ASSOCIATIONS INCORPORATION BILL 2014

Third Reading

MR P.T. MILES (Wanneroo — Parliamentary Secretary) [3.03 pm]: I move —

That the bill be now read a third time.

MS J.M. FREEMAN (Mirrabooka) [3.04 pm]: I rise to speak on the third reading of the Associations Incorporation Bill 2014. We went through consideration in detail quite quickly, and probably did not get into further aspects. We drilled down very strongly into the objectives of the bill, and we did not get into the other clauses. I want to spend a bit of time talking about the issues we raised.

It came to the fore during consideration in detail that this legislation is now more like enabling legislation. Whereas, previously, organisations were limited in their capacity to claim not-for-profit status, an organisation will be able to incorporate without any judgement on its capacity to operate as a not-for-profit body. All the organisation will really have to show is that its members do not get any dividends. This legislation will extend the capacity of these not-for-profits to earn a profit in various kinds of trading, whereas previously that capacity was quite limited. It is quite important to recognise that this legislation gives bodies that operate in a commercial manner, so long as they do not distribute any of their profits as dividends, the advantages of a corporate identity and limited liability without what was previously the pure aspect of a not-for-profit.

This legislation has been a long time coming, and there has been much debate about how this legislation has broadened the way in which incorporated associations can operate. It was introduced into the Legislative Assembly on 11 September 2014. Effectively, it has been a long time coming, and both sides of the house are very keen to see the community and not-for-profit sector get some clarity about their operations. This bill has taken quite a small act and broadened it to cover a whole field of large and small organisations. It attempts to cover organisations like the RAC, which has quite considerable financial operations. My understanding is that it will cover organisations like St John of God Health Care, which will deliver public hospital services for the government in Midland. The bill also covers very small organisations, such as local community gardens organisations or ratepayers and residents associations. The organisations will have different fiscal expectations on them, depending on their size, but the bill does not do this; it provides procedural applications. It is fascinating for me that it binds up a bunch of very small organisations with a bunch of very onerous obligations through provisions, schedules and rules. There are convoluted back-and-forths in the bill, such that this bit must be referred to in order to understand another bit. In consideration in detail, often when I asked the parliamentary secretary a question, he would say that to look at, say, clause 23, I would need to look at clause 165 or 169—that sort of stuff. That is fine when we have the resources of three advisers for the parliamentary secretary, but it will not be quite so easy for small organisations.

It would be good if the parliamentary secretary, in his third reading response, confirmed that a small community organisation can adopt the draft rules because it is too difficult to think about doing anything else. The committee will be told it has to adopt the draft rules, so everyone will say "All those in favour?" "Aye." "Yes, we have adopted them." To operate as a small organisation, there must be six ongoing members and the organisation must hold a regular annual general meeting at which the committee members and office bearers are elected. Those committee members need to meet at least three times a year. That is in the draft rules. There must be a membership list; there may be only six members, but there must be a membership list. It does not have to be given to anyone unless the Commissioner for Consumer Protection asks for it, but there has to be a list. If it is a small organisation, someone needs to look over the books and the books have to be endorsed by the committee. They seem to be the parameters for a small organisation. I am happy for the parliamentary secretary to tell me if there are more than five. There are duties. The organisation has to act appropriately, but, frankly, there were probably duties applying that they always act in the best interest of the organisation. The organisation has to have an AGM and has to call the AGM in an appropriate way. Those sorts of things seem to be the crux of it.

If it is a large organisation such as St John of God, pretty much the same things occur to the organisation—other than the fact that it has to get its books audited. I am happy to be told by interjection whether St John of God is not an incorporated association, but that is my understanding. Let us say the RAC, because we definitely know it is an incorporated association. If it is a large organisation such as the RAC, it does not have to make its membership list publicly available—this applies not so much to its membership list, as I get that it would not make it public, other than to its members—but, more importantly, it must not make publicly available who sits on its committee. If St John of God is in effect an association, which I think it is under this particular legislation, it has a contract to run a public health service in Midland, and its committee of management is required to show only to its members who is on that committee. That is the case unless it becomes a document that the commissioner can request—I think under clause 161—in which case it then becomes a public document. But it has to be on the request of the commissioner. It seems to me really important that the commissioner deem for

those large organisations that are dealing with large amounts of public funds that there is transparency if they are to operate under this legislation.

Frankly, the reality is that most operations of large organisations would fall into having to operate pretty much consistently with the federal Corporations Act. That is the case now that we have codified the duties of the Corporations Act and brought them across into this legislation. The reality is that they are probably better placed under the federal jurisdiction as companies limited by guarantee. In that way, they become a public company and they owe transparency to the committee of who is on the board and who manages it. This is to the public as a whole, not simply to their members. If one thinks of a large organisation that is getting government funding, it could have just six members. Nothing in the rules states that an organisation does not have to accept a member. In the constitution and rules, the organisation says, "Here is our membership. We've got six members, and we are now incorporated under the Associations Act. Here is our process for getting new members: we can agree to have them or not." In that way a whole organisation could be limited to six members and operate on vast amounts of government funding without any transparency. I am happy to be told that I am wrong, but that appears to be the case. Effectively, it is a public company; it is just not distributing any of its profits back to dividends. The company is distributing it back to grow the organisation and its influence and to grow the capacity of its members. The member for Gosnells talked about one that was a lobbying organisation. However, it is done without transparency. I think if it is going to be an organisation of that size, the Western Australian government should say, "Actually, you're better suited to be a company limited by guarantee, and you really should come under the federal powers and be scrutinised under the Corporations Act. But you are limited by guarantee; therefore, as long as you are only distributing to your members and not any profits, and you are distributing to the organisation, you can be limited by guarantee." Effectively, it would ensure that these large organisations that operate in the public sphere and gain public funding to operate public services are required to lodge annual returns—returns of particulars of directors and board members—and to publish annual accounts. I do not think that is the case under this legislation.

If the organisation is tier 3, it has to give its account documents to the commissioner, because the accounts have to be audited. Is that right, parliamentary secretary? The organisation audits the accounts. As part of the auditing process, is the company required to give the audited documents to the commissioner or is the organisation just required to audit the accounts?

Mr P.T. Miles interjected.

Ms J.M. FREEMAN: Yes—then they become publicly available, we assume, because they come under the relevant clause of the legislation. I am really sorry; I should have looked up the clause we talked about in consideration in detail that went to how those documents become available to the public and how one pays a fee to get those documents. I refer to clause 162, "Inspection of register or documents", which reads —

> (1) A person may, on payment of the prescribed fee —
>
> (a) inspect the register kept under section 161(1)(a) …

The commissioner keeps a register of incorporated associations and the rules, and the register may contain any such particulars as the commissioner thinks fit. I do not think the commissioner has to keep particularly great records for the community gardens organisation, because they are operating on a shoestring.

Mr D.A. Templeman interjected.

Ms J.M. FREEMAN: I am a member of a community. It is a coup to who will pick the strawberries or the spinach!

With small ratepayer associations and other such small organisations, I get that we just want them to be able to operate with integrity and be assured that they have annual general meetings so that people running the organisation run it in the manner that will not lose the organisation money or do anything untoward. That would be fine if that is all this bill does—but it does not. It tries to cover this enormous field. In trying to have such a large scope, it almost becomes too much. If members think about our conversation during consideration in detail, we spoke about a whole bunch of things prescribed in clauses 7 or 5; we got caught on them for a long time. Clause 5 goes to "Associations not eligible for incorporation", and then, by a double negative, it states that an association is not ineligible if it fits into these areas; therefore, it effectively becomes eligible. We then have clause 6, "Regulations may declare associations to be ineligible". When I asked the parliamentary secretary about clause 6, it was the "vibe"! It is about futureproofing, but I cannot understand why it needs to future-proof itself because it has everything. It is a "just-in-case" clause. It seems that we have made the scope of the bill so big that we have lost sight of what we actually want to achieve by the bill. What we want to achieve is transparency, and what we have done is give large organisations the capacity to not be transparent. The bill provides that lots of little organisations have to be extraordinarily transparent and caught up in a whole bunch of procedures, to which they will all say, "Yes, we accept these long draft rules. Whatever! What does that mean?",

but large organisations will not be in that situation unless the commissioner thinks it is fit. They will not be transparent and the community will not necessarily be able to see who is on a board that manages multimillion-dollar projects such as the Midland Health Campus. I think that is a bit of a worry.

The fact of the matter is that most organisations do not want to be companies limited by guarantee because it is easier under state legislation to be incorporated; it is cheaper and it affords large organisations the capacity to not disclose to anyone but the membership who makes their strategic decisions. I think that is a real concern and it is something that we do not need to wait another however long we have waited for this bill—another 20-odd years—to come to this place to look at that. I am concerned that an incorporated association can decide who can and who cannot be members and how big the membership can be. In a way, that is a good thing, because some organisations do not want to get too big, but it means that, again, under this bill organisations are not as accountable as they could be.

We have come to the end of looking at this bill in this house. I am sure that our colleagues in the other place, the Attorney General and the shadow spokesperson, will go through it with a fine toothcomb. We only got part of the way through scrutinising the bill because we did not want to disadvantage organisations that have been out in the community waiting for this bill for such a long time, but we needed to put squarely on the record the rules and regulations for small organisations and big organisations, their membership and how they operate—not necessarily the financials. I think the three-tier organisational aspect of the financials has been and should be effective, but it is my strong belief that any tier 3 organisation should be required to provide the documents of its management and the strategic aspect of who is operating and organising the operation, and that they should be discoverable to the commissioner. Given that the commissioner can do that as they see fit, I want to put on the record that I think that is a reasonable and a fit and proper role for the commissioner.

I thank my colleagues for their assistance on this bill, particularly the member for Gosnells whose contribution led to an amendment. It is always good to be on the ball in this place during the consideration in detail stage and for the government and the advisers to say, "Yes, you are right. That is not needed. That is something that we do not need." It can make members think that they have just ensured that the good people of Western Australia have benefited from our being in this place. I congratulate all of those people who contributed to this debate.

MR C.J. TALLENTIRE (Gosnells) [3. 25 pm]: I rise to make a brief contribution to the third reading debate of the Associations Incorporation Bill 2014. It is fair to say that I came to our deliberations on this bill with a high degree of enthusiasm. I was very pleased to see that after many years of connection with community groups, the legislative framework that enables them to operate in a well-organised, well-structured and legally correct manner was being reviewed and made more practical and more useful to their purposes. I came to the legislation with a real desire to see those improvements get through this place and to see an honouring of the role that community organisations play, because they are so valuable and because they mobilise that wonderful thing that is volunteer effort. The quality that comes forward and the sincerity with which people approach their work as volunteers is a sincerity that can come only because there is no pecuniary interest—that is removed. People work in volunteer organisations, in the sorts of incorporated bodies that we are familiar with, because they believe in the mission of the organisation passionately and want it to perform. They understand that it is an organisation that is providing the very essence of what community is—providing an opportunity for people to come forward and be involved in something that makes for a stronger community. That is how I approached this legislation.

As the member for Mirrabooka has kindly acknowledged, in the early stages of the consideration in detail stage we were successful, which is quite unusual, in bringing about an amendment in connection with voting at general meetings. The original draft of the bill contained something that limited and would overlook the huge potential that electronic voting could have. That is especially important when we consider that a growing number of organisations have members living right across the state. There are challenges for people to get to annual general meetings when they are passionate about an organisation and its work, especially if they live in the north of the state. That means that they would have to commute and pay for airfares and a hotel, and that would become onerous. So I am pleased that we got an amendment passed that will enable people to use other means of attending an AGM. The amendment also means that people will not have to rely on the mail system either and that there are now other ways to enable voting to take place.

My enthusiasm for the bill continued. As we progressed through the various clauses and looked at the bill, I was really keen to have a point confirmed, because I had understood something from the second reading speech—a really crucial point. When referring to incorporated bodies the second reading speech states —

> It is a popular and effective mechanism through which not-for-profit organisations, such as sport and recreation clubs, societies and community groups, in Western Australia can have the benefit of being a legal person to pursue their objects, while leaving their internal management largely to the members.
>
> The proposed act will provide a contemporary framework for their incorporation and regulation.

It continues —

> Most of the more than 17 000 incorporated associations in Western Australia are locally based community, cultural and sporting organisations.

Upon hearing that, I was convinced that we were of a like mind and that we were all on the same page when it came to understanding what sorts of associations the proposed Associations Incorporation Act would apply to. I thought it was understood what kinds of organisations we were talking about.

Just to tease things out, when we got to clause 5, I wanted to check with the parliamentary secretary about the nature of associations not eligible for incorporation, and that is when things started to unravel. It turned out that any organisation will be able to manipulate things and set itself up to be peak body with members who do have pecuniary interests and that peak body can say that it is a not-for-profit organisation but it just so happens that all its members are in it for profit and it can call itself an incorporated body. It is just disgraceful. It is an absolute manipulation. I feel quite conned by this legislation. When I heard the parliamentary secretary's words at the second reading stage, I thought there was a genuine attempt to improve the lot of the community organisations that are incorporated bodies. I did not think he had intended to broaden the scope to include all other kinds of organisations that do not have the true spirit of community organisations. I feel quite conned by this.

I think the government has got it wrong, frankly, and perhaps that will emerge when the debate happens in the other place. The bill states —

> **5. Associations not eligible for incorporation**
>
> (1) Despite section 4, —

Which outlines the types of bodies that are eligible for incorporation —

> an association is not eligible to be incorporated under this Act if it is formed or carried on for the purpose of securing pecuniary profit for its members from its transactions.

I think the word that is open to interpretation is "transactions". That does not necessarily mean cash register–type transactions. I asked the Clerks for the dictionary to check on the meaning of the word "transactions". The first definition is that it is a piece of, especially, a commercial business deal, or a profitable transaction. That is one understanding of the word "transaction". Another definition is that it is the management of business et cetera. Secondly, the plural word "transactions" means published reports of discussions, papers read et cetera at the meetings of a learned society. I think that a peak body that acts on behalf of its members who are interested only in making a profit should not be eligible for incorporation. It is absolutely outrageous that there are groups in our society that seek to equate themselves with not-for-profit groups when they act for a membership base that is all about making a profit. That is completely wrong.

I will come to the issue of the tiering because that needs teasing out. However, I note that I recently got a letter from HBF Health Ltd, the hospital benefit fund, telling me that my premiums will go up. That is an example of an organisation that is a not-for-profit fund, but it does not use the incorporations legislation. It has chosen to be HBF Health Ltd and it has an Australian business number. That is fair enough. Why can these other organisations not be shunted in the right direction as well? We should not allow organisations that are not community organisations to use this legislation. That is why there are so many inconsistencies in the way that the legislation has been drafted and why it has so many problems.

Now I come to the issue of the tiering, which has been held up as a way of filtering organisations. Tier 1 organisations are quite small and do not have such a big turnover. A tier 3 organisation that has over $1 million of turnover is not a particularly big organisation. On the contrary, a tier 1 organisation with less than $250 000 of revenue per annum is a very small organisation. However, there would be many community organisations that have managed to get into a situation in which they employ between 10 and 15 staff. As soon as an organisation starts to have that level of staffing, it is looking at over $1 million in revenue per annum. This tiering does not work as a way of filtering out organisations. What does it really do for a tier 3 association? There is an obligation to prepare annual financial reports. Let us take as an example a multimillion-dollar organisation that represents the wealthiest people in this country. There are such bodies around, and I am sure that the parliamentary secretary is taking careful note of this. I am not having a go at those organisations in particular; I am having a go at the government for failing to deliver the right administrative framework. The Association of Mining and Exploration Companies represents Andrew Forrest and Gina Rinehart. If it, as a tier 3 organisation, fails to present its financial reports, there is a penalty of $2 750. That would be meaningless to that company, so there would be no real incentive at all. It would barely even notice that penalty. The provisions in the bill are completely meaningless. I think it is a great discredit to the government. We have been waiting for this legislation for such a long time. I know that community groups have been anxious to have some improvement in and clarity around the legal framework, but now we find that we have a complete mishmash because this legislation is trying to capture such a huge range of groups, from tiny organisations to massive ones.

The member for Bassendean hit on the very serious issue of the secrecy surrounding an organisation's membership. It seems to be completely at odds with the spirit of a community organisation when people can use the secrecy elements just to hide the beneficiary of some very sizeable contracts. It sounds as though that is a problem that is rife in the social services areas when organisations that are incorporated can go out to tender and not be transparent about its members or its board. That seems to be completely wrong.

Finally, I want to touch on the issue of the department's capacity to manage this legislation. It is all very well to say that if there is a problem, it can be referred to the commissioner. I know that to date there has been a lot of frustration by people when there has been poor practice or a coup has been mounted at an annual general meeting and so people have wanted to get advice from the department. I do not think they have felt adequately serviced, and I do not see how this legislation will necessarily change things in the future. I am very disappointed. However, I recognise that some minor improvements will probably come from this legislation.

My contribution to the third reading stage is in stark contrast to the very optimistic and enthusiastic speech that I gave at the second reading stage. I think that demonstrates to the parliamentary secretary why I feel quite conned by this legislation. I am hopeful that perhaps the parliamentary secretary has got things wrong and the answers that he gave during the consideration in detail stage will be corrected in the other place. In the hope that there will be clarification of some of those points, especially in relation to clause 5, and in the hope that the minor improvements will improve the operations of a range of community organisations, I conclude my speech and look forward to hearing the deliberations of it in, and seeing it progress through, the other place.

MS L.L. BAKER (Maylands) [3.40 pm]: I spoke at the second reading stage and made a contribution to the consideration in detail stage on the Associations Incorporation Bill 2014. Given that the bill has been such a long time coming and it was such a major part of my life for about seven years, I feel as though it has had a very long gestation. Thank you to the wonderful team who have got the parliamentary secretary to this point.

I will pick up a couple of issues before I finish my contribution for the day. Some of those issues relate to a few specific clauses, but in general I want to speak about the intent of these changes and how they should have the capacity to influence what I call "social enterprise" or some of the new economy's view of business, which I think is very laudable. We should be doing everything we can to support a move away from businesses that operate for profit for their members or shareholders and into a different paradigm that looks at businesses as a vehicle for social development and for doing good in the world, not for making a lot of money for everyone.

The concept comes out of a new economy. One of the terms that has started to be bandied around and that I think we will see coming into Australia with a lot more vigour is "benefit corporations"—B corps—which encapsulates that view of a world in which businesses are not just about profit. I have recently been approached by a B corporation and it has told me a bit about how it is working. I am bringing it into this context because it relates specifically to the ability of not-for-profits to make a profit for their members or to keep that profit in-house. I think it is a very good thing. This new concept of B corporations and how to use businesses as a force for good is, in my view, a very major step forward and we should be embracing it. For too long we have been looking at a model of capitalism that is all about profit for a few. B corps, or social enterprises and this kind of not-for-profit enterprise, are about making a more fair, equitable and just society that is wealthy but does not have such an enormous gap between those who have money and power and influence and the rest of the population who do not. As we know, most of the money and power in this world is in the hands of very few people. Sometimes I think about that when I think about our job sitting in this house—what an incredibly honoured position this is, and we should never take that for granted.

I refer to the changes in this bill that I think are good. Certainly, the modernising of the statement of committee members and office-bearers and giving some shape to what they should be doing is laudable. That is fantastic. I am sure members know how complicated it has been in the past to pin down some organisations so that they understand the roles of office-bearers and what it means should they be a treasurer in a big or small organisation. What is the board of directors or the board's liability in many matters when running a not-for-profit organisation? Transparency and accountability is extremely important, particularly when an organisation takes finances or funds, contracts or grants from government or other players. Through a lot of hard work by everybody who has contributed, including the precious not-for-profit sector, we have seen some good outcomes in this bill.

All I can say about the requirement for organisations to have internal dispute resolution is hallelujah! Just because someone is in a not-for-profit organisation is not to say that they agree with everything that everyone in that organisation says. Quite often, the case is entirely the opposite. If an organisation has a set mission, vision, objectives and goals, that is good and they must be at the core governance of that organisation. Along with that, everybody needs to understand what happens when a member of that organisation meets a barrier or has an argument with someone and there seems to be no resolution. How do we resolve that? That is a very good and very positive addition, in my view. Those were just a couple of overviews.

I turn very briefly to a couple of clauses to reinforce the subject of micro-enterprises and, in particular, social enterprises and tiny organisations that might now come under the remit of this bill, of course. During the second reading debate and at the consideration in detail stage, there were some conversations around clause 23(5), which reads in part —

(c) that the application of the provision to the association would cause undue hardship to its members;

(d) as to any other prescribed matter.

That is about the ability of small organisations to find a way in which they might not have to comply with the five or six issues that we heard our learned colleague read out a short time ago. For example, an organisation may not have six members; it may have five members. I think I heard the parliamentary secretary say that an organisation could make a case about that to the commissioner. I would be very interested to see and somewhat cautious about how that will work. I cannot clearly see what the substance of a case might be. I think clarity might be needed around how a case might be drawn up. I hope that the department responsible is putting some thought into that, because at the very fundamental level we want to encourage social enterprise and community gardens. The front page of the *Eastern Reporter* this week shows a community garden that has been running in my electorate since 2007. People come and go in that kind of organisation. Fourteen people might be involved one year and then the kids grow up and move off or the parents lose interest or the kids get too old to play in the garden—I do not know—whatever the issue is, people come and go. What happens when those kinds of small enterprises find that they are being subject to some quite onerous recognition provisions in here? I am very keen to see that in some ways scoped out a bit more clearly so that the out clause is clear for the tiny organisations that still have a reason to be in this world and do some really good work, but perhaps do not need to be subject to all those issues.

Finally, I refer to the process for amalgamations. One of the things that always challenged me while running the Western Australian Council of Social Service was attempting to collaborate in the sector, rather than cannibalise each other. By that I mean how to bring two organisations together with good mediation procedures and in a fashion that gets everybody to the table to plan the next step. How will the amalgamation process be transparent and ensure that the majority of members agree on how things will go forward? I hope that that was clearly enunciated. It might have been a bit rubbery, but I have done my best with it.

In closing, I again congratulate the sector for the incredible trust it has shown in sticking with a number of governments over a very long time to get to this point. I do not want to prolong their wait too much longer, except to say that they are an amazing sector of this community and of this economy and what they contribute to Western Australia must never be undervalued. If anything, we should pay a lot more respect to the many volunteers who work in not-for-profits and micro and social enterprises around the state, because they are providing an invaluable set of services that government could never afford to provide if it had to pay full price for them. We would never be able to afford the input of volunteers in the state. I congratulate the not-for-profit sector, the charities, the small organisations and everybody who has contributed. I congratulate Noel Harding and his associates and all the people who have put in their two bob along the way for getting the bill into this house.

MR P. ABETZ (Southern River) [3.49 pm]: As someone involved in the community consultation process long before I even dreamt of becoming a member of this Parliament, I would like to make a few comments on the third reading stage of the Associations Incorporation Bill 2014. The review process has been a very long journey. As a person who is a member of some very small incorporated associations, such as the Volkswagen Club of Western Australia, and the Association for Christian Education, which runs Rehoboth Christian School and has a multimillion-dollar turnover to run the school, this act strikes a great balance in terms of catering for incorporated associations. One of the great things about this legislation is that it makes provision for the commissioner to intervene when things go wrong in an incorporated association. Since becoming a member of Parliament, numerous people who are members of incorporated associations have come to me with examples of how the executive of an incorporated association is clearly in breach of the law, yet, under the old act, the commissioner has no power to intervene. The only recourse that members of the association had was to go to court—they see a lawyer who says that if they can give him $10 000 upfront, he can do something for them. Who would do that? The provisions in this bill that allow for the commissioner to appoint someone to run the organisation for a time are very positive and will act as a disincentive for rogue committees to do the wrong thing.

One of the very positive things in this bill is the penalty for failing to hand over the organisation's records to the newly-elected office-bearers. In the past this has been a common problem for organisations. Hopefully, that will be a thing of the past with this new legislation because if a person does not hand over the records and the membership list et cetera, the newly-elected members do not have to go to the court and spend big dollars on lawyers; they simply inform the commissioner, who can address the issue. Hopefully, people, knowing that the resources of government can be brought to bear upon them, will hand over the records so that the organisation

can continue to function as intended. The three-tiered financial reporting system was something that the community consultations, of which I was a part, worked hard on to get that balance. The Department of Commerce staff who were involved in the consultation process certainly listened to the input from the workshops at the time, and this is an excellent outcome.

In conclusion, this is a great step forward for incorporated associations. As various other members have said, incorporated associations play such an important role in our community when we consider the services provided to the community by volunteers who work through them. It is very difficult to estimate the value that they contribute to our society. To all those involved in getting the bill to this point, it has been a very long journey and I hope that the upper house deals with this bill fairly promptly so that incorporated associations can benefit from the provisions in this bill.

MR P.T. MILES (Wanneroo — Parliamentary Secretary) [3.54 pm] — in reply: I would like to thank all members who participated in the debate. I thank the member for Mirrabooka, who was the lead speaker for the opposition. The member showed diligence in her discussions on the Associations Incorporation Bill 2014 and she was able to put on record a number of items that are just and right. I also thank the members for Maylands and Gosnells for their contributions. This is one of those bills that has been through multiple government changes, and this is one of those instances in which the public does not necessarily see the joint effort by members on both sides of the house to progress a bill through with due diligence.

I put on record a couple of clarifications that arose out of consideration in detail. One question was about the cost of an application for a certificate of incorporation, which is now $12.80, not $12.20—I apologise for the 60c leniency there. I was also asked about the fee for an application for a copy of the rules, which is now $32.40, not $31. They are just some small things. The member for Gosnells asked a question that I said I would come back to him on about how many complaints had been lodged in 2014. A total of 70 complaints were made to the Department of Commerce for notices. I will table the schedule of fees as I said I would do during consideration in detail so that it is on the record.

[See paper 2780.]

Mr P.T. MILES: As a final wrap-up, I thank the advisers who have supported and helped me through this process—Sarah Hazel, Melissa Rossair and Robyn Petersen. I now put the bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.