

**CONSERVATION AND LAND MANAGEMENT AMENDMENT BILL 2002**

*Second Reading*

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

**MR MASTERS** (Vasse) [3.11 pm]: Prior to question time I was quoting from an e-mail that had been written by someone who had been actively involved in the timber industry and with timber communities in the south west. I will read the last part again to refresh members' memories. The letter stated -

. . . the Conservation Commission seem to me to be finally showing their true colours in all this and are emerging as the most dangerous body of green fanatics with enormous political power over environmental matters and the Minister for the Environment.

As I said, I do not necessarily agree with all the detail or sentiments that are expressed in that e-mail. However, it sends a message to the minister and the Government that more and more people in the community believe that the Government is applying ideology and is not using commonsense when addressing environmental matters in Western Australia at this time. The legislation before us today will go a long way towards making the statements of the author of that e-mail become truer than they are at present. The current political reality in Western Australia is that five members of the Greens (WA) hold the balance of power in the upper House. I share the inherent concerns expressed in that e-mail. Those concerns suggest that more and more decisions will be made on an unsound, non-scientific and emotional basis in the name of political expediency rather than on a basis of trying to achieve a true, genuine and desirable outcome that treats everyone in our society fairly.

When the Minister for the Environment and Heritage delivered her second reading speech on this Bill, she spoke for only a few minutes. She relied on the scene she had set some two years ago when the current legislation was amended to allow the then Minister for the Environment and two other ministers to seek consensus on the acceptance of forest management plans. However, towards the end of the minister's second reading speech she said -

Indeed, in opposition, we found the constraints on the Minister for the Environment's discretion to approve a proposed management plan for state forests, timber reserves and public water catchment areas under those amendments to be an unsatisfactory arrangement akin to a veto power.

I repeat my belief and the belief of the Opposition that the minister has not proven her case. Will the minister give us one example of when the two ministers other than the Minister for the Environment used what she wrongly referred to as a power of veto to frustrate or otherwise impact upon the deliberations and decision-making capability of the then Minister for the Environment? I am not aware of any power of veto having been exercised. I am unaware of the constraints about which she talked. I am unaware of any genuine need to proceed with the changes contained in the Conservation and Land Management Amendment Bill. Will the minister give us some detail to justify the need for this legislation?

On 14 March 2000 in this place there was a robust and healthy debate between the member for Kingsley, who was the then Minister for the Environment, and the then shadow minister for the environment. In the space of two paragraphs the shadow minister made 10 separate statements, accusations, summations or conclusions. For the record, I state my belief that many of those statements are unconnected. The member jumped from one conclusion to another without having proved her case. I will take a few minutes to explain some of the concerns I have about what the member said just over two years ago. The member stated -

The difficulty is that first the Minister for the Environment must effectively incorporate the submissions of the Minister for Forest Products.

That is not what the legislation says. The legislation says that the Minister for the Environment must consider the submissions from the Minister for Forest Products. If the Minister for the Environment and the Minister for Forest Products did not resolve their differences, the matter could be taken to Cabinet for the Government to resolve the issue. The member's suggestion that the Minister for the Environment must incorporate the submissions made by the Minister for Forest Products was incorrect.

The member also said that if the Minister for the Environment and the Minister for Forest Products could not agree, the matter would go to Cabinet. That is fair enough. The member also stated -

We are setting up situation where a hypothetical Minister for Forest Products, even the present minister, could roll the Minister for the Environment in Cabinet. We would then be left not knowing what would happen with the EPA.

So what if the Minister for Forest Products rolled the Minister for the Environment in Cabinet? Perhaps I have a naive belief, but that is what democracy is all about. At the end of the day, the minister was not elected as the Minister for the Environment and Heritage just as I am not elected as the opposition spokesman for the environment; the Government is elected to govern for the benefit of the people. If the Minister for the Environment and Heritage does not have her views accepted and supported by Cabinet in the cut and thrust of cabinet decision making, so be it; that is what democracy is all about. Therefore, it can only be concluded that the Bill before us seeks to make this process of creating the forest management plan less democratic and less representative; it will not be a process of the people by the people for the people. The Minister for the Environment and Heritage is subverting the democratic process of Western Australia by trying to take supreme control of the forest management plan process. The minister continues -

It makes a farce if these two ministers cannot agree.

With respect, is the minister calling democracy a farce? I do not accept that for one second. If two ministers cannot agree, regardless of who the ministers are, Cabinet is the logical and desirable place to air their disagreement no matter what the nature of their disagreement is. I do not see anything farcical in it. If ministers cannot agree, a Westminster system of government has been set up to put the democratic principles of government into force in a way that makes sure that the majority rules, and the Government of the day assesses and makes decisions about what is good for the people.

There is a certain degree of arrogance and dictatorship in this legislation because it attempts to ensure that when there are areas of dispute involving forest management plans, those disputes will not go to Cabinet and therefore will not be resolved by Cabinet. Instead, the minister, as a person, will have the power to resolve these issues, and will basically, as I understand - the minister will correct me if I am wrong - set herself up in a position that is superior to Cabinet and to the Government.

The minister went on to say -

Where does true public consultation fit in with that?

That is the "farce" of two ministers not agreeing? With respect to the minister, I must say that that is exactly what public consultation is all about. If two ministers cannot agree, there are presumably some pretty good reasons for that. I imagine those reasons would be well known to the broader public. Because the preparation of forest management plans is a public process, I can only assume that the minister is somehow saying that the process that was set in place by the previous Government, which with this one exception she has not been particularly critical of, fails when two ministers disagree, and that means that the public consultation process fails when an issue must be taken to Cabinet. That is a farcical conclusion to reach. I welcome argument from the minister to convince me otherwise. Public consultation will lead to the very disputes between ministers that make for a strong and free democracy. When ministers cannot agree, and after public consultation, it is entirely appropriate that issues be resolved by Cabinet - by the Government of the day.

I will put this in context in a moment. The minister went on to say -

However, when the EPA has looked at the matter, it will go back to the Minister for Forest Products because he is now the decision making authority under the Environmental Protection Act.

My understanding is that if Cabinet decides something, that should virtually be where it ends. If Cabinet decides that a forest management plan will encompass this or that decision or consideration, it is up to the appropriate ministers to put those decisions in place. I would be grateful if the minister could explain to me why she somehow believes that Cabinet's making of a decision subverts the normal and desirable processes of government, because that is what she seems to have said two years ago -

... it will go back to the Minister for Forest Products because he is now the decision making authority under the Environmental Protection Act.

That can occur only after the Cabinet has resolved an issue. Again, will the minister please address that issue because, under the democratic system of government that has been set up in Western Australia, we want matters decided by Cabinet? The minister went on to say -

We are fearful that some gung-ho Minister for Forest Products could get Cabinet on his side, roll the Minister for the Environment and then put any Minister for the Environment in a very invidious situation in how he or she would deal with appeals on the Environmental Protection Authority's report if he or she had already been rolled by Cabinet.

I am sorry, but I hope that the minister now has a better understanding of the way in which Cabinet and our democratic system of government work.

Mr Omodei: The converse could be the case.

Mr MASTERS: Of course, that is the case; and I will get to that in a second, member for Warren-Blackwood. Even if the minister is rolled in Cabinet by the minister responsible for forest products or by any other minister - the minister responsible for water resources, the Minister for Tourism, the minister responsible for resources development or whomever - the bottom line is that that is the system of government that is in place in Western Australia. I would welcome the minister's refutation of my belief that the minister is trying to set herself up as a decision-making body that is superior to Cabinet. If the minister is rolled in Cabinet, that is part of the cut and thrust of this democratic form of government.

As the member for Warren-Blackwood pointed out, what should the Opposition think should the reverse happen? What will happen if the minister, under the existing legislation, rolls the minister responsible for forest products in Cabinet? Should we criticise the Minister for the Environment for having done what we accept is part of the normal democratic process? I do not think so. The Opposition accepts that when three ministers with equal powers over the way in which forest management plans are determined, as is the case at the moment, are all arguing their point of view, and Cabinet makes a decision, regardless of who is rolled - because I do not think that is the issue - Cabinet is the appropriate decision-making body.

The minister made further remarks a couple of years ago that deserve to be commented on. On page 5814 of *Hansard*, the minister said -

I would have thought that turbidity in the water was more of an issue for the Water Corporation as it was affecting the water supply.

To put that in context, the minister was talking about the role of the Water and Rivers Commission in the process of ticking off or making submissions on forest management plans. This is only a small point - I am not trying to belittle the minister or anything like that - but turbidity in drinking water is the final consequence of forest harvesting or other activities in forest areas. I ask the minister to think about the impact of turbidity between the site in the forest where the ground disturbance occurs and the final resting place for that turbid water once it gets into a dam. That water must flow down a natural watercourse that has environmental values. With respect, there is a significant role for the Water and Rivers Commission in the forest management plan process. It seems to be a role that the minister either does not accept or does not understand. Before the water gets into a dam, it is involved in many environmental issues. I was at a briefing this morning at which we talked about the possibility of modifying forest logging processes to increase the amount of water that comes out of the forests and into dams. The plans that were produced during that briefing show that for every water catchment dam in Western Australia, almost all of which have their catchments in state forests, tens of kilometres of watercourses feed into those dams. Turbidity may pose a problem for drinking water-related issues but, before that, that turbidity will affect environmental values in tens of kilometres of natural waterways. That is the issue on which the minister should have focused two years ago and on which she should focus now, because the Government's legislation is proposing to remove the Water and Rivers Commission from that position of consensual agreement among the three ministers on the issue of forest management plans. I believe that the minister has looked at the drinking water issue; however, I need to encourage her to think instead about the environmental values of that water before it gets into the dams.

On page 5815 of *Hansard* of Thursday, 30 March 2000, the minister commented -

We have the suspicion that if there are nefarious characters and dreadful situations involved, this legislation may send the whole process backwards. This is set up so that land is vested in the Conservation Commission and conservation ethic underlies all decision making. If at the end of the day "acting jointly" does not work out and the Minister for the Environment is very unhappy with what happens, it is feasible that we could get an outcome that is potentially worse than that which occurs under the current system.

I quoted somewhat lengthily from the then shadow minister's words of two years ago because they refer to the triple bottom line and what would happen if the concept of sustainable development was not considered in the preparation of forest management plans. She was saying that the outcome under the new system could be potentially worse than what had occurred under the system that was in place at that time. However, under the concept of the triple bottom line, if something is worse for the environment, it must, ipso facto, be better for both society and the economy. In other words, the other two components of the triple bottom line must have benefits accruing to them that far outweigh the environmental costs. I do not know if the then shadow minister had a particular issue or situation in mind when she made those comments; however, I repeat my belief that we have gone beyond the old adversarial system of resolving such issues. We have moved on to the concepts of the triple bottom line and environmentally sustainable development. After reading the minister's words of two years ago and the current legislation, I am concerned that the Bill does not reflect modern thinking. During that debate, the then Minister for the Environment, the member for Kingsley, tried to put all the now minister's concerns into some sort of context. The member for Kingsley said -

I will take members through this process step by step, because it is important to understand the mechanics. The Conservation Commission, the Department of Conservation and the Forest Products Commission will work together to develop draft forest management plans. The plans will go out to the public at the same time as they are referred to the Environmental Protection Authority, which also sends them out to the public. The two ministers agree to the draft forest management plans going out to the public. When the plans come back to the EPA, they are assessed in the normal course and recommendations are made to the Minister for the Environment for ministerial conditions that the Minister for the Environment will apply to forest management plans.

In other words, the normal environmental assessment process is applied to the preparation of forest management plans, and the Minister for the Environment and Heritage has the ability - the current legislation charges her with the responsibility - to apply ministerial conditions to the forest management plans. Under this system, three ministers are required to agree on a plan, and, in the absence of an agreement, Cabinet must make a decision. That is then subject to rigorous Environmental Protection Authority and public assessment and, at the end of the day, the Minister for the Environment and Heritage has a final bite of the cherry by being able to set ministerial conditions. I do not understand the minister's concern that that system somehow weakens sound environmental policies and practices, or why she thinks that it puts the forest management plan process at any sort of risk or subject to any sort of question. I strongly urge the minister to address those issues, either in her response or during the consideration in detail stage.

I refer the minister to page 5985 of *Hansard* of 5 April 2000, where she referred to the process that was in place at that time -

Perhaps it is an accident of history that has worked well and we want to ensure it continues to work fairly well.

I am not sure why the then shadow minister used the adjective "fairly"; nonetheless, she was saying that the system had worked well up to that stage. I have not been made aware of any problems that have arisen in the past two years because of those changes to the Conservation and Land Management Act. On page 1642 of *Hansard* of Thursday, 21 September 2000, the then shadow minister said in relation to the forest management plan process -

The Opposition continues to have an ongoing concern about the role of the Minister for Forest Products.

I hope the minister will be able to tell me whether she had Hon Kim Chance, the Minister for Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries and a member of the other place, in mind when she expressed concerns about the role of the forests products minister in this process.

The Opposition will oppose the legislation. It will also propose three amendments. I will wait and see how the Government responds to those amendments. I believe the Minister for the Environment and Heritage is putting herself in a position in which she and her department will presume to be the Government's experts on the many various forest product matters, including sustainable timber yields, that at present are the responsibility of the Forest Products Commission. The same sort of belief will apply to water resource issues. The minister and her department do not have access to the expert staff in those areas, and I feel that this will be bad legislation, and bad for the environment.

**MR AINSWORTH** (Roe) [3.36 pm]: The National Party will support this legislation. We believe that it is important that one lead agency take responsibility for the preparation and management of plans for state forests and reserves. It is also important that that lead agency continue to engage in a high level of consultation with interested parties such as the Forest Products Commission and the Water and Rivers Commission. However, a premier agency must be in charge of drawing up the management plans and reporting to the responsible minister, who in this case is the Minister for the Environment and Heritage.

We ask the minister whether the Department of Conservation and Land Management, as the body responsible for the land vested in it by the State, will take a more active interest in other aspects of the management of its estate, such as vermin control, fire risk management and dealing with noxious weeds. It has long been a concern of many owners of land adjacent to land owned by CALM that although private landholders have a legal responsibility to rid their properties of certain types of vermin or noxious or declared weeds, the next-door neighbour, CALM, does not appear to be under the same obligation. That has adverse effects on the adjoining land. The same also applies, to a certain degree, to fire management. Although that is not the thrust of the Bill, the development of management plans for state forest and reserves is not just a matter of managing the timber asset; it is a matter of managing the entire estate and considering all the responsibilities that any landlord should have. I hope the minister can in her response address some of the issues about CALM managing matters other than just the timber asset.

In summary, we support the legislation. We believe one lead agency should be responsible for the management plan, but, more importantly, that that agency should not be responsible for that plan in isolation. The management plan still refers to all the other bodies that have been part of the process in the past. We believe that the process will streamline the whole decision-making effort without in any way watering down the final outcome. It makes for better management, particularly as the minister will still have the ability to call on the expertise of all agencies, not only CALM, when assessing the plans put before her.

**MR OMODEI** (Warren-Blackwood) [3.40 pm]: I am pleased to see that the minister is back in the Chamber. I know that ministers cannot be in the Chamber all the time, but this is important legislation. It is a sad day for the Parliament: first, because we are bringing in legislation for political purposes, to respond to a political commitment and a political statement made prior to the election; and, secondly, the media are not here. I hope that they are listening, but this whole issue probably will not be reported.

I want to take members back to the days of the amalgamation of the old department responsible for forestry, fisheries, wildlife and national parks to create the Department of Conservation and Land Management. That was done in the early 1980s by a Labor Government and opposed by the conservative Opposition. The facts of the matter are that through the effluxion of time, the very good officers of those departments made the Department of Conservation and Land Management work to such an extent that it became world renowned as a land management body. The department had very well qualified, professional people and a range of officers with PhDs. It is a sad day when we find a decade or so later the conservative Opposition supporting the structure and the Labor Government trying to pull it apart.

For the first time under that process in this State, forestry and the management of forests became a political issue. Over a 20-year period there was bipartisan support for the way we went about consulting with the public and producing management plans. It is now part of history that the present Premier decided to make the management of forests a political issue. It really concerns me that we are here again in 2002 discussing an amendment to the legislation and people still do not understand how the process works. In response to the comments by the member for Roe, under section 53(3) of the Act the Department of Conservation and Land Management already has primacy in managing the process. We had in the past a very thorough process for going to the community, the community being able to make decisions, and a management plan being brought forward to the Government of the day and supported by the Opposition.

What concerns me greatly is that we are already seeing signs of division within what was once the Department of Conservation and Land Management. I have found from very good sources that the officers of the Conservation Commission and the Department of Conservation and Land Management are starting to have disagreements with people in the forest products section of forest management. That is sad. It shows that under the old system, the Department of Conservation and Land Management represented not only land management but also the management of wildlife and national parks. A compromise decision was always found. The decision found was the best for government and governing the state forest. That process is now being fragmented. I predict that in future it will fragment even further to the extent that anybody with an extreme green position will dominate what happens with forest management outcomes.

[Quorum formed.]

Mr OMODEI: I do not normally resort to calling your attention to the state of the House, Mr Acting Speaker (Mr McRae), but this is very important legislation. I am sure that all members were listening intently while they were having their tea.

The legislation will amend the Conservation and Land Management Act 1984. It refers to giving pre-eminence to the Conservation Commission as the body responsible for the preparation of forest management plans. The Bill also provides for the removal of the present requirement that the Department of Conservation and Land Management act jointly with the Forest Products Commission in all the management planning processes for state forests and timber reserves. It also removes the requirement that the Conservation Commission must act jointly with the Water and Rivers Commission and water utilities in all management planning processes.

The first question one must ask is why should those two bodies be removed when they are fundamental to the development of management plans. I think I know the answer. The answer is that prior to the election, the Labor Party propagated the proposition that the minister responsible for forest products had the power of veto over forest management plans. Aided and abetted by the Greens, the Labor Party put in place a promise before the election which perpetuated the perception that the minister responsible for forest products had some power of veto. The minister's second reading speech refers to an unsatisfactory arrangement akin to a power of veto. I do not know what the difference is between a power of veto and something that is akin to a power of veto.

This legislation is about putting in place a political promise by the Labor Party to remove any perceived power of veto of the minister responsible for forest products and the minister responsible for water resources. In reality, the power of veto does not exist under the legislation. The minister might explain to me in simple terms, because I am only a simple spud farmer, where that power of veto is set out. The present structure of the legislation is very sound. I will refer later in my speech to the case of a management plan being proposed and the public consultation process taking place. In that case, ministers should have the ability to speak in Cabinet. I do not know whether those in the Labor Cabinet make decisions by a show of hands, but when I was a cabinet minister there were usually consensus decisions. If a minister violently disagreed with a proposition before Cabinet, the issue was deferred until a satisfactory solution was arrived at. I believe that is the right way to make decisions. Should two or three ministers disagree violently, the matter would go back to the Environmental Protection Authority and the whole process would start again. I believe the process was very thorough. I know that the former Minister for the Environment, Hon Cheryl Edwardes, went through this part of the legislation very carefully, because we did not want to have a situation in which there was a perception that one minister dominated another. In the end, Cabinet makes the decision. It is a decision of Cabinet, not of the Minister for the Environment, the Minister for Forestry or the minister responsible for water resources. Why not involve those people? Surely in time the Conservation Commission will be more concerned with the management of land resources, the surface water resource, lakes and swamps and so on, the animals that exist in the forest and the general environment. The Minister for Forestry will be expert on matters that relate to forestry - the amount of the resource that is available for production and the different species, and how they should be harvested and regenerated. On the other hand, the minister responsible for water resources would be concerned fundamentally about where the future water resources for Western Australia will come from. To that extent, the national parks that have been gazetted over a long period are normally vested not only as national parks but also for water production. It is eminently sensible that, for the future of Western Australia, which is fundamentally reliant on water - if there were ever a time that water was important it would be right now - there should be a provision that a government body should have a say in where the water resource should come from.

Only recently I learned from an interesting source about a report of the Water and Rivers Commission concerning an allocation planning unit. It reads -

The findings of this work provided a list of all practical and unconstrained surface water source development sites within each river basin of the South West Drainage Division affecting CALM land within the RFA portion of the CALM estate totalling 67 sites comprising 38 storage sites and 29 pipehead development sites. The findings also identified a list of 12 possible sites that potentially may be affected by reservation into the conservation estate under the Government's Protecting our Old Growth Forests policy and a provisional list of 7 sites currently being, or are likely to be needed to be developed for drinking water supply purposes before 2020, provided environmental approval is given.

Those 67 sites are in the south west land division and would provide water for human consumption. I would expect the minister responsible for water resources and the Water and Rivers Commission to have a say in where the water comes from and whether any activity by any other government department impacts on those water resources. I would think it would be fundamental that the minister, his office and all of the professional bureaucrats in that organisation have a say in the management plan because, as the current legislation says, they act jointly in preparing the management plan. I am given to understand that a report is available; the member for Vasse referred to it briefly. I am interested in when this report will be tabled in the Parliament. I think that the report was compiled jointly by the Water and Rivers Commission and CALM and identifies that in certain catchments, in particular the Wungong catchment, the yield would increase by 30 per cent if the catchment were selectively thinned and burnt. We know that at the moment the conservation movement is very concerned about the Government's proposal to put down three new bores into the Yarragadee formation for our water supply. Those three bores will cost \$37 million and will yield 15 gigalitres of water, which is probably about one-twentieth of the yield required to supply Perth with water. We know that selective thinning, not logging or clear felling, and a mosaic burning of the Wungong catchment would increase the capacity of the run-off of the Wungong catchment by 30 per cent. There are 16 or 17 surface water supplies in Western Australia. If we take that to its logical conclusion, and we were to thin the catchment - the Minister for the Environment will be interested in this - one of the projections is that our water supplies would be at capacity over a three-year period. I understand that the conservation movement might be concerned about sinking bores into Yarragadee and the perception it would draw down on surface aquifers and therefore cause plant deaths etc. However, I put it to the minister that the professionals in the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation and the Water and Rivers Commission would know more about that than the Greens (WA), the Australian Labor Party, the Liberal Party or any other political party. Let us accept just for one minute that the findings of the report that the selected thinning of the forest catchments in our dams and reservoir areas will increase the yield by 30 per cent; that would resolve the water issues. If we added to that all the good drinking water that is going into swimming pools, and stopped all this nonsense about spending \$11.5 billion on a pipeline that will produce

water at \$3.50 a kilolitre and green the outback where the ground temperature is 60 degrees Celsius and Carnarvon growers can only afford to pay 24c a kilolitre otherwise they would go broke, would we then not surmise that the minister responsible for water resources should have some say in what happens as far as forest management plans are concerned? That is absolutely fundamental. I know there is a broad knowledge among Conservation and Land Management officers about the management of the forests. This has come about over time because of the integrated management of our forests. It followed the decision by the former Minister for the Environment and me as the former Minister for Forestry to split the roles of CALM because that is what the committee demanded - against my wishes, I might add. We were trying to find the best compromise, but it was a retrograde step. I believe that those divisions will continue to widen in the future.

This legislation is about placating the concerns of the left of the Labor Party and the green movement in Western Australia. It gives me an opportunity to talk about the situation because, as far as I am concerned, the pendulum in forest management in Western Australia has swung too far in the opposite direction from where it was. I have said this in Parliament before, but I will remind members about the cut of first and second-grade jarrah in Western Australia under previous Labor Ministers for the Environment. Under Minister Hodge the cut was 680 000 cubic metres and under Minister McGinty it was 520 000 cubic metres. Under Kevin Minson in the coalition Government it was 420 000 cubic metres coming down to a yield of 324 000 cubic metres last year. Under the RFA it is projected to be 286 000 cubic metres. What is the figure now, minister?

Dr Edwards: It is 140 000 cubic metres.

Mr OMODEI: Is that the definitive answer? Can I hold the minister to that?

Dr Edwards: It is indicative.

Mr OMODEI: I refer the Minister for the Environment to the expression of interest document that was put out by the Forest Products Commission in November last year, with responses to be received by 4 December. Of course, that is where the magnificent 10 came from; the 10 successful people who applied for the resource. It says that about 97 000 cubic metres were available for sale. Bearing in mind the allocation at Nannup is already 20 000 cubic metres and Greenbushes 23 000 cubic metres, that comes to 140 000 cubic metres. I have said this before but I will repeat it. The report states -

Further quantities of jarrah sawlogs may arise from the availability of resource currently held under moratorium and from carryover of resource released by early stepdown prior to December 2003. Final quantities will be dependant on the sustained yield levels identified in the next Forest Management Plan.

I would like to think that the volume of timber is more than 140 000 cubic metres. The allocations to Sotico Pty Ltd and Cardoso Pty Ltd and those already allocated to Nannup and Greenbushes total 140 000 cubic metres. If the available volume is only 140 000 cubic metres, the eight other people in this picture will miss out on the timber resource.

I raise the issue of volumes because I wonder whether the Parliament understands the direction this debate is taking. People from the Conservation Commission and the Department of Conservation and Land Management recently visited a block called Mack block, west of Manjimup in Davidson Road, and a bright, intelligent person said that he could not find any stumps there; therefore, it had to be old-growth forest. That coup was taken out of production. The system is now going in only one direction. More and more resource is being taken out of production in Western Australia. At the same time, we are importing \$3.6 billion worth of wood products from other countries, in most cases third world countries, and we are exporting about \$1.2 billion worth of wood products, which means there is a deficit of \$2.4 billion.

Debate interrupted, pursuant to standing orders.