

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

INQUIRY INTO WORKSAFE



**TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE
TAKEN AT PERTH
WEDNESDAY, 11 OCTOBER 2017**

SESSION TWO

Members

**Hon Adele Farina (Chair)
Hon Jacqui Boydell (Deputy Chair)
Hon Ken Baston
Hon Kyle McGinn
Hon Darren West**

Hearing commenced at 11.18 am**Ms STEPHANIE MAYMAN****Chair, Commission for Occupational Safety and Health, sworn and examined:**

The CHAIR: We are on air. We are having a hearing with the Commission for Occupational Safety and Health and we have the chair of the commission as a witness before the committee. On behalf of the committee, I would like to welcome you to the meeting. Before we begin, I must ask you to take either the oath or the affirmation.

[Witness took the affirmation.]

The CHAIR: You will have signed a document entitled “Information for Witnesses”. Have you read and understood the document?

Ms MAYMAN: I have.

The CHAIR: These proceedings are being recorded by Hansard and are broadcast on the internet. A transcript of your evidence will be provided to you at the conclusion of the hearing. To assist the committee and Hansard, please quote the full title of any document you refer to during the course of the hearing, and please be aware of the microphones and try to talk into the microphones and not cover them with paper. I remind you that your transcript will become a matter for the public record. If, for some reason, you wish to make a confidential statement during today’s proceedings, you should request that the evidence be taken in closed session. If the committee grants your request, any public and media in attendance will be excluded from the hearing. Please note that until such time as a transcript of your public evidence is finalised, it should not be made public. I advise you that publication or disclosure of the uncorrected transcript of evidence may constitute a contempt of Parliament and may mean that the material published or disclosed is not subject to parliamentary privilege.

Having gone through those formalities, would you like to make an opening statement to the committee?

Ms MAYMAN: Thank you very much. I am here today in my capacity as chair, as indicated, of the commission. I guess my opening line or statement is to say that my submission on behalf of the commission is quite restricted in that the commission has asked me to say to you, as the Legislative Council committee, that we as the commission are quite separate from WorkSafe, but they have asked me to indicate to you that the one term of reference that is relevant to you as the committee is that relating to legislation and jurisdiction. To that extent, I guess at the time that I penned the written submission, several things have happened here in Western Australia in relation to the Occupational Safety and Health Act. One of them, in fact, is happening today; that is, the minister is rising in the Legislative Assembly to move amendments to the Occupational Safety and Health Act. In that context I wish to say to you that the act in which WorkSafe is instituted is, in fact, very much out of date. That is a matter that I am in another capacity working on, and to that extent I have brought material for you. I have brought nine copies to consider. My printer was working overtime this morning, and fortunately it did work, so I will deal with that at a later time.

I just wanted to say that the commission has always been a tripartite body. It is set up under the act and unlike WorkSafe it does not operate under the Public Sector Management Act. Effectively, it is a committee and it is a policy making body, although it is a body of statute because it comes out of

the Occupational Safety and Health Act. To perhaps give you the history of it without going into miles and miles of history, back in 1984 it was the only body; there was no WorkSafe. When it was established in 1984, it was basically the body that then established the legislation associated with WorkSafe. Effectively, the body was asked by the Premier of the day, who said, "It is too hard for me to establish all of the controversial legislation surrounding WorkSafe, surrounding health and safety reps, surrounding the notion of bringing the mining industry potentially into this act, so you, as the commission, go away and work out what the legislation should be and bring it to the Parliament for me." Of course, the mining industry did not come into it. They had their own act, the Mines Safety and Inspection Act, and the rest of the industry was covered under the Occupational Safety and Health Act, but that was where the commission was first born in 1984. WorkSafe, the department, under the Public Sector Management Act, was subsequently established and all of its statutory role in enforcing occupational health and safety law was not established until 1987. So it was that departmental body, which was established by the tripartite commission, of which I was a member from 1984—I feel as if I have been on the commission for years. So you can perhaps start hitting at my age, but I am not going to tell you that because I do not think that is relevant for a Legislative Council committee. It was very important the commission, and it has continued to play that role. Although it has WorkSafe officers servicing it, it is very much separate from WorkSafe. It has a separate letterhead and it has all of those separation things, as it is in the legislation.

I guess those are all of the things, except to say one other thing; that the legislation surrounding the Occupational Safety and Health Act, as established in 1984, is very much out of date. The rest of the states in this country and the commonwealth, with the exception Victoria, have now harmonised the legislation in occupational health and safety. They have brought it forward and they have modernised it, and just as a simple example, this act still operates under the concept of an employee and an employer. None of the other acts in Australia operate under that concept now, because, of course, the nature of work has significantly changed. Because we have the nature of work significantly changing, this constrains the officers of WorkSafe to be able to enforce the law. They cannot do it because many workers out there are not employees as defined under this act, and there are not employers as defined under this act. This act has fallen behind and it has become out of date. The minister has recognised that and the government of the day has recognised that, and so too did the last government, to be fair. Whilst there was a draft act under the last government, that draft act, unfortunately, although it was tabled in the Parliament, it never got any further. Although all of the other states, with the exception of Victoria, and the commonwealth harmonised their laws back in 2011, we are, unfortunately, the shady cousin over here in WA and we did not do ours. Although we attempted to and there was lots of consultation, we did not. That is where I come forward with my steadfast little printer to say that this government, on coming to power, is attempting now to harmonise and has set up a separate body to the commission of which I am chair. It is called—as we all have to have in any part of Australia our acronyms—MAP, but it is the ministerial advisory panel, shortened to MAP. I am the chair of MAP as well as being chair of the commission. Instead of having the legislative advisory committee to the commission, the minister has set this up as a separate body because not only is this body charged with harmonising the legislation as other states and the commonwealth have done, this body is charged with harmonising and bringing up to date this act, but also bringing it together with the Mines Safety and Inspection Act and all of the petroleum legislation onshore, not offshore, because, of course, that is a federal piece of legislation. We are currently very busy and we meet fortnightly on a Friday. As you can see, it is similarly tripartite and it is not set up under legislation; it is set up and it reports directly to the minister.

I will leave my opening comments there, because I could go on and on, other than to say that occupational health and safety has been my life and my passion. I have been involved at international, national and state levels forever. Thank you.

[11.30 am]

The CHAIR: Thank you very much Stephanie. Can I just clarify, in terms of trying to understand that separation between the commission and WorkSafe, now the objects of the act apply to both the commission and WorkSafe?

Ms MAYMAN: Yes, except the commission has separate functions.

The CHAIR: So those functions that are detailed under section 14 of the act, which are the functions of the commission, are exclusively the functions of the commission and not the functions of WorkSafe?

Ms MAYMAN: Correct.

The CHAIR: However, the commission is supported administratively by WorkSafe.

Ms MAYMAN: Correct.

The CHAIR: How frequently does the commission meet?

Ms MAYMAN: It is required to meet under the act at least five times a year. It actually meets monthly.

The CHAIR: In terms of the functions of the commission, are you able to tell the committee for each of the last five years what recommendations the commission has made in relation to the formulation of standards and specifications and other forms of guidance for the purposes of assisting employers and employees?

Ms MAYMAN: I would have to take that one on notice, Adele, and get back to you. Would you like me to?

The CHAIR: Yes, please. That is question on notice 1. We will write to you Stephanie and it will be included in the transcript of evidence that we provide to you, once Hansard has produced it, for your correction, and also the covering letter will highlight the questions that have been taken on notice. So you do not need to take notes now.

My next question you may also need to take on notice. For each of the last five years, what matters has the commission referred to the minister for inquiry, have those inquiries been completed and was there a report provided to the minister on each of those inquiries?

Ms MAYMAN: I am not sure. I have only been back on the commission since June as I was in the Industrial Relations Commission, so I did not play a role then.

The CHAIR: What I might do Stephanie, if it is okay with you, is we will list that as question on notice 2. The other questions that I have of similar form I will not go through today. We will simply do a letter to you so that you have time to look those up because there is probably not much point in going through those if you do not have the information.

In terms of the role that you have in looking at the harmonisation of the health and safety laws in this state, I notice that, as you said, you are looking at legislation, not only the Occupational Safety and Health Act in this state but also the ones that relate to petroleum and mining. Is the intention to have just one agency that undertakes occupational health and safety inspection and investigation right across the state at the end of the day to bring all of those different groups together?

Ms MAYMAN: That is correct, and that agency has been created. It is called—of course we have an acronym—DMIRS. If I can spell it out, it is the Department of Mines, Industry Regulation and Safety. It comes under the single minister, Minister Johnston, and it covers petroleum onshore. Western Australia only covers petroleum onshore. It covers mines and it covers occupational health, but it is divided, currently, into WorkSafe and resources; so there are divisions within it. One of the things that the panel will have to consider or shall we call it MAP, is how the act, once it is harmonised, will be facilitated by the department, so how it will be resourced. I do not mean resourced as in the mining industry. I mean resourced generally; how it will be divided, because they will have separate sets of regulations. There will be a mining set of regulations and there will be a petroleum set of regulations, but there will be a general bill and that will be a work, health and safety reform bill, based on the 2016 model bill at the federal level provided by WorkSafe Australia. It will be similar to all the other model laws around Australia.

The CHAIR: Is there similarity across all the harmonised laws across all the jurisdictions, because the committee has heard evidence that they are actually quite different? Even though we refer to them as harmonised laws, each state has different variations.

Ms MAYMAN: In answer to your question, there are peculiarities in each state because there are divisions or there are sections in each state which have their own peculiarities. For example, some states seek to enforce within Magistrates Courts. Some states seek to enforce within courts of industrial commissions. Some states seek to enforce within, for example, Victoria—I think it is in their—I am not sure of the name of their court, but there are different courts in each state and that will be the same here within Western Australia. We currently enforce laws relating to occupational safety and health in our local Magistrates Court. So, that will be a matter that the panel will have to consider together with—well, that will be a matter that will be considered by the Attorney General because that comes under the Attorney General's department. But it may be that the more egregious laws, the more egregious breaches of law go to a District Court and the simpler breaches stay in the Magistrates Court or whatever, but that is a matter that the panel is yet to consider. But, overall, the principles of harmonisation have been the same in each state. There are little differences from state to state, but overall it is the same.

The CHAIR: Now, the functions of the commission are to provide the minister advice and recommendations in relation to occupational health and safety. When the commission provides that advice to the minister, what role does WorkSafe have in that? Does the commission consult with WorkSafe in the making of those recommendations?

Ms MAYMAN: Well, WorkSafe has a representative on the commission and that is the commissioner, Lex McCulloch. He is on there. But no, they do not have a role other than a representative on that body.

The CHAIR: So when a recommendation is made to the minister and the minister adopts the recommendation, who has the responsibility of implementing the recommendation?

Ms MAYMAN: Well, the minister may ask WorkSafe to implement it, or the minister may ask an industry body or the minister may write to the commission and ask the commission to consult. For example, I have a matter at the moment. I have been asked with the minister to consult with Farmsafe and other agriculture-related bodies. So, that is my role. The minister is very active in health and safety. It varies from minister to minister. Some ministers are active in the area of health and safety and some ministers are less active and wait for the commission to advise them. It depends on the role of the minister. This minister is particularly active and it would not be unusual for there to be three letters from the minister at a commission meeting.

The CHAIR: In view of the fact that the WorkSafe commissioner is a member of the COSH, does this result in COSH having any influence over what WorkSafe may focus on for its projects or its educational initiatives?

Ms MAYMAN: Within the department? No. Well, no. We would not have control over that.

The CHAIR: No, I did not say control over that—influence.

Ms MAYMAN: Influence. No, but we might ask questions as to what WorkSafe is doing and we might ask for a report at the next meeting. We certainly would ask for regular updates as to what WorkSafe's representative is raising at the national level to inform the commission as to what WorkSafe—we get reports on enforcement matters, coronial inquiries. For example, we have just had a recent report on the number of deaths that are occurring in the country compared to the number of deaths that occur in the metropolitan area, which is quite stark compared to the population densities. Those sorts of things WorkSafe would prepare for us, but that is upon our request.

[11.40 am]

The CHAIR: On page 3 of your submission, you told the committee that COSH has recently undertaken strategic planning sessions to prioritise projects and focus areas for the coming year. Can please tell the committee what those projects and focus areas are for the coming year?

Ms MAYMAN: I can provide you with that, but it was before my appointment.

The CHAIR: We will take that as question on notice 3.

Is there collaboration between COSH and WorkSafe on projects and education campaigns?

Ms MAYMAN: It is a bit outside what I am supposed to be talking to you about.

The CHAIR: I know but you are here now; we can ask you those questions.

Ms MAYMAN: Thank you, Adele. On education campaigns, yes, there is collaboration.

The CHAIR: All right. Can you elaborate on the nature of that collaboration?

Ms MAYMAN: For example, there is a leadership campaign going on at the moment where I as the chairman am approaching leaders of organisations, such as the MBA, WACOSS, CCI and Unions WA to invite them to a leadership breakfast together with Worksafe to raise relevant and current health and safety issues—a talkfest.

The CHAIR: Just going back to the last question, are the reports that are provided by WorkSafe to COSH made public?

Ms MAYMAN: I cannot answer that, Adele. I assume that they are public documents.

The CHAIR: We will make that question on notice 4 and you can come back to us on that because we might like to access some of those documents.

Ms MAYMAN: Sorry, I have not been able to answer anything and everything is on notice.

The CHAIR: No, that is not true; it is not true at all.

You have given an example on page three of your submission that COSH endorsed a set of education materials to promote awareness of risks of slips, trips and falls.

Ms MAYMAN: That is right.

The CHAIR: Who produced that information? Was it WorkSafe?

Ms MAYMAN: A committee worked on it for some time and that was produced by the commission.

The CHAIR: How was that information disseminated to the public?

Ms MAYMAN: That question was actually put at the last commission meeting as to how the dissemination took place. Another one on notice!

The CHAIR: That is fine. That is question on notice 5 and as part of that, what TV and radio —

Ms MAYMAN: TV? We do not have that money, Adele. Sorry.

The CHAIR: See, you answered that question!

I am still trying to understand the relationship between WorkSafe and the commission. Is there an oversight role that the commission plays with WorkSafe?

Ms MAYMAN: No. That is a ministerial role. WorkSafe is an independent statutory body in enforcing an act. Our role is reporting to the minister as a tripartite body. Tripartism came out of the Robens—if anyone remembers Robens back in England, that came out of the coal. Robens was a lord in the English Parliament who thought up this concept of health and safety legislation. Whilst it was a good one in 1972, which was when Robens handed down his report to the English Parliament, as I say it is significantly out-of-date now because employees and employers are not really the flavour of the month in terms of workplaces; in fact, we are getting to the stage now with Uber and Deliveroo where the contracting or the point of contract is actually your mobile phone. Whilst we are moving under the new act to what is called “person conducting the business undertaking” and not an employer, even that is now out-of-date. We have an Uber-style employer, which is your phone so no-one employs the person. You may be interested to know that that is called the gig economy —

The CHAIR: We have learnt about the gig economy.

Ms MAYMAN: The gig economy is in fact people such as Uber, such as Deliveroo—and is it Airtasker?—that avoid their obligations under the occ health and safety act, they avoid their obligations under the workers’ comp act, and they avoid other obligations, but principally my concern is their obligations under this act and under the new harmonised act, potentially. So, we are trying to shape the new harmonised act. Because we are a long way behind here in WA, let us make us first cab off the rank—or first Uber off the rank, as the case may be!—to bring them in so they are in fact caught up. But it is a little bit difficult to be able to incorporate statutorily your mobile phone! So they are not quite sure of how to do that legislatively yet.

The CHAIR: I find it curious that you are actually saying the mobile phone is the employer. Is it not the person who places the order on the mobile phone?

Ms MAYMAN: No. They are the client. Interestingly enough, the Uber driver does not want to be caught up by this either. So, there is an avoidance. Uber drivers are quite comfortable. The big Uber company and the Deliveroo company are quite happy being out of any type of statutory requirement, be it the minimum wage, be it occ health. They do not want that, because it also covers taxation law and any other capturing arrangement that must take place. I do not have the full information, so I do not want to give you—at the moment, I am getting legal advice in relation to it. But it is myriad out there.

There was a very serious case here. Just to explain briefly, I was appointed by Julia Gillard when she was employment minister to draw up the harmonisation federally in 2007. There was a very sad case here that we used for COAG. It was a fisherman who did not even fall under this act, and he was employed not as a contractor, which does fall under this act, but outside of the contract provisions of this act. He was a young person, and he was killed on the third day of his employment. It subsequently went before Justice Heenan, and he tried to pull the employment relationship in under this act. That was overturned and it went to the Supreme Court. Anyway, to cut a long story

short, the case was lost in our Supreme Court here before the Industrial Appeal Court. It was that case that we used to switch the whole legislation then away from employer–employee to the person conducting the business undertaking, because “employer” had then gone. We were saying goodbye then to employer–employee. That was back in 2007. We have still got employer–employee here. So, it is so vital that we change this act. WorkSafe now is working with their hands behind their back. They cannot go out there. Most people out there now are not in an employer–employee relationship—that is the sad thing—and if they are in an employer–employee relationship, it is so negligible. I always think back to the fisher boy who lost his life within three days of being employed, and they just could not capture him under the act, no matter how hard WorkSafe tried. They threw thousands of dollars at that case, and it just disappeared. It is those sorts of cases where WorkSafe just loses heart. It cost them so much money to run that case, and it was lost. I digress. We have got to think, at the end of the day, there was a life behind all of that, and it was a young boy’s life. It was in the north of Western Australia. That is when I get sad, and I get a bit bitter about it sometimes, but I digress; sorry.

[11.50 am]

The CHAIR: That is quite okay; I think it was very valuable information for the committee to have. Now, in the role of COSH advising the minister on occupational safety and health legislation, does COSH have a view about the length of time WorkSafe takes to complete an investigation and what advice have you provided the minister about this?

Ms MAYMAN: No; we do not have a view on that.

The CHAIR: It is not something that have you considered?

Ms MAYMAN: I have heard chatting on the streets that it does take a while, but that would be over cups of coffee. I have a role, I guess, as chair, and I take that role very seriously, to meet with lawyers, to meet with industry employers, and it has been raised with me that that is an issue. I do not take those issues up with the minister.

The CHAIR: Do you take those issues up with WorkSafe—as a committee, not you personally? Does the committee —

Ms MAYMAN: As the commission?

The CHAIR: Yes.

Ms MAYMAN: No; we do not. There are lots of those functions, I would hazard a guess, that we have never touched.

The CHAIR: They are all the questions you are going to get on notice that I have avoided asking you now.

Ms MAYMAN: Yes, I know. I have to say, I cannot remember when there was an inquiry on a matter. I do not know whether we have ever done an inquiry. It would be interesting to have a look back. I think we did one years ago into tilt-up and, as a result, the tilt-up regulations were produced. It was under John Kobelke, who was the minister of the day, following the death of John Kelsh. Was that his name? Des Kelsh.

The CHAIR: I do not recall his name.

Ms MAYMAN: Des Kelsh, yes. They became the tilt-up regulations, but it would be interesting to see how many of these we have actually —

The CHAIR: You will get to explore them once you have received —

Ms MAYMAN: Mea culpa. I will fall on my sword probably.

The CHAIR: The committee has heard evidence, and concerns raised, that WorkSafe does not actually produce a report at the end of their investigations and that the report is not made public; whereas, other safety investigation authorities do produce a public investigation report at the conclusion of their investigation. I am wondering has the commission heard those concerns, and has the commission thought to act on that?

Ms MAYMAN: I would be concerned if WorkSafe produced a report about individuals, with individuals' names in it, particularly where there had been deaths and things. We see reports coming to the commission where there have been deaths and things. Those reports do not go anywhere and I certainly would not be happy about a member of the commission passing those on.

Hon KYLE McGINN: They used to produce reports is evidence that we have heard. At the end of an investigation, they would produce a report. Now, I would assume that there would be sensitivity around names, but a report provided probably most particularly to the people involved, and we have seen other organisations that are providing reports publicly.

Ms MAYMAN: About the issue? I have seen reports like that. Do you mean, if it is, say, about quad bikes, putting a report out about quad bikes generally?

The CHAIR: No; a report on a fatal workplace investigation.

Ms MAYMAN: I have seen media releases on that sort of thing, but I have not seen one about a report.

The CHAIR: So your only concern would be identifying individuals in such a report?

Ms MAYMAN: Yes, and also if there is a prosecution to follow, there would be jeopardy for WorkSafe in making public a report.

Hon KYLE McGINN: If it was following the prosecution, releasing the report after the prosecution should not be an issue, should it?

Ms MAYMAN: That may be a long time, knowing how long prosecutions take, because that will be an issue of some concern—how long prosecutions take. That is a concern that I am not sharing here. Sorry; I am not here to do that.

Hon JACQUI BOYDELL: Stephanie, I just want to take you back to your comments around being aware of the length of time that WorkSafe take to conduct investigations and that you have been made aware of those concerns over cups of coffee et cetera.

Ms MAYMAN: Some people have told me. I would not know. Other people have told me, so it is second-hand information.

Hon JACQUI BOYDELL: I assume that those people have told you because of your role. Do you think that is fair?

Ms MAYMAN: Possibly. I do not know.

Hon JACQUI BOYDELL: Do you think that the commission has a duty of care to respond to those concerns; and, if you do, has the commission failed to act on those concerns?

Ms MAYMAN: No; I think that has gone a bit far.

The CHAIR: Can I just suggest a bit of caution here. We need to separate a private conversation that Stephanie may have had with people that she knows as compared to her role as chair. I suppose the question needs to be: has the commission received any formal complaints or letters of concern raising this issue?

Ms MAYMAN: No.

Hon JACQUI BOYDELL: I think you already said that. I understand that, Chair. But given that you are here today before the committee —

Ms MAYMAN: To talk in very restrictive terms about legislation and jurisprudence.

Hon JACQUI BOYDELL: I am prepared to ask you those questions because you tabled the evidence. That is the question that I want to ask you.

Ms MAYMAN: I refuse to answer it.

The CHAIR: Can you just repeat the question?

Hon JACQUI BOYDELL: Given that those concerns have been raised by people over cups of coffee, I think was the term that you used, and that you agreed that it had possibly been raised with you because of your role, what had the commission done in acting out of a duty of care knowing those concerns were out there? That was my question. I accept that you refuse to answer, but I have the question on record.

Ms MAYMAN: I will withdraw it when the transcript comes around. I am sorry I made the comment.

The CHAIR: I am not sure that you can withdraw a statement that you made before the committee.

In terms of the other evidence that the committee has heard, we have heard evidence from the State Coroner that the State Coroner has a huge amount of difficulty accessing evidence that WorkSafe investigators have obtained through the course of their investigation—evidence that is critical to her role as State Coroner in determining the cause of death—and that often WorkSafe will argue legal professional privilege and public interest immunity for the basis of not releasing the information, and every single request for information has to go through a formal request, consideration and then a response about whether or not the information will be provided and if it is redacted in any way. Has the commission heard these concerns and has the commission ever considered these concerns and whether things could be improved to facilitate information being made available to the State Coroner?

[12 noon]

Ms MAYMAN: Not directly in relation to the coroner. There have been concerns raised, not specifically about information to the coroner, but specifically about certain industries where there have been delays, more in relation to legislative guidelines coming out in certain industries where there have been deaths. So we are sort of acting where there have been deaths and subsequently, the commission will consider policy in relation to those areas. We are not back at the WorkSafe front. We are going forward in relation to developing policy and there are, from time to time, delays in developing the policy. That may not be at the WorkSafe end. That may be at the industry end or it may be at the union's end. It can be in a raft of areas. It may be at the national end for a number of reasons. There can be a whole host of factors involved, or it may, indeed, be at the coroner's office because of a hold-up of a number of factors. There have been delays, for example, in the diving sector for that very reason.

The CHAIR: I suppose the committee has a concern in that from the date of a fatality, the length of time that it takes for an investigation to be completed, which can take up to three years, and then you have the period of time the prosecution will take on top of that, which could take a considerable amount of time. In that time frame, with no information being made public, there is a risk that those factors that led to that fatality could recur again at another workplace or the same workplace. What role does the commission play in assessing that risk and ensuring that information is made public to minimise the likelihood of that fatality occurring again in those circumstances?

Ms MAYMAN: A report would come through to us on the death.

The CHAIR: At what stage—at the end of the three-year investigation?

Ms MAYMAN: No, no; we have reports of deaths coming through to us, as a commission, regularly. It does not matter what sector it is coming from. Those reports are coming through to us all the time and comments are being made by the commission. That would be within a month of the death—no more.

The CHAIR: So what do you do once you have that information?

Ms MAYMAN: Comments are made back to WorkSafe. It can vary depending on the death.

The CHAIR: Would there have been instances where the commission recommended to WorkSafe to issue a safety alert to inform industry that this death occurred in these circumstances?

Ms MAYMAN: There have not been since I have been back on the commission, but, certainly, there have been historically for me anyway, yes.

The CHAIR: Stephanie, do you have any further comments you want to make on any issue? I will certainly, on behalf of the committee with the committee's consent, be forwarding you a letter with some outstanding questions, which will clearly be questions on notice. I do not see any point in asking them now, given that you clearly do not have that information. We will make sure that they get to you and provide you with a time frame for responding to those questions.

Ms MAYMAN: I will leave my card and my email for the members of the committee, if they wish to have it.

The CHAIR: Fantastic; thank you for that. Thank you very much for making your time available and providing us with an overview of this really huge challenge you face in bringing together all the various safety legislations, and also trying to harmonise all of that and address the issue of a "person who is not an employer" but is contracting work. It is definitely a complex issue. I just might remind you that the transcript will be forwarded to you from today's hearing and that you will have an opportunity to correct any typos or transcript errors. If you just identify those on the *Hansard* and then return them to committee staff, and the covering letter to that transcript will indicate the time frame for providing answers to the questions taken on notice. If you have any additional information you would like to elaborate on, or particular points you want to make, you are always welcome to provide supplementary information to the committee.

Ms MAYMAN: Will that come out by email or by post?

The CHAIR: It will be emailed.

Ms MAYMAN: All right; thank you.

The CHAIR: Thank you very much. I close the hearing.

Hearing concluded at 12.04 pm
