

CITY OF PERTH BILL 2015

Second Reading

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

HON RICK MAZZA (Agricultural) [5.13 pm]: It has been explained to me that there will be some savings and reduced costs for the City of Subiaco to the tune of \$2.9 million. The shortfall will be around \$1.4 million a year, which, on my figures, will be more like \$14 million rather than \$44 million over the 10-year period. But there certainly will be upward pressure on rates for the residents of the City of Subiaco. In fact, I am sure that the Leader of the House's rates will skyrocket, seeing as he is at the top end of town. But if there is a shortfall in revenue, rates obviously have to increase.

I also think the provision for the disclosure of gifts within a set period is welcome, although I think the 10-day period is onerous and may cause some trouble given the short time frame.

I do not necessarily agree with the National Party that the change of boundaries is some sneaky way of amalgamating councils. It will not amalgamate anything; it is just a change of the boundaries.

I have to question the purpose of the City of Perth Bill 2015. The second reading speech states that the bill will give Perth special status as the capital city of Western Australia. I think most people understand that Perth is the capital of Western Australia. One of first things I was taught in primary school was that Perth is the capital of Western Australia; I am sure schoolchildren in Perth, Tasmania, are taught that Perth is the capital city of Western Australia, and maybe even schoolchildren in Perth, Scotland, are told that Perth is the capital city of Western Australia. Most people in the western world would know that Perth is the capital city of Western Australia. I heard the other day that some visitors refer to us as "Perthlings", so we are well known around the place. I do not know that any special status will be conferred by this bill. Certainly, I think it is well entrenched that Perth is the capital city of Western Australia, and I do not think we need legislation to confirm that.

Kings Park will be brought into the City of Perth, which concerns me somewhat. My understanding is that at the moment Kings Park comes under the Department of Environment Regulation. Kings Park is more than just a city park; it has a lot of history and is a Western Australian state treasure. When I am in Perth I enjoy walking through Kings Park most mornings. It has a lot of history attached to it, and at the foundation of Western Australia the people who landed with Governor Stirling climbed Mt Eliza in Kings Park to survey their surroundings. Kings Park is certainly an iconic area, and I think it sits very well within the Department of Environment Regulation. My ancestor, Private James Hertnan, came in 1833 and he later became a gardener; he probably did some gardening at Kings Park. Kings Park has a lot of history attached to it. I do not think we need to encompass it within the City of Perth.

Hon Liz Behjat: What harm would it do if we bring it under the City of Perth?

Hon RICK MAZZA: That question is probably getting to the point. What harm will it do? Why have a bill that will not change things? It has been explained to me that nothing will change and it will continue the same as it is, so why go to the trouble of passing a bill that will not change anything? I came into this place with the idea that we pass legislation that will make a difference. I cannot find anything in this bill that will really make a difference, apart from maybe increasing the rates paid in the City of Subiaco. Kings Park will be unchanged.

Hon Liz Behjat: But the middle of Kings Park is already in the City of Perth.

Hon RICK MAZZA: That is as may be. It is historic and iconic in itself that the water catchment in Kings Park belongs to the City of Perth. I am struggling to find any reason to support this bill, so I advise that I will not be supporting it.

HON HELEN MORTON (East Metropolitan — Minister for Mental Health) [5.17 pm] — in reply: I rise to reply to the second reading debate. I will probably not revisit much of the territory we covered while debating the referral motion. If members feel that I have somehow or other not answered their question this time around, it is because I probably referred to and answered it during the referral motion debate. I do not know for certain, but I assume we will go into Committee of the Whole House; if members want to pick up additional information at the committee stage while my advisers are here, they will be able to. My second reading reply will be relatively short.

I thank members of the chamber for their contributions to the debate. I will start with the comments of Hon Rick Mazza, who said that I have mentioned a number of times that Western Australia is the only mainland state without a piece of legislation that recognises its capital; this bill will remedy that. It is more about the role that the Lord Mayor and those councillors have to perform that makes the City of Perth different from other local government authorities. This will be the recognition of the role and responsibility they have for the whole of Western Australia. Members may say that the Lord Mayor already knows that and acts accordingly, but matters

Hon Rick Mazza; Hon Helen Morton; Acting President; Hon Ken Travers; President; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Lynn MacLaren

were recently brought to our attention that would make one think that that is probably not the case. Certainly, some of the councillors need to step up and take on a more responsible role for the whole of the state of Western Australia —

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon Simon O'Brien): Order! I am sorry to interrupt, minister, but there are too many conversations going on around the chamber that are far too audible. Please give your attention to the honourable Minister for Mental Health.

Hon HELEN MORTON: Thank you very much, Mr Acting President. I welcome the Labor Party's indication of support for the bill and I have listened to its concerns about the process that has been used and it being unhappy with that process. Although I do not agree fully with those concerns that have been expressed by members opposite, I appreciate that they have concerns, particularly around consultation. Although they have received information around a number of contacts between the City of Subiaco and the minister's office et cetera, I am not able to say in my second reading reply who is responsible; that is not the point. The consultation that members opposite are looking for did not occur; there is no doubt about that. The type of consultation with the full involvement of all the residents in that part of the City of Subiaco who are going to be moved did not occur. No-one is questioning that, but the process that I will outline is better than what members opposite are making it sound like. I am saying that the consultation process might not have been ideal, but it is certainly not as bad as members opposite are making it sound like.

Let me talk a little bit about the issue of the consultation process that was raised by almost everybody who spoke on this bill. A working group was established early in the process that included representatives of the Cities of Perth and Vincent, the Minister for Local Government, and the Department of Local Government and Communities. This working group was established to guide us and make recommendations on the content of the legislation. One of the working group's first tasks was to identify key stakeholders whose views should be sought on the bill. This included a mix of businesses, government agencies and both industry and ratepayer peak bodies. Those stakeholders were sent a consultation paper with key questions and they were invited to make a submission to the working group for consideration. Some stakeholders —

Hon Ken Travers: Can you undertake to table the paper you have just referred to?

Hon HELEN MORTON: I do not have the paper with me; I am just reading from notes about what took place.

Some stakeholders, including the University of Western Australia, attended meetings of the working group to speak to their views on the proposed City of Perth Act. In developing its recommendations, the working group examined the models in other jurisdictions and took into consideration the views of the stakeholders. I think Hon Alanna Clohesy raised issues that I did not address during the debate about the referral motion around the composition of the City of Perth Committee. The City of Perth Committee is closely modelled on the City of Adelaide Capital City Committee, which consists of the Premier or a minister nominated by the Premier, two other ministers nominated by the Premier, the Lord Mayor and two other members of the Adelaide City Council nominated by that council. The functions of the Adelaide committee are similar to those of the City of Perth Committee. Due to the wide scope of the committee's functions, it was decided that rather than have two ministers as permanent members of the committee, there should be flexibility for the Premier to invite any minister or parliamentary secretary. This would enable the appropriate minister to be present depending upon the focus of the committee at that time, whether it be planning, transport, business, tourism or any other portfolio. At the Lord Mayor's request, the city's chief executive officer was also included as a member, as well as the director general of the Department of Local Government and Communities. Any member can propose who should be invited to the meeting for consideration by the committee. As with any committee, it is the role of the chair to invite others to attend meetings of the committee.

We covered quite a lot about the Henry VIII clause in the referral motion, but considering the concerns expressed by many members, I will cover some of that again. The purpose of clause 25 is to ensure that transitional matters that may not be foreseen at the present time can be attended to if and when issues arise. It is important that there be a transitional regulation-making power included in the bill so that any unforeseen issues that may come up as a result of the new boundaries and the repeal of the City of Perth Restructuring Act can be addressed with the minimum of administrative burden. Although it is unlikely that there will be any unintended consequences as a result of this bill, by including the power to make transitional regulations, we have provided the state government with a mechanism to address any such consequences. A similar power was included in the restructuring act and was used to enable the appointment of an acting town clerk. These provisions are not outside the parliamentary process as every regulation goes to the Joint Standing Committee on Delegated Legislation for review and possible disallowance if it is considered to be outside the scope of the legislation.

Hon Ken Travers: That is dishonest because the action has already occurred —

Hon Rick Mazza; Hon Helen Morton; Acting President; Hon Ken Travers; President; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Lynn MacLaren

Several members interjected.

Withdrawal of Remark

Hon HELEN MORTON: I have a point of order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Order; the minister has the floor.

Hon HELEN MORTON: My point of order, Mr Acting President, was the suggestion that somehow or other what I was saying was dishonest. The member knows that what I am saying is absolutely honest and he really should retract that statement.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon Simon O'Brien): I did not hear the minister raise that in the first instance as a point of order. I was raising a point of order of unruly interjection, not of a detail that I did not hear. Hon Ken Travers, the minister has objected to a comment you have made. Do you have any response?

Hon KEN TRAVERS: If you are advising me that it was unparliamentary, I will withdraw it; if you are not, then I stand by my comment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: It is not clear to me what the comment was because I did not hear it. I am not going to ask for it to be repeated but apparently words were uttered that caused offence. I did not hear the precise nature of what was said simply because of the general uproar and talking over each other. I was not listening for a particular voice so I do not know what was said. I am not suggesting there was any unparliamentary language, but I know that the member complaining and raising the point of order was offended by something you said. In that respect, having raised the point, the option to you would seem to be clear.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Mr Acting President, I understand the offer but I am not aware of the term “dishonest” being treated as unparliamentary in the past. If you rule that that is the way, then, of course, I will withdraw it, but otherwise I stand by the comment that I made.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: I might have to refresh the honourable member’s memory. If I was ruling that a matter had been uttered that was using unparliamentary language, there would be no question about it. The question that is being raised is another one. Just bear with me.

Hon Helen Morton: Mr Acting President, might I say something on this matter?

The ACTING PRESIDENT: No.

Hon Helen Morton: Okay.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Minister for Mental Health, I am going to address a question to you. Are you objecting to the words used by the honourable member as unparliamentary language?

Hon HELEN MORTON: May I speak now?

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Please do.

Hon HELEN MORTON: Thank you. The member said “It is dishonest and you know it is dishonest”, and in that process he is calling me a liar.

Hon Sue Ellery: He did not use that word!

Hon HELEN MORTON: He did not use the word “liar”, but he said, “It is dishonest and you know it is dishonest”, so Mr Acting President, I want those words withdrawn.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Order! Members, I am contemplating standing orders 44, 45 and 46. There are some terms that unfortunately crop up from time to time that are clearly unparliamentary language or, indeed, even the demeanour with which they are delivered may constitute unparliamentary language. Recently, changes or modifications to our standing orders have us arriving at the situation in which a member may object to the President that the words used by another member constitute unparliamentary language, so long as the objection is taken immediately after the words have been used, which in this case they have been. It is therefore up to the President to determine that the words used by a member constitute unparliamentary language, whether or not an objection has been raised by another member, and then the President may take certain actions. I am currently acting in the role of President and therefore that falls to me. However, I am concerned, as an Acting President—I have been doing this for a long time—that the recourse to standing order 46 in this way has the nature of certain words being identified as unparliamentary and thereby setting a precedent, whereas perhaps on other occasions the identical words might not have been viewed as unparliamentary. With that in mind—I am sorry to

Hon Rick Mazza; Hon Helen Morton; Acting President; Hon Ken Travers; President; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Lynn MacLaren

delay progress on the debate—I think it is appropriate that the President be asked to rule on this matter, not someone temporarily occupying the chair. Therefore, I shall leave the chair until the ringing of the bells.

Sitting suspended from 5.33 to 5.46 pm

Ruling by President

THE PRESIDENT (Hon Barry House): Members, the Acting President (Hon Simon O'Brien) left the chair to confer with me on a point of order that was raised by the Minister for Mental Health during her speech, objecting to words that were used by Hon Ken Travers. That is the background. In terms of general practice, I refer members to standing order 46, in particular, standing order 46(2), which states —

A Member may object to the President that the words used by another Member constitute unparliamentary language, so long as the objection is taken immediately after the words have been used.

That is the standard practice of this house. What is unparliamentary and what is not often comes down to the context in which it is used; in fact, it always comes down to the context. Certain words can be used and thrown around this chamber and it depends entirely on the context in which they are being used. When they are directly personal and reflect on a member in particular, that is when the line is crossed into unparliamentary language. The normal practice when an issue like that arises is that the President or the acting chair invites the member who has been requested to withdraw certain words to withdraw them. That invitation lines up with standing order 46. That invitation is initially given as a courtesy. The member is invited to withdraw the words if they wish. If they refuse, it becomes a matter for the Chair to adjudicate whether the words are unparliamentary or not.

I could go on to stage 2 immediately if I wished and make a decision now but I think it is better if I go back to stage 1, in which the Minister for Mental Health has requested the member who said certain words—I could not hear them, quite frankly, because the microphone was not on in my room—to withdraw. In terms of the debate, let us go back to that stage. I invite Hon Ken Travers to withdraw the remarks as a courtesy in this case.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Mr President, I withdraw.

The PRESIDENT: Thank you. Just to confirm that, if that had not been the situation—if the member felt that the words uttered were in a general context; in this case, the tone of the debate was about general government processes—the comment would not have been unparliamentary. If it was directed personally at the member on their feet, it would have been unparliamentary. I hope that clarifies it to some extent for members.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Just on that point, I am not withdrawing my withdrawal but I had said “that is dishonest”, not that the member was dishonest. I just want to make that clear.

The PRESIDENT: I hope that is a bit clearer than mud and we can move on.

Debate Resumed

Hon HELEN MORTON: Thank you for your ruling, Mr President. We were talking about the Henry VIII clause. I was saying that the provisions of the Henry VIII clause are not outside the parliamentary process as every regulation goes to the parliamentary Joint Standing Committee on Delegated Legislation for review and possible disallowance if considered to be outside the scope of the legislation. I appreciate the limitations of that process in that some things can be put in place before the disallowance has taken place.

Hon Ken Travers: And you can't undo it.

Hon HELEN MORTON: It can be disallowed.

Hon Ken Travers: Yes, but once the act has occurred, you cannot undo that act because it was legal at the time it was done.

Hon HELEN MORTON: That is right but that process can then be stopped.

Hon Ken Travers: But in many cases, that is too late.

Hon HELEN MORTON: That was the context of the concerns that were being expressed.

Hon Martin Aldridge and Hon Martin Pritchard raised the issue of boundaries and boundary changes. Firstly, the bill is much, much more about the change to the boundary of the City of Perth than elsewhere. It is about the

Hon Rick Mazza; Hon Helen Morton; Acting President; Hon Ken Travers; President; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Lynn MacLaren

recognition of the special status of the City of Perth and its accompanying responsibilities, and that is the point I made also in response to the comments of Hon Rick Mazza. Communities of interest have also been referred to, so let us be clear about something to do with that. The residential colleges of the University of Western Australia are currently within the City of Perth. The Crawley finger, as we have been referring to that tract of land, contains many student and staff residences. In fact, it has been reported that around 50 per cent of the residences and businesses in this area have strong links to the university. The campus itself extends across to Stirling Highway to the education and fine arts faculty, with the oral health and medical research facilities located on the QEII Medical Centre campus. Indeed, UWA's own master plan shows further development and expansion of the university's Crawley campus. This boundary change brings together this community of interest into a world-class medical and research precinct.

In relation to the other issues that the Local Government Advisory Board has in making recommendations on boundary change requests, this proposal also takes into consideration economic factors, the history of the area, transport and communication, demographic trends and the effect of delivery of local government services. Only physical and topographical features have little relevance in this.

Hon Robin Chapple spoke about forced amalgamations, but I must say again that he has it very wrong. An amalgamation is when two entities become one and in this case there will still be two. A boundary change does not trigger the Dadour provision. Although some ratepayers in Subiaco south ward may be unhappy, as Mr McGowan stated in the other place, Parliament must make decisions for the greater good.

A lot of comment has been made about the ongoing viability of the City of Subiaco. Hon Rick Mazza raised some of the financial aspects of that as well. I might go into those more deeply. These changes do not affect the viability of the City of Subiaco. In fact, the City of Subiaco earned \$1.5 million in interest on its investments in 2015. On 30 June 2015 Subiaco had over \$42.6 million in cash and cash equivalents; another \$2.1 million in investments and \$121 million worth of investment properties. This is not a local government that needs to raise its rates by seven per cent because of the loss of 1 347 rateable properties. This is a local government that spends more money currently on its employees than it raises in rates.

The employment provisions for the City of Subiaco staff were raised by Hon Alanna Clohesy and Hon Ken Travers. The Local Government Act 1995 already sets out the rights of local government employees whose positions are affected due to boundary changes. The occupants of positions that are no longer required due to the boundary change have two years' guaranteed employment or they can receive a 12-month payout or the balance of their contract if that is less than 12 months. As there is no change to that entitlement as a result of this bill, it is not necessary to provide additional clarity to those affected staff.

This bill, which gives Perth recognition as a capital city—as exists for capital cities in other states—sets out the objects and functions of the city and establishes an advisory committee to progress matters of joint interest to the state and local governments. It also removes anomalies in current district boundaries such that our leading educational, research and medical establishments have central campuses split across multiple districts. As I said in my second reading speech, this bill not only gives Perth the recognition it deserves, but also provides an important mechanism for the state and City of Perth to work together to support the growth and development of a city of which we can all be proud. Combine this with amendments to the Local Government Act that require every councillor and designated employee through the state to declare gifts and contributions to travel within 10 days of receipt, and we have an important piece of legislation for this chamber to pass.

Hon Lynn MacLaren raised some further issues around a motion that was passed last night by the City of South Perth. However, I understand that members opposite now want to go into Committee of the Whole House so I will leave those questions to be answered there. I think it is easier for me to do that. I was going to go into a bit more detail about the number of rateable properties, the employee expenses and some of the other financial components that have been raised around the City of Subiaco.

Hon Ken Travers: Just one question: what do you think the impact will be on the City of Subiaco?

Hon HELEN MORTON: The outcome has been determined. I am trying to look for the exact figure, but it is one point something million.

Hon Ken Travers: Per annum?

Hon HELEN MORTON: Per annum.

Hon Ken Travers: So the Leader of the House's rates will go up to cover that now!

Hon HELEN MORTON: There is, of course, the option of looking for efficiencies within an existing operating structure, as we are doing at the moment across every other government agency in Western Australia.

Hon Ken Travers: That happens all the time.

Hon Rick Mazza; Hon Helen Morton; Acting President; Hon Ken Travers; President; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Lynn MacLaren

Hon HELEN MORTON: Exactly. I do not think it will come to that. However, the increase is likely to be in that vicinity, and that is when we take off the costs. That refers to the comment that was made by Hon Rick Mazza about the reduction in the number of expenditures that need to take place as a result of those people —

Hon Ken Travers: But you are saying that you have done that, and the net figure is they will be \$1.3 million worse off—and that is before you increase government fees and charges on them again.

Hon Simon O'Brien: They get that much in parking fines already.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon HELEN MORTON: If members want to go into those questions in a bit more detail, we can do that in committee. With that in mind, I move that the bill be read a second time.

Division

Question put and a division taken, the Acting President (Hon Brian Ellis) casting his vote with the ayes, with the following result —

Ayes (20)

Hon Ken Baston	Hon Kate Doust	Hon Nick Goiran	Hon Helen Morton
Hon Liz Behjat	Hon Sue Ellery	Hon Peter Katsambanis	Hon Martin Pritchard
Hon Jim Chown	Hon Brian Ellis	Hon Mark Lewis	Hon Sally Talbot
Hon Alanna Clohesy	Hon Donna Faragher	Hon Robyn McSweeney	Hon Ken Travers
Hon Peter Collier	Hon Adele Farina	Hon Michael Mischin	Hon Samantha Rowe (<i>Teller</i>)

Noes (9)

Hon Jacqui Boydell	Hon Nigel Hallett	Hon Rick Mazza
Hon Robin Chapple	Hon Col Holt	Hon Simon O'Brien
Hon Dave Grills	Hon Lynn MacLaren	Hon Martin Aldridge (<i>Teller</i>)

Pairs

Hon Alyssa Hayden	Hon Stephen Dawson
Hon Phil Edman	Hon Amber-Jade Sanderson

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

Committee

The Deputy Chair of Committees (Hon Brian Ellis) in the chair; Hon Helen Morton (Minister for Mental Health) in charge of the bill.

Clause 1: Short title —

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: I am glad we are in Committee of the Whole House, although I heard it rumoured that we might not be going into committee—I have to say I admire the optimism of the minister on that point—because it means that at least we will be able to examine in committee a number of things in this bill that need to be looked at. That includes aspects related to the University of Western Australia; the famous south ward of Subiaco, where people have, according to the local paper, been shafted by Labor; and the area of land known as, curiously, the “Crawley finger”. A range of other matters will be considered. I am using clause 1 to give that overview of the bill, and I will not detain the chamber any longer, except to observe that I do not think these matters can be addressed. Therefore, I recommend that the committee resolve clause 1 in the negative, thereby disposing of the bill.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: I share the concerns raised by Hon Simon O'Brien about clause 1 of the bill. I have some more specific questions about the bill, and if I can ask them at this stage, it may expedite the committee clause-by-clause consideration. One of the concerns of the City of South Perth that I raised with the minister earlier is the appropriateness of using this bill to impose requirements on all local government authorities. The primary purpose of this bill is to assert the difference between the City of Perth and other local governments. On one reading of the bill, it is beyond the scope of the bill to contain clauses that will require all local governments to undertake certain actions. Normally, if we want to implement this kind of reform, it would be done through

Hon Rick Mazza; Hon Helen Morton; Acting President; Hon Ken Travers; President; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Lynn MacLaren

a separate amendment to the Local Government Act. However, in the case of this proposed reform, it is being done through this bill. I hope the minister will address how it is possible to expand the scope of this bill to include requirements that are proposed to be placed on all local governments.

Hon HELEN MORTON: The member will be aware that prior to this bill being discussed, a number of issues had arisen with the City of Perth around declaring gifts et cetera. When this bill was first introduced, the suggestion from the other place was that we needed to have embedded in this legislation a requirement for the City of Perth to meet these requirements around accountability, providing information within 10 days et cetera. The Minister for Local Government was concerned that it should apply to not only the City of Perth, but also all local government authorities. It can be brought forward in this legislation. That is the process by which it became a requirement in this bill to impact on all local government authorities, not just the City of Perth.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: I am sure that the minister can sympathise with the concerns of local governments that this bill, which they assumed would be about just the City of Perth, has been expanded and this very comprehensive additional reform has been slapped on at the last minute, after the bill has been put out for consultation, after it has been tabled and after we have had our briefings. Is that a good process of developing laws on the accountability of local government? Certainly, if there was an agreement in the other place that the accountability of local government needed improving, that could have been done in any number of ways without affecting this capital city bill. If we were to look at local government accountability mechanisms, a lot more could be done in that space than just including this one small feature of local government accountability to deal with expense reporting. Other members in this place have questioned whether the frequency of that requirement is impractical. Were other mechanisms considered to deliver that accountability measure, other than inserting it into the City of Perth Bill?

Hon HELEN MORTON: The minister had flagged for some time that he would introduce amendments around improved accountability, so much so that a number of other local government authorities have already voluntarily implemented this provision. I know for a fact that the City of Gosnells has done so. I am also aware that the City of Vincent has done so. Other local government authorities have readily picked up this provision and implemented it because they knew that this was coming through. It needed to be an act amendment. It could have gone through a separate act amendment process, but it did not need to. As the member will be aware, bills are often modified during their development on the floors of both houses of Parliament. This is not unusual. An act is a vehicle by which certain outcomes are achieved. As I have said, this could have been done in a separate bill or it could have been done in this bill. It made no difference, because, at the end of the day, the outcome is what was to be achieved and that is what is being achieved at the moment.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: I have one further question on this matter. Let us say that in implementing this new accountability measure, local governments work out that a 10-day reporting time is too short a period or they are not able to meet the criteria or the high standard of accountability that we are aiming for and that provision needs to be changed. I would have expected this kind of provision to be in a regulation rather than a piece of legislation that would need to come back to Parliament for amendment if there were some problems with the implementation of the accountability measures that have been tacked onto this bill. Was consideration given to pursuing a regulation rather than a clause in the bill? If this new accountability feature does not work out, will the City of Perth Act come back to us for amendment to the provision that has been added at the last minute?

Hon HELEN MORTON: The answer to the last part of the question is no, it will not come back. There was no head of power for it to be a regulation. Equally, I am having a bit of difficulty working out what the member imagines is so onerous about someone registering or declaring a gift within 10 days of receiving it. That can be as simple as sending an email or putting it in writing. It is a matter of jotting down the receipt of a gift and its value or putting it in an email. That is about the extent of it. It is not as onerous a task as the member is suggesting.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: I did not suggest that it was onerous. I believe that the accountability reforms for local government are going in the right direction, and obviously recent events have proved that it is necessary to do so in some fashion. I am merely questioning this particular way of achieving it. During the second reading debate, I listened intently to other members who raised the issue because it had been expressed to them by local governments. I am sure that the minister is aware that I do not have any experience as a local government councillor. All we can do is raise the matters that local governments have brought to our attention and ask that the department and the minister put their minds to addressing those concerns, and this is the appropriate time to do that as we are discussing the City of Perth Bill.

I have one other question, because I know Hon Robin Chapple has a couple of queries. This question relates to the boundary change for the 3 000 Subiaco residents. Can the minister confirm that the number is 3 000, because I thought I heard a smaller number in a briefing?

Extract from *Hansard*

[COUNCIL — Wednesday, 24 February 2016]

p722a-728a

Hon Rick Mazza; Hon Helen Morton; Acting President; Hon Ken Travers; President; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon
Lynn MacLaren

Hon HELEN MORTON: It is about 1 300 rateable properties, but it is about 3 000 people. The number of people changes frequently, so it is about 3 000 people.

Progress reported and leave granted to sit again, pursuant to standing orders.