

IMPACT

A QUARTERLY NEWSLETTER ON ENVIRONMENTAL LAW

March 1989.

Environmental Defender's Office Ltd

8th Floor, 280 Pitt St., Sydney 2000

DX 722 Sydney

Phone (02) 261 3599

Editor: Brian J. Preston

ENVIRONMENTAL LAW IN THE U.S.A. - A LEGAL CLINIC EXPERIENCE WESTERN NATURAL RESOURCES LAW CLINIC UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, Eugene U.S.A.

Nicola Pain, Solicitor of the Supreme Court of N.S.W.
Principal Solicitor of the Environmental Defenders Office

Following a visit to Sydney in October 1988 by the two co-directors of the Western Natural Resources Law Clinic, a part of the Law School at the University of Oregon, an invitation was received by the Environmental Defender's Office to send each of its solicitors to the Clinic for two months each in the spring (January to May) term 1989. Nicola Pain has just returned from the first two month period spent at the Clinic and has been replaced by Elena Kirillova for the second half of the term at the Clinic. In this article, she sets out some of her impressions of the practice of law in the environmental law field in the U.S.A, as experienced through the Clinic, and makes some observations about the practical legal experience obtained in the clinic.

CLINICAL EDUCATION IN OREGON

The clinic is one of four practical litigation clinics available to students at the University of Oregon (U of O) as part of the first degree of law (Juris Doctor). Others include the civil clinic, the prosecution clinic (run from the District Attorney's Office) and the defence clinic (run from the Public Defender's office). Clinical education is an accepted part of many law school curriculums in the U.S.A., including those at Harvard, Yale, Stanford and Columbia. In fact, practical skills training is a requirement of accreditation of law schools by the American Bar Association. The Western Natural Resources Law Clinic, known formally as the environmental clinic, has been operating in the U of O law school in one form or another for about 13 years. It was the first clinic in the environmental law field in the United States, paving the way for about a dozen more clinics of this kind around the United States as at 1989.

The clinic is located at the Law Center at the U of O. In the spring term (January to May 1989) fifteen students were enrolled in the clinic and were running eight major cases under the direction of two law professors. Students come to the U of O from all over the United States to study environmental law. The clinic in turn represents clients in disputes throughout the United States, as does any law firm.

The clinic's principal purpose is to select and conduct cases having educational merit in the environmental law field. Unlike other clinics it is not designed to assist a particular interest group such as, for example, the civil clinic which represents only indigenous people. The clinic does however tend to represent conservation-oriented groups being those who can generally ill-afford private practitioners. The clinic has never acted for so-called "industry" concerns, not having been requested to do so. There is also less likelihood of such interests wishing to be applicants in the types of suits conducted by the clinic.

ORGANISATION OF THE CLINIC

The whole clinic meets once a week to discuss cases so that everyone is aware of what is happening on all cases. Professors also lecture on relevant topics. Any problems of general application can also be discussed.

Each case has a team of students, usually three or four, assigned to it. The individual teams meet once a week, and more often if necessary, to discuss and work in detail on their particular cases. When court documents are due students spend many hours at a time, at all hours, completing these to comply with court deadlines. At other times, students are on the telephone uncovering evidence, negotiating with opposing lawyers, and dealing with clients. The professors work closely with students and generally require drafts of a brief before it can be finalised. Students are responsible for legal research on matters relevant to cases, preparation of court documents and all aspects of litigation.

There is considerable emphasis on the need for each student to regard her file as her own responsibility and her duties in regard to the file as those of any professional lawyer. This applies to all aspects of the file including file management and organisation and attorney/client communications.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN AMERICAN AND AUSTRALIAN LAW.

The clinic has generally conducted litigation in federal district courts at first instance, representing clients seeking to enforce environmental and pollution control laws breached because of government inaction. The respondents in most clinic cases are federal government agencies, such as the US Forest Service, the Department of Defence or the US Department of Treasury or federal officials.

The nature of the cases run by the clinic reflect the major differences between the American and the Australian

environmental law systems. In America there is a well developed body of federal law, which includes pollution control laws, such as Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act. The pollution control laws, provide for "citizen suit" enforcement proceedings whereby any person may issue proceedings over a breach of a pollution control Act whether by government or industry. Many of the pollution control Acts have provisions requiring the promulgation of regulations and the setting of standards by government departments within a time frame. Failure to carry out such tasks leaves a federal government agency open to prosecution by citizen groups and much of the litigation under pollution statutes is aimed at such failure on the part of the government.

Reflecting increasing concern in the area of the use and disposal of hazardous chemicals and waste Congress has passed legislation attempting to deal with this. There are two major US federal Acts in this area under which there is an increasing amount of complex litigation, being the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA) and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). Under CERCLA so-called "Superfund" sites have been identified. These are abandoned toxic waste dumps requiring cleaning up and monies have been allocated by Congress to provide for this cleaning up. RCRA is the main Act under which would be producers of hazardous chemicals are regulated and the Act contains licensing provisions relating to the disposal of hazardous chemicals. A useful article for comparative purposes is one by William Hedman for the 1986 NELA conference in Canberra.(1)

The principal US federal environmental law statute is known as the National Environment Policy Act (NEPA) on which Act some of the provisions of the New South Wales Environmental Planning & Assessment Act have been modelled. It requires the making of environmental impact statements for those activities conducted by federal agencies which will significantly affect the environment. There has been a considerable body of litigation against US federal government agencies under NEPA.

In Australia environment and pollution control laws are generally promulgated in each State and there is no uniformity of legislation across the nation as a result. There are also marked differences between States in terms of the access provided to the courts for citizens. No State in Australia has "citizen suit" provisions in pollution control legislation - a major omission. Appeal rights under other areas of legislation are limited and vary between States. NSW legislation with its broad standing provision under s.123 allowing "any person" to sue for a breach of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act, 1979 (NSW) is unique amongst Australian States. Third party merit appeals in NSW are more limited, however, than in Victoria and Queensland where there is wider provision for appeals on the "merits" of particular developments.

The difference between the American and Australian systems is emphasised in part because of the different structure of their constitutions. Under the American constitution the federal government has greater power to legislate for environmental matters than does the Australian government whose powers are more constrained under the Australian constitution.

It is fair to say that overall the American legal system in this field, and I suspect many others, appeared more dynamic than the more conservative English system on which our Australian legal system is based. The greater willingness

of courts in the United States, particularly federal courts, to entertain arguments based on policy grounds added quite different dimensions to litigation in the US context. It was common in arguments run by the clinic in litigation to put matters of public policy which would be less likely to be pressed in courts in Australia.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES/CASES

It appeared from the US media and in discussions with people in and around Eugene, Oregon that, as well as the "greenhouse" effect and its impacts, major environmental issues in the United States, and particularly Oregon, included the disposal of hazardous chemicals, the use of pesticides and herbicides and the management of forests. The environmental issues raised in several of the cases run in the environmental clinic reflected these concerns and I have set out below details of a few of these cases to demonstrate the nature of the litigation involving these issues.

A. The Spotted Owl Case, as it has become known, involves several statutes and multiple parties as it impacts on the local timber industry in Oregon.

The clinic represents two local conservation organisations, the Lane County Audubon Society and the Oregon Natural Resources Council, two of several applicants in the case who include the Portland Audubon Society, the Wilderness Society and the Sierra Club. The applicants are challenging the decision by the Bureau of Land Management to award timber sales for areas of old-growth forest. Old-growth forest is forest which has never been logged. The basis of the client's argument is that such awards are in breach of the requirements of three statutes:

- (a) The National Environment Policy Act (NEPA) in that an adequate EIS was not done on information about the likely extinction of the Northern Spotted Owl, which relies on old-growth forest for its habitat,
- (b) the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, which prohibits anyone from "taking" a listed species - a concept idea that the clinic argues, includes cutting of the trees that are a species' habitat, and
- (c) a third statute that applies specifically to the land under dispute, the Oregon and California Lands Act.

The litigation is viewed as a threat by local timber interests, who are a powerful lobby group and the largest industry in Oregon. A possible effect of the courts decision, if the plaintiffs are successful, is to remove areas of old-growth forest from timber sales, thereby reducing the available supply of such timber. The local Oregon County local governments have also sought to intervene and oppose the applicants as fifty percent of the revenue from timber sales is paid to the counties, a substantial part of their revenue. The case therefore has significant political ramifications and received extensive local press coverage.

One of the Republican U.S. Senators from the Oregon sought to limit judicial review by having passed in the Senate an appropriation bill containing a provision which intended to limit judicial review of matters pertaining to certain timber plans relating to particular areas of forest, including the old-growth forest in question. The effect of the appropriation bill's rider provision was held by a single judge of the Federal District Court of Oregon to block the law suit, but her decision was reversed on appeal by the Ninth Circuit U.S. Court of Appeal. The matter was remanded back to a single judge in the District Court for further argument on the merits of the case concerning the three statutes.

Students at the clinic have prepared extensive legal documents and researched, and argued parts of the case in court.

The Spotted Owl is at the centre of other litigation, including a challenge conducted by the Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund to the decision of the Department of Fish & Wildlife not to list the Owl as endangered under the Endangered Species Act, and another suit challenging the U.S. Forest Service's own forest management plan.

B. There is increasing concern throughout the United States about the use of pesticides and herbicides on both private and public lands. The use of chemicals is increasingly being questioned. Such concern has not been allayed with exposure of problems in the registration system, and the testing on which it is based, employed by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the U.S. federal body responsible for registration of chemicals, prior to their release for use by the public. It was discovered that in fact many of the registrations had been made on the basis of falsified test results. Rather than actually registering many chemicals the EPA has allowed provisional registration of several chemicals until such time as further information has been supplied. This has resulted in the anomalous situation whereby many chemicals being used commonly throughout the United States with the consent of the EPA.

The two clinic cases outlined below reflect two different aspects of litigation involving pesticide use and hazardous chemicals. The first relates to a potential challenge to the use of pesticides by the U.S. Forest Service in California State forest and the second a challenge to the actions of the Department of Defence in relation to an airforce base on which are located in numerous hazardous waste dump sites.

- (i) Californian Coalition for Alternatives to Pesticides, a clinic client, is a group advocating a reduction in the use of hazardous pesticides in California. The group has been monitoring for some time use by the US Forest Service of herbicides in national forests. For Forest Service lands in California the Service has prepared an EIS on the use of herbicides on which the client has commented. The client has been awaiting release of the final EIS (FEIS) which they can assess for adequacy under NEPA and it has just been published at the end of February 1989. Important issues raised include -
 - a) the treatment of chemically sensitive people and children,
 - b) the question of inerts (the chemicals, potentially hazardous, which chemical companies include in pesticide/herbicide formulations and claim cannot be identified to the public because they are a trade secret) and
 - c) the assessment of cumulative and synergistic effects of herbicide use.

If treatment of such issues is not adequate as a matter of law under NEPA then the clinic may act in court proceedings to challenge the adequacy of the FEIS.

- ii) A group of residents, the McClellan Ecological Seepage Situation (MESS), has commenced action in the Federal Court of the Eastern District of California to enforce the Clean Water Act and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) as well as various sections of the state law in California relating to water quality, alleging failure by the Secretary of the Depart-

ment of Defense to comply with these Acts. The area in question is an Air Force base where several sites containing hazardous waste have been identified. The residents allege the chemical contamination of the groundwater and numerous health complaints are caused by the hazardous waste sites and discharge of contaminated water generally from the base. Shortly after suit was filed, the Air Force announced the building of a \$3.5 million pipeline to provide clean drinking water to the residents.

The action is a complex one, has been in court for over three years, and raises issues of jurisdiction of the court under citizens suit provisions of RCRA, the Clean Water Act and the Administrative Procedures Act. Clinic students have appeared in the federal court in California, prepared expert testimony and written many legal briefs and motions that have been filed in court.

C. Another important aspect of administrative decision making in the United States of America are provisions in many statutes requiring government agencies to make rules often of a regulatory nature in relation to matters within their jurisdiction. An accepted mechanism in dealing with federal agencies is for groups to petition for rule-making by an agency by sending a formally written request to the government agency asking that it make rules in relation to particular matters. The clinic is involved in one such matter.

In collaboration with another litigation clinic at Georgetown University representing Greenpeace application for rule-making was made to the department of Agriculture under the Administrative Procedure Act to implement child nutrition programs under the National School Lunch Act in order to protect school children and the environment from the effects of dioxin in chlorine-bleached paper milk cartons. The petition was prompted by concern about the presence of dioxin in school milk cartons. A decision on the petition is awaited.

D. The clinic has been involved in several requests for information and appeals following refusal of information under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), a federal statute which is greatly utilised in the United States. One of the larger FOIA cases in which the clinic was involved concerned information about the data collected by the Environmental Protection Agency about pesticides in the Alsea area of Oregon.

The case involved several applicants for information including Carol Van Strum, author of the book "A Bitter Fog" about pesticide use and related problems in the USA and the North-West Coalition for Alternatives to Pesticides, an Oregon-based public interest anti-pesticide group.

This matter involved several applications under FOIA for information about samples taken from water supplies in the Alsea area of Oregon, pesticide studies and research contracts between EPA and the University of Nebraska-Lincoln and epidemiological studies conducted between EPA in the Alsea area. These studies were prompted in part by reports of residents in that area of Oregon to EPA about the number of spontaneous abortions occurring in the area. Following such reports EPA conducted its own studies and found an unusually high rate of 130 spontaneous abortions per 1000 compared to 46 per 1000 in a central group. EPA then suspended and banned the herbicide, 2,4,5-T. EPA conducted tests on water supplies in the area subject of the study to ascertain the presence of

chemicals, such as pesticides. The FOIA requests related to these samples and tests. Two of the clients lived in the area where the studies were being conducted and had been informed they would receive the test results.

Because the agency failed to respond adequately to the FOIA request over a period of years, a complaint was filed in the federal District Court of Oregon. After considerable delay by the EPA, the clients received substantial quantities of documents in response to the requests. Following the making of court orders that EPA produce documents or affidavits clarifying those produced, and after releasing 30,000 pages of documents, this was granted. Students in the clinic on behalf of the clients filed a motion and supporting affidavit for attorney's fees. This was refused at first instance as the court held, *inter alia*, that the applicants had not "substantially prevailed". The clinic appeal led this decision to the US Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and is presently waiting on a decision.

CLINIC OUTREACH

As well as running litigation the clinic has involved itself in other projects, the most well known being the co-sponsorship of the Western Public Interest Law Conference and the Director of Environmental Lawyers in the West.

Now in its seventh year, the conference has grown to become the largest and most energetic environmental law conference held in the USA annually. The conference is jointly sponsored by the clinic, a student research society called Land, Air, Water (LAW) and, in the 1989 version, the Wilderness Society and the National Wildlife Federation. Open free to the public, the conference attracts a growing number of lawyers and non-lawyers interested in the public interest environmental law area. With its increasing size and reputation the conference represents an excellent opportunity for networking by those who are interested in the field. The conference is acquiring an international perspective with several delegates from Australia, Malaysia, Peru, China, Canada, and Chile participating this year. The conference is generally held in February or March for three days.

Published at about the same time as the conference is the directory of Environmental Lawyers in the West, a convenient reference for those seeking representation in public interest environmental law disputes. The Directory lists names of lawyers, addresses, areas of expertise and billing policy.

THE CLINICAL EXPERIENCE

The clinic is an important opportunity for students to obtain practical legal skills in the course of their theoretical legal studies. The clinic is run as far as possible as a law firm, but with the students serving as attorneys, not mere legal clerks to an attorney. Students have the opportunity to appear in the court under the "Third Year Appearance Rule" whereby law students in their third year can be certified by the Oregon Supreme Court under its Law Students Appearance Rule to appear on the same basis as a qualified lawyer and present argument in court. Other jurisdictions throughout the USA have similar provisions. Each team is encouraged to take responsibility for every aspect of the file and organisation of the workload between team members. Students usually serve on two or more teams, so they must juggle conflicting deadlines and case demands, as well as their other studies and (for some) outside jobs. Students receive three semester credits (out of a normal load of 12-15), but spend far more than 20-25% of their study time on clinic work. They are graded

on a pass/fail basis, rather than letters or numerical marks, but this has no impact on their willingness to work hard.

The students are encouraged to view the workload as something to be shared so that if one team faces impossible court deadlines members of other teams are encouraged to, and do, volunteer time on a case other than their own.

Having said that, it is true to say that running long, drawn out court cases involving complex issues can tax the resources of the clinic. The clinic must have a regular turnover of students at the beginning of each semester. Each new team must familiarise itself with the file, a lengthy process on some of the more complex matters. The difficulty of the task can be appreciated when you realise that every case mentioned earlier in his survey was a current matter 18 months ago and many predate that period. The clinic's outstanding success rate (about 95%) is a tribute to both its directors and the motivation of the numerous teams engaged in a case during its course. Only highly motivated students are encouraged to apply since the clinic work is to be shared equally. Selection is done by a random "draw" process, so any student in the school has equal chance to participate in the clinic.

Of crucial importance to the learning process in the clinic is the inter-action between the professors and the students. It is the constant discussion of draft documents, arguments, tactics, and ideas that is both the most frustrating and the most rewarding part of the clinic experience.

For an Australian lawyer, the clinic provided an excellent window through which to participate in litigation under US environmental laws. The legal system is dynamic with considerable opportunity for citizen participation. This is enabled to a much greater extent than in Australia. The existence of citizen suit provisions is an accepted part of the system for the enforcement of pollution control laws. The actual style of litigation in the federal system in America is quite different to that in Australia as it does not have anything like the same emphasis on oral presentation of cases. Lawyers spend many hours preparing so-called "briefs" in which their entire argument in a particular federal court matter, particularly at the appeal level, must be argued in full in a limited number of pages. The lawyers may have the opportunity to speak to the judge or judges for thirty minute period in addition to the brief. This is in marked contrast to the lengthy oral submissions made in the course of litigation in Australia.

The large number of environmental statutes in the federal sphere enables considerable litigation by environmental groups at that level, in marked contrast to Australia. The development of a uniform code of environmental legislation across the States of Australia, if not at the federal level, providing adequate citizen participation in the court system would enable a more vigorous and stringent application of environmental protection laws, the scope for which already exists in the USA. The system is, of course, not perfect in the USA but with the acceptance and use of FOIA legislation and generally greater public notification of decisions made by government agencies than here the public, in theory, does have more opportunity to be informed of matters affecting the environment. Groups having the resources to litigate under the existing legislative framework have been established for many years now and there is a reasonably large volume of litigation at the federal level involving enforcement of federal environmental laws.

(1) "A comparison of the Regulations and Management of hazardous substances and wastes in Australia and the U.S." by

William Hedman, paper presented to NELA conference. Canberra September 1986 Available from Christine Trenorden. Honorary secretary NELA, Norman Waterhouse & Mutton, Solicitors, 6th Floor, MLC Building 185 Victoria Square, Adelaide 5000, or DX 397 Adelaide.

Legal Briefs.

Seventh Annual Western Public Interest Law Conference.

EDO solicitors Nicola Pain and Elena Kirillova were in Eugene, Oregon in March this year to attend the Western Public Interest Law Conference held at the University of Oregon.

The conference was organised by LAW, a student environmental law organisation, and the Western Natural Resources Law Clinic, the leading clinic of its type in the USA.

EDO solicitors were fortunate enough to be invited to participate in the work of the clinic by University of Oregon Professors John Bonine and Mike Akline who are directors of the clinic.

Nicola Pain worked at the clinic for 8 weeks starting in January and Elena Kirillova commenced her 8 weeks at the clinic in March. (The clinic's work is described in the article by Nicola Pain in this issue.)

The conference was attended by over 900 people, many of them public interest environmental lawyers. This conference has been the most comprehensive environmental law conference in the USA for several years. This year the conference took on an international perspective with attendance and presentations by public interest environmental lawyers from Malaysia, China, Australia, Peru, Chile and Canada.

The conference was addressed by His Honour, Mr Justice Wilcox who spoke of the need to educate judges about environmental issues. He reminded the conference that environmental law is a relatively new area, which would not have been taught when today's judges were at Law School. He suggested an international judges' conference discussing how to approach environmental cases.

Impact editor, Brian Preston, past EDO convenor Ben Boer, Nicola Pain and Elena Kirillova all spoke at the conference. David O'Donnell, EDO's present convenor also attended the conference.

The conference dealt with a large variety of issues.

Dr. Mary O'Brien, a well-known scientist specialising in pesticides addressed the conferences. Dr. O'Brien was involved in the recent successful campaign to stop the controversial Wesley-Vale Pulp Mill project in Tasmania.

There were several panels on forest issues. These are of major concern in Oregon and nearby Washington as the last stand of ancient forests are being logged and the Spotted Owl (the subject of the controversial litigation run by the clinic) is threatened with extinction.

The panels on Water Law, Coastal Management and Marine issues were popular.

There were several panels on toxic waste problems in the US and the solutions to them. Martha McCabe, Assistant Attorney General at the New York Department of Law described a successful undercover operation in New York to catch illegal toxic waste dumpers.

One of the highlights of the conference was an address by Brian Wilson, Co-founder, Institute for Practice of Non-Violence in San Francisco. Mr. Wilson's legs were severed in 1987 when he was hit by a weapons train while protesting weapon shipments to Central America. At the conference he spoke about intimidation law suits, a growing practice in the US to silence public interest activism.

The conference ended on a positive note, with several speakers talking about the growing interest and public support for the protection of the environment being evident throughout the world.

The plans for next year's conference being bigger, better and with greater international, especially third world and eastern bloc representation are already underway. Dr. Bob Brown and Dr. Gerry Bates from Tasmania will be attending next year.

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON ENVIRONMENTAL LAW 14 - 17 JUNE 1989

The Law Association for Asia and the Pacific (LAWASIA) and the National Environmental Law Association of Australia (NELA) are holding an international conference on environmental law at the Powerhouse Museum, Sydney on 14 - 17 June 1989.

The conference is the most ambitious attempted and brings together the world's leading figures in environmental law.

Overseas speakers include:

- Professor Joseph Sax, a lawyer pre-eminent in his field, having written numerous books and articles on environmental law and drafted the Michigan Environmental Protection Act.
- Mr. Thomas Jorling, the Commissioner for the State of New York Department of Environmental Conservation.
- Mrs Helen Hughes, the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment in New Zealand, a type of environmental ombudsman.
- Mr. Anil Divan, a senior advocate in India who has regularly appeared in environmental and public interest cases, including the litigation arising out of the Bhopal disaster.
- The Hon. Betty B. Fletcher, a Circuit Judge with the United States Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit, who regularly hears cases under federal environmental statutes such as the National Environmental Policy Act.

SUBSCRIPTION FORM

I wish to become a Friend of the EDO/Subscribe to IMPACT

Name _____

Address _____

_____ Phone _____

Regular \$35 per annum

Concession \$17 per annum

Groups \$125 per annum

Groups —
IMPACT only \$50 per annum

Cheque enclosed for \$ _____

Please make your cheque payable to the Environmental Defender's Office Ltd., complete this Subscription Form and forward the cheque and completed Subscription Form to:

Environmental Defender's Office
8th Floor
280 Pitt Street
Sydney NSW 2000
DX 722
Telephone 261 3599

DONATION FORM

Alternatively, or in addition to becoming a Friend of the EDO or subscribing to IMPACT, you can make a Tax Deductable Donation through the ACF.

Please make your cheque payable to the Australian Conservation Foundation, sign the statement of preference below and post this donation form to the Australian Conservation Foundation, 672b Glenferrie Road, Hawthorn, 3122

"I prefer that this donation be spent for the purposes of the EDO."

Signed _____

Name _____

Address _____

Cheque enclosed for \$ _____

- Professor Peter Adler, Director of the Programme on Alternative Dispute Resolution, Office of the Administrative Director of the Courts, The Judiciary, Hawaii, who is experienced in environmental meditation
- Mr. Iosefatu Reti, Co-ordinator of the United Nations-sponsored South Pacific Regional Environment Programme, New Caledonia.
- Mr. Mohideen Abdul Kader, a senior public interest lawyer in Malaysia working on the Bukit Merah and Sarawak cases concerning logging and its impact on indigenous people.

Australian speakers include:

- His Excellency, the Honorable Bill Hayden A.C, Governor-General of Australia
- The Honorable Mr. Justice Toohey, a judge of the High Court of Australia
- The Honorable Sir Laurence W. Street, former Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of New South Wales.
- The Honorable Mr. Justice Cripps, Chief Judge of the Land and Environment Court.
- Sir Maurice Byers QC, former Solicitor General for the Commonwealth

A conference registration form is enclosed with this issue of Impact. Students and unemployed may attend for free, if places are available, provided they complete and return the form in advance. Enquires may be directed to Brian Preston Ph: (02) 232 3589.

PLEASE RETURN THE FORM BELOW TO:

THE LAWASIA/NELA CONFERENCE ORGANIZER

C/- J. G. Taberner
Freehill Hollingdale & Page
Solicitors
Level 30, MLC Centre
Martin Place, Sydney NSW 2000 AUSTRALIA
Tel: (02) 225 5427 Fax: (02) 233 6430

REGISTRATION FORM

NAME:

POSTAL ADDRESS:

POSTCODE:

COUNTRY:

TELEPHONE:

FAX:

I will be attending the LAWASIA/NELA International Conference on Environmental Law in Sydney, Australia on 14-18 June, 1989. I enclose my cheque payable to "LAWASIA/NELA CONFERENCE" for A\$ _____ being:

A\$400 registration fee (up to and including 30 April, 1989)

OR

A\$500 registration fee (on or after 1 May, 1989)

AND

A\$75 for conference dinner per person. I will be accompanied by
[NAME OF ACCOMPANYING PERSON]

.....

TOTAL
=====

I will be attending the complimentary reception and drinks on Wednesday evening, 14 June, 1989 at historic Juniper Hall, Paddington.

I would like my name to be placed on the STUDENTS STANDBY LIST so as to be notified after 1 June, 1989 if there are places still available at a discounted registration rate.