

Economic Development and
Infrastructure Committee

Inquiry into State
Government Taxation and
Debt

Interim Report

February 2010



Inquiry into State Government Taxation and Debt

Interim Report of the Economic Development and Infrastructure Committee on the Inquiry into State Government Taxation and Debt

ORDERED TO BE PRINTED

Victorian Government Printer 2010

Parliamentary Paper
No. 276 Session 2006-2010

Parliament of Victoria
Economic Development and Infrastructure Committee
Inquiry into State Government Taxation and Debt Interim Report
ISBN – 978-0-9751357-8-5

Table of contents

Committee Members	vii
The Economic Development and Infrastructure Committee	ix
Terms of Reference	xi
Abbreviations	xii
Inquiry into State Government Taxation and Debt	1
General observations on taxation	1
Principles of taxation	1
Interjurisdictional tax harmonisation	2
Stamp duty and property tax.....	3
Taxation on insurance and the Fire Services Levy	4
Growth Areas Infrastructure Contribution	6
Commonwealth equalisation.....	6
Simplicity for GST redistribution calculation	7
Payroll Tax.....	7
Government debt	8
The Australian Government Henry Review.....	9
Appendix One: List of Submissions	11
Appendix Two: List of Witnesses	13
Public hearings	13
Sydney 29 October 2009.....	13
Melbourne 30 November 2009	14

Committee Members

This Inquiry was conducted during the term of the 56th Parliament.

The members of the Economic Development and Infrastructure Committee are:

Hon. Christine Campbell, MP (Chair)

Mr David Davis, MLC (Deputy Chair)

Mr Bruce Atkinson, MLC

Mr Peter Crisp, MP

Mr Hong Lim, MP

Mr Brian Tee, MLC

Hon. Marsha Thomson, MP

Staff

For this Inquiry, the Committee was supported by a secretariat comprising:

Executive Officer: Dr Vaughn Koops

Research Officer: Mr Joshua Saunders

Administrative Officer: Ms Shanthi Wickramasurya

The Economic Development and Infrastructure Committee

The Victorian Economic Development and Infrastructure Committee is constituted under the *Parliamentary Committees Act 2003*, as amended.

The Committee comprises members of Parliament drawn from both Houses and all parties.

Its functions under the Act are to inquire into, consider and report to the Parliament on any proposal, matter or thing connected with economic development, industrial affairs or infrastructure, if the Committee is required or permitted to do so by or under the Act.

Committee Address

Address:	Parliament of Victoria Spring Street EAST MELBOURNE VIC 3002
Telephone:	(03) 8682 2832
Facsimile:	(03) 8682 2818
Email:	edic@parliament.vic.gov.au
Internet:	http://www.parliament.vic.gov.au/edic

Terms of Reference

The Legislative Council under section 33 of the *Parliamentary Committees Act 2003* refers Terms of Reference requiring:

That the Economic Development and Infrastructure Committee be required to inquire into, consider and report on the impact and effectiveness of increased State Government taxation (including land tax, payroll tax, stamp duties, State Government taxes and charges and development levies) and increased State Government debt on Victorian —

- (a) development;
- (b) competitiveness;
- (c) sustainability;
- (d) employment;
- (e) job creation; and
- (f) small businesses, including their national and international competitiveness under the State Government's current taxation arrangements;

and to table an interim report by 28 February 2010 and a final report by 30 September 2010.

Abbreviations

BCTR	Business Coalition for Tax Reform
CGC	Commonwealth Grants Commission
CPA Australia	Certified Practising Accountants Australia
FSL	Fire Services Levy
GAIC	Growth Areas Infrastructure Contribution
GFC	Global Financial Crisis
GSP	Gross State Product
GST	Goods and Services Tax
ICA	Insurance Council of Australia
IGA	Inter-government Agreement
RACV	Royal Automobile Club of Victoria
REIV	Real Estate Institute of Victoria
VFF	Victorian Farmers Federation

INTERIM REPORT

Inquiry into State Government Taxation and Debt

The terms of reference for the Inquiry into State Government Taxation and Debt require the Committee to table an interim report on 28 February 2010. This Interim Report fulfils the Committee's requirements to Parliament.

The Inquiry into State Taxation and Debt received 44 submissions, and heard evidence from eleven witnesses representing six organisations, by 28 February 2010. Submissions were received and evidence was provided by a broad range of stakeholders, including private sector organisations, Victorian Government departments and agencies, Australian Government agencies, universities, research centres, association groups and individual community members.

The Committee's intention in this Interim Report is to present a summary of the range of topics and issues raised in submissions, and discussed in public hearings, to date. In this Interim Report the Committee does not intend to critique, or offer its own opinions on, any of the matters raised to date.

The Committee intends to conduct more public hearings during the course of this Inquiry, and to incorporate material obtained from its recent overseas investigations. Topics the Committee intends to investigate further include, but are not restricted to, the use of price strategies by governments to: influence behaviour; improve revenue; and promote environmental sustainability. The Committee awaits the release of the Henry Review which may have significant implications for state and federal taxation arrangements. Once all of this evidence has been considered the Committee will prepare its final report for the Inquiry, incorporating its analysis and final recommendations.

General observations on taxation

Principles of taxation

All of the submissions received by the Committee considered specific taxes, or offered opinions on the appropriate use of debt by the State Government. A number of submissions, however, also suggested that the Committee consider the characteristics of 'good' taxation. These submissions suggested that there were a set of key principles against which a tax could be measured in order to determine its appropriateness.

In its submission, for example, the Victorian Farmers Federation (VFF) described the following principles as features of an efficient tax system:

...Adequacy; Broad Basing; Compatability; Ear marking; Efficiency; Equity; Neutrality; Predictability; and Simplicity...¹

The Insurance Council of Australia (ICA) focused on the efficiency of taxes as a measure of appropriateness, suggesting that taxes such as municipal rates, land tax and gambling tax were more efficient than motor vehicle tax and insurance tax.² The ICA also suggested that, although municipal rates, land tax and payroll taxes were often unpopular with the community, overall economic welfare is enhanced when these relatively efficient taxes are employed:

...for any given budget or outlay, reducing the burden of these efficient taxes increases the need to fund budgets from the more inefficient State taxes, such as stamp duties – thereby reducing overall economic welfare. Simply put, the “cost” of reductions in efficient taxes is the extent to which inefficient taxes are raised to meet any budgetary target or shortfall.³

Some of these sentiments were echoed in the submission from the CPA Australia, which noted that:

...Victoria imposes a range of taxes some of which are reasonably efficient (such as payroll tax and land tax) but also others (such as duties on property transfers and insurance policies) which are very inefficient.⁴

Some submissions suggested that the Victorian Government relies too heavily on an inefficient and narrow tax base.⁵ In its submission to the Committee, the Business Coalition for Tax Reform (BCTR) noted that:

[t]here are many asymmetries in the State tax system. There are a small number of State taxes that raise a relatively large proportion of tax revenue. Meanwhile, there are a large number of taxes that raise only a small amount of revenue.⁶

In separate submissions the BCTR and CPA Australia noted key characteristics of inefficient taxes, including that they are: unpredictable; have high compliance costs; are distortionary; non-neutral; harmful to competitiveness; and allow less accountability.⁷

Interjurisdictional tax harmonisation

Some submissions to the Inquiry argued that greater harmonisation of taxation rates across Australian states was required.⁸ Generally, these

¹ Victorian Farmers Federation, *Submission*, no. 18, 2 October 2009, p. 3.

² Insurance Council of Australia, *Submission*, no. 38, 16 October 2009, p. 22.

³ Insurance Council of Australia, *Submission*, no. 38, 16 October 2009, p. 23.

⁴ CPA Australia, *Submission*, no. 19, 5 October 2009, p. 2.

⁵ Business Coalition for Tax Reform, *Submission*, no. 6, 28 September 2009; CFMEU Construction and General Division, *Submission*, no. 26, 9 October 2009; CPA Australia, *Submission*, no. 19, 5 October 2009; Property Council of Australia, *Submission*, no. 17, 2 October 2009; Tenants Union of Victoria, *Submission*, no. 42, 24 November 2009; The Institute of Chartered Accountants in Australia, *Submission*, no. 16, 2 October 2009.

⁶ Business Coalition for Tax Reform, *Submission*, no. 6, 28 September 2009.

⁷ Business Coalition for Tax Reform, *Submission*, no. 6, 28 September 2009, p. 1; CPA Australia, *Submission*, no. 19, 5 October 2009, p. 2.

⁸ Australian Bankers' Association, *Submission*, no. 3, 24 September 2009; CFMEU Construction and General Division, *Submission*, no. 26, 9 October 2009; Government of Victoria, *Submission*, no. 37, 19 October 2009.

submissions argued that different tax regimes between the States harmed business, by increasing administrative and compliance costs to companies that operated across state boundaries. The Australian Banker's Association argued that differences in state regimes were a "significant impediment to business growth, employment and investment and... that businesses operating nationally... suffer from the compliance costs caused by the different arrangements."⁹

Stamp duty and property tax

Issues surrounding taxation associated with property ownership were frequently raised in evidence. Of the 44 submissions received, 21 discussed property and land taxation.

Stamp duties, particularly duties applied to the sale and purchase of property, were a concern raised in twenty submissions.¹⁰ The Australian Banker's Association described stamp duties as "among the least efficient taxes in Australia".¹¹ Westfield Ltd argued that stamp duties and property taxes were: volatile and unpredictable revenue sources; difficult and costly to manage; "deadweight" taxes that impede business efficiency and drag on the economy; unequally and unfairly applied; and harmful to business competitiveness.¹²

Not all the submissions regarded all property taxes as inherently inefficient – as noted above, the ICA and CPA Australia both argued that land tax, as contrasted with land transfer duties, was relatively efficient. However, in his appearance before the Committee, Professor John Warren of the Australian School of Taxation pointed out that just because a particular tax is efficient it does not mean it will be accepted by the community:

We have got about 2.7 to 2.8 million property holders, if you like — units of property in New South Wales. With the current land tax about 520 000 are subject to land tax. When they dropped the threshold it jumped to about 1.2 million. When people talk about broadening the base of the land tax, which is going to be floated, they are talking about a lot of people who are not currently paying tax. You can see the sensitivity of it in what happened in New South Wales when you doubled that number. That is the territory you have to go into if you are going to talk about conveyancing duty and

⁹ Australian Bankers' Association, *Submission*, no. 3, 24 September 2009, p. 3.

¹⁰ Australian Bankers' Association, *Submission*, no. 3, 24 September 2009; Australian Unity, *Submission*, no. 30, 12 October 2009; Brotherhood of St Laurence, *Submission*, no. 40, 27 October 2009; Business Coalition for Tax Reform, *Submission*, no. 6, 28 September 2009; CPA Australia, *Submission*, no. 19, 5 October 2009; Glenne Drover, *Submission*, no. 12, 1 October 2009; First National Real Estate, *Submission*, no. 39, 21 October 2009; Government of Victoria, *Submission*, no. 37, 19 October 2009; Nanette Griffiths and Morrie Griffiths, *Submission*, no. 22, 2 October 2009; G Lloyd-Smith, *Submission*, no. 23, 25 September 2009; Master Builders' Association of Victoria, *Submission*, no. 21, 6 October 2009; Owners Corporations Victoria, *Submission*, no. 2, 22 November 2009; Property Council of Australia, *Submission*, no. 17, 2 October 2009; Schiavello Group of Companies, *Submission*, no. 13, 5 October 2009; Eu-Jin Teo, *Submission*, no. 11, 1 October 2009; The Real Estate Institute of Victoria, *Submission*, no. 20, 5 October 2009; Victorian Farmers' Federation, *Submission*, no. 18, 2 October 2009; Westfield Management Limited, *Submission*, no. 9, 1 October 2009.

¹¹ Australian Bankers' Association, *Submission*, no. 3, 24 September 2009, p. 4.

¹² Westfield Management Limited, *Submission*, no. 9, 1 October 2009, p. 3.

your concerns about its impact on holdings in property and the immobility of individuals as a result of those stamp duties...¹³

Taxation on insurance and the Fire Services Levy

A number of submissions to the Inquiry drew attention to issues surrounding taxation levied on insurance products.¹⁴ Most of these submissions suggested that insurance tax in Victoria (and in other jurisdictions) contributed to under-insurance by raising the cost of insurance products. The ICA argued that:

...despite the widespread benefits that accrue from the presence and availability of private insurance, the Australian general insurance industry remains unreasonably burdened by inefficient taxation...¹⁵

Conversely, the submission received from the Brotherhood of St Laurence et. al. did not support the view that the level of taxation on insurance products leads to a general under-insurance problem in Victoria. With regard to this issue, the submission states that:

...[T]here is evidence that...more significant factors are contribution to rates of under- and non-insurance in the community, which have been ignored or understated by the insurance industry.¹⁶

The submission argues that while affordability is the key factor affecting insurance take-up, removal of the insurance tax would not substantially improve affordability for people who do not currently have insurance.¹⁷

Most evidence that considered the effect of taxation on insurance also referred to the Fire Services Levy (FSL). Under the *Country Fire Authority Act 1958* and the *Metropolitan Fire Brigades Act 1958*, insurance companies are required to assist in funding both emergency service authorities. Under the Acts, insurance companies are required to fund 75 per cent of the operating costs of the Metropolitan Fire Brigade and 77.5 per cent for the Country Fire Authority. This revenue is collected by insurance companies through a cost percentage levied on insurance premiums.

All evidence on the FSL received by the Committee to date has recommended that it be replaced by a tax or levy with a larger base. Many submissions suggested that the high rate of the FSL in rural and regional Australia led to an 'under insurance' issue, particularly in fire prone areas.

¹³ Prof. Neil Warren, Head of School, Australian School of Taxation, University of New South Wales, *Transcript of evidence*, Sydney, 29 October 2009.

¹⁴ Australian Unity, *Submission*, no. 30, 12 October 2009; Brotherhood of St Laurence, *Submission*, no. 40, 27 October 2009; Brotherhood of St Laurence, et al., *Submission*, no. 41, 30 October 2009; Business Coalition for Tax Reform, *Submission*, no. 6, 28 September 2009; Insurance Council of Australia, *Submission*, no. 38, 16 October 2009; National Community Titles Institute, *Submission*, no. 36, 15 October 2009; National Insurance Brokers' Association, *Submission*, no. 8, 5 October 2009; Royal Automobile Club of Victoria, *Submission*, no. 29, 9 October 2009; Victorian Farmers Federation, *Submission*, no. 18, 2 October 2009.

¹⁵ Insurance Council of Australia, *Submission*, no. 38, 16 October 2009, p. 1.

¹⁶ Brotherhood of St Laurence, et al., *Submission*, no. 41, 30 October 2009, p. 1.

¹⁷ Brotherhood of St Laurence, *Submission*, no. 40, 27 October 2009, p. 4.

Mr Geoff Crick, Farm Business and Regional Development Committee Member of the VFF, told the Committee that:

...rural businesses pay 84 per cent tax on their insurance to cover fire services. It affects not only farmers but all regional businesses. As a consequence of that a significant sector of the community chooses not to insure, and we saw classic examples of that last summer in the unfortunate fires that we had at that stage...¹⁸

The Real Estate Institute of Victoria (REIV) informed the Committee that:

...[r]eports following the Black Saturday bushfires suggest that only 70 per cent of affected households and property owners had adequate levels of insurance.¹⁹

Most submissions suggested the key problem with the FSL is that the burden of funding fire authorities only falls on those who choose to take out insurance. This means that people who take out insurance are, effectively, paying for a fire service that provides protection for everyone – insured or uninsured.²⁰ In its submission, the VFF recommended that this situation be rectified by:

...the State Government...commit(ing) to replacing the Fire Services Levy and conduct an inquiry into developing a new system of funding the fire Authorities based on building asset value and a motor vehicle charge...²¹

The ICA, Insurance Australia Group, CGU, Owners Corporations Victoria, National Community Titles Institute and the RACV suggested that the FSL be replaced by a property or land tax, as a means to ensure all property-owners were required to contribute to the fire services protection for their properties.²²

The Committee notes that following the Black Saturday fires of 2009, the Victorian Government initiated an inquiry into the FSL and a Royal Commission to report on issues surrounding the bushfires. In December 2009, the Parliament of Victoria passed the *Fire Services Funding (Feasibility Study) Act 2009* that allows the Commissioner to undertake feasibility studies into the funding of fire services in Victoria. The Act defines a feasibility study as:

...[A]n examination and analysis conducted for the purpose of—

- (a) evaluating an existing tax, duty, levy or impost; or
- (b) developing and evaluating policies and proposals for a new or existing tax, duty, levy or impost²³

The Act also increases Government access to information that is deemed relevant to any study conducted by the Commissioner.

¹⁸ Geoff Crick, Past Chairman, Farm Business and Management Committee, Victorian Farmers' Federation, *Transcript of evidence*, Melbourne, 30 November 2009, p. 2.

¹⁹ The Real Estate Institute of Victoria, *Submission*, no. 20, 5 October 2009, p. 6.

²⁰ CGU Insurance, *Submission*, no. 7, 28 September 2009, p. 7.

²¹ Victorian Farmers' Federation, *Submission*, no. 18, 2 October 2009, p. 12.

²² Royal Automobile Club of Victoria, *Submission*, no. 29, 9 October 2009.&7

²³ *Fire Services Funding (Feasibility Study) Act 2009* Victoria, 86/2009, p3

In late 2009, the Victorian Government released the document *Fire services and the non-insured Green Paper* for public comment. The paper refers to data collected by the Insurance Council of Australia and compiled by the Australian Bureau of Statistics suggesting that approximately 13 per cent of residential properties lost in the fires were uninsured.²⁴ The paper also proposes policy options to address the issue of under-insurance in fire-prone areas.²⁵ The Victorian Bushfires Royal Commission also released a discussion paper and media statement in November 2009 calling for submissions on the issue of the FSL.

Growth Areas Infrastructure Contribution

The Growth Areas Infrastructure Contribution (GAIC) was a significant area of concern for the VFF, and for a number of land owners who made submissions to the Inquiry.²⁶ Most submissions received on the issue were from agricultural land owners, all of which were opposed to the introduction of the GAIC. Since the Committee called for submissions, the Government has tabled the *Planning and Environment Amendment (Growth Areas Infrastructure Contribution) Bill 2009* that makes a number of significant changes to the GAIC. The bill is currently under consideration by the Parliament of Victoria, and the Committee will reflect on the submissions and any consequent legislation in the final report; however it does appreciate the concerns of stakeholders and appreciates the input received to date on the issue.

Commonwealth equalisation

In its submission to the Committee, the Victorian Government raised concerns about the redistribution to the states of revenue collected through the Goods and Services Tax (GST). The Victorian Government submission suggested that Victoria has been disadvantaged because it was the first state to abolish the eight taxes all States agreed to discontinue under the 1999 Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA), and that the equalisation process does not take this into account. More generally the Victorian Government is critical of the equalisation process, claiming that the process employed by the CGC results in:

...Victoria receiving a smaller proportion of Commonwealth grants than would be suggested by our population or the share of GST collected within Victoria.²⁷

²⁴ The Department of Treasury and Finance, *Fire services and the non-insured Green Paper*, 2009, p13

²⁵ The Department of Treasury and Finance, *Fire services and the non-insured Green Paper*, 2009, p16-20

²⁶ Neil Gaghan and Rachael Gaghan, *Submission*, no. 33, 12 October 2009; Chris Janson, *Submission*, no. 28, 2 October 2009; Zoyee Kartalis and Teresa Kartalis, *Submission*, no. 25, 2 October 2009; Emmanuelle Pannuzzo and Lorenza Pannuzzo, *Submission*, no. 31, 13 October 2009; Property Council of Australia, *Submission*, no. 43, 25 November 2009; Victorian Farmers' Federation, *Submission*, no. 18, 2 October 2009; Xuereb and Galea Family, *Submission*, no. 24, 27 September 2009.

²⁷ Government of Victoria, *Submission*, no. 37, 19 October 2009, p. 7.

Simplicity for GST redistribution calculation

Another theme raised in evidence is that the mechanism for calculating the redistribution of the GST should emphasise simplicity rather than complexity.

On 29 October 2009, the Committee met with Professor John Warren who called for increased simplicity in the equalisation process. Professor Warren also noted that the use of five year relativities as a base for calculations had produced inaccuracies that did not reflect fluctuations in the economic cycle.

On November 30 2009, the Committee heard evidence from the Secretary of the Commonwealth Grants Commission (CGC), Mr John Spasojevic, who noted that the Commission is currently conducting a major review of the equalisation process.²⁸ He told the Committee that a new equalisation methodology, to be introduced February 2010, will move from the current five year data period to a three year data period.²⁹ On the issue of simplicity, Mr Spasojevic stated in his evidence that, under its terms of reference, the Commission is directed to make its methodology as simple as possible.

Payroll Tax

Payroll Tax is a relatively new state tax, being transferred from the Commonwealth Government as a uniform tax to the States in 1971. During that period, despite various harmonisation exercises conducted across the eight States and Territories in Australia, payroll taxes currently differ between jurisdictions.

Issues surrounding payroll tax were raised in nine submissions.³⁰ The primary areas of concern were that current tax levels inhibit Victoria's competitiveness with other states, and have a negative impact on employment within the State.³¹ One submission suggested that harmonisation of payroll tax levels across the eight jurisdictions would reduce costs for business.³²

The Property Council of Australia also noted disadvantages of variations in payroll tax across Australia, suggesting that State reliance on payroll tax, and competition between States to attract businesses had a negative effect on overall efficiency, including an overall reduction in revenue:

²⁸ John Spasojevic, Secretary, Commonwealth Grants Commission, *Transcript of evidence*, Melbourne, 30 November 2009, p. 2.

²⁹ John Spasojevic, Secretary, Commonwealth Grants Commission, *Transcript of evidence*, Melbourne, 30 November 2009, p. 3.

³⁰ Australian Bankers' Association, *Submission*, no. 3, 24 September 2009; Australian Unity, *Submission*, no. 30, 12 October 2009; Business Coalition for Tax Reform, *Submission*, no. 6, 28 September 2009; CPA Australia, *Submission*, no. 19, 5 October 2009; Government of Victoria, *Submission*, no. 37, 19 October 2009; Property Council of Australia, *Submission*, no. 17, 2 October 2009; RSM Bird Cameron, *Submission*, no. 1, 11 September 2009; Schiavello Group of Companies, *Submission*, no. 13, 5 October 2009; Totally Integrated Financial Planning, *Submission*, no. 35, 9 October 2009.

³¹ Australian Bankers' Association, *Submission*, no. 3, 24 September 2009; Business Coalition for Tax Reform, *Submission*, no. 6, 28 September 2009; Schiavello Group of Companies, *Submission*, no. 13, 5 October 2009.

³² RSM Bird Cameron, *Submission*, no. 1, 11 September 2009.

...the main effect of interstate competition has been to reduce the overall amount of revenue, raised from payroll tax. It is likely that interstate competition in payroll tax would become more intense if this source of tax revenue was increased in absolute terms and in terms of relative importance. It is likely that that increased reliance on this tax base will be instable and unsustainable.³³

The Property Council of Australia recommended that harmonisation of payroll tax across all States be pursued by governments. The Victorian Government submission confirms that it is working with New South Wales and Tasmania to harmonise administrative arrangements for payroll tax, and that a Payroll Tax Harmonisation Committee has been established comprising membership from each jurisdiction, to oversee the “design, implementation and maintenance of an administrative framework in line with the Protocol for Maintaining Payroll Tax Harmonisation between States Territories signed by all State Commissioners on 11 July 2008.”³⁴

Government debt

The issue of Government debt was discussed in submissions from the Property Council of Australia,³⁵ the Victorian Government,³⁶ the Master Builders Association,³⁷ and Mr Lloyd-Smith.³⁸ Most of these submissions did not have any in-principle opposition to the Government using debt to finance spending.

Submissions discussed the use of Government borrowings to fund infrastructure and other growth-related spending. Regarding this issue, the Property Council of Australia stated that:

...[I]nfrastructure spending itself is likely to have a positive impact on Victoria's GSP [Gross-State product], and creates an environment that will help to attract further private sector investments.³⁹

A submission from the Tenants Union of Victoria suggests that fiscal prudence is of primary importance and that changes to debt policy should only be made with a view to of State Government having increased fiscal capacity in the future.⁴⁰

Similarly, the submission from CPA Australia directly tied the need for debt-financed fiscal stimulus to efficient taxes, where it stated that:

...the replacement of Victoria's currently inefficient taxes with more efficient taxes would assist in facilitating the state's adjustment in future to the impact of events such as the GFC...⁴¹

In its submission to the Committee, the Victorian Government details its infrastructure spending tied to borrowings, describing the increased

³³ Property Council of Australia, *Submission*, no. 17, 2 October 2009, p. 14.

³⁴ Government of Victoria, *Submission*, no. 37, 19 October 2009, p. 8.

³⁵ Property Council of Australia, *Submission*, no. 17, 2 October 2009.

³⁶ Government of Victoria, *Submission*, no. 37, 19 October 2009.

³⁷ Master Builders' Association of Victoria, *Submission*, no. 21, 6 October 2009.

³⁸ G Lloyd-Smith, *Submission*, no. 23, 25 September 2009.

³⁹ Property Council of Australia, *Submission*, no. 17, 2 October 2009.

⁴⁰ Tenants Union of Victoria, *Submission*, no. 42, 24 November 2009, p. 1.

⁴¹ CPA Australia, *Submission*, no. 19, 5 October 2009.

Government debt as “...*prudent and necessary to continued economic growth.*”⁴²

The Australian Government Henry Review

The timing of the Australian Government’s Henry Review of Australia Taxation (also known as *Australia’s Future Tax System*) is likely to have an impact on the final report of the Committee in September 2010. Under the terms of reference of the Henry Review, the Australian Government Department of the Treasury is considering not only Commonwealth taxes, but also State taxes.

The report was delivered to the Australian Government Treasurer in December 2009, and the Australian Government will release the report along with its response to the recommendations made by the Review panel in 2010. The Committee hopes that the Henry Review is released within a adequate timeframe that allows it to comment on both the Review and the recommendations made in its final report.

⁴² Government of Victoria, *Submission*, no. 37, 19 October 2009, p. 16.

Appendix One: List of Submissions

Australian Bankers' Association Inc
Australian Custodial Services Association
Australian Finance Conference
Australian Unity
Brotherhood of St Laurence
Brotherhood of St Laurence, Footscray Community Legal Centre, West Heidelberg Community Legal Service and Consumer Action Law Centre
Business Coalition for Tax Reform
CFMEU Construction and General Division
CGU Insurance
CPA Australia
Mr Glenne Drover
Financial Planning Association
First National Real Estate
Ms Rachael Gaghan and Mr Neil Gaghan
Ms Nanette Griffiths and Mr Morrie Griffiths
Insurance Australia Group
Insurance Council of Australia
Mr Chris Janson
Ms Zoyee Kartalis and Ms Teresa Kartalis
Mr G Lloyd-Smith
Master Builders' Association of Victoria
National Community Titles Institute
National Insurance Brokers' Association
Owners Corporations Victoria

Ms Emmanuelle Pannuzzo and Mr Lorenza Pannuzzo

Property Council of Australia

Prosper Australia

Royal Automobile Club of Victoria

RSM Bird Cameron

Schiavello Group of Companies

Mr Jack Stanhope

Tenants Union of Victoria

Mr Eu-Jin Teo

The Australia Institute

The Geelong Chamber of Commerce

The Institute of Chartered Accountants in Australia

The Real Estate Institute of Victoria Ltd.

Totally Integrated Financial Planning Pty Ltd

Victorian Farmers' Federation

Victorian Government

Mr Kim Wells MP

Westfield Management Limited

Xuereb and Galea Family

Appendix Two: List of Witnesses

Public hearings

Sydney 29 October 2009

Mr John Hanks	Consultant National Insurance Brokers Association
Professor Neil Warren	Head of School Australian School of Taxation University of New South Wales
Mr Nicholas Scofield	General Manager, Corporate Affairs Allianz Australia
Mr David Wellfare	Senior Advisor, Economics and Policy Insurance Australia Group
Mr Alex Sanchez Mr Phil O'Sullivan	General Manager Senior Policy Adviser, Economics and Taxation Directorate Insurance Council of Australia

Melbourne 30 November 2009

Mr Geoff Crick	Member, Farm Business and Regional Development Committee
Mr Graeme Ford	Executive Manager, Policy
Mr Darryl Harrison	Policy Adviser Victorian Farmers' Federation
Mr John Spasojevic	Secretary Commonwealth Grants Commission
Mr Enzo Raimondo	Chief Executive Officer
Mr Robert Larocca	Policy, Research and Communication Manager Real Estate Institute of Victoria.

