

TAXATION LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL 2015

Committee

The Deputy Chair of Committees (Hon Brian Ellis) in the chair; Hon Peter Collier (Leader of the House) in charge of the bill.

Clause 1: Short title —

Hon SALLY TALBOT: I will start by asking a little bit about the planning process that went into this Taxation Legislation Amendment Bill. We noted during the second reading debate that it is about 12 months since we were in this place looking at statutory changes to payroll tax. I will focus specifically on payroll tax in my initial question. It is clear that part of the sequence of events preceding the passing of that bill midyear last year was the midyear economic review in which the need to make a considerable amount of savings measures was identified. I think they were announced as savings measures. How was the decision chosen to use small-to-medium businesses as a source of these funds?

Hon PETER COLLIER: A range of corrective measures was considered by the government and that is just one of them. That is all I can offer, basically. As I said, there was a range of corrective measures. This was one and it was decided to go down this path.

Hon SALLY TALBOT: The Leader of the House may have given me a clue about the way to continue. With the range of other measures considered, is the Leader of the House talking about a range of measures other than changes to payroll tax or a range of other changes to payroll tax?

Hon PETER COLLIER: They were in the midyear review. I can go through them if the member likes. New measures announced in the midyear review comprise the new public sector workforce renewal policy, estimated to generate salary-related savings of \$1.272 billion over the forward estimates period; targeted reductions in general government agency information and communications technology expenditure, estimated to generate net savings of \$85 million; changes announced in October 2014 worth \$2 billion to 2017–18 comprising the interim dividend arrangements to Synergy, Western Power and Horizon Power from 2014–15; a one per cent efficiency dividend on most general government agencies and the Public Transport Authority, to apply from 2014–15; an ongoing 15 per cent reduction in non-essential general government procurement expenditure in 2015–16—a 15 per cent procurement reduction was implemented for 2014–15 in the recent budget—a 15 per cent per annum reduction in road maintenance expenditure over the three years from 2014–15 to 2016–17; a voluntary separation scheme targeting 1 500 public sector employees across agencies with identified surplus staff; a 10 per cent per annum, 7.5 per cent in 2014–15, reduction in operating subsidy payments to Synergy; the Water Corporation and the Western Australian Land Authority, matched by the requirement for these public corporations to identify offsetting expenditure savings; and building on favourable tender results achieved from most capital projects a further five per cent efficiency saving to agencies' asset investment programs from 2015–16. As I said, a range of options was considered and implemented and payroll tax was one of those.

Hon SALLY TALBOT: I appreciate the Leader of the House providing us with that list, but, of course, none of that is news. He may have slightly misunderstood my question. As I understand it, leaving aside changes to payroll tax, what the Leader of the House just read out accounts for roughly 90 per cent of the savings that were identified as required. Payroll tax accounts for 10 per cent. I am putting to the Leader of the House that cabinet, the Economic Regulation Authority, or whatever process the government uses, having nailed down that 90 per cent of the \$3.8 billion that needed to be saved, leaves us with 10 per cent. I am asking the Leader of the House whether options other than the changes to payroll tax were considered to fill that 10 per cent hole.

Hon PETER COLLIER: A number of options were considered. Of course, they are cabinet-in-confidence, but this is one that was decided on by government.

Hon SALLY TALBOT: Can the Leader of the House help me, without divulging any of the secrets of the cabinet process. I am asking this question because I have a purpose. I am sure it has not escaped the Leader of the House that a number of changes to payroll tax have been proposed, most of which have quite significant revenue implications. They are contained in the final report of the inquiry into microeconomic reform in Western Australia, which has been publicly available since 30 June last year. Were any of the other changes to payroll tax considered as a way of plugging this hole?

Hon PETER COLLIER: As I said before, I cannot comment on what was discussed and considered in cabinet; it is cabinet-in-confidence, but the state government will consider the scope for further state tax reforms in the context of the commonwealth government's white paper and reform of Australia's tax system and reform of the Federation. As I said, they will be considerations. As to what was determined or considered in cabinet, that is cabinet-in-confidence.

Hon SALLY TALBOT: What I would specifically like the Leader of the House's comments on are a couple of observations made on pages 242 and 243 of that Economic Regulation Authority review that relate specifically to the efficiency of payroll tax, because I think this is, and ought to be, of genuine concern to every member of this place. I draw the Leader of the House's attention to paragraph 6.4.1, "Payroll tax", which reads —

Payroll tax has the potential to be a highly efficient tax if it is applied to a broad base and at a low rate. This is because the base (labour) is relatively immobile and cannot relocate to avoid the burden of payroll tax.

However, the efficiency of payroll tax is reduced because of the high exemption threshold (which results in a large number of small businesses being exempt from the tax base) and the number of concessions and exemptions, which together equal 57 per cent of the revenue collected. There are around 12,000 businesses paying payroll tax in Western Australia out of a total potential number of businesses of 220,000.

That is 220 000 businesses. Could the minister perhaps just comment in a general sense on those two paragraphs; about the potential of the tax being more efficient than it is?

Hon PETER COLLIER: Yes. A lot of theories have been published about the efficiency or inefficiency of taxes and they are always taken into consideration, as I have said. The government will consider a raft of different options, proposals or considerations, but this is where we landed in this particular area of payroll tax.

Hon SALLY TALBOT: Let me condense that into a more specific question about the effect of the Taxation Legislation Amendment Bill 2015 that we are considering this afternoon. Recognising that this was 30 June 2014, that second paragraph I quoted states —

There are around 12,000 businesses paying payroll tax in Western Australia out of a total potential number of businesses of 220,000.

Assuming that 12 000 is the figure before this bill comes into effect, what will the figure be after the measures in the bill have taken effect?

Hon PETER COLLIER: There is no change to the number at all.

Hon KATE DOUST: I wish to follow on from the questions asked by Hon Sally Talbot. The Leader of the House said that certain matters were discussed in cabinet that he cannot talk about, and that is fine. But given that the government made some very strong commitments to the small business sector during the state election on its plans for payroll tax and that it has now sort of deferred those changes, what consultation occurred with the small business sector in this state prior to cabinet making that decision?

Hon PETER COLLIER: I am not aware of any consultation that took place.

Hon KATE DOUST: I would have thought that if the government was going to renege upon a commitment, at least we would have some consideration. Was there any discussion with the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Western Australia or some of the larger employers that will be affected by this change, or with some of the smaller business groups, particularly those, I imagine, in some of our more regional areas that might have had an interest in these changes? Can somebody explain to me why there was not any consultation? It would have been quite devastating, I would imagine, for some of those groups to have found out about this only via the media.

Hon PETER COLLIER: I understand where the member is coming from, and I think it is quite legitimate. But it was a corrective measure; it was hardly going to be popular, I have to say. I acknowledge that. The simple fact is, as I said, that it is a corrective measure for the difficulties the state is facing at the moment. Business groups, particularly the CCI, are very vocal about tax in general and corrective measures when it comes down to that. But in terms of a formal consultation of process, there was none.

Hon SALLY TALBOT: Again, I think this is appropriate to pursue under clause 1. I have some specific issues to do with the way payroll tax currently works and the effect of these changes. I am going to the Economic Regulation Authority report. The first dot point on page 243 states —

The current form of payroll tax in Western Australia distorts economic decisions.

- The exemption threshold—

We are talking about the exemption threshold as it currently operates —

may provide incentives for businesses to remain small. This distortion is amplified by the necessity of using a higher marginal rate to achieve revenue targets.

Do the measures contained in this bill make that particular measure more efficient or go anywhere towards addressing what the ERA has identified as a distortion of economic decisions?

Hon PETER COLLIER: The exemption threshold has not changed. There is that sliding scale then as a result post the exemption threshold. From that, it is anyone's guess. But, as I said, certainly the exemption threshold as it stands has not changed.

Hon SALLY TALBOT: I do not know that it is terribly reassuring to hear the Leader of the House say, "After that, it is anyone's guess." I think it is quite a valid concern that we are running economic policy on the back of an envelope.

The second point the ERA makes about the distortions in the current system is —

- The narrow-base of payroll tax may distort the composition of employment, as some workers are likely to leave businesses that pass on the additional cost to the workers and seek higher wages in exempt businesses.

Do the changes being proposed address that situation?

Hon PETER COLLIER: It is consistent with other jurisdictions. It is no different in other jurisdictions.

Hon SALLY TALBOT: What about the third dot point, Leader of the House, which reads —

- Payroll tax effectively increases the cost of labour to businesses which affect the optimal mix of factors of production, thus producing an efficiency loss to the economy.

Perhaps I will go through the final point as well, because I think I am beginning to guess what the Leader of the House's answer will be. Specifically, my question is whether the measures in this bill go any distance towards addressing what the ERA calls "economic distortions". The final dot point reads —

- The effective decrease in real wage encourages workers to substitute labour for leisure ...

Hon PETER COLLIER: Yes, it could potentially lead to problems with labour incentive et cetera. It could, of course, pass on costs—increase costs et cetera—that could help alleviate the problem, but there is a potential in terms of labour accessibility.

Hon KATE DOUST: Actually, Leader of the House, it has the capacity to deter employers from putting staff on in the first place, so that they do not hit the threshold. That means that whomever they have will just have to work that little bit harder. I am just wondering what other options were looked at. When we look at what is happening in some of the states, obviously the thresholds are different, but there also some states, as I understand it, where there are exemptions for some employers that might employ apprentices; they do not pay payroll tax for those people. I know there has been some discussion around the fact—now that the federal government is changing the boundaries and expecting people to work longer, up to the age of 70—that employers should be exempted from payroll tax to employ people of a more advanced age. I am just wondering, in trying to provide some sort of comfort to employers in this state who are going to be impacted by this decision, was there any consideration given to packaging up this decision in a different manner to try to accommodate a variety of employment options in the state? Given our current situation with rising unemployment, we might have been able to facilitate more jobs in a different manner rather than putting in place a situation that might actually shut the door to employment opportunities for people in Western Australia.

Hon PETER COLLIER: I obviously cannot go into other options that were considered; they are part of cabinet-in-confidence. Can I please make the point though—it is a valid point that the member has raised—that exemptions are provided for trainees, apprentices, new employees with a disability and new Aboriginal employees. Exemptions are provided for that cohort of workers, and quite legitimately.

Hon Adele Farina: What is the exemption?

Hon PETER COLLIER: For trainees, apprentices, new employees with a disability and new Aboriginal employees.

Hon Adele Farina: That is, no income tax for any of those?

Hon PETER COLLIER: No—payroll tax.

Hon SALLY TALBOT: I will raise this under clause 1. If the Leader of the House would prefer to talk about it later, he can just give me the signal. I have made my general comments about the formulae in clauses 13 and 14, but I just wanted to ask the Leader of the House whether the intention of the bill is that the taxpayer can actually do the calculation.

Hon PETER COLLIER: Almost 100 per cent of employees currently do it electronically and that calculation will be done internally and will adjust accordingly. Pretty much almost all employees will have it done automatically. The alteration will just occur automatically.

Hon SALLY TALBOT: I do not think I am actually talking about the employees, I think I am talking about —

Hon PETER COLLIER: Employers. Sorry, if I said employees, I would like Hansard to note it was employers.

Hon SALLY TALBOT: What I am curious about is whether any part of the formulae included in the bill actually requires the Commissioner of State Revenue to do not so much the calculation, but to determine what one of the algebraic values might be.

Perhaps while the Leader of the House is taking advice I can flesh out the question. My question really is —

Hon PETER COLLIER: I have got an answer for the member.

Hon SALLY TALBOT: Okay. It follows on from the point made in the second reading debate, which is why the amounts have not been set in the legislation; why it seems to require information from the Commissioner of State Revenue rather than the employer.

Hon PETER COLLIER: They will be identified according to these three groups and then that will determine how the tax is calculated. The groups are firstly, a local non-group employer; secondly, an interstate non-group employer; and, thirdly, groups of employers.

Hon SALLY TALBOT: But those are groups of human beings, presumably. An employer has to say, “I have got X number of employees in this category.” What I am getting at is: year by year, is part of the formula subject to a calculation by the commissioner of what one of the values is?

Hon PETER COLLIER: From 1 July 2016, the threshold will increase from \$800 000 to \$850 000 and that will affect the tapering value of the particular threshold rate. The legislation does not reflect a particular number; it reflects what the number will be, given a particular threshold level, and that will change after 2016.

Hon SALLY TALBOT: The Commissioner of State Revenue has to announce what the tapering scale is going to be?

Hon PETER COLLIER: In the legislation.

Hon SALLY TALBOT: Is the dollar value or the sliding scale given?

Hon PETER COLLIER: The calculation of the dollar value is in the legislation.

Hon SALLY TALBOT: An individual taxpayer, by which I mean an employer, does not need any further information from the commissioner in order to complete the calculation, and will that be the case in the tax years 2015–16, 2016–17 and 2017–18?

Hon PETER COLLIER: Yes; that is correct.

Hon SALLY TALBOT: Thank you.

Hon KATE DOUST: Given that the variety of calculations depends upon the different types of employer, whether they be local or interstate, why are they treated differently in that context if they are employees working in WA? What is the difference? I am trying to get my head around why there is different treatment for each category. Does one receive some sort of discount?

Hon PETER COLLIER: This will overcome some potential disparity. Interstate non-group employers are entitled only to partial exemption based upon the ratio of WA wages for that particular employer. Only one exemption applies for the groups of employers that have multiple members.

Hon ADELE FARINA: I seek clarification. I raise this question because of an answer that the minister provided in his reply to the second reading debate. Is the payroll tax paid by employers paid on an annual basis or more regularly than that? Proposed section 10 is headed “Annual tax liability: Local non-group employers”. In answering one of the questions that I asked during my speech on the second reading, I thought that the minister said that they do not pay the tax annually.

Hon PETER COLLIER: It is an annual tax but it is paid intermittently—either monthly or quarterly.

Hon ADELE FARINA: I would like to clarify why the government has chosen to retain the diminishing tax-free threshold and whether that is the case in all the states. Why do we not have a cut-off level and a standard application from that point on?

Hon PETER COLLIER: By way of clarification, we are introducing the diminishing tax-free threshold.

Hon Adele Farina: Yes, but why?

Hon PETER COLLIER: Queensland and the Northern Territory have that system and it is something that was considered. As I said, we considered a number of options. We looked at the Queensland and Northern Territory models and that is the one we decided upon.

Hon ADELE FARINA: It is nice that the minister has told me the procedure that was undertaken but I did not ask what procedure was undertaken to make that decision. I asked: what were the reasons for making that decision? I think the people of Western Australia have a right to know the reasoning behind the decision that was made to introduce a diminishing tax-free threshold.

Hon PETER COLLIER: Ultimately, it was a corrective measure for the state in terms of the challenges that we face. That is all I can offer the member.

Hon ADELE FARINA: I do not really think that is enough of an explanation. I appreciate that the government has a budget black hole that it needs to plug and that it needs to find money and this is one way of finding money but it does not explain why it chose a diminishing tax-free threshold and why it simply did not set a point and leave it at that. The government made a decision to diminish that tax-free threshold over \$800 000 to \$7.5 million, I think. I would like to know why the government chose the \$7.5 million cut-off and why it has a diminishing tax-free threshold through that range of payroll tax.

Hon PETER COLLIER: As I have said before—I am sorry that the member will not accept this—they are the considerations that we took to cabinet. They are cabinet-in-confidence. It was a corrective measure that we decided upon as a government. As I said earlier, we instituted a host of other corrective measures, and this is one of them. That was the one with regard to this particular change.

Hon ADELE FARINA: I do not accept that it is a cabinet-in-confidence matter. The government needs to explain why it chose \$7.5 million as the cut-off for the tax-free threshold as opposed to \$8.5 million. That is a legitimate question. Was the government targeting a certain amount of money? Did it decide that a certain size of business should not be offered any tax exemptions? What were the reasons behind it? There had to be some reason for coming to the decision that \$7.5 million was the cut-off point.

Hon PETER COLLIER: As I said before, it is consistent with the Northern Territory model. It is part of a raft of different considerations that were made by government, and that is where we have landed.

Hon ADELE FARINA: When I talk to Bunbury Chamber of Commerce and Industry members at their next regular meeting and they ask me why the government has made the decisions that it has and why it has received support in Parliament to put the bill through, what do I tell them? I do not have an explanation from the minister to give to my constituents.

Hon Peter Collier: We could have said \$8 million; we could have said \$9 million. That is what we decided upon.

Hon ADELE FARINA: I know but when we make decisions, we need to provide reasons. It is a basic principle of administrative law. The minister cannot claim cabinet-in-confidence to decide not to provide that information. If the minister is uninformed on that point, I do not mind asking the Chair to leave until the ringing of the bells so that he can obtain that information. I certainly have a problem with the minister thinking that he can come to this place, expect us to support the bill and not provide the chamber and the people of Western Australia with an explanation of why the government chose the cut-off point of \$7.5 million. Perhaps I can ask the question differently. On average, how many employees would a business that had a payroll tax of \$7.5 million employ?

Hon PETER COLLIER: I cannot offer any more response to the initial part of that question than what I have given on about three occasions. That is where the government has landed. I am sorry that the honourable member cannot accept that. That is what happens with government all the time. It was exactly the same with our predecessors. We had a look at it, we assessed some options and that is where we landed. In terms of employees, we are looking at an average of 100.

Hon ADELE FARINA: Was it the decision of cabinet not to greatly impact on large business?

Hon PETER COLLIER: The figure of 100 is where there is no exemption threshold. That is where the government has landed.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 2: Commencement —

Hon SUE ELLERY: Paragraph (b) of the commencement provision is unusual in that it deems that the bill is to come into operation on 1 July 2015 if assent is later than that day. This is in respect to part 4, which deals with the payroll tax provisions. It might be that I did not pay attention before, but do we have advice on whether other bills have a deemed operational date?

Hon PETER COLLIER: It is quite common with payroll tax bills because it is an annual tax.

Hon SUE ELLERY: We do not do payroll tax bills all that often, although we do so increasingly under this government.

What regulations are necessary with respect to part 4? Are they ready? Is there a draft available that the minister might table?

Hon PETER COLLIER: No regulations are required.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3 put and passed.

Clause 4: Sections 122 and 123 replaced —

Hon KATE DOUST: I have a simple question. Do these changes that have been put in place impact only upon self-funded or self-insured or private superannuation for individuals?

Hon Peter Collier: Yes, they do.

Hon KATE DOUST: Does it impact on any other types of schemes?

Hon Peter Collier: No.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 5 and 6 put and passed.

Clause 7: Section 14 amended —

Hon KATE DOUST: I am just trying to find the relevant section. It is in relation to the Land Tax Assessment Act. The second reading speech refers to clawback provisions and dwelling park exemptions. I have not found that in the bill. My question is about where the speech states the “dwelling park exemption is subdivided”. Would this apply to residential parks if they are being used as caravan parks on a permanent basis or, in some cases, in lifestyle village-type arrangements where people are leasing a plot of land for a 30-year period? I am wondering whether the legislation picks up on those types of arrangements.

Hon PETER COLLIER: Caravan parks are exempt from compulsory acquisition. They are exempt from land tax. However, if they are subdivided, they are subject to the clawback from exemption. They are currently excluded from the clawback in a compulsory acquisition of land.

Hon KATE DOUST: I understand that they may be defined as a caravan park for the purposes of this legislation. I was talking more about how long-term residential parks are treated, because they are a different beast from a caravan park. A caravan park is traditionally for short-term stays and is more of a tourist environment, whereas a residential park or a lifestyle village park is for long-term stays. In fact, it is long-term in some cases for up to 30 years. I am wondering how these changes impact on those types of living arrangements in those parks.

Hon PETER COLLIER: The only exceptions that are provided for are with retirement villages or caravan parks. There are no exemptions for long-term stays.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 8 to 19 put and passed.

New part 5 —

Hon SUE ELLERY: I move —

Page 24, after line 24 — To insert —

Part 5 — Independent Review of the Operation of Part 4 of the Act

20. Review of Operation of Part 4

- (1) The Minister must cause an independent review of the operation of Part 4 of this Act generally and, in particular, to examine and report on the impact of the new payroll tax rates and the impact of the changes on —
 - (a) the ability of Western Australian businesses to invest, expand, employ and innovate; and
 - (b) Western Australia’s tax competitiveness relative to other state and regional economies.
- (2) The review is to be undertaken as soon as possible after the first anniversary of the commencement of this Act.
- (3) A person who undertakes such a review must give the Minister a written report of the review.
- (4) The Minister must cause a copy of the report of the review to be laid before each House of Parliament by 31 December 2016.
- (5) If a House of Parliament is not sitting when a report is ready to be laid before that House —
 - (a) the Minister may transmit a copy of the report to the Clerk of that House; and
 - (b) the transmitted report is to be regarded as having been laid before that House; and
 - (c) the laying of a copy of the report that is regarded as having occurred under subsection (5)(b) is to be recorded in the Minutes, or Votes and Proceedings, of the House on the first sitting day of the House after the Clerk received the copy.
- (6) In the event that a report is not tabled under subsection (4), and is not regarded as having been tabled under subsection (5), by 31 December 2016, the amendments contained in Part 4 of this

Act will cease to apply and the provisions as they were prior to amendment by Part 4 will be revived as at 1 January 2017.

(7) In this section —

independent review means a review undertaken by persons who —

- (a) in the opinion of the Minister possess appropriate qualifications to undertake the review; and
- (b) include one or more persons who are not employed by the State of Western Australia, a State agency, the Commonwealth or a Commonwealth authority.

We know from the bill that the payroll tax provisions are going to have an impact on employers to the value of some \$397 million at a time when our economy and the labour market are contracting. We know from the debate in the other place that the Minister for Finance said in his second reading reply on 22 April —

Most of the other concerns raised by members were about the impact of the \$397 million on small businesses. Obviously, we are aware of that and that is why there will be no impact on businesses earning under \$800 000 and why the threshold is being recouped over the diminishing range from \$800 000 this year to \$7.5 million.

What was most interesting, I think, was in his second reading reply, the minister representing the Minister for Finance, Minister Collier, in responding to issues raised by Hon Ken Travers about how payroll tax diminishing exemption thresholds help employment and the economic prosperity of the state, advised —

No formal economic modelling of the payroll tax measure was undertaken.

I think we are being asked to accept blindly that there will be no impact on business as a result of this measure when all of the other signals about our economy tell us that our economy is contracting, that the labour market is contracting, and that this is not the time to impose more onerous requirements on businesses.

We moved a motion of referral to a committee, and the house decided in its wisdom not to accept that. That would have provided the opportunity for a parliamentary inquiry into these matters, but the house chose not to do that. This amendment will insert into the bill a new part that requires the government to undertake that review and to measure the impact that this bill will have on business. It has a sting in the tail—there is no question about that—because if that review is not conducted, these measures will not come into play. I think this government should put its money where its mouth is. The government has not done the modelling; we have been told that by the minister in his second reading reply speech. I think we have an obligation to test and determine exactly what the impact of these measures will be, and this is the clause that gives effect to that.

Hon PETER COLLIER: The amendments proposed in the bill in relation to payroll tax exemption thresholds seek to put in place the measure announced in the midyear review. That was part of a package of measures aimed at addressing the ongoing weaknesses in the state's revenue outlook. The amendments proposed by the government change the way in which the payroll tax exemption threshold is calculated to determine employers' payroll tax liability. It does not seek to expand the payroll tax base in any way. In formulating this proposal, the government did consider its impact on businesses and the economy in this state, as I have stated in some of my comments previously. Furthermore, measures of Western Australia's tax competitiveness with other states are reported in the state budget every year. Accordingly, the government does not believe a review as proposed is required and therefore does not support the proposed amendment.

Hon SUE ELLERY: Predictable, but still disappointing nonetheless. I wonder what the government is afraid it might find if it were to conduct this review. I think the government might find, given all the other pressures that businesses are under right now in Western Australia, that there will be an impact. Given also, I guess, the philosophical base that the minister's side of the chamber comes from, it is extraordinary to me that the government would not want to measure the impact of this change. I suspect the government does know what the impact of this change will be; it will not be a good one, and the government does not want to shine a light to reveal that to all. But I am not going to ask the government to reconsider that. Ample argument has been put in this place over many, many years about the impact that payroll tax has on businesses. I think we owe it to Western Australians to have such a review, and I think it is extraordinary that the government does not want to shine a light on what its contribution to that will do to businesses in Western Australia.

Division

New part put and a division taken, the Deputy Chair (Hon Brian Ellis) casting his vote with the noes, with the following result —

Extract from *Hansard*
[COUNCIL — Tuesday, 19 May 2015]
p3812b-3820a

Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Peter Collier; Hon Kate Doust; Hon Adele Farina; Hon Sue Ellery

Ayes (10)

Hon Robin Chapple
Hon Stephen Dawson
Hon Kate Doust

Hon Sue Ellery
Hon Adele Farina
Hon Martin Pritchard

Hon Amber-Jade Sanderson
Hon Sally Talbot
Hon Darren West

Hon Samantha Rowe (*Teller*)

Noes (18)

Hon Martin Aldridge
Hon Ken Baston
Hon Jacqui Boydell
Hon Paul Brown
Hon Peter Collier

Hon Brian Ellis
Hon Donna Faragher
Hon Nick Goiran
Hon Dave Grills
Hon Alyssa Hayden

Hon Col Holt
Hon Peter Katsambanis
Hon Mark Lewis
Hon Robyn McSweeney
Hon Michael Mischin

Hon Helen Morton
Hon Simon O'Brien
Hon Phil Edman (*Teller*)

Pairs

Hon Ken Travers
Hon Alanna Clohesy
Hon Lynn MacLaren

Hon Jim Chown
Hon Nigel Hallett
Hon Liz Behjat

New part thus negatived.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by **Hon Peter Collier (Leader of the House)**, and passed.