

TAXATION LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL 2015

Third Reading

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan) [2.45 pm]: I am resuming my comments on the third reading debate on the Taxation Legislation Amendment Bill 2015. I find it interesting that in question time today we heard, “Wait for the budget.” Why are we debating a taxation bill three weeks before a state budget? Why is the government so desperate for cash that three weeks before the budget we are debating a taxation bill? As I recall, taxation bills actually come after the budget. But the government is so desperate for cash that here we are in the weeks leading up to a state budget—I noticed that Peter Kennedy was in the media gallery a second ago —

Mr M.J. Cowper interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order, members! Member for Murray–Wellington, settle down. The member for West Swan is trying to speak. If you want to have a private meeting, go outside. Member for West Swan, can you speak into the microphone because people are battling to hear you.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Maybe they should be called to order like I am, Mr Speaker.

Here we are three weeks before a budget, and when we ask questions about the finances, we keep being told that we have to wait for the budget. Why is the government trying to raise \$400 million in another emergency cash grab? Why has an \$8 billion Loan Bill been introduced into this place—I was saying “million” this morning, I was getting confused—when the budget will be handed down in three weeks? Never in the weeks preceding a budget have I seen us debating so many financial bills. When we ask a question that has anything to do with the state’s finances, we are told to wait for the budget, yet we have been asked to debate and pass these bills with some sort of urgency. We have to wait for the budget to get answers to basic questions such as what the government is doing to fund fire and emergency services or when net debt will peak. If the government cannot answer simple questions like those, why are we being asked to debate and pass what are pretty much budget bills three weeks before the handing down of the budget? It shows the absolute chaos and mismanagement of the state’s finances by this Liberal government. As I have said, its legacy will be “the government that blew the boom”. It will leave nothing behind but debt for generations to come.

Dr K.D. Hames interjected.

The SPEAKER: Minister for Health, I call you to order for the first time. A lot of talking is going on on both sides of the house.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I refer to the interjection by the Minister for Health. Has he not seen the billions of dollars that have been coming through his door? Did he miss them? Was he out fishing when the billions of dollars from royalties were streaming through the door?

Was he there? What was he doing?

Mr B.S. Wyatt: Physically—mentally he was on another planet!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Physically—mentally he was on the Abrolhos Islands.

Meanwhile, the revenue was gushing in—the government was probably having to hold it back! This government has received millions and billions of dollars of mining royalties over the years, and it cannot even acknowledge it. It has just experienced a massive windfall because of the iron ore price, and the Minister for Health still cannot acknowledge it. He is still obsessed with Jim McGinty! This poor man is still obsessed with Jim McGinty. I am sure that when he is retired and in an aged persons’ home he will still be obsessed with Jim McGinty, this man. He does not acknowledge what is in front of him now. We ask him about Fiona Stanley Hospital and he tells me about Jim McGinty. He has to get over the obsession! He needs to acknowledge the obsession and then get over it, because, honestly, he has not acknowledged the obsession with us. He should think about himself. He is sitting here introducing a tax bill for \$400 million and an \$8 billion Loan Bill—all-up \$21 billion. The government has had revenue streaming in so much that it has not been able to stop it. It has been overflowing from the Treasury coffers, the government has been spending it everywhere, and the Minister for Health is sitting there saying, “You guys got revenue, too.” Yes, we did, and we ran massive surpluses and we kept debt under control and we paid for things with cash. We built a rail line to the Minister for Health’s electorate and paid for it in cash!

Dr K.D. Hames: You cancelled Indian Ocean Drive to do it.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Kim Hames; Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Bill Marmion; Acting Speaker;
Mr John Day

The SPEAKER: Minister for Health, if you want to have a rest early today, you are going about it the right way.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We built Indian Ocean Drive. We committed the funding and started Indian Ocean Drive. The Liberal Party opened it, but we started it.

In relation to that, I think the Minister for Health would be concerned about the rail line to his electorate that we paid for in cash.

Point of Order

Dr K.D. HAMES: Mr Speaker, the member is not directing comments to you. She is directly attacking me and my integrity, and you expect me to not do what they do and to sit quietly.

The SPEAKER: Member for West Swan, I want you to come back to the contents of the bill.

Debate Resumed

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We will see a massive increase in revenue—a payroll tax increase of \$397 million in revenue over three years. As the member for Cannington said, he thought it was over four years. But, remember, this government does not budget over four years. We are lucky we got a three-year figure. Normally we get a month-to-month update on what is happening in the state finances. The Premier again confirmed today that he does not understand the state finances. Economics 101: who would ever want to receive a lecture from this Premier about the economy? Seriously! My mother, who probably had two years' education, understands the finances of this state better than the Premier does in respect to the economy.

In relation to the state finances, the revenue has been coming through the door, and now there is a taxation bill. Remember, when we asked a question about the budget we were told to wait for three weeks. When we come back from recess, does everyone know what we will be debating? Does the Liberal Party know what we will be debating?

Mr B.S. Wyatt: I just got an email that they want to debate the Loan Bill as soon as we are back—in the first week. Incredible.

The SPEAKER: Member for Victoria Park!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I just heard the member for Victoria Park, and I will take the interjection, thank you very much. Sorry for that.

When we come back, we will be debating an \$8 billion Loan Bill.

Mr P. Papalia: How much was that?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: That is \$8 billion, and that is just before the budget. Why do we not wait for the budget? Oh, we cannot wait for the budget because you guys will run out of cash! The government is borrowing to pay salaries! Does the government understand that? Does the government understand how bad that is? After years of economic growth and revenue gushing through its doors, it is now borrowing to pay salaries. It is obvious that if the government does not get the Loan Bill, it will not be able to pay the nurses or teachers. This is something that is beyond anyone's contemplation—beyond anything I have ever seen in a state government. The government has mismanaged the finances so bad that it has to come in, rush a Loan Bill —

Mr J.H.D. Day: Badly. There is an “ly” on the end of bad.

Mr P. Papalia: You're right—“badly”. You've done it badly.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: What did I say? Sorry. “Badly”; thanks for that, John.

Several members interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I will welcome that because I can repeat it again!

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for West Swan, thank you; come back to it.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I just welcomed the interjection from the member for Kalamunda. My bad, sorry. That is what young people say today.

To try to better demonstrate the amount of revenue gushing through the doors, the member for Cannington has just passed something over to me. What? Royalty income was \$1.7 billion in 2007-08, member for Cannington. What is it now? It was \$6 billion in the last completed financial year, up from \$1.7 billion. The Minister for Health has this very, very unhealthy obsession with Jim McGinty. A lot of people had obsessions about Jim McGinty for different reasons, but this Minister for Health is absolutely obsessed with him. Royalty incomes

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Kim Hames; Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Bill Marmion; Acting Speaker;
Mr John Day

increased from \$1.7 billion in 2007–08 to \$6 billion in 2013–14. Why are we standing here debating \$400 million? The budget is in a couple of weeks. Why are we debating this? Why will we have the Loan Bill being brought in? We should all be waiting for the budget, should we not? How many sleeps to go to til the budget? But we cannot wait for the budget because you guys have trashed the economy so badly—trashed the state finances so badly—that they are rushing in, trying to bring tax measures in two weeks before a budget, bringing in borrowings of \$8 billion two weeks before a budget. It is absolutely incredible.

Last night we had some very interesting debates on clauses 12, 13, 14 and so forth about the calculations for determining the changes in the payroll tax methodology that will be used. I will not go through all the equations in detail because, frankly, I did lose track of them last night at about 12.30 am. I did ask in consideration in detail—because it is an interesting way of increasing payroll tax revenue: abolishing the tax-free threshold for payrolls over \$800 000—whether that is why this method was chosen, not others. Obviously, it came through the debate last night that there were other options being put forward, but the government chose this method. I think this is probably one that will take more money over the future, and maybe that is why the government did it, knowing how Treasury would have put the options forward. But it is quite a complex change; it is not just a change to the rates, it is more the abolition of that tax-free threshold. We will see massive increases for a lot of businesses around the state, and the increases will be up to \$44 000.

In reflecting on the streams of revenue—the rivers of revenue—that have flowed to this government, payroll tax has increased significantly under the Barnett government primarily due to the strong economic growth driven by the mining sector and driven by, in particular, the iron ore price. We have seen some strong wages growth flow into strong payroll tax collections. I went through some of those figures last night.

I want to reflect on something we discussed in consideration in detail last night and through the second reading debate. It was again reflecting upon the election commitment made by this government—the election campaign in which commitments were made on payroll tax by the Liberal Party. I described it as some sort of financial *Xanadu* at the time, with the Premier rollerskating down the Terrace saying everything was possible.

Several members interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: There are a couple of Xanadus out there. My reference is to Olivia Newton-John’s *Xanadu*, spelt with an “X”, not a “Z”. But I can picture the Premier skating down the Terrace asking, “Do you want a light rail? We will give you one. Do you want and airport rail by 2018? We will give you one. Business, do you want payroll tax cuts? We will give you one.” Even though on that fateful morning at a breakfast hosted by *WA Business News*, and well attended with over 600 people, the larger than life former Treasurer, the former member for Vasse, Troy Buswell, said that they will deliver tax cuts for business because it deserves it. Then the member for Victoria Park said —

Mr B.S. Wyatt: “Dr No”.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: “Dr No” was booed at the end of it. He was lucky to escape to his car in one piece as he said to the business audience, “I can’t promise tax cuts because—you know what?—they will be debt funded.” Hang on; where are we today? The government committed to some tax cuts, the \$121 million, but where are we now? We are increasing taxes by \$400 million —

Mr W.J. Johnston: Over three years

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: That is over three years, and now we have to borrow to pay for salaries and paper and pens. That was always the criticism. I remember a number of decades ago when it was said that you know a government is in crisis when it has to borrow to stock the stationery cupboard, which is what this government is doing. Can members believe that? Liken that to increasing a mortgage: we all have that redraw facility on our mortgage that we access quite a bit for holidays and capital items or to increase our net asset base, but imagine a person borrowing an amount over the equity in his home. We are talking about a massive debt.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: Equity?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Sorry, “equity” is a foreign word to this government. Imagine a person undertaking brand-new borrowings just so he can afford to buy the milk; that is what this government is doing. It has put us in the situation of increasing debt just to stock the fridge or the stationery cupboard. It is an appalling set of circumstances. That the Premier believes he is not responsible for this is again beyond imagination. That he does not believe that he created the structural imbalance that has led us into this situation is again beyond imagination. Nobody should get an economics lecture from this man, because all he has done is fail to deliver big, new projects for WA. He has not diversified the economy and he has left this state’s finances in their worst shape ever historically.

MR B.S. WYATT (Victoria Park) [3.03 pm]: I, too, rise to make some comments on the third reading of this Taxation Legislation Amendment Bill 2015. A strange thing happened between the second reading of this bill

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Kim Hames; Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Bill Marmion; Acting Speaker;
Mr John Day

and today and its third reading. This happened before consideration in detail. I was sitting here yesterday, as is often the case, and the Speaker was going through the various bits and pieces. We got to orders of the day and the Treasurer jumped up and said, “I give notice of a Loan Bill to borrow ‘mmm’.” I thought, “What?” He said, “To authorise borrowing for the general government sector of ‘mmm’.”

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr P. Abetz): I remind the member that this is the third reading stage of the bill, and therefore you must confine your remarks to aspects of that bill—this is not a wideranging debate.

Mr B.S. WYATT: When I listened again to the “mmm” being borrowed under the Loan Bill 2015, it struck me that perhaps this is how it got through the Liberal Party room.

Mr R.F. Johnson interjected.

Mr B.S. WYATT: Aha! Thank you, member for Hillarys. When I heard of the “mmm” being borrowed by the Treasurer yesterday through the third loan bill of a government that has already brought in \$8.3 billion in 2009, plus \$5 billion in 2012—as an aside that \$5 billion was supposed to take us through to the end of the financial year next year—I had to go to the second reading speech of the bill. The bells were ringing, ding-ding-ding, and I asked for a copy of the second reading speech and the bill because I could not hear how much we were borrowing again. It then appeared to me—this is why I want to talk about this—that the “mmm” mentioned by the Treasurer was another \$8 billion. I understand why he had some difficulty in saying that in the chamber yesterday when he told us all about the “mmm” dollars that he wanted to borrow for general government purposes. Member for Hillarys, I hope that when it came to the party room, at the very least, at some point in there deep within the DNA of some government members—I know it is in the DNA of the member for Hillarys; I have heard his speeches and read his opinion pieces—there was a twinge of a fiscal conservative. I hope that at the very least in the party room when the Treasurer said that the government was seeking authority to borrow another “mmm”, somebody said, “How much, Mike? I did not hear that up the back of the party room. How much do you want to borrow? Because from memory we borrowed \$8.3 billion and then we borrowed \$5 billion. I am unsure of how much you said you want to borrow again.”

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Victoria Park, I will have to sit you down if you do not confine your remarks to the third reading speech. This is not a wideranging speech about a bill that is yet to come before the house.

Mr B.S. WYATT: There has been some wideranging conversation during the third reading of this bill, and I hope Mr Acting Speaker will be as consistent as was the case with previous speakers —

The ACTING SPEAKER: The previous speaker tested the boundaries well and truly.

Mr B.S. WYATT: I am sure you will be consistent, Mr Acting Speaker.

Late last night we asked the minister some questions about this revenue bill that asks for another \$400 million. It is a good bill because we need that \$400 million in addition to the “mmm” that the government wants to borrow under the Loan Bill introduced yesterday. It will be an interesting debate and I guarantee it will be declared urgent because I know what is going on.

Mr M. McGowan: How much was it that they are borrowing?

Mr B.S. WYATT: The amount is “mmm”. A couple of points were made by the Minister for Finance during consideration in detail, and I wrote down an interesting interjection from the Deputy Premier on the member for West Swan during her third reading contribution. The Deputy Premier said, “You didn’t do anything” in response to commentary by the member for West Swan about the strong surpluses under the Gallop–Carpenter years and under Treasurer Eric Ripper. I do not accept that line from the Deputy Premier, but let us assume for a minute that we do. I get it that ministers like to get up in this chamber and say that they have done this and that; we all like to do stuff. But if a person is going to do that, he has to accept responsibility for what happens to the finances when it is all done at once.

Mr M. McGowan: It is part of the “Bigger Picture” of financial management.

Mr B.S. WYATT: It is part of the “Bigger Picture” of financial management. A person has to accept that responsibility. One thing I will not accept—I have said it time and time again and it has been confirmed by this bill—is the argument that we are in this situation because of the unfair GST deal set up by the previous Liberal governments of Howard and Court. I have a chart here that is printed in black and white; I cannot print it off in colour but members should get the idea from the chart I did. It shows one bar well above the other states. This bar shows the state revenue per capita from 2013 through to the current year on the *Government Mid-year Financial Projections Statement*, and also projected out to 2017–18. This factors in the iron ore decline captured

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Kim Hames; Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Bill Marmion; Acting Speaker;
Mr John Day

in the midyear review. In every single year since the 2003–04 financial year, Western Australia has had the highest revenue per capita of all the Australian states. We had conversations about our population growth GST. The highest revenue per capita of all Australian states has been found in Western Australia, particularly during the time of the Barnett government.

The reason that the GST declined was that royalties increased dramatically. As a result, the entire revenue, which is what members should look at when they look at the finances, increased dramatically. The Barnett government has enjoyed a 40 per cent increase in revenue. Let us think about that for a moment. It took from the moment that Stirling arrived to the election of the Barnett government to get to the revenue base, and then it took six years for it to increase by 40 per cent. That strong totality of revenue growth is extraordinary by any stretch of the imagination. The critique I have always made is that, unfortunately, the Premier has spent the revenue that he wished he had, not the revenue that he actually had. We will look back at the end of our lives and say that that period was an incredible time to be alive. On the back of huge expansion in China and the explosion of the urban middle class in China, Western Australia benefited from an amazing surge in revenue from iron ore in particular; of course, 90 per cent of our revenue is from iron ore. After that 40 per cent increase in state revenue, we have been left with a crippled balance sheet. I have said this before: ultimately, Labor and Liberal governments lose—every government loses—but they have to manage the finances with future governments and future taxpayers in mind. They do not take the financial capacity of the state as is, as well as for the next three or four governments, and spend it all at once. That is not responsible financial management. Now that the iron ore price is in decline, and we read everywhere that the iron ore glut will be around for a while because—guess what, Premier?—there is this thing called supply and demand —

Mr R.F. Johnson: And competition.

Mr B.S. WYATT: Exactly, member for Hillarys; thank you—and competition. The position taken by the Premier on the export of iron ore from Western Australia can hold on only one premise, and that is that iron ore is not produced anywhere else in the world. That is it. The member for Hillarys knows it; that is why he said “and competition”. Supply and demand and competition are not new concepts, particularly for the standard and calibre of the great economics teacher, the Premier.

Mr M. McGowan: He could talk for three months.

Mr B.S. WYATT: He could talk for months about stuff he would not do if he was Premier.

Mr R.F. Johnson: It’s the economists who caused the GFC.

Mr B.S. WYATT: I like that.

Mr R.F. Johnson: I’m sure you’re aware of that, and American ones predominantly.

Mr B.S. WYATT: What is it—the dismal science? I could spend some time on the dismal science, but I have an agitated Acting Speaker, who is trying to drag me back in a bit. I appreciate the flexibility that you are giving me at the moment, Mr Acting Speaker. I just want to make this point.

The ACTING SPEAKER: It is entertaining, but I encourage you to go in the right direction.

Mr B.S. WYATT: I appreciate the interjections.

The government has revenue growth of 40 per cent but then increases debt. I am having a guess here, because I have asked the Premier and the Treasurer but they do not have the foggiest idea of when this trajectory of debt is going to stop or slow—not even an approximate time. That is why another Loan Bill has come in—and it is for only two years. That will get us through to the end of the 2016–17 financial year.

Mr M. McGowan: Doesn’t it overlap the existing one?

Mr B.S. WYATT: It does, apparently. According to the Treasurer, there is \$1.6 billion left in authorised borrowing from the \$5 billion Loan Bill, so in the next two years, apparently the government is going to borrow \$9.6 billion.

Ms R. Saffioti: I reckon that \$1.8 billion will be done by 30 June.

Mr B.S. WYATT: Yes; I think the member is probably right. Assuming that that is correct, that is nearly \$10 billion.

I was struck yesterday when the Premier got to his feet in response to a question from the Leader of the Opposition—this is from the blue *Hansard*, so I am not quoting it; I am looking at the notes I wrote in the blue—and said —

... which concerns me—is the level of accumulated debt. Previous decisions will affect that, but they will not affect this year’s operating surplus or deficit.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Kim Hames; Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Bill Marmion; Acting Speaker;
Mr John Day

I was struck by that, because he is an economics teacher. He said that accumulated debt will not affect this year's operating surplus or deficit. I thought I must have misremembered, so I went back to the 2007–08 annual report, which was also confirmed in the *Pre-election Financial Projections Statement* in the lead-up to the 2008 election, and had a look in the operating accounts of the general government sector for how much interest we were paying. We were paying \$120 million a year in interest, but we were receiving about \$350 million in interest from our investments, so we were in a net positive position. But when Mr Barnett came to power —

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

Mr B.S. WYATT: We actually had a future fund. When he came to power, we had net positive cash flow from interest into the finances of the state in the general government sector. The Premier said that accumulated debt will not affect this year's operating surplus or deficit. I thought that that was strange and that there must not be any change in the interest being paid from our operating account. So I had a look and I was struck to see that, on a net basis to offset the interest income, this financial year we will pay \$364 million in interest, which will rise to \$703 million by 2017–18. Does the Premier know what that is? That is the accumulated debt having an impact on this year's operating surplus or deficit position. Of course it has an impact! I was not that surprised, but I was interested that the Premier would be so flippant as to say and put it on the *Hansard* record that he does not have an understanding of the impact of accumulated debt on the operating balance. That struck me as startling from an economics teacher.

One other graph I want to show my colleagues is a graph I did of Western Australia's public debt. I like this graph because it shows the percentage of debt in our total public sector that is being held in the general government sector. By that I mean the debt that is not being held by our utilities, such as Western Power and the Water Corporation—those organisations that operate on a commercial basis and cover their cost of debt from their activities, or they should do. All we see on this graph are very small levels of net debt held in 2000–01, effectively the assets we held because we had no net debt in the general government sector, through to the election of the Barnett government, when half of the net debt is held in the general government sector. The accumulated interest on that impacts on the operating surplus or deficit, but Mr Barnett said that there is no impact from accumulated debt on our operating surplus or deficit. Of course there is. Unless he understands that, there will be another Loan Bill brought in here before we even get to the next election.

This is out of the box. It is absurdity from the Premier. I think it is embarrassment from the Treasurer. I know the Premier does not like it when we start quoting his words; he gets cranky at us because he does not like being held to account for the positions he takes. I want to remind members just once—I have a file full of stuff that he said—of what the Premier said on 14 June 2001.

Mr W.J. Johnston: It's his famous debt speech.

Mr B.S. WYATT: It is actually not the same quote, because I figure I have quoted that one to death. On 14 June 2001, the Premier said —

The only part of the debt that is sustainable is that which is served by income generating assets. State debt that is used for new power stations or water treatment, which generates an income, must roll on, and those credit rating agencies will be reasonably accepting of that. However, if the Government starts to run up state debt to fund recurrent services of government ... it will lose our AAA credit rating in a flash, and immediately the State's debt servicing costs will rise.

My frustration with the Premier is that he talked a pretty good game when he was in opposition, but when he got into government he decided that none of the rules applied to him anymore, which is why the member for West Swan was reflecting upon the *BusinessNews Western Australia* breakfast in January–February 2013 at which Troy, the former member for Vasse, and I were having a discussion about what we would do around finances. I do not think we had had the Valentine's Day 2013 announcement at which we announced all the things we were not going to do. I cannot quite remember the order of things. At that breakfast in early 2013, I knew the state's finances were not in a position to spend more without finding savings, or to deliver tax cuts. I knew that and I was the shadow Treasurer in 2013, so the government must have known. At that breakfast, when Troy said he had an announcement to make, I thought, "Here we go!" He announced his payroll tax cut and I thought, "Okay!" I hope members can appreciate the position I found myself in, as the shadow Treasurer, with 600 eyes on Troy and lo their eyes swing to me! Peter Kennedy said, "Mr Wyatt, will the Labor Party match that promise?" I said, "No, it won't, Peter." I was brutally honest. I said that we would all love to go to an election campaign announcing tax cuts; I could not think of anything better, but I could not do that because that would simply be—what I said at the time was quoted—debt funding a tax cut. I said to the business community that it should be critiquing the government for that announcement. I always hear from various organisations representing business or whatever that they want honesty in government and they want sustainable finances. When a government that has clearly given up the mantle of financial responsibility starts making commitments that are going to ratchet up more debt, I want to hear back from the people making those critiques.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Kim Hames; Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Bill Marmion; Acting Speaker;
Mr John Day

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr P. Abetz): I urge the member, again, to remember that this is the third reading debate. You need to stick to the content of the bill or make a direct reference to things that are stated or said in consideration in detail.

Mr B.S. WYATT: After the then member for Vasse committed to that payroll tax cut in that election campaign and I said that the Labor Party could not match it, we ended up in this ridiculous world in which, in the May budget last year, that tax cut was delivered but six months later, in the midyear review, the government was increasing payroll taxes.

Mr M. McGowan: Did he mention that?

Mr B.S. WYATT: The announcement was videorecorded, so I went back and watched it and I did not see the member for Vasse talk about that part of it, and I was there for the duration.

Do members remember at the time of the *Government Mid-year Financial Projections Statement* when the Treasurer said that the government did not increase taxes and make policy changes in the midyear review? However, that is where the best stuff happens with the Barnett government. It could be hiding the Insurance Commission of WA's dividend. Do members remember that? It could be another \$400 million tax increase that is followed lickety-split by the Loan Bill. Again, I emphasise that that is so that the general government sector can borrow an extra—ergh!

The member for Hillarys' position is very clear on this, but I keep imploring in these speeches and looking above the heads of the front bench, who are hopelessly compromised—they cannot get out of the death spiral that the Premier has put the state finances in—and I look along the back bench. Now I can see the member for Churchlands, the member for Belmont and the member for Hillarys. I say to them that at some point one government backbencher is going to have to take the Premier on. Someone is going to have to challenge the Premier on the path he has set the state, because I can guarantee —

Mr R.F. Johnson interjected.

Mr B.S. WYATT: The member for Hillarys is right, I know, and he has.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Victoria Park, I have warned you sufficiently. I will give you two more minutes. If you do not confine yourself to what should be a contribution to the third reading debate, I will be sitting you down.

Mr B.S. WYATT: Can I seek some guidance, Mr Acting Speaker? How is talking about the payroll tax increase not relevant to the payroll tax increase debate? I am confused.

The ACTING SPEAKER: The tangent that you have gone off on and continue to go off on is simply not relevant.

Mr B.S. WYATT: Anyway, as I was saying, the payroll tax increase —

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Victoria Park, I am on my feet. I have sought advice from the staff and they assure me that what you are doing is not a third reading contribution. I have warned you a number of times. I insist that you do that or I will sit you down permanently.

Mr B.S. WYATT: I am talking about the payroll tax increase in this payroll tax bill and asking Liberal members to stand up about the increases in taxes and increases in debt. If you, Mr Acting Speaker, cannot see the link between this bill and debt, then you are in the same position as the Premier! Not relevant! It is like doing PMP at my kid's kindy sometimes! Where was I?

During the second reading debate I had a conversation across the chamber with the Minister for Finance around GST. We were talking about all sorts of things around the GST and other issues that have got us into this position.

I make a couple of final points. Until we understand the direction of debt, these sorts of bills are going to keep coming in. We will keep seeing the budget delivered and immediately becoming irrelevant, and the midyear review trying to fix it up. It will keep happening. The government has never charted a sensible direction, which is why we have this bill that is increasing payroll taxes, six months after the budget that cut payroll taxes. It is just crazy, colleagues. It will not affect only the government of 2017; it will probably wash through badly to two or three governments in terms of tax revenue, service delivery and interest costs. That will have an impact on the operating balance, contrary to the Premier's assertion in the chamber yesterday. Colleagues, it is a grim picture. It is a grim state of affairs that the Premier has left us with and will leave us with. All I ask of government members is: did they take responsibility for the decisions they have made? Until members opposite do that, we will get more of these Loan Bills and more of the Minister for Finance bringing through tax increase bills. That will be the legacy of the Barnett years, not the baubles.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Kim Hames; Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Bill Marmion; Acting Speaker;
Mr John Day

MR P. PAPALIA (Warnbro) [3.28 pm]: What an extraordinary contribution from the shadow Treasurer—outstanding and absolutely on the money and on the subject the entire time, in my view—not that I am an expert on these sorts of matters.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Warnbro, you are not to use your speech to question the ruling and the comments of the Speaker.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I beg your pardon; I was not intending to. I was just making an observation.

The ACTING SPEAKER: You certainly were; there is no question about that.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I was just making an observation on the wonderful speech by the shadow Treasurer.

I wanted to say that, unlike the Premier, I am not an economist, so I have been a little confused listening to his logic and trying to follow it. The member for Victoria Park assisted me with that. In the end, I think the conclusion he drew was that it is impossible to follow the logic when we are trying to track where the Premier is going.

Point of Order

Mr W.R. MARMION: I do not think the Premier spoke on this bill, so I am not sure why the member is talking about the Premier. He did not make any contribution on this particular bill, so I am trying work out how the member relates what the Premier has said to this bill.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr P. Abetz): I am not sure that is a point of order, nonetheless.

Debate Resumed

Mr P. PAPALIA: I thank the minister for his contribution. The Premier has spoken regularly about these matters during question time in response to questions from the opposition.

Mr W.J. Johnston: I think he did speak.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I think he did. He quite often interjected on members on this side of the chamber in his usual gruff and abusive fashion.

I have been trying to work this out. We are frequently told that it is the Labor Party's fault that we find ourselves in this situation. That is the Minister for Health's standard refrain. Regardless of the subject or the question, it is always to do with Jim McGinty—as the member for West Swan identified. I think I have worked it out. It is the Labor Party's fault. We are saddled with so much debt and the necessity for this Taxation Legislation Amendment Bill to be rushed into Parliament moments before the budget and we will be confronted with the third enormous loan bill just before the budget because the Labor Party made the fundamental error of managing the finances in such a fashion that it ran high surpluses for a significant period and managed to get the state's books into probably the best situation in history when it lost government in September 2008. In so doing, the Labor Party presented the Premier with the opportunity to inflict the damage that he has done. Had the government inherited anywhere near as bad a situation that it will hand over in 2017, when Labor will be left to clean up the mess —

Mr W.J. Johnston: Who knows whether we will win?

Mr P. PAPALIA: Who knows whether we will win? But let us hope that Labor wins, because the damage that could be done in subsequent years based on what has been done to date would be horrendous. Imagine the extent of debt racked up under a third Barnett government and a third term of Barnett management or mismanagement. Imagine how many generations over how many decades it would take to recover from that situation. Labor's problem is that it managed the books too well during its two terms of government, under two responsible Premiers and an excellent Treasurer, and, as a consequence, the government has been like a child getting hold of the cookie jar without any adult supervision. That is the first bad part. Then there was some sort of malfunction in the cookie production machine and the cookie jar kept refilling. The same child, having already gorged himself, found that he was able to continue to fill his face with even more opportunity in the form of an unprecedented royalties boom. Now, we are left to shrug in wonderment at how we got the state into this position. I think based on the premise that it is Labor's fault because it left the books in too good a condition for someone too immature to handle it, one could accuse Labor of being irresponsible—that is true!

Unfortunately for the Liberal and National Party members who sit in cabinet, they have responsibility for providing oversight of expenditure. Even if one assumes that it is Labor's fault because we left the books in too good a state and the opportunity too tempting for this Premier—the individual who has wrought this damage—to do the damage he has done, one has to wonder why this has been allowed to continue. Three separate enormous loan bills have been introduced. How much was the first one—\$8 billion? The first was \$8.6 billion, then

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Kim Hames; Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Bill Marmion; Acting Speaker;
Mr John Day

\$5 billion and now \$8 billion. In the course of those bills being introduced, why has no-one in the Liberal Party been able to confront the Premier? Even when we had a Treasurer with a bit of character about him—I would not say he was responsible at all, but at least the former member for Vasse had a bit of character about him—why did no-one confront the Premier? At that stage, I think he was in the process of doing that. I think that is what was happening, but unfortunately he imploded before the opportunity to confront the Premier arose. He was not quite ready. It is clear that there is no-one else. I have to ask the question: is there no-one else within cabinet? The Minister for Finance is not capable of it. The Treasurer certainly is not capable of it. The Treasurer comes out and says things in the chamber in direct contradiction to everything that he has stood for over decades. His entire adult life has been dedicated —

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Warnbro, I draw your attention to standing order 198 and the footnote at the bottom of page 88, which states —

Third reading debate is restricted to the content of the Bill —

The content of the bill —

and is not as wide as the debate on the second reading:

I have extended a lot of leniency to the member, but I have to draw his attention to the standing order because it is not what he is doing. Certainly, it would be very appropriate for a contribution to a second reading debate but not to a third reading debate. I ask the member to restrict his comments to the content of the bill.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker.

This bill deals with a broken promise. Who broke that promise? The Liberal and National Parties of Western Australia broke that promise. I think that is relevant. The Liberal and National Parties of Western Australia are led by a Premier who has racked up an unprecedented amount of debt and found himself having to break another election promise and impose taxes of \$400 million on Western Australian businesses. That is what is in the bill—\$400 million over three years.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Warnbro, what you are saying would be very appropriate for a contribution to a second reading debate but not to a third reading debate.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Which part of that is not appropriate for the tax bill?

The ACTING SPEAKER: It is not. You need to restrict yourself to the content of the bill. If you do not understand that, I will be sitting you down in a few minutes. This is not a second crack at the second reading speech.

Mr P. PAPALIA: This bill —

The ACTING SPEAKER: Refer to a particular clause or a comment or an answer to a question that the minister gave in consideration in detail, but do not continue this wideranging debate.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I was talking about the bill.

The ACTING SPEAKER: You were not, and I will sit you down if you do not stick to what you need to do for a third reading debate.

Mr P. PAPALIA: In the minister's second reading speech about the bill, he explains what the legislation does. It imposes \$400 million extra tax on Western Australian businesses over three years.

The ACTING SPEAKER: The general stuff is to be dealt with in the debate on the second reading speech, now you must restrict yourself to the clauses and the content of the bill. I will sit you down. I will not argue with you, I will simply sit you down. The choice is yours.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I think it is an extraordinary suggestion that talking about the fact a bill has been introduced to increase taxes in Western Australia by \$397 million over three years and the government that did that is somehow outside the third reading debate.

The ACTING SPEAKER: It certainly is if you do not address yourself to the specific content of the bill.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Is that outside the debate?

The ACTING SPEAKER: I am saying that.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I am saying that the government responsible for this bill that will introduce taxes —

The ACTING SPEAKER: I will not go into a debate with you; I am telling you that if you do not stick to the third reading debate of the bill, I will sit you down.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Kim Hames; Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Bill Marmion; Acting Speaker;
Mr John Day

Mr P. PAPALIA: Mr Acting Speaking, I seek guidance. If I cannot speak about the extra tax of \$397 million over three years that will be imposed as a consequence of this bill, what am I allowed to speak about?

The ACTING SPEAKER: The clauses of the bill.

Mr P. PAPALIA: If that is what the Acting Speaker is suggesting, I will just start reading the clauses of the bill. I do not think that is the intent of the standing order the Acting Speaker referred to. It is not that members can only read from the bill—that is not a contribution to a third reading debate.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member, resume your seat. I made it very clear, I read the section of the standing orders, and I have been repeatedly advised by chamber staff that what is happening here this afternoon is not what should happen in a third reading speech. I am not on my own on this. Stick to what a third reading speech should be. This is not a second crack at the second reading debate; you all had your turn and spent half an hour on the second reading debate to cover that broad territory, which you were entitled to do in a second reading debate, but a third reading debate is to simply look back particularly at consideration in detail and highlight matters from that. It is not a broad ranging debate. If you have nothing else to say other than a broad ranging debate, I will sit you down.

Point of Order

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Can I ask for clarification through a point of order? I understand that during the third reading debate members can reflect upon what happened in the consideration in detail stage. Last night the house spent about four or five hours on the consideration in detail stage and covered a range of issues, including whether the bill would impose significant tax increases, the impact of GST and whether the bill was a loan bill. Two speeches were given—one by the member for Cannington and one by me—on a motion to refer the bill to a committee, and again a lot of issues were covered. The consideration in detail stage was wideranging and discussed a wide range of matter, so I am double-checking whether I am right in thinking that we could go through the issues that were discussed during the consideration in detail stage.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr P. Abetz): I will read the *House of Representatives Practice*, which states —

Third reading: At this stage the bill can be reviewed in its final form after the shaping it may have received at the detail stage. When debate takes place, it is confined strictly to the contents of the bill, and is not as wide-ranging as the second reading debate. When a bill has been read a third time, it has passed the House.

It is very clear: debate in the third reading stage is confined strictly to the contents of the bill.

Debate Resumed

Mr P. PAPALIA: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. I hope the same strict interpretations are applied when we are in government.

My concern with the final version of the bill lies primarily in the reluctance, and in fact the refusal, of the government to indicate whether it consulted, or had shown any evidence whether it had consulted, on the content of the bill, on the formulation employed for determining changes to payroll tax and whether key stakeholder groups and peak bodies in Western Australia and around the nation had been consulted. That was part of the concern I had with the final version of the bill. The final version of the bill represents a refusal on behalf of the government to even consider in any way the amendments moved by the opposition, one key component of which was a referral to a committee to enable thorough consultation with those peak bodies—the people most impacted by the legislation. This final legislation that is about to be forced through the Parliament will have dire consequences for some small businesses. Some small businesses will find that in the current environment this small further imposition is enough to damage them, perhaps terminally. That is significant.

As a consequence of the final version of the bill not reflecting any of the suggestions or proposed consultation from the opposition, we do not know whether or not those peak bodies that represent the 17 000 or so businesses that will be impacted by this legislation have been spoken to. We do not know whether they are fortunate enough to have the time while they try to keep their businesses afloat to read *Hansard* or watch the live streaming of Parliament, if they are so inclined and are short of things to do in the evening and need assistance to keep them awake right through to 1.15 am, or whatever time it was that we stayed to last night. By the look of it, those businesses have not been spoken to, consulted or asked about their view of the potential outcome of this bill. Because of this final version that is going to be passed, all of those businesses will find out about the consequences, or the government is going to find out about the consequences on those businesses, only when that happens. That is not a good thing.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Thursday, 23 April 2015]

p2854c-2868a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Kim Hames; Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Bill Marmion; Acting Speaker;
Mr John Day

It is worthy in the third reading debate to reflect on the quite reasonable suggestion made during the consideration in detail stage that this legislation be referred to a committee and be assessed before the final version is passed to the third reading, passed through this place and pushed through to the upper house in an incredible hurry because the government is in desperate need of money to pay people to operate. Before that happens, it makes sense, and is a reasonable suggestion, that a committee be given the opportunity to give a forum to businesses that are going to be affected by this bill to air their concerns and grievances and to warn the government about the damage and the potential consequences of what it is going to impose on this state.

The government on this final bill should have been more consultative. The final version of this bill, instead of reflecting an almost embarrassing haste on behalf of the government, introduced only weeks before the budget itself, should have been compiled following an appropriate process. The only reason that has not occurred is that it has been drafted and managed by this government, the same government that has, through absolute mismanagement, incompetence, ineptitude and lack of courage on behalf of anyone other than the Premier—and other than the member for Hillarys. It is obvious that he should be excused because he is the only government member who has had the courage to stand up to the Premier.

Mr D.J. Kelly: And to have shown any ticker.

Mr P. PAPALIA: That is right; he is the only one who has shown any ticker on behalf of his constituents and the Liberal Party. Any capital “L” Liberal principles—the party principles—are being trashed by this government, and the only person who has demonstrated any capacity to draw that to the attention of the Premier has been the member for Hillarys. We have had a succession of Treasurers, all of whom to varying degrees have failed. Ultimately, it is clear that the prime responsibility lies with the Premier for the damage that has been done to the state’s economy. I really do resent it. I resent it on behalf of the constituents I represent; I resent it on behalf of my family and my children, and possibly, the way it is looking at the moment, their children. I resent the fact that this government has inherited the best possible revenue situation it could have at that time, and also lack of debt, and despite a record 40 per cent growth in revenue over the course of government, it has turned that into the worst possible outcome anyone could have imagined. I resent that. It is worthy to reflect upon that in the third reading. Whether or not it could have been changed through a different final version of this bill is possibly open to debate, but the suggestion made by the opposition would have at least given those 17 000 businesses that are subject to this broken promise to have a voice in the process. It may not necessarily have eased the burden that they will ultimately bear, it may not have stopped the government from pursuing this course, but at least it would have given them more of a voice in the whole process.

The final version of this bill, as we look at it now and as it is about to be forced through Parliament, reflects the government’s inadequate contribution to the entire debate. At no time during the debate has the minister indicated any willingness to engage beyond a perfunctory response to very bland questions. There has been no recognition or acknowledgement of the inappropriate nature of breaking the promise that the government is breaking. This is a serious matter. No concession was given in the debate to the future consequences of having eroded the confidence that anyone in the Western Australian business community will have about the veracity of promises made to them during an election campaign—at least promises made by the Liberal Party. I urge anyone in the business community, and in the wider community for that matter, to extend to the Labor Party consideration for the fact that we kept our promises. We intended to keep our promises with regard to financial management. That was absolutely and undeniably indicated by the courage shown by the shadow Treasurer when he went in front of 600 businesspeople who had been told the now known lie by the then Treasurer that the government of the day would provide a \$400 million tax break. He said to those businesspeople that we would not match it. In the heat of an election campaign, the shadow Treasurer was honest, responsible and did the right thing: he said that we would not match it because it would be funded by debt.

The final version of this bill reflects the dishonesty of the government. It trumpets the dishonesty of the government. The 17 000 Western Australian businesses that will be impacted by this final version of this bill will know that the Barnett Liberal–National government lied to them—every single one of them. The final version of this bill, as it passes through this Parliament—through this house and out into the other place—and is enacted will be the confirmation that those people will get, if they needed any, that they were lied to. A dishonest government led by a dishonest Premier deceived them during the heat of an election campaign by promising that everything was fully costed and fully funded including their tax break, and it was not.

Unfortunately, other consequences associated with all the mismanagement will continue to be felt. We have another two years to go of this government. As the shadow Treasurer indicated, it will be really difficult to see this government getting through those two years without seeking to add debt to the already gross amount of debt that we are looking at, half of which is in the general government sector associated with just paying the day-to-day bills. That is just shocking! It is a frightening thing to contemplate—member for Cockburn and friend—that we have not had the third loan bill yet. Having had two huge loan bills pass through the place and a third one on

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Kim Hames; Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Bill Marmion; Acting Speaker;
Mr John Day

the way, it is frightening to contemplate the possibility that there might be more before the opportunity at the next election to rid the state of this scourge represented by the member for Cottesloe and those people too lacking in courage to confront him and change his behaviour. There is no indication that there is a plan. We know that there is no plan, no idea and no inkling for when debt will peak. It indicates that there is no plan to have debt peak, which suggests that the only plan is to continue to increase taxes and borrow. It is a pretty tragic situation. It is a fact that the final version of this bill, as it passes through the house, is no more than yet another confirmation of the danger confronted by the state.

I know that I am not supposed to refer to things outside the final version of the bill, but the minister's reply to the second reading debate suggested that the only reason this bill is needed is the collapse of iron ore prices and as a consequence the state's projections will not be realised. That is not entirely true, because there is always the option of continuing the good governance that the government inherited. The only reason that we are in a position whereby we are vulnerable to the precipitous drop in iron ore prices, which has been pretty dramatic, is that the government has engaged in really poor governance. In the interim years from the time the government inherited the most sound set of books in the state's history, it has enabled the Premier to get us to this point—and that is the truth.

Mr W.R. Marmion: You can mention iron ore because it's in the second reading speech.

Mr P. PAPALIA: No. If I was allowed to talk about the second reading speech, I would have been talking a lot more about it, but I am not allowed to. I am allowed to talk only about the final version of the bill, apparently.

Mr R.F. Johnson: I think you can refer to things that happened in consideration in detail.

Mr P. PAPALIA: No. We sought clarification. The third reading is a very constrained debate. It is on only the content of the final version of the bill, to which I have to keep referring. I think probably by now the Leader of the House has conceded that it was a bit silly to try to constrain us from drawing attention to the government's failure, in light of the fact that the whole purpose of this debate is to confirm a \$400 million broken promise. The government has been compelled to do it and it has been forced upon the government by its inadequacy and mismanagement in the years since it took office. I therefore think it is silly to think that we cannot talk about it. What was the intent? Was it to stop people in Western Australia knowing that the Premier is incapable of restraining himself? Everyone knows that. I do not think anyone has bought the GST bogeyman story. It is true that the GST deal is a crock. The Premier signed it. He was part of it. That is true. No-one argues that. But it is not a GST —

Ms R. Saffioti: Shock!

Mr P. PAPALIA: It is not a GST shock. Treasury knows what the GST is going to do. It does what it does. When revenue goes up, the GST goes down. There is a lag. We can predict it. We can identify it.

Ms R. Saffioti: It was predicted.

Mr P. PAPALIA: It was predicted; everyone knew. It is therefore farcical to suggest that that is the reason. The Premier keeps doing that, and that is silly.

Mr J.H.D. Day: What should we have not spent money on that you wouldn't have?

Mr P. PAPALIA: We told the government at the last election what it should have done. We did the right thing. The Premier said that we were idiots. The Premier said that we had lost our mind. We identified \$3.8 billion—was it that much or more?

Ms R. Saffioti: Yes.

Mr P. PAPALIA: We identified \$3.8 billion worth of things we would not do. We told the government the things we would not do. We told the government what we would not do. The government told the people of Western Australia that it would do everything. The Leader of the House is confronted now with the consequences of the deception that the government played out on the people of Western Australia in 2013. The government should stand and have the courage to accept the responsibility that it misled the people of Western Australia. What was said was not true. The election promises were never fully funded and fully costed. There was never money available to build the Metro Area Express. There was never money available to do all the things that were promised by the Premier unless the government decided that it would borrow and unless the government decided that it would continue to blow out the debt to levels that have never been seen before and will have to be paid off by generations of governments in this state.

Mr J.H.D. Day: So which hospitals and which schools shouldn't have been built?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr P. Abetz): Leader of the House!

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Kim Hames; Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Bill Marmion; Acting Speaker;
Mr John Day

Mr P. PAPALIA: We told the government what we would not do. Elizabeth Quay was one of the ones on which we were not going to spend \$470 million of taxpayers' money. The Premier looked at us today and said, "Tell me, would you not have done Elizabeth Quay?" And we said, "No, we wouldn't have done Elizabeth Quay"! Funnily enough, we said that at the election.

Several members interjected.

Mr P. PAPALIA: He said, "Would you not have built the Burswood stadium?" We said we would not build the stadium at Burswood because it would cost at least half a billion dollars more than the alternative that had been chosen by an independent committee led by the very responsible John Langoulant. We said we would do that one because a little work had been put into that one. But, no, the government said it wanted to pick the most expensive site in Western Australia for a stadium. Wear the consequences! The shadow Treasurer wore the consequences of his honesty during the election campaign—the derision of the business community of Western Australia—because the hail-fellow-well-met Troy Buswell lied to the business community and told it that it would get a \$400 million tax cut. The shadow Treasurer was honest and said we would not do that because it would be debt funded. The government has to wear the consequences now. It is the government's turn. It is the turn of the Liberal and National Parties of Western Australia to wear the consequences. The next two years will be long. Every time there is an impost on the people of Western Australia in the form of cuts in services or a breakdown in opportunity because there is an opportunity cost when the government has to spend money on paying interest on loans, and some unforeseen emergency or tragedy arises that the government cannot fund a response to —

Mr F.M. Logan: We go cap in hand to other states.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Yes, go cap in hand to other states that the Premier has abused, and suggested that the assistance we provided was tied to some sort of quid pro quo with GST—extraordinary behaviour.

Every time something happens like that, it is the government's responsibility. It is the Minister for Finance's responsibility. It is the responsibility of everybody on that side, with the exception of the member for Hillarys because he is the only one who has said the truth; he is the only one who has stood up. If any others stood in the party room, I will concede that may have happened and they are just —

Mr D.J. Kelly: Too shy to tell us.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Yes, perhaps too reluctant to be exposed in the public domain by talking to people about it.

But that aside, every single time these things occur—every single time there is a cut in service or a failure in service because of a lack of resourcing because the government has had to make cuts as a consequence of the massive debt and servicing that debt—we will remind the government. It is the government's responsibility. I know the Leader of the House is going; I know that in 18 months—do not worry, it is not that far away—the Leader of the House will be off fishing with the member for Dawesville.

Ms R. Saffioti: No they won't; they don't like each other!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Warnbro, can you direct your comments to the bill, please. This is the third reading debate.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Okay, the Leader of the House will not be off fishing with the member for Dawesville; he will be off fishing like the member for Dawesville, somewhere else!

Dr K.D. Hames: I haven't been fishing for ages.

Mr P. PAPALIA: In the Minister for Health's mind he is fishing.

The truth is that every time it happens neither the Minister for Health nor the Leader of the House will have to confront the ultimate consequences, but their colleagues who survive the next election will. Unfortunately, the rest of us will have to live with it. Worst of all, we are going to have to confront the real consequences of having to deal with it. We will have to clean up the mess. That is the most frightening thing. That is the most unfair thing.

Question to be Put

MR J.H.D. DAY (Kalamunda — Leader of the House) [4.03 pm]: I move —

That the question be now put.

Division

Question put and a division taken, the Deputy Speaker casting her vote with the ayes, with the following result —

Extract from *Hansard*
[ASSEMBLY — Thursday, 23 April 2015]
p2854c-2868a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Kim Hames; Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Bill Marmion; Acting Speaker;
Mr John Day

Ayes (27)

Mr P. Abetz	Ms W.M. Duncan	Dr G.G. Jacobs	Dr M.D. Nahan
Mr F.A. Alban	Ms E. Evangel	Mr R.S. Love	Mr D.C. Nalder
Mr C.J. Barnett	Mrs G.J. Godfrey	Mr W.R. Marmion	Mr J. Norberger
Mr I.M. Britza	Dr K.D. Hames	Mr J.E. McGrath	Mr A.J. Simpson
Mr V.A. Catania	Mrs L.M. Harvey	Mr P.T. Miles	Mr T.K. Waldron
Mr M.J. Cowper	Mr C.D. Hatton	Ms A.R. Mitchell	Mr A. Krsticevic (<i>Teller</i>)
Mr J.H.D. Day	Mr A.P. Jacob	Mr N.W. Morton	

Noes (17)

Dr A.D. Buti	Mr D.J. Kelly	Mr J.R. Quigley	Mr B.S. Wyatt
Mr R.H. Cook	Mr F.M. Logan	Ms M.M. Quirk	Mr D.A. Templeman (<i>Teller</i>)
Ms J. Farrer	Mr M. McGowan	Ms R. Saffioti	
Ms J.M. Freeman	Ms S.F. McGurk	Mr C.J. Tallentire	
Mr W.J. Johnston	Mr P. Papalia	Mr P.C. Tinley	

Pairs

Mr J.M. Francis	Ms L.L. Baker
Ms M.J. Davies	Mrs M.H. Roberts
Mr G.M. Castrilli	Mr P.B. Watson
Mr D.T. Redman	Mr M.P. Murray

Question thus passed.

Third Reading Resumed

Division

Question put and a division taken, the Deputy Speaker casting her vote with the ayes, with the following result —

Ayes (29)

Mr P. Abetz	Ms E. Evangel	Mr W.R. Marmion	Mr J. Norberger
Mr F.A. Alban	Mrs G.J. Godfrey	Mr J.E. McGrath	Mr A.J. Simpson
Mr C.J. Barnett	Dr K.D. Hames	Ms L. Mettam	Mr M.H. Taylor
Mr I.M. Britza	Mrs L.M. Harvey	Mr P.T. Miles	Mr T.K. Waldron
Mr V.A. Catania	Mr C.D. Hatton	Ms A.R. Mitchell	Mr A. Krsticevic (<i>Teller</i>)
Mr M.J. Cowper	Mr A.P. Jacob	Mr N.W. Morton	
Mr J.H.D. Day	Dr G.G. Jacobs	Dr M.D. Nahan	
Ms W.M. Duncan	Mr R.S. Love	Mr D.C. Nalder	

Noes (17)

Dr A.D. Buti	Mr D.J. Kelly	Mr J.R. Quigley	Mr B.S. Wyatt
Mr R.H. Cook	Mr F.M. Logan	Ms M.M. Quirk	Mr D.A. Templeman (<i>Teller</i>)
Ms J. Farrer	Mr M. McGowan	Ms R. Saffioti	
Ms J.M. Freeman	Ms S.F. McGurk	Mr C.J. Tallentire	
Mr W.J. Johnston	Mr P. Papalia	Mr P.C. Tinley	

Pairs

Mr J.M. Francis	Ms L.L. Baker
Ms M.J. Davies	Mrs M.H. Roberts
Mr G.M. Castrilli	Mr P.B. Watson
Mr D.T. Redman	Mr M.P. Murray

Question thus passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.