with Hon Jim Scott on that, but I accept that it was not a perfect solution. Nobody is suggesting that there should be a perfect solution. What I am saying about this decision is that we do not have the information to judge it. I have serious concerns, but my biggest concern is that we have not been given the information that relates to the decision. We have not been given the information that relates to the cost. I think that cost will be many more times higher than it was estimated to be.

Hon Murray Criddle: It is going up like that.

Hon PETER FOSS: Yes, I am sure it is. Those are matters of concern. All I am saying is that we will deal with the Railway (Jandakot to Perth) Bill, but we think that we can legitimately ask the Government -

Several members interjected.

Hon PETER FOSS: I oppose the amendment. I support the original motion.

**HON GIZ WATSON** (North Metropolitan) [10.28 am]: As this debate has evolved, it has come to our attention that when Hon Jim Scott spoke on this motion, he assumed he was speaking to the original motion, not the amendment. For a point of clarification, the Greens (WA) do not support this amendment. We support the original motion. We have some sympathy for the view that has been expressed that we do need adequate time to debate the Railway (Jandakot to Perth) Bill. I just wanted to make that clear. Obviously, Hon Jim Scott cannot speak again as he has already spoken to the amendment. I put on the record that we are sorry about the confusion. At this point we are not in favour of supporting the amendment.

**HON SIMON O'BRIEN** (South Metropolitan) [10.29 am]: Mr President, as I do not have a copy of the amendment in front of me, I ask that the exact terms of the amendment be repeated.

The PRESIDENT: The proposed amendment is to insert after "2002" the words -

subject, however, to the Railway (Jandakot to Perth) Bill 2002 having passed the House before that date

The question is that the proposed amendment be agreed to.

Hon Norman Moore; Hon Kim Chance; Hon Jim Scott; Hon Murray Criddle; President; Hon Peter Foss; Hon Giz Watson; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Ray Halligan

---

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: Thank you, Mr President. Obviously, I oppose the amendment. However, I make this point to the House: why can this Government not do anything in a straightforward way? Why can it not play anything with a straight bat? Why does it always try to be too clever by half? Why does it have to relate the passage of the Animal Welfare Bill to some other Bill about the railway, a Bill about which the Government is trying to convince the public that somehow the Opposition is delaying the railway being built?

Hon Kim Chance: You are just proving it right now. You are trying to kill the rail.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: It is the same way in which the Government is trying to con the public.

Hon Kim Chance: You just don't have the courage to vote against it. Just say that you don't want the rail.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: The Government does not like to hear about it; it is incapable of playing a straight bat. I will argue with the Leader of the House and the rest of the mob on the government benches at the appropriate time. Government members interject all the time with their nonsense announcements that they get from their press officers, telling everybody that it is the Liberals that are holding up this Bill and holding up that Bill. The fact is it is not true and government members know it. It does not matter how much they interject or shout about it; it does not make it true. This is a classic example of the sort of "bs" with which this Government persists. It was not enough that it tried dishonestly to put through the House two unlawful Bills about electoral reform, claiming that the Bills had nothing to do with each other; it is not enough that the Government wants to tell everyone a pack of nonsense about how it has delayed the railway, which should be open next year, yet it is the Government that has delayed it. Now it is trying to relate the railway Bill to the Animal Welfare Bill.

It is opportune to remind the House that some years ago - I think in the early 1980s - a satirical American magazine called *National Lampoon* was published.

Hon Ray Halligan interjected.

Hon Ken Travers interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! If the parliamentary secretary and Hon Ray Halligan wish to continue their conversation, they will do so outside the Chamber.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: It is appropriate to refer to that satirical magazine when dealing with the joke actions of this contemptible Government. I particularly recall an advertisement for the magazine in the early 1980s that caused great controversy at the time because of the way in which it inappropriately dealt with the matter. An advertisement promoting the magazine contained a picture of a cute dog with a hand gun held to its head. The caption to sell that stupid magazine was "If you don't buy this magazine, we'll shoot the dog". It was not a particularly funny advertisement, but it is appropriate to raise it because we are trying to deal with the Animal Welfare Bill and this Government has said, "Sure, if you just pass the Railway (Jandakot to Perth) Bill just like that." This amendment is like putting a gun at our head and saying, "If you don't buy this Bill, we will shoot the dog". That is the way this Government operates. The Opposition wants to pass the Animal Welfare Bill and it should not be bound up by the Government's absurd conditions on unrelated matters.

**HON RAY HALLIGAN** (North Metropolitan) [10.34 am]: We have heard this Government say on numerous occasions that it is open and accountable. Hon Peter Foss has quite reasonably asked for the information that the Government used to determine the path that it wishes to go down. It has not provided that information, presumably because it does not have it. I had to go down this path only a few weeks ago with the Home Building Contracts Amendment Bill 2002 and tell more than 200 small business people - builders - exactly what this Government was doing. It again is pushing forward this railway Bill but will not bring forward for debate the Home Building Contracts Amendment Bill. When the Government heard the reaction of those 200-odd people, it immediately changed its mind. That occurred on a Monday and on the following Tuesday the Government had changed its tune and wanted to do something about the Home Building Contracts Amendment Bill. The Government should tell the people what it proposes. The Government is again prepared, for its own ends, to leave the Animal Welfare Bill languishing until the railway Bill passes through this House. Let us not forget that a member in the other place brought forward a petition many months ago on animal welfare with some 65 000 signatures on it, to which the minister said that it was the Government's intention. The Government's intention to do what - use the Animal Welfare Bill as a lever against the Opposition to pass the Government's contentious legislation? That is how it appears in this place. I want to see this open and accountable Government go out to the people of Western Australia and tell them exactly what it is that the Government proposes to do.

**HON NORMAN MOORE** (Mining and Pastoral - Leader of the Opposition) [10.37 am]: The amendment is obviously opposed. It simply tells the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Western Australia and other organisations that are anxious for the Animal Welfare Bill to be passed that it is not the Government's

Hon Norman Moore; Hon Kim Chance; Hon Jim Scott; Hon Murray Criddle; President; Hon Peter Foss; Hon Giz Watson; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Ray Halligan

---

first priority and that the Government has other priorities. It is time that the Government told everybody who has an interest in the Animal Welfare Bill that it is not at all a top priority. It is not on the list of Bills that the Government wants passed in these two weeks of sittings. The Government should stop persisting with the myth that the Opposition is somehow seeking to delay the passage of the railway Bill. We are happy to deal with the Bills, but it is the Government's business to decide the order of business in the House. It has not put the Animal Welfare Bill anywhere near the top of its priority list. The Government should tell the people that it has no priority.

Hon Kim Chance: It has a priority; it will be passed this year.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: Hang on! The Government should tell the people that although the Bill they want passed was brought into this place in September 2001, it has a lower priority than the railway Bill brought in two weeks ago. The Government should tell them that so that I do not have to explain to them any more. I hope that the media will explain to the people of Western Australia that that is the Government's priority. The Government should then leave it at that and not blame us for its incapacity to manage the place. It should not blame us for its priorities; the Government determines its priorities. The Government has told us today, by way of amendment to the motion, that its first priority is the railway Bill and, by virtue of the letter sent to me by the Leader of the House, that the Animal Welfare Bill is not a priority in these two weeks of sittings.

Hon Kim Chance: No, the letter did not say that. Read the letter again.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: It is not even on the list.

Hon Kim Chance: The letter did not say that at all.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: If, however, the Leader of the House accepts my motion, albeit that he wants to amend it, that the Animal Welfare Bill is next on his list of priorities -

Hon Kim Chance: I am more than happy to do that.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: That is different from what the Leader of the House said at the beginning of this week. However, I am pleased the Leader of the House has changed his mind and it is now second on the list.

Hon Kim Chance: That is not what the letter says. Read it again.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: I do not want to take a lot of time on this. I want to get this motion debated, but the Leader of the House has now provoked me, I regret to say. His letter does not mention the Animal Welfare Bill.

Hon Kim Chance: No, it does not.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: The letter from the Leader of the House states -

I am writing to advise that the Government will seek to progress all remaining stages of the following Bills during the next two parliamentary sitting weeks -

- Railway (Jandakot to Perth) Bill 2002;
- Volunteers (Protection from Liability) Bill 2002;
- Home Building Contracts Amendment Bill 2002;
- Civil Liability Bill 2002;
- Insurance Commission of Western Australia Amendment Bill 2002; and
- Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation (Acts of Terrorism) Amendment Bill 2002.

There is no mention in that letter of the Animal Welfare Bill. At the beginning of this week, that Bill was not part -

Hon Kim Chance interjected.

Hon Peter Foss: Well done! You're as good as Jim McGinty.

Hon Kim Chance: It is true. They are the six Bills that we want to get through.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order, members! Not only is the Leader of the Opposition trying to be heard, but so am I.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: At the beginning of this week that Bill had no priority with the Government in the context of the next two weeks sitting, otherwise it would have been put on the list.

**Extract from *Hansard***  
[COUNCIL - Thursday, 7 November 2002]  
p2722c-2729a

Hon Norman Moore; Hon Kim Chance; Hon Jim Scott; Hon Murray Criddle; President; Hon Peter Foss; Hon Giz Watson; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Ray Halligan

---

Hon Kim Chance: It was on the Notice Paper.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: So what! It has been on the Notice Paper since September last year.

Hon Ken Travers: That clearly indicates that we wanted to get it through.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon NORMAN MOORE: If I were the Leader of the House -

Hon Kim Chance: Just be honest and say that you do not want the railway, you are going to filibuster it as long as you can, and you do not care about the Animal Welfare Bill. You have been two days arguing about a referral.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Two members who have already exercised speaking rights are trying to exercise them over another member. They will cease to do so forthwith.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: If I were the Leader of the House, I would suggest to the parliamentary secretary that if that is the best he can do, he should not try to help me. It is as simple as this: the Leader of the House wrote to the Opposition telling us what he wanted to do this week and next week. I accepted that in good faith. He did not include the Animal Welfare Bill, but that was his decision. I would not now be standing if the Government's parliamentary secretaries and ministers were not out in the marketplace and on the airwaves in Western Australia telling the people that the Animal Welfare Bill is not being dealt with because the Opposition is delaying it. The only reason I am on my feet is to put that to bed. We are not delaying that legislation.

The Leader of the House has made a decision, by virtue of his amendment, that animal welfare legislation has a lower priority than the railway legislation. He is entitled to do that, but he should go and tell the RSPCA that that is the situation, and not have the rubbish being trotted out by his colleagues in the media that somehow or other we are delaying the Bill, because we are not. We are prepared to deal with the Animal Welfare Bill next Tuesday and we will deal with the railway Bill as well; it is just that one might take longer than the other. I am pleased the leader moved the amendment, because once and for all, those people in the community who have an interest in this matter will know what the Government's priorities are. We will debate both Bills whenever and at whatever time the Government brings them on. Let us get rid of the amendment, let us deal with the Animal Welfare Bill next week, and we can get on with the Railway (Jandakot to Perth) Bill after that.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result -

Ayes (9)

Hon Kim Chance	Hon Graham Giffard	Hon Tom Stephens	Hon Kate Doust ( <i>Teller</i> )
Hon Sue Ellery	Hon Nick Griffiths	Hon Ken Travers	
Hon Jon Ford	Hon Ljiljana Ravlich		

Noes (18)

Hon Alan Cadby	Hon Peter Foss	Hon Simon O'Brien	Hon Giz Watson
Hon George Cash	Hon Ray Halligan	Hon Barbara Scott	Hon Christine Sharp
Hon Robin Chapple	Hon Robyn McSweeney	Hon Jim Scott	Hon Bruce Donaldson ( <i>Teller</i> )
Hon Murray Criddle	Hon Dee Margetts	Hon Bill Stretch	
Hon John Fischer	Hon Norman Moore	Hon Derrick Tomlinson	

---

Pairs

Hon Louise Pratt	Hon Paddy Embry
Hon Ed Dermer	Hon Frank Hough
Hon Adele Farina	Hon Barry House

Amendment thus negatived.

*Motion Resumed*

Question put and a division taken with the following result -

**Extract from *Hansard***  
[COUNCIL - Thursday, 7 November 2002]  
p2722c-2729a

Hon Norman Moore; Hon Kim Chance; Hon Jim Scott; Hon Murray Criddle; President; Hon Peter Foss; Hon Giz Watson; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Ray Halligan

---

Ayes (18)

Hon Alan Cadby	Hon Peter Foss	Hon Simon O'Brien	Hon Derrick Tomlinson
Hon George Cash	Hon Ray Halligan	Hon Barbara Scott	Hon Giz Watson
Hon Robin Chapple	Hon Robyn McSweeney	Hon Jim Scott	Hon Bruce Donaldson ( <i>Teller</i> )
Hon Murray Criddle	Hon Dee Margetts	Hon Christine Sharp	
Hon John Fischer	Hon Norman Moore	Hon Bill Stretch	

Noes (9)

Hon Kim Chance	Hon Graham Giffard	Hon Tom Stephens	Hon Kate Doust ( <i>Teller</i> )
Hon Sue Ellery	Hon Nick Griffiths	Hon Ken Travers	
Hon Jon Ford	Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich		

---

Pairs

Hon Frank Hough	Hon Ed Dermer
Hon Barry House	Hon Adele Farina
Hon Paddy Embry	Hon Louise Pratt

Question thus passed.