

LOCAL GOVERNMENT AMENDMENT BILL 2023

Consideration in Detail

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

Clause 8: Section 2.2A inserted —

Debate was interrupted after the clause had been partly considered.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 9 to 12 put and passed.

Clause 13: Section 2.17 replaced —

Ms M. BEARD: Proposed section 2.16B(6) refers to five-year intervals. Is this just aligned to the census?

Mr J.N. CAREY: Yes, it is.

Ms M. BEARD: The WA Electoral Commission takes snapshots of voters on a periodic basis, so could this apply at any point in time?

Mr J.N. CAREY: We base it on population, not the voters, and that is determined by the census.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 14 and 15 put and passed.

Clause 16: Section 2.18A inserted —

Ms M. BEARD: Can the minister explain whether proposed section 2.18A, “Change orders”, will make the provision at clause 8 null and void? Clause 16 will empower the government to make orders as a consequence of a change made by regulations under amendments of the act. Can the minister explain the difference between those two for me?

Mr J.N. CAREY: Proposed subsection (8) relates to the spilling of officers and proposed subsection (7) relates to the removal of wards. Is that what the member was asking?

Ms M. Beard: Yes.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 17: Section 2.19 amended —

Ms M. BEARD: Clause 17 relates to those eligible to vote in elections. I know the minister is aware that some regional people have an investment property, say, in the city and they may also have one in the metro area and they split their time accordingly. It will be a significant change for people who previously could vote. How many people are likely to be impacted by the restriction on voting, because some people will spend 50 per cent of their time in each location and have a vested interest in the electorate they vote in?

Mr J.N. CAREY: Member for North West Central, I need to make a correction for the record. I misspoke and said that there was a commissioner at Augusta. Of course, it is in fact Donnybrook. I want to put that on the record.

This will not make the change that the member is suggesting. It will not change voting rights; it will deal with sham leases. It will prescribe a time frame. The City of Perth inquiry identified that people were enrolling using a business lease taken out three months before an election to participate in that election. This provision will prescribe 12 months, creating a longer time line to show that there is a legitimate lease in action. This provision will not affect people’s property owning rights to vote. I want make that clear. If a person lives in, say, Perth but they own a farm in another council, they will still be able to vote if they have enrolled that property; remember that people still have to enrol their property.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 18 to 20 put and passed.

Clause 21: Section 3.1 amended —

Ms M. BEARD: Section 3.1 of the act will be amended to include the need for local governments to plan for and mitigate risks associated with climate change. There will also be a need to consider long-term consequences and impacts on future generations. Will this remove these responsibilities from the state? I will explain that with an example that sprang to mind. If there is an issue with coastal erosion in a particular area, would that responsibility be put on the local council, or have I misinterpreted the provision?

Mr J.N. CAREY: Respectfully, this is a principle; so, no, it will not erode the state’s responsibilities. But I also want to acknowledge that the provision reflects the reality that many local governments are making conscious decisions to make plans and policies for mitigating climate change.

Ms M. BEARD: I totally agree and I think they should. I was just trying to work out what will change and what the financial implications and responsibilities will be if the lines change on what might need to happen.

Mr J.N. CAREY: I think putting this out is, again, similar to recognising the interests of Aboriginal people and involving them in decision-making. This is about modernising the act to reflect what local governments are doing right now and as key principles. It is fair to say that more and more local governments are embracing the challenge of climate change. I think the member would acknowledge that all tiers of government are responsible to help mitigate changes.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 22 to 24 put and passed.

Clause 25: Section 4.8 amended —

Ms M. BEARD: Proposed section 4.8(1) allows for an extraordinary election for mayors or presidents in the event of a vacancy. Was consideration given to allowing a deputy mayor to automatically take on the role of mayor, alleviating the need for an election and the costs associated, bearing in mind that they would have the skills to potentially step up, and then backfill the other roles?

Mr J.N. CAREY: No, it was not. Respectfully, the election of a mayor can be done differently from a deputy mayor. Someone runs for the office of shire president or mayor directly but a deputy mayor is elected by their peers. They are different methods of election.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 26 to 37 put and passed.

Clause 38: Section 4.46A inserted —

Ms M. BEARD: How will tracking which councils still have or may be using electoral roll information be undertaken?

Mr J.N. CAREY: To be very clear, it is the candidate's responsibility to meet those obligations. As the member would be aware, as state candidates we have certain obligations that we must meet. Similarly, that should be expected of a local government candidate.

Ms M. BEARD: With the level of information sharing between the Western Australia Police Force and the Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries, if a community member has taken out a restraining order, for example, will their details be struck off information for all council candidates?

Mr J.N. CAREY: That is a conscious decision for someone to be a silent enrollee. As the member would be aware, police, journalists and others can apply—as the member has described, someone who may be significantly worried about their safety—to be a silent enrollee, but, obviously, there are some constraints around that. If someone does that on the state roll, it applies to the local government roll.

Ms M. BEARD: Can the CEO of a council or the CEO of the DLGSC determine who is on the roll?

Mr J.N. CAREY: There is a slight difference. As the member would be aware, every state voter is able to vote in local government elections. However, of course, with property owners, that information rests with the local governments. As is the case at the moment, there will be a time frame by which the CEO is obligated to provide that information to the Western Australian Electoral Commission to create the total number of voters for that election.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 39 to 41 put and passed.

Clause 42: Section 4.52 replaced —

Ms M. BEARD: The information on candidates to be published has been an issue for some time, particularly residential addresses, for authorisation of materials. For example, candidates who for whatever reason may feel uncomfortable in the past have used other residential addresses. I understand some candidates may have to ask someone else to use their address instead. Is there provision for these people if they want to get around that requirement?

Mr J.N. CAREY: We understand that the member is talking about campaign material. This provision is about the candidate's own nomination process. My understanding, and the advice I have been given, is that it does not require the publication of that person's address.

Ms M. Beard: But the campaign material does?

Mr J.N. CAREY: Yes.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 43 to 73 put and passed.

Clause 74: Sections 5.92A to 5.92C inserted —

Ms M. BEARD: This clause will insert proposed section 5.92A, “Local government to have communications agreement”. I know the minister touched on this before. Has a communications plan or default agreement been developed?

Mr J.N. CAREY: That is a good question. We are working on that as we speak. As the member would be aware, we created a working group. We are working with the Western Australian Local Government Association and working through the exact model. I want to put on the record again—I think this is important—I noticed there has been some conspiratorial and, quite frankly, very disappointing social media commentary that in some way this is about seeking to restrict information. That is false. That was never the intention and those allegations are completely and absolutely wrong because we are not changing the part of the act that relates to which information can be accessed. This will be an advantage to councillors. We are trying to prescribe a clear time frame in an agreement for when they can expect information. It will deal with those sorts of issues.

As the member would be aware, part of the key problem we face is that often there is contention between elected officials and a CEO or administration about how information is requested and the time line for information, so we are seeking to resolve that. I note that when someone becomes a minister, they are required to undertake a communications protocol with their agency stipulating similar requirements. It is about ensuring a transparent process for both sides of this information transaction.

Ms M. BEARD: Can the minister advise on the parameters or what a framework of that might look like?

Mr J.N. CAREY: It will say how it is done; as we know, email is often the case. There will be time frames. But also interestingly, it will say who they can contact. Different local governments across Western Australia do different things. Some CEOs demand that it is through the CEO. Other CEOs tell the mayor that they can contact the senior directors. We will set the template, but there will be nothing to stop the CEO of a local government, if it agrees, from saying, “I am really comfortable that you can email any of the senior leadership—the executive—but you must still register it through a central website so that we can track it.” We are going to create the basic benchmark. I will give the member another example. It is very easy for a mayor to be out and about and suddenly see a senior director and say, “Can you give me that info? I just spoke to a resident and there’s a broken footpath.” The template would probably say to put that down in writing, because the member knows what will happen; if the mayor does not get a response in a week, they will go around and say something. It will be very clear and transparent.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 75 to 90 put and passed.

Clause 91: Schedules 4.1A and 4.1B inserted —

Ms M. BEARD: This is just a general question for my understanding. If there needs to be a change and someone has to step into a particular role on a council, and it can be backfilled, what will happen if there is a change in the circumstances of that person, such as they have undertaken something that is not seen in the community as being reputable or they have broken the law? Is there a provision to mitigate that?

Mr J.N. CAREY: I really appreciate the question, and I hope the member feels that I am being respectful as part of this process; I always try to be. First of all, if a council is backfilling, someone will have to agree to decide. There will have to be a clear, conscious decision, as the member might have seen in the upper house recently.

Ms M. Beard: That is what prompted my question.

Mr J.N. CAREY: Secondly, it is about eligibility. Whether someone is nominating to backfill a position or is running for general public office, the same eligibility requirements have to apply. As long as they are not disqualified, they will be eligible to run. That is democracy in action.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 92 to 100 put and passed.

Clause 101: Section 20 amended —

Ms M. BEARD: What will be the overall impact of imposing the provisions of schedule 4.1A on the office of the Lord Mayor?

Mr J.N. CAREY: This is obviously a consequential amendment. As the member will be aware, the City of Perth has its own act. If a Lord Mayor resigned, it would use the same backfilling provisions that we are proposing. If there were, say, three candidates, the second candidate would fill the position if they accepted. Of course, if no-one did, it would then go to a full election again.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 102 to 110 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

[Leave granted to proceed forthwith to third reading.]

Third Reading

MR J.N. CAREY (Perth — Minister for Local Government) [3.43 pm]: I move —

That the bill be now read a third time.

MS M. BEARD (North West Central) [3.43 pm]: I would like to thank the minister and his office and, in particular, Sam McLeod and Matt O'Keefe for the briefing on the Local Government Amendment Bill 2023. Also, I would like to acknowledge and thank the local governments that have clearly provided a raft of information and input to this process during consideration of the changes. We have been through a very lengthy and comprehensive process.

I acknowledge that the electoral reforms in tranche 1 are important for ensuring the integrity of the sector and that councils often have to step up in this space for housing, planning, community safety and health. Often ratepayers are ultimately slugged for the costs associated with delivering some of these key services. Tightening this up and giving a lot more transparency is really important. I also think reporting is really important, and streamlining processes for those local governments is essential.

We all know that local governments are a lot more than roads, rates and rubbish. They are a vital part of democracy. They are major employers in regional centres, particularly outside the metropolitan area, and they contribute a lot to the growth and development of those communities. The Nationals WA will always support the local government sector and devolving decision-making capabilities.

In summary, I would again like to thank the minister and look forward to discussing the second tranche of local government reform.

MRS J.M.C. STOJKOVSKI (Kingsley — Parliamentary Secretary) [3.45 pm]: I rise to make a brief contribution to the third reading of the Local Government Amendment Bill 2023. It has been quite enlightening to listen to the contributions of all my colleagues. Many have a local government background. I commend them for their service, whether it be as councillors or, like me, in administration. One part of the bill that I have really engaged with is the community engagement charter. This is a really important aspect of what we are changing through this bill. Any state member will agree that concerns, issues and complaints about local governments, and sometimes their lack of engagement, are raised nearly every day through their offices. If we provide some guidance and structure around this, it will improve. Having worked in a local government, I know that most people in local government are doing the best they can to engage with the community. It is not always easy, so I think providing some structure around this is a great move.

I am very lucky that the three councils in my electorate record audio of their meetings. I think that is a really great step. Moving forward, band 1 and 2 councils definitely should be doing visual recordings and band 3 and 4 councils should do audio recordings. The technology to do this exists. This will provide more transparency for electors and allow them to check what has been said. It could be particularly important for voters around election time to check what incumbent councillors have said about an issue that they are passionate about to make sure they are making an informed decision. I commend that change in the bill.

Members who have been here for two terms or longer will know that parental leave has been an issue for state Parliament. It is certainly something that the Minister for Health has been championing for a long time. I am pleased that we have seen some changes for female members of Parliament, particularly our colleague in the upper house Hon Ayor Makur Chuot, member for North Metropolitan Region, who has just had a beautiful baby girl, Ajak. I put on the record that I and everyone in the chamber congratulate her on the birth of her second child since being elected to Parliament. It is really important that we have included this provision for councillors. Becoming a mother for the first, second, third or fourth time is both a beautiful and trying time. It can be one that causes a lot of stress and a lack of sleep, but ensuring that we protect new parents and allow them to undertake their parental duties without having to worry about their council duties on top of it will open the gateway for more young women to get involved in council. We want a diversity of opinion on council. Robust discussion is welcomed in this chamber and in the federal chambers, and it should be welcomed in council chambers as well. I think this is a great addition to the bill.

The member for Joondalup made a great contribution earlier in the debate about consultation and the ramifications when it sometimes goes badly. I certainly know that in the City of Joondalup the poor consultation around housing opportunity areas has caused a lot of angst in the community. It has also caused a lot of trouble for the council and for the state members of Parliament. That is because there were no guidelines about what proper consultation should

look like. We have made some changes in the planning legislation, but this bill will broaden the need for consultation in all aspects of the work of councils and is also a great addition in the bill.

Another great addition to the bill is council planning. This part of the bill focuses on ensuring that councils take a long-term strategic view in considering what services and facilities are required and where they are required. It is also important that councils consider risks and long-term trends that might cause a threat. I know from my interactions with the Cities of Joondalup, Wanneroo and Stirling that coastal hazards and erosion have been considered and that coastal hazard risk management and adaptation plan maps have been well developed.

I now want to quickly address the politicising of local government. The member for Cottesloe stated yesterday that he believes these changes will draw political organisations into local councils. Honestly, that is a very disrespectful thing to say. That shows that he thinks voters are not aware that political organisations are already involved in councils. We need to acknowledge that anyone in the community who is politically active will potentially have a political affiliation and could run for council. That seems to be a natural progression for a lot of people. There is no issue if a person moves from local government to state or federal government or from state or federal government to local government. What the member for Cottesloe said yesterday is very disrespectful and is taking voters for fools.

In the City of Joondalup, Mayor Albert Jacob is a former Liberal minister; Christine Hamilton-Prime used to work for a former Liberal member of Parliament; and Christopher May, John Chester and John Raftis are all members of the Liberal Party. In the City of Wanneroo, Linda Aitken is a former Liberal candidate for the federal seat of Pearce and the state seat of Butler; Chris Baker is a former Liberal member for Joondalup; Paul Miles is a former Liberal member for Wanneroo; Nat Sangalli used to work for the current Labor member for Wanneroo; the deputy mayor, Brett Treby, is a former Labor candidate for Wanneroo; and James Rowe works for the current Labor member for Landsdale. In the City of Stirling, Tony Krsticevic is a former Liberal member for Carine; Karlo Perkovic is a member of the Liberal Party, as was verified in “The Clan” messages that we all read last year; Chris Hatton is a former Liberal member for Balcatta; Andrea Creado is a former Liberal candidate for Mirrabooka; Councillor Lagan is a former Liberal candidate for the state seat of Perth; Councillor Ferrante is a former Liberal candidate for the federal seat of Perth; Suzanne Migdale is a former Liberal candidate for the seat of Mount Lawley; Teresa Olow is a former One Nation candidate for Midland; and Councillor Elizabeth Re was both an Independent and a Western Australia Party candidate in various state and federal elections and also a former National Party Senate candidate for the federal election. Therefore, the claim that this will bring politics into local councils is slightly undercooked, because it is clear from just those three councils in my electorate that politics already exists in local councils.

In the few minutes left to make my contribution, I want to talk about the principles and objects of this bill. The one that resonates most strongly with me is the recognition of Aboriginal Western Australians. A lot of councils are doing a great job with their reconciliation action plans. That is a great step. We will be faced with the opportunity to take another great step in the coming months with the Voice referendum. I have sought permission from the member for Kimberley, Ms Divina D’Anna, to speak on this next part. According to my notes, in May 2017, in a Facebook post headed “Feeling Proud”, she said —

I am proud to have been part of the National Convention on Constitutional Reform. I had approached with an open mind looking for ways to make real and meaningful change for not only my children and grandchildren but for all our mobs and future generations. I say why not explore all avenues to get to the end game. Let’s do something, anything and everything to try and help reduce the despair in our communities and support the mobs in their fight to be self sufficient and empowered.

The member for Kimberley was part of the collective team from northern Western Australia that was brought together as part of a series of regional dialogues that were held across the country with the Voice referendum council. She then went with the delegation to Uluru, as did others from across our nation, where discussions were had and the following statement was born. I will quote the Uluru Statement from the Heart for *Hansard* —

We, gathered at the 2017 National Constitutional Convention, coming from all points of the southern sky, make this statement from the heart:

Our Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander tribes were the first sovereign Nations of the Australian continent and its adjacent islands, and possessed it under our own laws and customs. This our ancestors did, according to the reckoning of our culture, from the Creation, according to the common law from ‘time immemorial’, and according to science more than 60,000 years ago.

This sovereignty is a *spiritual notion: the ancestral tie between the land, or ‘mother nature’, and the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples who were born therefrom, remain attached thereto, and must one day return thither to be united with our ancestors. This link is the basis of the ownership of the soil, or better, of sovereignty.* It has never been ceded or extinguished, and co-exists with the sovereignty of the Crown.

How could it be otherwise? That peoples possessed a land for sixty millennia and this sacred link disappears from world history in merely the last two hundred years?

With substantive constitutional change and structural reform, we believe this ancient sovereignty can shine through as a fuller expression of Australia's nationhood.

Proportionally, we are the most incarcerated people on the planet. We are not an innately criminal people. Our children are alienated from their families at unprecedented rates. This cannot be because we have no love for them. And our youth languish in detention in obscene numbers. They should be our hope for the future.

These dimensions of our crisis tell plainly the structural nature of our problem. This is *the torment of our powerlessness*.

We seek constitutional reforms to empower our people and take a *rightful place* in our own country. When we have power over our destiny our children will flourish. They will walk in two worlds and their culture will be a gift to their country.

We call for the establishment of a First Nations Voice enshrined in the Constitution.

Makarrata is the culmination of our agenda: *the coming together after a struggle*. It captures our aspirations for a fair and truthful relationship with the people of Australia and a better future for our children based on justice and self-determination.

We seek a Makarrata Commission to supervise a process of agreement-making between governments and First Nations and truth-telling about our history.

In 1967 we were counted, in 2017 we seek to be heard. We leave base camp and start our trek across this vast country. We invite you to walk with us in a movement of the Australian people for a better future.

I stand here today, feeling slightly emotional but very proud to walk with them on this journey. It is fitting that today, the Prime Minister released the wording of the referendum question. Prime Minister Albanese stood alongside the referendum working group and said that the question would be —

“A Proposed Law: to alter the Constitution to recognise the First Peoples of Australia by establishing an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Voice. Do you approve this proposed alteration?”

For what it is worth, I do approve of this alteration. I believe that we need a voice for our First Nations people to federal Parliament. This proves that at a federal, state and local government level, we all need to work towards these goals. I commend the Minister for Local Government for the amazing work that he has done and for the team that has put together this piece of legislation. I commend the bill to the house.

MR J.N. CAREY (Perth — Minister for Local Government) [4.00 pm] — in reply: I thank the members for Kingsley and North West Central for their contributions to the third reading debate. I thank the opposition for its support of the Local Government Amendment Bill 2023. I want to put on the record again that these are substantial reforms. As we know, this is the first tranche.

Particularly for ratepayers, I want to go over the transparency measures because there is a very small element in the social media glitterati who are obsessed with local government. They seek out the worst views or peddle the worst conspiracies about local government and local government reform. They can make their personal commentary about me and they do on a regular basis. I think the former Minister for Local Government experienced the joys of social media commentary by local government activists who believe the worst in local government.

The reforms we are implementing will increase transparency in local government. That cannot be denied. The creation of an election caretaker period clearly is going to bring greater prudence in the lead-up to elections. The mandatory video and audio recording of meetings is not just about ratepayers being able to watch from home or see what has happened, but also so that a local government inspector can investigate matters, because there will be an accurate record on the public agenda, rather than he-said, she-said. Standardising meeting procedures means that all local governments will be the same and will deal with conflict at meetings in the same way. There will also be a clearly prescribed format for the way in which ratepayers can ask questions of their local government.

A range of new online public registers are being created, which includes leases of local government property. Anyone who knows local government knows that there is often conflict and public debate about local governments giving leases to particular organisations, whether they be sporting or community organisations, and that there is confusion. This will put it all on the record—the lease, who is receiving the lease, the cost of the lease, the length of the lease and the property. It will be on the record.

Other reforms include the awarding of grants, high-value goods and services contracts, the disclosure of interests related to items considered at council meetings and cash contributions collected from applicants by local government

for car parking and public open space. I do not know how anyone could argue against these reforms or say that these reforms will not increase transparency.

CEO KPIs will be publicly reported for the first time. We all know that the most critical decision that any local council makes for its administration is the employment of the CEO. They are the only person whom councils employ. We are saying that ratepayers will now be able to see what performance indicators have been put forward and the response by the chief executive. This will work to hold not only the CEO accountable, but also elected officials to account because ratepayers will be able to see in public what the councillors decided should be the performance indicators. If the community is crying out for reform in financial transparency, for example, and the council decides not to have that as a performance criterion for the CEO, that is something the council will have to explain to the local community.

Community engagement charters are about trying to encourage local governments to go beyond the normal few people who engage and seek a wider opinion. It will also require tier 1 and tier 2 councils to do ratepayer surveys. It will mandate that and the results will have to be published. Basic benchmarks will be set for the surveys. All these reforms are good for ratepayers, so I find it extraordinary that a very small subsection of people are criticising this legislation. It is a fear and scaremongering campaign. It is great to see that the Western Australian Local Government Association overall has embraced the reforms. The opposition has indicated it is supportive of the reforms. I believe that anyone in the wider community who reads this legislation and sees these reforms will also be supportive and embrace them.

This is not the end of the reforms. We have a second tranche coming, which will create the role of local government inspector. That will also enable us to create monitors who can go in early and deal with dysfunction. These are critical reforms. It is widely recognised that they are needed. Despite the ability of the agency to send out particular notices requesting information, the ability to get into a local government to try to sort out issues is not there. Often, the last resort is an inquiry. We want greater intervention when it is required so that we can deal with problems early. No-one wants to see inquiries and I put that on the record.

I want to touch on optional preferential voting because it was raised by the member for North West Central, the member for Cottesloe and many members on my side. Optional preferential voting will ensure a fairer, more democratic system of voting because it will enable the aspirations of voters to be clearly seen. It will also ensure that we do not have the ridiculous situation in which some councillors are elected with few votes; I think some got under 10 per cent and it has been as low as six per cent of the vote. That is not acceptable and no-one believes that that is democratic.

The argument against preferential voting, which the member for Cottesloe touched on, is that somehow it is going to cause greater politicisation of local government. I say respectfully to the member for Cottesloe that it is widely recognised that there are people in local government who either have political aspirations or belong to political parties. It is a reality and that is the nature of democracy. We should not be disrespectful to ratepayers and say that that is not the case. We have heard it multiple times. Western Australia is unique because, unlike other states where political parties make political endorsements, we do not have that. I think that is a good thing. There is a difference between saying there are people active in councils who belong to political parties and saying that political parties are endorsing and funding candidates.

I can tell members that everyone in my constituency knew I was Labor when I was a councillor. I put in all my own money or sought donors in accordance with local government rules. The Labor Party was not giving me any funds because, frankly, it was worried about the state and federal governments. I did not need endorsement from the Labor Party to run. That is a good thing. We want everyone to be able to run, regardless of whether they belong to a political party. They do not need endorsement from a political party to run.

There is an element that says everyone should be independent and no-one should have involvement in any politics. Being involved in a community group that is advocating for or against something in the local community is political. Saying you are independent is actually a deeply political position because it is saying that you are against party politics. Groups of candidates run in elections saying that they are a group of independents. That kind of does not make sense when we think about it, because it is another form of organisation. We have to understand that Western Australian local government elections are unique. I think the system works really well. People can run for local council without the endorsement of political parties and give it their best crack. We acknowledge that—we do not deny it—and we should never pretend to ratepayers that it does not exist or that the reforms we are making will somehow make it greater. I think it has been widely demonstrated by a number of members that that is a furphy.

I will end on this: the Local Government Amendment Bill 2023 was a long time coming. It was started by the former minister in 2017. It is built on a breadth of work from the City of Perth inquiry, the upper house inquiry, other inquiries, panel reports and even a last round of consultation that received 200 submissions. There has been substantial engagement on this issue—I think it has been exhaustive—and we continue to consult the sector through the working group. I look forward to these reforms being passed. This is the first set of reforms. We will come back

to Parliament and introduce the second major tranche of reforms, which will create the role of local government inspector and deal with major dysfunction in local government.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.