PARLIAMENT OF VICTORIA

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES (HANSARD)

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

FIFTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT

FIRST SESSION

2 November 2000

(extract from Book 5)

Internet: www.parliament.vic.gov.au/downloadhansard

By authority of the Victorian Government Printer

The Governor

His Excellency the Honourable Sir JAMES AUGUSTINE GOBBO, AC

The Lieutenant-Governor

Professor ADRIENNE E. CLARKE, AO

The Ministry

Premier and Minister for Multicultural Affairs	The Hon. S. P. Bracks, MP
Deputy Premier, Minister for Health and Minister for Planning	The Hon. J. W. Thwaites, MP
Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister assisting the Minister for Workcover	The Hon. M. M. Gould, MLC
Minister for Transport	The Hon. P. Batchelor, MP
Minister for Energy and Resources, Minister for Ports and Minister assisting the Minister for State and Regional Development	The Hon. C. C. Broad, MLC
Minister for State and Regional Development and Treasurer	The Hon. J. M. Brumby, MP
Minister for Local Government, Minister for Workcover and Minister assisting the Minister for Transport regarding Roads	The Hon. R. G. Cameron, MP
Minister for Community Services	The Hon. C. M. Campbell, MP
Minister for Education and Minister for the Arts	The Hon. M. E. Delahunty, MP
Minister for Environment and Conservation and Minister for Women's Affairs	The Hon. S. M. Garbutt, MP
Minister for Police and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrections	The Hon. A. Haermeyer, MP
Minister for Agriculture and Minister for Aboriginal Affairs	The Hon. K. G. Hamilton, MP
Attorney-General, Minister for Manufacturing Industry and Minister for Racing	The Hon. R. J. Hulls, MP
Minister for Post Compulsory Education, Training and Employment and Minister for Finance	The Hon. L. J. Kosky, MP
Minister for Sport and Recreation, Minister for Youth Affairs and Minister assisting the Minister for Planning	The Hon. J. M. Madden, MLC
Minister for Gaming, Minister for Major Projects and Tourism and Minister assisting the Premier on Multicultural Affairs	The Hon. J. Pandazopoulos, MP
Minister for Housing, Minister for Aged Care and Minister assisting the Minister for Health	The Hon. B. J. Pike, MP
Minister for Small Business and Minister for Consumer Affairs	The Hon. M. R. Thomson, MLC
Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet	The Hon. G. W. Jennings

Legislative Council Committees

Economic Development Committee — The Honourables R. A. Best, Andrea Coote G. R. Craige, Kaye Darveniza, N. B. Lucas, J. M. McQuilten and T. C. Theophanous.

Privileges Committee — The Honourables W. R. Baxter, D. McL. Davis, C. A. Furletti, M. M. Gould and G. W. Jennings.

Standing Orders Committee — The Honourables the President, G. B. Ashman, B. W. Bishop, G. W. Jennings, Jenny Mikakos, G. D. Romanes and K. M. Smith.

Joint Committees

Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee — (*Council*): The Honourables B. C. Boardman and S. M. Nguyen. (*Assembly*): Mr Cooper, Mr Jasper, Mr Lupton, Mr Mildenhall and Mr Wynne.

Environment and Natural Resources Committee — (*Council*): The Honourables R. F. Smith and E. G. Stoney. (*Assembly*): Mr Delahunty, Ms Duncan, Mr Ingram, Ms Lindell, Mr Mulder and Mr Seitz.

Family and Community Development Committee — (*Council*): The Honourables E. J. Powell and G. D. Romanes. (*Assembly*): Mr Hardman, Mr Lim, Mr Nardella, Mrs Peulich and Mr Wilson.

House Committee — (*Council*): The Honourables the President (*ex officio*), G. B. Ashman, R. A. Best, J. M. McQuilten, Jenny Mikakos and R. F. Smith. (*Assembly*): Mr Speaker (*ex officio*), Ms Beattie, Mr Kilgour, Mr Leighton, Ms McCall, Mr Rowe and Mr Savage.

Law Reform Committee — (*Council*): The Honourables D. G. Hadden and P. A. Katsambanis. (*Assembly*): Mr Languiller, Ms McCall, Mr McIntosh, Mr Stensholt and Mr Thompson.

Library Committee — (*Council*): The Honourables the President, E. C. Carbines, M. T. Luckins, E. J. Powell and C. A. Strong. (*Assembly*): Mr Speaker, Ms Duncan, Mr Languiller, Mrs Peulich and Mr Seitz.

Printing Committee — (*Council*): The Honourables the President, Andrea Coote, Kaye Darveniza and E. J. Powell. (*Assembly*): Mr Speaker, Ms Gillett, Mr Nardella and Mr Richardson.

Public Accounts and Estimates Committee — (*Council*): The Honourables D. McL. Davis, R. M. Hallam, G. K. Rich-Phillips and T. C. Theophanous. (*Assembly*): Ms Asher, Ms Barker, Ms Davies, Mr Holding, Mr Loney and Mrs Maddigan.

Road Safety Committee — (*Council*): The Honourables Andrew Brideson and E. C. Carbines. (*Assembly*): Mr Kilgour, Mr Langdon, Mr Plowman, Mr Spry and Mr Trezise.

Scrutiny of Acts and Regulations Committee — (*Council*): The Honourables M. A. Birrell, M. T. Luckins, Jenny Mikakos and C. A. Strong. (*Assembly*): Ms Beattie, Mr Carli, Mr Dixon, Ms Gillett and Mr Robinson.

Heads of Parliamentary Departments

Assembly — Clerk of the Parliaments and Clerk of the Legislative Assembly: Mr R. W. Purdey

Council — Clerk of the Legislative Council: Mr W. R. Tunnecliffe

Hansard — Chief Reporter: Ms C. J. Williams

Library — Librarian: Mr B. J. Davidson

Parliamentary Services — Secretary: Ms C. M. Haydon

MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

FIFTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT — FIRST SESSION

President: The Hon. B. A. CHAMBERLAIN

Deputy President and Chairman of Committees: The Hon. B. W. BISHOP

Temporary Chairmen of Committees: The Honourables G. B. Ashman, R. A. Best, Kaye Darveniza, D. G. Hadden, P. R. Hall, Jenny Mikakos, R. F. Smith, E. G. Stoney and C. A. Strong

Leader of the Government:
The Hon. M. M. GOULD

Deputy Leader of the Government:
The Hon. G. W. JENNINGS

Leader of the Opposition:
The Hon. M. A. BIRRELL

Deputy Leader of the Opposition:
The Hon. BILL FORWOOD

Leader of the National Party:
The Hon. R. M. HALLAM

Deputy Leader of the National Party:
The Hon. P. R. HALL

Member	Province	Party	Member	Province	Party
Ashman, Hon. Gerald Barry	Koonung	LP	Hall, Hon. Peter Ronald	Gippsland	NP
Atkinson, Hon. Bruce Norman	Koonung	LP	Hallam, Hon. Roger Murray	Western	NP
Baxter, Hon. William Robert	North Eastern	NP	Jennings, Hon. Gavin Wayne	Melbourne	ALP
Best, Hon. Ronald Alexander	North Western	NP	Katsambanis, Hon. Peter Argyris	Monash	LP
Birrell, Hon. Mark Alexander	East Yarra	LP	Lucas, Hon. Neil Bedford, PSM	Eumemmerring	LP
Bishop, Hon. Barry Wilfred	North Western	NP	Luckins, Hon. Maree Therese	Waverley	LP
Boardman, Hon. Blair Cameron	Chelsea	LP	McQuilten, Hon. John Martin	Ballarat	ALP
Bowden, Hon. Ronald Henry	South Eastern	LP	Madden, Hon. Justin Mark	Doutta Galla	ALP
Brideson, Hon. Andrew Ronald	Waverley	LP	Mikakos, Hon. Jenny	Jika Jika	ALP
Broad, Hon. Candy Celeste	Melbourne North	ALP	Nguyen, Hon. Sang Minh	Melbourne West	ALP
Carbines, Hon. Elaine Cafferty	Geelong	ALP	Olexander, Hon. Andrew Phillip	Silvan	LP
Chamberlain, Hon. Bruce Anthony	Western	LP	Powell, Hon. Elizabeth Jeanette	North Eastern	NP
Coote, Hon. Andrea	Monash	LP	Rich-Phillips, Hon. Gordon Kenneth	Eumemmerring	LP
Cover, Hon. Ian James	Geelong	LP	Romanes, Hon. Glenyys Dorothy	Melbourne	ALP
Craige, Hon. Geoffrey Ronald	Central Highlands	LP	Ross, Hon. John William Gamaliel	Higinbotham	LP
Darveniza, Hon. Kaye	Melbourne West	ALP	Smith, Hon. Kenneth Maurice	South Eastern	LP
Davis, Hon. David McLean	East Yarra	LP	Smith, Hon. Robert Fredrick	Chelsea	ALP
Davis, Hon. Philip Rivers	Gippsland	LP	Smith, Hon. Wendy Irene	Silvan	LP
Forwood, Hon. Bill	Templestowe	LP	Stoney, Hon. Eadley Graeme	Central Highlands	LP
Furletti, Hon. Carlo Angelo	Templestowe	LP	Strong, Hon. Christopher Arthur	Higinbotham	LP
Gould, Hon. Monica Mary	Doutta Galla	ALP	Theophanous, Hon. Theo Charles	Jika Jika	ALP
Hadden, Hon. Dianne Gladys	Ballarat	ALP	Thomson, Hon. Marsha Rose	Melbourne North	ALP

CONTENTS

THURSDAY, 2 NOVEMBER 2000

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

TUESDAY , 31 OCTOBER 2000

CONTENTS

CONTENTS

Thursday, 2 November 2000

The PRESIDENT (Hon. B. A. Chamberlain) took the chair at 10.02 a.m. and read the prayer.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Televising and broadcasting of proceedings

Hon. M. M. GOULD (Minister for Industrial Relations) — By leave, I move:

That the sessional orders relating to broadcasting of proceedings, adopted by the Council on 4 November 1999, be revoked and that the following new sessional orders be adopted in place thereof:

That during the present session this house —

1. Authorises —

   (a) sound transmissions of the proceedings in the Legislative Council chamber to offices within the precincts of Parliament House;

   (b) the broadcasting and rebroadcasting of sound and/or visual transmissions by radio and television stations of the proceedings in the Legislative Council;

   (c) the video recording of the proceedings of the Legislative Council to persons and organisations outside Parliament House approved by the President, on terms and conditions determined by the President from time to time; and

   (d) the publication in electronic form of the proceedings of the Legislative Council.

2. Determines that the following conditions will apply in relation to the broadcasting and rebroadcasting of the proceedings referred to in paragraph 1:

   (a) Media organisations or individuals must be accredited by Mr President.

   (b) Sound shall be recorded only from the audio signal of proceedings transmitted by the house monitoring system by representatives of accredited media organisations or individuals. No alteration to the sound relay equipment is permitted without the permission of Mr President. The use of separate recording equipment is not permitted unless authorised by Mr President.

   (c) Visual and/or sound recordings and excerpts of visual and/or sound recordings shall not commence until the conclusion of the prayer and shall conclude on the adjournment of the house. Visual and/or sound recordings of the proceedings must be used only for the purpose of fair and accurate reports and reasonable balance between both sides of the house is to be achieved by avoiding undue concentration on any one member.

   (d) Visual and/or sound recordings and excerpts of visual and/or sound recordings shall not be used for:

      (i) political party advertising or election campaigns; or

      (ii) satire or ridicule; or

      (iii) commercial sponsorship or commercial advertising; or

      (iv) television advertisements or promotion.

   (e) Visual and/or sound recording of any particular proceeding must provide equality between government and non-government members.

   (f) Visual and/or sound transmissions or broadcasts of, or broadcasts or rebroadcasts of recordings of, proceedings shall be such as to provide in context a balanced presentation of differing views and may not include the transmission or broadcast of, or broadcast or rebroadcast of a recording of events in the chamber unrelated to the proceedings of the house.

   (g) Visual and/or sound excerpts of recordings of proceedings must be placed in context. Commentators should identify members at least by name.

   (h) Visual and/or sound excerpts of recordings of proceedings shall not misrepresent any proceeding before the house, or the seating position or office held by any member of the house.

   (i) When making visual and/or sound transmissions or recordings, camera operators shall operate within the guidelines issued by the President.

   (j) The visual and/or sound transmission of points of order or remarks withdrawn are not to be rebroadcast.

   (k) Media personnel are required to obey any instruction given either generally or in a particular case by the President or through him by the Clerk of the Legislative Council, the Usher of the Black Rod or the Housekeeper.

Hon. M. A. BIRRELL (East Yarra) — The opposition supports the new sessional order on the basis that it will allow authorised media access to broadcasting from this chamber. It removes a rule which has worked well but which is now out of date that required the prior approval of all parliamentary leaders before broadcasts could be made. The rule is timely, and although its effectiveness should be monitored it should work for the benefit of the house.

Motion agreed to.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Impact of GST on small and medium-sized businesses

Hon. N. B. LUCAS (Eumemmerring) presented report no. 1, together with appendices, extracts from proceedings, minority report and minutes of evidence.

Hon. N. B. LUCAS (Eumemmerring) (*By leave*) — The report on the effects of the GST on small and medium-sized business has been under preparation for a number of months. Given the subject of the report it is understandable that there can be differences of opinion among members of the committee. The committee has dealt with those differences as best it can and has recorded in the minutes, as required by the house, where those differences have occurred through division. One member of the committee has seen fit to lodge a minority report.

The committee took evidence across the state. The findings of the committee relating to the GST have been agreed upon in a bipartisan manner. Those on which agreement was not reached have not been included in the final report.

I place on the record my appreciation for the work of the members and, importantly, the staff of the Economic Development Committee who assisted with the preparation of the report, led by Richard Willis and those assisting through their research — namely, Karen Ellingford, Mark Ryan and other committee staff.

The report gives a reasonable overview of the situation as at the end of October with the GST having been introduced on 1 July.

The time to prepare this report was short, and the committee has prepared and issued this interim report, report no. 1. A further report will be presented to Parliament in April next year.

Laid on table.

Ordered that report, appendices, extracts from proceedings and minority report be printed.

Ordered that report be considered later this day on motion of Hon. N. B. LUCAS (Eumemmerring).

PAPERS

Laid on table by Clerk:

Arts Centre Trust — Report, 1999–2000.

Barwon Region Water Authority — Report, 1999–2000.

Central Gippsland Region Water Authority — Report, 1999–2000.

Central Highlands Region Water Authority — Report, 1999–2000.

Coliban Region Water Authority — Report, 1999–2000

East Gippsland Region Water Authority — Report, 1999–2000.

Glenelg Region Water Authority — Report, 1999–2000.

Goulburn Valley Region Water Authority — Report, 1999–2000.

Grampians Region Water Authority — Report, 1999–2000.

Legal Aid — Report, 1999–2000.

Lower Murray Region Water Authority — Report, 1999–2000.

Natural Resources and Environment Department — Report, 1999–2000 (two papers).

North East Region Water Authority — Report, 1999–2000.

Optometrists Registration Board — Minister for Health's report of 1 November 2000 of receipt of the 1999–2000 Report.

Portland Coast Region Water Authority — Report, 1999–2000.

South Gippsland Region Water Authority — Report, 1999–2000.

South West Water Authority — Report, 1999–2000.

Westernport Region Water Authority — Report, 1999–2000.

Western Region Water Authority — Report, 1999–2000.

TRAINING AND FURTHER EDUCATION ACTS (AMENDMENT) BILL

Second reading

Debate resumed from 24 October; motion of Hon. C. C. BROAD (Minister for Energy and Resources).

Hon. B. N. ATKINSON (Koonung) — Tertiary and other post-secondary education is an area that has become important to the community in recent years as the workplace has changed and lifestyles have changed, with early retirements and more leisure giving people the time to devote to personal development and the acquisition of new skills, skills that will support them in re-entering careers, in advancing their careers or in looking for new opportunities to pursue recreational interests.

The tertiary education sector has had to be responsive to changing industry training needs and to a changing dynamic between secondary education and tertiary education. People have become involved in an ongoing, all-of-life learning process rather than simply completing a particular academic course and moving on perhaps never to open a textbook or to engage in studies again.

We have a different society and a different attitude to learning from the past. There is a diverse range of providers who are experienced in education training, including community houses, the University of the Third Age (U3A), the Council of Adult Education (CAE), which is picked up in the bill, multicultural education services, which are also picked up in the bill, TAFE colleges, universities and even distance education, which is playing an increasingly important role for many people.

Because of the differences in the way people seek access to learning and their different needs — in some cases they want to pursue business careers and in other cases they simply want to pursue personal development — they want greater flexibility in education services and access to those services. They want to access services at times that suit them and in a range of locations that suit their needs.

In this whole-of-life process people are increasingly tapping into the skills and experience of a range of people, not only those who have traditionally been educators or lecturers but those who have skills to share. The Council of Adult Education has played a key role in that process in many ways for many people over many years. People want to further their skills base so that they can re-enter the work force or advance in the work force and they certainly want to retrain because of changes in technology or simply to play more active roles in the community and pursue their personal development.

In the context of the way education services are provided, there has obviously been a need for each education provider to look at the services it provides, its structure, the way it develops courses and the range of courses it offers to people.

In this legislation members of the opposition assume the government has examined the two major organisations that are affected and has decided there is a need for a change in their administration and accountability. I hope the thinking behind the government's approach has not concerned only accountability and the new governance provisions but has included, through the structural changes, making the organisations more responsive to the needs of the people who use or access their courses.

The bill will amend the Adult, Community and Further Education Act to provide for the establishment of adult education institutions. In the first instance it will pick up only the Council of Adult Education and Adult Multicultural Education Services, but there is provision for other organisations to be established. One that may qualify in the future is the University of the Third Age, which has seen a significant growth in both its membership and the range of activities and courses it provides to many people who are looking for ongoing learning opportunities in the community. With its increasing sophistication and growth the University of the Third Age is an organisation that may be considered for later legislation, but it is not proposed to be included at this time.

The two adult education institutions to be established are Adult Multicultural Education Services and the Centre for Adult Education.

The bill also provides that the Governor in Council can empower other organisations to establish education institutions, and certainly in respect of these two, the bill provides for the establishment of boards that will act as bodies corporate, with the powers commonly exercised by bodies corporate to administer the two organisations established as adult education institutions. I hope the bodies corporate will provide them with input into changing educational needs, particularly given the membership that has been proposed within the boards' structure. I also note that the proposed legislation provides for the transfer of employment responsibilities from the existing organisations and their reporting systems to those boards.

At present the existing multicultural education service reports directly to the minister and the department. Therefore it is a significant change for that particular organisation to report to a new governing board that will have accountability for future directions of the organisation, notwithstanding that it will ultimately still have a reporting function back to the minister.

The Council of Adult Education has had a board for some years and enjoys a number of provisions that go with an independent organisation. However, the legislation governing the CAE has been operating for some time, and many of the provisions of that legislation appear out of step with the practices expected from the organisational structure of boards and bodies corporate in today's environment and in the context of today's education sector.

The legislation provides that the boards to be established for the two organisations will have between 9 and 15 members. The number will be fixed by Governor in Council order in each case. Of those members it is proposed that at least half will be appointed by the minister; one will be a staff member of the institution elected by staff; one will be a student of the institution and that person will be elected by students; one will be a director of the institution; and the remainder will be coopted by the board on the basis of relevant knowledge or skills.

As is the expectation of government for any similar boards or organisations structured under legislation and reporting back to ministers of the Crown, the boards will be required to act within state government policy frameworks and be subject to the directions of the minister which may be given generally or on specific matters.

The opposition's position in this house is no doubt known to the government. As my colleague in another place, the honourable member for Hawthorn indicated, the opposition will not oppose the bill. However, it has some concerns about how it will operate. Nonetheless it believes both the organisations may well have an opportunity to function more effectively and to prosper, and one hopes deliver a quality program of education services to people who want to continue their education in the community and to provide a range of services that are sensitive to the specific needs of the people who will access those programs.

Obviously the multicultural services organisation that will continue to exist under the bill has always had a particular focus on English-as-a-second language programs and programs that enable people from multicultural communities to gain skills that enable them to play a more active role in the broader community.

The CAE has had a long history of providing a range of courses, some of which are conducted under the auspices of the minister as formal training courses with recognised qualifications. Other courses are almost hobby courses. In recent times the CAE has had particular demand — I know this is also the case with the University of the Third Age — for technology courses, associated with learning how to use computers. It is terrific to see that organisations like the U3A and the CAE are viewed as accessible service providers. People can pick up skills and expand their opportunities to use technology, enabling them to feel more comfortable about that subject. The legislation will allow both organisations not only to continue providing the courses and educational experiences they have in the past, but to enrich and expand their programs to make them more flexible education service providers.

The opposition is concerned that the directions of the minister provided for under the legislation ought not be directions that inhibit the conduct of those organisations in a way that would represent a loss of some of their independence in fairly crucial areas. It is particularly concerned about a change in one of the provisions, which introduces industrial relations directions as one of the issues upon which the minister might expect to direct action by the boards.

In fact proposed section 49A, relating to the accountability of the governing boards, contains a clause that is similar to section 27 of the TAFE college council model in the Vocational Education and Training Act. Section 27(1)(b) of that act, when discussing accountability and ministerial direction states:

> … any economic and social objectives established from time to time by the government of Victoria …

Although that seems to be a fairly broad, all-encompassing statement, the opposition does not have a problem with it; indeed in the case of the TAFE colleges it would seem to have been a fairly satisfactory procedure.

The opposition is concerned about the bill in the context of ministerial directions in that proposed section 49A(1)(b) states:

> (b) any economic or social objectives or industrial relations policies established from time to time …

Although that may seem to be a fairly minor change when compared to contemporary legislation in the tertiary education sector, the opposition considers it to be a significant amendment because the boards of organisations can be directed to pursue industrial relations policies which might not necessarily be in the best interests of the economic, social or educational objectives of the organisations or the general community.

The opposition regards that as a significant change and seeks an assurance from the government today — as it has sought assurance from a minister in another place — that the introduction of industrial relations as an area of specific direction will not be abused by the government and not be pursued with other pieces of legislation. It is the first time such a provision has been included in legislation and the opposition would be interested in determining whether the government has plans to amend other legislation to introduce similar provisions.

It is not entirely apparent where the decision to change the legislation came from. As the honourable member for Hawthorn has indicated in the other house, the government made no commitment in its election policies to introduce the boards and made no provision in the budget in anticipation of the creation of such boards. However, the opposition does not view the proposed legislation as a backward step; it believes it has potential benefits for both organisations, which is why it does not seek to obstruct its passage in this chamber.

In the course of reviewing the legislation the opposition has undertaken significant consultation with the Australian College of Education Providers, the Victorian TAFE Association, TAFE directors and chief executive officers, and neighbourhood and community houses — which play a significant role in adult learning and, like the University of the Third Age, may in the future also become candidates for institutions. The opposition has discussed the bill with the Council of Adult Education — one of the directly affected organisations — and the Adult, Community and Further Education Board regional director, and has sought briefings from the government to pursue some of the issues surrounding the legislation.

The opposition believes the proposed legislation is an appropriate way to manage organisations which must be responsive to the community. They need some flexibility in how they deliver their courses, but there must also be an accountability to the community, and that is exercised through an accountability to government. The opposition accepts that that is appropriate.

The opposition has some concerns about the financial viability of both organisations as they currently stand. At this point the adult multicultural education services organisation is quite well placed, having won a number of federal government contracts to deliver education services. Ever since its establishment in 1951 the organisation has been very successful. Its budget is around $50 million a year, which is the equivalent of that of a TAFE college, so it is a significant organisation in its own right. However, although it is probably unlikely, the opposition is concerned about what would occur if that organisation were not successful in continuing to receive federal government contracts which are so important to its funding.

Recently the Council of Adult Education has had a fairly difficult period financially. The opposition has some concerns about its substantial investment in a city property which has been part of the history of the organisation and has underpinned much of its fine work in adult education over many years. But in the context of today's education sector with other providers out there in the marketplace, whether such a large investment in a city facility is the best way of the CAE administering its affairs and delivering education services will no doubt exercise the minds of members of the new board.

The CAE has been under some financial pressure for a number of years and the organisation has acknowledged that its investment in the city property is an issue which relates to its ongoing financial viability and ability to deliver quality education services into the future. The CAE has a budget of around $15 million a year, it receives an annual government contribution of $6 million to $7 million, and gains much of the rest of its funding from charges for courses. In 1999 the CAE delivered nearly 1.9 million student hours to Victorians in terms of education and experience. So it has obviously been a significant organisation. It was established in 1947 and has had a rich history in the area of adult education.

The opposition hopes the organisation will benefit very much from the changes. While it has had the benefit of having a governing board of a different structure from that of the multicultural services organisation, nonetheless it has been hampered by some provisions which have made its governance a little unwieldy. The opposition hopes the legislation will free up and enable the CAE to be an even more dynamic organisation in the future.

The opposition has a slight concern about — and I understand the Honourable Cameron Boardman who will follow me in the debate will also raise the issue — the exclusion of members of Parliament from boards of TAFE colleges.

Hon. B. C. Boardman — Hear, hear!

Hon. B. N. ATKINSON — I understand that in some cases some members of Parliament have not necessarily shown the diligence or interest, particularly in TAFE colleges, which might have been expected. But in the past few years most honourable members who have been appointed to the college boards have discharged their responsibilities remarkably well and have shown a great deal of interest in the institutions.

Hon. T. C. Theophanous interjected.

Hon. B. N. ATKINSON — Mr Boardman was very well regarded by the TAFE college with which he was associated. The honourable member for Wantirna in the other place, Kim Wells, and Mr David Davis, who were both representatives on boards of TAFE colleges that

service the electorate of Koonung Province, were also well regarded and active contributors to the two organisations.

The opposition is concerned that the exclusion was made on some premise that members of Parliament were not able to contribute to those organisations. It would not expect that members of Parliament would play a role on the boards of the Adult Multicultural Education Services and the Centre for Adult Education. It would seem to be a contradiction to be excluded from TAFE boards yet be able to sit on the board of a multicultural service or CAE. However, I am not sure that it should be mandated that members of Parliament ought to be excluded. The fact that members of Parliament are excluded implies that they would not make an active contribution, take a great deal of interest or may even politicise their positions, which would seem to be a ridiculous notion.

The Liberal Party has one other major concern that goes to the heart of the membership of the boards. Honourable members will be aware, that proposed section 49B deals with the constitution of the boards. As I mentioned earlier, it establishes a board of between 9 and 15 persons. I have outlined that the representation expected on those boards includes both ministerial appointments and some people elected from the interested parties who have direct interests in the boards and the institutions. I am concerned that section 28(2) of the Vocational Education and Training Act, which is the similar provision in that act, specifies that at least half the members of the board are required to be persons with knowledge or experience in any industry in which training is required in the college.

The legislation does not provide for the same qualification or knowledge. Perhaps the minister and the government have assumed that by appointing representatives from teacher, lecturer or student bodies and active providers as board members they would pick up that knowledge or experience. The opposition is not sure that the provision in this legislation, as distinct from the provision in the Vocational Education and Training Act, loses something for not being specific. In other words, there is no requirement that the minister have due regard for appointing knowledgeable people to the organisation.

The more important point is that there is no term of office stipulated for the appointments. In the old CAE provisions the board members were appointed for three years and the membership of TAFE college boards were established with 12 members, each of which had three-year terms.

As the honourable member for Hawthorn in the other place said during debate in that chamber, the government is silent on that issue. The opposition is concerned about that because it is important that the government ensures that both a body of knowledge and experience is represented on the boards and that its members have set terms of office so there is the opportunity to review the skill set of the board and introduce new people. Although that may be the assumed position of the government, the legislation is poorer for not establishing a set position on the terms of office.

I have indicated the main concerns the opposition has with the bill. It notes the legislation provides for the continuation of employment responsibilities and the transfer of employment responsibilities and liabilities. That is appropriate when establishing boards as body corporates, as they will be under the legislation.

The opposition has no real concerns about the transfer of those responsibilities, but it notes staff are moved to those new organisations and in the same context we note the minister has assumed that industrial relations directions will now be made to those organisations under the legislation. That may cause difficulties. If the organisations are to manage their staff and employ competent employees with the skills and abilities to deliver a range of quality education services they ought to have the opportunity to establish the industrial relations framework and the management framework to manage the work force and be free of direction from the minister.

As I said, the opposition will not oppose the bill but it hopes the government will take into account some of the concerns expressed both here and in another place.

Hon. T. C. THEOPHANOUS (Jika Jika) — I support the bill. The government congratulates the opposition on not opposing the legislation and allowing it to pass. I note that Mr Atkinson said the organisations will have, as a result of the legislation, the opportunity to function more effectively. I welcome those statements. This simple bill has as its key objectives the amendment of the Adult, Community and Further Education Act to provide for the establishment of adult education institutions and their governing boards. It establishes the Adult Multicultural Education Services and the Centre for Adult Education. The bill also will transfer existing staff employed in the Department of Education, Employment and Training to the new bodies with the maintenance of all their entitlements. The employees currently reside with AMES, which is already known by that name.

The government believes it is important for the key educational institutions that play a pivotal role in adult education in Victoria, such as the ones I mentioned, to operate within a framework that makes them efficient, enhances their coordination and assists the further education sector.

During the debate the opposition expressed concern about proposed section 49A. That provision outlines the parameters a government board must consider in performing its functions and exercising its powers. Those parameters include a performance agreement with the government. Mr Atkinson raised some issue with proposed subsection (1)(b), which requires the bodies to be subject to:

> any economic or social objectives or industrial relations policies established from time to time by the Government of Victoria …

Although I can understand the issue raised by Mr Atkinson, he would be aware that these boards would be required to operate within the framework of government industrial relations policy even if it were not stated in the legislation. Under the existing legislation directives can be made by the minister about the industrial relations policies or practices of these bodies. To say that this is a substantially new direction would be playing it up more than necessary.

The organisations will, as they have always had to, operate within the public sector industrial relations framework. Public servants operate these organisations and the organisations will be subject to the public sector industrial relations framework similar to all other public sector bodies. The inclusion of the proposed subsection simply makes it clear that this is the expectation of government.

Hon. B. N. Atkinson — Will it go into other acts?

Hon. T. C. THEOPHANOUS — The house is dealing with a particular act which is about the establishment of new bodies to govern these two organisations. The government has taken the view that it is important for direction to be given in a clear way in the legislation and that is why the provision has been included. However, it is nothing new from the point of view of the practical functioning of those organisations.

Hon. B. C. Boardman — If it is nothing new, why do you need a legislative inclusion?

Hon. T. C. THEOPHANOUS — It is a matter of providing clear objectives and parameters for the functioning of bodies and the exercising of their power. A minister should not have to keep making these things clear in every circumstance when establishing boards. It is something the boards should take into consideration in their normal functioning. They are public sector organisations, they have public servants working for them, and they should operate within the public sector industrial relations framework. I believe they understand that and if they do not it is made clear in the legislation.

Hon. B. N. Atkinson — Isn't that covered by industrial relations legislation? Why is it needed in the act?

Hon. T. C. THEOPHANOUS — The public sector industrial relations framework is more than simply a piece of legislation; it is a set of practices and policies which emanate from arrangements made with the union from time to time. This is simply saying that these boards are subject to those requirements like every other part of the public service.

Hon. B. N. Atkinson — But policies are very different to an established industrial relations regime.

Hon. T. C. THEOPHANOUS — I do not know whether the opposition is suggesting that these boards should not be subject to the public sector industrial relations framework.

Hon. B. N. Atkinson — Not at all, but you just said — —

Hon. T. C. THEOPHANOUS — I am glad Mr Atkinson said 'Not at all' because I agree with him. They should not be and that is why the legislation clarifies that point. I do not believe in practical terms this will make any difference to the functioning of these organisations. In their new form they will continue to do what they have always done — that is, take account of the public sector industrial relations framework established by the government. They have always done that and I expect them to continue to do so.

Hon. B. C. Boardman — They have to under the IR laws.

Hon. T. C. THEOPHANOUS — If members opposite are saying these bodies have to do that anyway, they should not have any problem with this legislation.

Hon. B. C. Boardman — But that makes this subsection a nonsense.

Hon. T. C. THEOPHANOUS — If I was generous and gave the opposition the benefit of the doubt and said the provision was redundant in some way, the

opposition's argument would be that we do not need it in the legislation. I understand that the opposition is saying that we do not need it one way or the other. That is a matter of judgment. All this does is clarify an existing set of practices which we all agree the organisations should be following. I do not see a need to get hot under the collar about that.

Another issue raised was in respect of the right of members of Parliament to sit on TAFE boards.

Hon. B. C. Boardman — Be kind!

Hon. T. C. THEOPHANOUS — I have served my time sitting on university boards.

Hon. Bill Forwood — Careful!

Hon. T. C. THEOPHANOUS — Yes, I have to be careful, Mr Forwood. When as a young member of Parliament I enthusiastically told people that I was on the board of La Trobe University, one member of Parliament asked me if it was a punishment.

Hon. Bill Forwood — In the case of La Trobe, probably yes.

Hon. T. C. THEOPHANOUS — I did not see it as a punishment, but the meetings were not the most exciting thing one could do. Obviously some members of Parliament want to attend those meetings, for some reason which escapes me. These are independent boards and bodies and we do not normally allow members of Parliament to sit on independent boards of other types. Nobody would argue that a member of Parliament should be on some of the boards which have operated from time to time in Victoria.

Hon. Bill Forwood — You have just appointed three members of Parliament to hand over $1 million.

Hon. T. C. THEOPHANOUS — The question of whether members of Parliament should be on boards of organisations is important. Generally speaking, my answer is that they should not be on boards of organisations that deal with the sorts of activities dealt with by the organisations we are talking about.

Hon. Bill Forwood — I am on the board of the University of Melbourne. I have been there since 1993. Should I not be there?

Hon. T. C. THEOPHANOUS — I understand yours is a special case, Mr Forwood. How special you are and how much contribution you make to Melbourne University would be up to the university to tell us. It has not told me, but I am sure your contribution is important, as I am sure the contributions of other honourable members were when they were on those boards.

However, this is about perception, and the government's view is that organisations not only need to be completely impartial and have independent boards but must also be seen to be impartial. That is a reflection of the government's insistence on absolute propriety and the perception of absolute propriety on boards such as those.

Hon. B. C. Boardman interjected.

Hon. T. C. THEOPHANOUS — I certainly do not think the operation of the boards and organisations would be affected negatively as a result of not having members of Parliament on them. I think they will continue to operate effectively. I did not want to go any further than that. One might even argue that they could operate even more effectively; I do not know. However, I certainly do not think that their operations would be affected negatively.

I will make some points about the various organisations. The Council of Adult Education, which is to be renamed the Centre for Adult Education, so it will still be known as the CAE, has provided learning opportunities to Victorians for more than 50 years. I see the centre and its provision of opportunities as an important part of our education system. In a very real sense we now take the view — this would be so on both sides of the house — that education is a lifelong endeavour. It is not something that ends once a person has left school or even university but something that continues, and the upgrading of knowledge is a vital part of that.

The CAE is a very busy place and is located in the heart of the city. It caters for a diverse mix of students, whose ages range from 15 through to 70 or 80 years. In peak times more than 5000 students a week attend the centre. It is open for up to 14 hours a day, seven days a week. It is a place where adults have an opportunity to upgrade their skills and knowledge, and it should be supported.

Honourable members should be aware that about 1.4 million Victorians between the ages of 18 and 64 have completed 13 years of schooling. Thousands of those now want to catch up and better the skills they have already acquired, so the CAE is a very important part of that process.

I will also comment on Adult Multicultural Education Services, better known in the community as AMES but pronounced 'aims', which is an appropriate

pronunciation for an organisation that has a number of aims in providing services for our diverse ethnic communities. The organisation's vision is to set world-class standards of excellence in the design and delivery of education, training and employment services for adults from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds.

AMES provides an impressive range of services in response to the English language needs of newly arrived migrants and migrants who have been here for some time. The courses in AMES centres are delivered flexibly to meet a range of language and vocational needs. Today AMES is the largest provider in Australia of specialist English language services to newly arrived migrants and refugees. It has gone into workplaces and provides workplace-based training and culturally diverse training in a number of enterprises, and it maximises the advantages of culturally diverse work forces both to the state generally and to the state's economic development.

English-as-a-second-language programs are now not seen as part of an assimilation-type framework or policy. That important development has taken place since the mid-1970s, when the previous policy of integration — which was preceded by the policy of assimilation — was changed federally and that change was adopted by a number of states. We now teach English as a second language not in order to assimilate people but in order to provide them with the tools and skills they need to function effectively in our community. In teaching English as a second language we recognise the value of diversity in the community. We do not say to people, 'Look, the only language that is valuable is English', as was the case in what I would term the bad old days.

I can remember that when my parents first arrived in Australia they used to go to English language classes. In fact, they went to English language classes while I went to Greek language classes. At one time there was only one place in Victoria — —

Hon. Bill Forwood — How's your Greek now?

Hon. T. C. THEOPHANOUS — It could be a lot better! But it is indicative of the development of the education system that at the time I arrived in Australia and studied Greek there was only one after-hours Greek school in Melbourne. My father used to take me there on the tram from Albert Park. When I went to learn a little bit of Greek he coincidentally went with my mother to try to learn a little bit of English, so there were attempts even back then to have that happen.

I should say, however, that my son is studying Greek at VCE level and sits his exam in a week or so. It is indicative of the development of language teaching in this state that I can say that his Greek is more developed than mine, although I was born overseas.

Hon. Bill Forwood — It skipped your generation!

Hon. T. C. THEOPHANOUS — Perhaps. I am not saying that is so for everybody, but it is in his case — although I have a bit of a problem with my other two children!

Nevertheless, the services have been available for a very long time. In the past when people taught English as a second language they did so within a framework based on the notion that all migrants needed to assimilate and become Australian. Thankfully we have moved on quite a lot since then. Honourable members will agree that all Australians are the better for it. One need only walk down Bourke Street and see people from diverse cultures and places offering a variety of cuisines to realise some of the benefits — and that is without mentioning the substantial economic benefits for the state.

I support the aims of AMES, so to speak. It is an important organisation for refugees who come to this country and have to learn English to be able to function effectively. As I said, now it does so in the context of valuing their culture, their language and their contribution to a multicultural society.

I have no hesitation in supporting the bill and the ongoing work of the two organisations for which it makes provision.

Hon. P. R. HALL (Gippsland) — I welcome the opportunity to make a few comments on the Training and Further Education Acts (Amendment) Bill. The main function of the bill is to amend the Adult, Community and Further Education Act to provide for the establishment of adult education institutions and their governing boards. It sets up a framework for the establishment of adult education institutions, but in particular it creates two such institutions — that is, the Centre for Adult Education, or CAE, and Adult Multicultural Education Services or AMES. As the bill is framework legislation it is possible that in the future more adult education institutions will be established.

As I said, the bill amends the Adult, Community and Further Education Act. In the course of the debate the significance of that act should not be passed over. It was passed in 1991 and amendments were made to it through the introduction by the previous government of supporting legislation. The then Minister for Tertiary

Education and Training was the Honourable Haddon Storey, and I had the pleasure of working as chairman of his bills committee when that supporting legislation was formulated. The 1991 act represented a major step forward in the history of adult education in Victoria because it recognised for the first time the importance of adult education in the total network of education providers across the state.

Legislation governing preschool, primary, secondary and tertiary education had been passed and, although there had been adult education providers, in 1991 their true position was established by giving them legislation in their own right. That has been a giant step forward for adult education in Victoria.

It is interesting to note that this week the report of the Adult, Community and Further Education Board was tabled in Parliament. I have had a glance through it. Some of the points worth recording about adult education are that in the past 12 months more than 12 million student contact hours were delivered in adult community education — generally called ACE — organisations, including the Council of Adult Education and Adult Multicultural Education Services. There were nearly 500 000 enrolments in adult education courses. They are significant figures.

Before turning to address some of the features of the bill I point out that the bill predominantly addresses just two institutions in the total spectrum of adult education. The Council of Adult Education and Adult Multicultural Education Services are only two such providers. We have an excellent network of adult education providers throughout Victoria. They play an important role, particularly in country areas, where they enable many people to further their skills and knowledge. Both the institutions honourable members are considering today are mainly city based, but we must also recognise the excellent work being performed by a number of ACE centres and neighbourhood houses. Victoria has in excess of 500 adult education providers, and the importance of all of them should be recognised in the total context of adult education.

I refer quickly to a couple of aspects of the bill. On reading the bill for the first time one is struck by the similarities between it and the Vocational Education and Training Act. In many respects the proposed arrangements for the adult education institutions mirror those governing the technical and further education institutes established under the Vocational Education and Training Act.

There are a few minor differences, some of which have already been highlighted in the debate, particularly the amendments to section 49 relating to board membership. Proposed new section 49B provides that the governing board of each institution will consist of between 9 and 15 persons, and the categories of the members of those boards are listed at page 16 of the bill.

I cannot let the opportunity pass without commenting that a member of Parliament must not be appointed or elected to be a member of a governing body. I expressed my outrage at that notion when the chamber debated such amendments to the Vocational Education and Training Act. That act renders all members of Parliament, including those serving on TAFE boards, ineligible to serve on those boards. I simply repeat the point that I see no valid or logical reason why any member of the community should be excluded from participation on an educational board of any sort.

Hon. B. C. Boardman interjected.

Hon. P. R. HALL — Indeed, as the Honourable Cameron Boardman says, we are being discriminated against by occupation, and that certainly should not happen.

I refer to the amendment in proposed section 49F(2)(b), which provides that if a minister wants to dismiss a board of an adult education institute or individual members of that board the minister will be required to table in each house of Parliament within seven sitting days a copy of that notice. The provision includes a few other details as well. I do not think that is such a bad thing; it is a good initiative. Certainly if a minister is taking action of that nature it should be available for members of Parliament to make comments. Therefore I welcome that provision.

By establishing both organisations as institutes in themselves and having them comply with the Financial Management Act greater financial accountability will be imposed on them. That is a good thing. The level of accountability required of TAFE institutes has meant that taxpayers' dollars — the public money funding those institutes — have been spent wisely. The accountability to be imposed on those adult education institutions will prove to be a good initiative. The National Party welcomes the measures that will ensure a greater degree of accountability in respect of the public funding that goes to both organisations.

I shall now make some comments about both organisations. The Centre for Adult Education, which is the new name — I suppose honourable members should still refer to it as the Council of Adult Education until the bill receives royal assent — is a well-known

organisation based predominantly in Flinders Street. Over the years I have had the pleasure of visiting that organisation on several occasions. I note that its web site describes the Council of Adult Education as:

> … the largest provider of adult and community education programs and services in Australia with more than 63 000 enrolments each year in over 5000 courses.

An enormous amount of activity is being undertaken by the Council of Adult Education. I know those 5000 courses are extremely diverse.

The Council of Adult Education was established in 1947, so it has been serving the community for well over 50 years and providing an excellent service predominantly for the people of Melbourne. Some years ago CAE courses were being delivered in regional centres of Victoria through various providers, but that is not so much the case now with the existing excellent adult and community education providers. I am not familiar with too many CAE courses being delivered through local providers any longer, but in the past they certainly did.

I also noted in some of the Council of Adult Education literature that about 75 per cent of the participants are females. That shows that CAEs perform an important role by providing opportunities for women, who are often involved in child care at home, to attend part-time or out-of-hours courses to further their education. It is true of adult education in general that the participation rate for women is much higher than for men.

I confess to not knowing a lot about the Adult Multicultural Education Services, which is part of the public sector. I might say that it is difficult to consult on the bill with people in the public sector. A few barriers have been drawn up. One of the ministers said in the house last night that members should not talk to public servants, and that they should ask questions in Parliament. Indeed, it has been difficult to consult directly with people in Adult Multicultural Education Services because they are part of the public sector, in the Department of Employment, Education and Training.

Once again I had to resort to the Internet to find out a little more about Adult Multicultural Education Services. The web site said it was established in 1951 and has been:

> … at the forefront of English language and literacy training in Australia for people from language backgrounds other than English. A service agency of the department of education in Victoria, AMES is the largest English language institute in Australia.

The web site outlines the different functions that AMES has provided over the years. I notice in the brochure circulated to all members of Parliament recently that AMES is also now providing an important employment service — that is, for people who come from non-English-speaking backgrounds, assisting them to seek employment. I also noted in my reading about AMES that it is involved in that sort of service in New South Wales and Victoria. Its reputation is very good.

Although the bill is rather simple, it is important because it is a further positive step towards giving adult education the esteem it deserves in the community. The Adult, Community and Further Education Act of 1991 was a vital, historic step. The possibility of now creating further adult education institutions is a further step in the right direction.

Other adult education institutions may be developed in the future. With those few comments, the National Party supports the bill.

Hon. S. M. NGUYEN (Melbourne West) — I support the Training and Further Education Acts (Amendment) Bill. The Minister for Post Compulsory Education, Training and Employment in the other house has set about restructuring parts of her portfolio as it relates to further education and training. I congratulate her on that reorganisation. The bill is important for many people who use further education services. The purpose of the bill, as stated in the explanatory memorandum, is:

> … to amend the Adult, Community and Further Education Act 1991 to provide for the establishment of adult education institutions and their governing bodies. The bill establishes Adult Multicultural Education Services (AMES) and the Centre for Adult Education as the first two adult education institutions.
>
> It transfers the staff employed in the Department of Education, Employment and Training in the administration or provision of adult multicultural education services to AMES. AMES is to be governed by a body corporate to be known as the Board of Adult Multicultural Education Services.

I come from a non-English-speaking background and am familiar with AMES.

Hon. C. A. Furletti — It is very good.

Hon. S. M. NGUYEN — Yes, Mr Furletti, it has done a lot of good work to assist many migrants since 1951. A role of the government and the Department of Education, Employment and Training is to assist migrants to learn English and about Australia's culture. It is important that they learn how to tap into the life of Australia. The bill gives me a great opportunity to thank

AMES for its work over many years; I have never had the chance to thank that organisation.

Hon. P. R. Hall — Send them a copy of your speech, Sang.

Hon. S. M. NGUYEN — I think I will.

Hon. B. C. Boardman — And the press release.

Hon. S. M. NGUYEN — Yes, that also. I understand the role of AMES is to educate new migrant groups but also to assist others. I have been invited to AMES meetings and have spoken to principals or directors of the centres. AMES organises multicultural days and Refugee Week. It does a lot of good work with ethnic groups. Because of changing customs, many community groups are now able to access AMES courses, as has happened with other colleges.

AMES is now attempting to attract overseas students and is marketing its facilities and services overseas. It depends not only on government funding but on raising money by attracting overseas students. AMES has introduced competitive study fees particularly for Asians. AMES is a respectable organisation and has many students. It will attract more overseas students because of the new facilities it intends to build.

For many years AMES has helped students not only with their English studies but with how to settle into a new country. Many things can be learnt from teachers, who are generally good communicators. They help students to be heard in their communities and encourage them to speak English. They try to sort out the many cultural difficulties faced by new migrants when they are learning how to speak English.

AMES has offices throughout Victoria. In my electorate an office is located in Footscray. I have seen many people study there, including my auntie, brothers, sisters and cousins. They attended Footscray AMES when they arrived in Australia and found its services most useful.

The policy of the commonwealth government is to allow newly arrived migrants to undertake about 500 hours of study. They can attend AMES and later move on to further study at tertiary and further education (TAFE) or agriculture colleges.

Much work has been done in assisting the migrant community. It is also next to the migrant centre in Footscray, which shows how multicultural it is.

The Council of Adult Education has its building in Flinders Street. When I was a tertiary student, together with other Vietnamese student groups, we organised courses for the newly arrived Vietnamese who had difficulty in coping with studies. We volunteered to assist the years 11 and 12 students. In the beginning we could not find a venue so we went to the CAE and asked for the use of a room. The staff were helpful and gave us a hall and did not charge a fee. We taught new students, but over time the numbers increased from about 20 to more than 200 and we had to book three or four rooms. After two years many volunteers had started families and could not continue. The new committee organised places in Richmond and Footscray to make it more accessible for those people to attend.

I know the CAE well because I have had much to do with the way it assists people. Many people wish to take up study but do not want to do it in a formal sense, such as through TAFE or university courses. The CAE is an alternative for people who want to build their skills in writing, literature, mathematics and so on. The CAE has taught people life skills, such as sewing, knitting, painting, and cooking. The CAE was a friendly place. It also organised courses in foreign languages. I recall one Australian who said that he had studied Vietnamese at the CAE. One does not have to go to a university to study Vietnamese or other languages.

The institution has induction courses for people who are thinking about taking on further study and, if they wish, they can undertake formal courses. I know many who have not finished their high school studies but have gone on to further studies. The CAE is one institution that can help them do that.

It is pleasing to see students participating on education boards because they can speak on behalf of their classmates, learn how to make decisions, work with adults as well as take on responsibility. They also have a chance to be on government bodies and be part of the decision making of this country. They will be better equipped as adults from gaining that experience. They also learn how to manage schools, deal with students, manage school funds, ensure that students have access to the library and so on. They also take part in meeting the changing requirements of students.

The bill transfers the staff employed in the Department of Education, Employment and Training to AMES. It ensures that they do not miss out on their current entitlements when their employment is changed, which is important to staff because it concerns their wages and conditions.

It is certainly sensible to transfer staff rather than employing a whole new work force, and it makes sense for the staff to be part of the change. It would not be possible to do what is planned without the support of the staff, and they will perform more effectively in teaching students if they are satisfied with the arrangements. Staff members are unfairly put under stress if they feel they are not part of the team and are told only what they have to be told rather than being part of the process. I do not think they would be happy to walk into their place of employment if they were not part of that process.

Teachers always play an important role in any educational institution. I have been to many educational institutions, and I am sure that having contented staff is the best way to improve the standard of any institution. The AMES staff members are currently funded by a commonwealth department so they are public servants. They will no longer be employees of the Crown, but their other terms and conditions will remain unchanged. CAE staff members are not part of a formal institution. The two groups have to work in together.

On the issue of capital ownership, the property of the CAE will be transferred to the new board. However, if the CAE receives future capital grants for the purchase of land that property will be under the charge of the minister.

The minister has worked closely with various organisations relating to this matter, including the Adult, Community and Further Education Board, AMES management and staff, the board of the CAE and the unions. All those groups had been part of the review team. The department was keen to seek their opinions and ensure they understood what was intended.

The bill will, after many years, through better courses give more opportunities to the students who attend classes. I am sure the students on the board will consult with their classmates more frequently to find out how the teachers perform and how the day-to-day business of the institutions is being run.

I would like to see the department run training courses to teach student representatives how to effectively represent their classmates on the new boards. A lot of them do not have the experience the staff have, but with a training course they could be helped to perform better because they would know how the board works, understand the issues and work as part of a team. We should assist them to be effective on the board and make the system work. As they will themselves be students at the institutions I am sure they will learn fast. After a number of months they will be able to effectively represent other students on the board. It will give them a great opportunity to be leaders.

The bill is one step forward. It is a chance to recognise the work of the two institutions — the Council of Adult Education and Adult Multicultural Education Services — in serving our Victorian community over many years. It also recognises the important role of the staff of the two institutions. When the bill becomes law the department and staff will have a great role in working under this system.

I congratulate the minister and her staff members, who have done a lot of hard work to ensure that everyone involved has been consulted. I commend the bill to the house.

Hon. B. C. BOARDMAN (Chelsea) — I welcome the opportunity to speak on the Training and Further Education Acts (Amendment) Bill. Most of the principles contained in the legislation are relatively sound and are administrative in their execution. Any bill introduced into the chamber that is designed to improve the quality and accessibility of educational services in Victoria should be welcomed and supported.

I am disappointed that the bill reflects the different philosophical and ideological platforms for educational management policy in Victoria of the major political parties. The government of the day is highly interventionist and quite authoritarian and dictatorial in the way it deals with education policies. That is in complete contrast to the previous government, which believed in a policy that was demonstrably successful in its application and execution of self-governance whereby educational facilities, through their boards, management and the participation and involvement of communities, were able to design a product that was not only responsive to the needs of individuals and the community, but also attractive and competitive in the marketplace.

Even Mr Nguyen in his contribution in support of the bill touched on the notion of competitiveness in educational facilities when he referred to the number of overseas students who are currently studying in Victoria. It is a well-known fact that educational institutions of all standards and grades, whether they be secondary schools, TAFE colleges, universities or adult education facilities such as this bill proposes, recognise the economic benefits of being in a competitive environment and of attracting students from diverse backgrounds. It enables the institutions to increase the revenue available to further expand facilities and

programs and to make benchmarks in service delivery so that the product provided is of a high class.

As one who is currently participating in a master's degree course being offered by a private institution I am a great supporter of educational facilities being self-managed and being able to design their programs with autonomy and without government interference so that the product they are offering and subsequently delivering to their clients is of a first-class nature.

I particularly refer to proposed section 49A of the bill, which makes a directive, if you like, about the accountabilities of governing boards. Section 49A(1)(b) refers to the governing board performing its functions and exercising its powers subject to:

> (b) any economic or social objectives or industrial relations policies established from time to time by the government of Victoria …

It seems slightly over the top.

In his contribution Mr Theophanous gave what I would consider a lukewarm explanation of the proposed section. He rightly acknowledged that the opposition has an element of concern over the proposed section, but he went to minimal lengths — his explanation was not by any stretch of the imagination in detail — to differentiate between legislative provisions for the administration of the act versus policy directions. As all honourable members know, a policy is quite different from a legislative provision.

Mr Theophanous talked about industrial relations policy. It seems bizarre to include that in the bill because any statutory or private body in Victoria is subject to the relative and responsive industrial relations legislation to which it must adhere. To say that the boards proposed to be established under the bill now have to take notice of industrial relations policy seems contradictory, because in a legislative sense that compulsion already exists.

In a policy sense, although the government may have a policy within the Fair Trading Act, a policy is by no means a legislative imperative to institutions. By a clear interpretation of the section the situation could exist where adult education councils may have to have regard to the government's current industrial relations policy. Many commentators from industry associations, private enterprise and employer groups have noted what devastating consequences the bill would have, and I am sure the facilities would be affected.

The economic and social objectives of the government concern me. I have already referred to Mr Nguyen and his comments on the benefits of competition in educational facilities. If a government policy of the day goes against the trends of competition and the government believes there should be a level playing field in service delivery for educational facilities, it may have an adverse affect on the viability of those individual institutions. I suggest an element of caution should be applied when interpreting proposed section 49A(1)(a). The explanation of the Parliamentary Secretary for Education, Employment and Training was lukewarm. His comments lacked substance and did not appease the concern of opposition members about how the provision would be administered.

Proposed section 49B refers to the board membership and understandably clarifies who and who cannot be a member of the board. The troublesome inclusion that has been seen once before in legislation introduced in this chamber provides that a member of Parliament may not be elected or appointed to one of the new proposed boards. Earlier this year I joined my colleague Mr Peter Hall in making a contribution to the debate on the Vocational Education and Training (Council Membership) Bill about the exclusion of members of Parliament from serving on TAFE boards.

At the time I was a member of the Chisholm Institute of TAFE council and had been in that position for a relatively short time; I had completed only eight months of my three-year appointment. I was just getting to the stage where my contribution was becoming, as the chairman of the council, valuable. The very first piece of legislation the Minister for Post Compulsory Education, Training and Employment introduced into Parliament was a bill to sack me and other members of Parliament who served on TAFE councils, without any real explanation or justification for doing so other than she had an executive power, as the minister has an executive power under this bill. Proposed section 49C(3) states:

> The Minister may remove a member appointed by the Minister under section 49B(1)(a) from office at any time.

As a ministerial appointee to the Chisholm institute I could have been removed at any time by the minister under the legislative provisions available to her at the time. But instead the bizarre and irresponsible process was gone through of introducing legislation to achieve what was clearly a political outcome.

I expressed my outrage to the house, and after receiving a letter from the Minister for Post Compulsory Education, Training and Employment thanking me for my contribution to the Chisholm institute I decided to reply to the minister. In my response I pointed out that the reserve and executive power was fully available to

the minister and asked her to justify her actions and give me a detailed description of why the legislation was necessary and why my role was to be taken away under those circumstances. The response I received from the minister was identical to the first communication. The letter thanked me for my contribution and said that I should not interpret it as a personal or political slur.

It seems that the government has become fixated with the notion of members of Parliament serving on the boards of either educational agencies or statutory bodies. Mr Theophanous said the boards of those institutions would not be affected by having members of Parliament excluded from them. The institutions have close links to their communities and are involved in developing services and policies that benefit their communities. Members of Parliament are at the forefront of community involvement and are best qualified to represent those facilities in a board role.

The provision specifically discriminates against individuals because of their occupation. The paradox is that there is no similar exclusion of members of Parliament serving the institutions in an advisory capacity. The Chisholm Institute of TAFE has an advisory board that is at present considering the future of the Bonbeach campus of the institute. The honourable member for Chelsea in the other place serves as a member of that advisory board, which has been given the task of evaluating the future of the Bonbeach campus of the institute, which is presently situated in the honourable member's electorate. The honourable member is excluded from sitting on the board of the Chisholm Institute, but as the local member, she may or may not achieve a political outcome in her capacity as a member of the advisory body. That is contradictory and defies logic. It goes against the premise of the legislation excluding members of Parliament from serving on the boards of management of educational institutions.

I note there is no restriction on former members of Parliament serving on boards of educational institutions. There is also no restriction on the minister appointing people who are either members of a political party or have close links to the government. The Parliamentary Secretary for Education, Employment and Training, Mr Theophanous, will undoubtedly play a role in the appointment of members to the boards of the institutions. No doubt he will seek to appoint people who have close political links to his faction. I hope that will not be the case and that the minister will appoint people who have the appropriate qualifications and skills, but history tells us that does not always happen.

Proposed section 49F(2)(b) is a unique provision, which states that the minister must:

> cause to be tabled in each house of Parliament within 7 sitting days of the house after the notice is given to the governing board —
>
> (i) a copy of the notice; and
>
> (ii) a report of the circumstances leading to the action; and
>
> (iii) a copy of any written submission made by the governing board.

I welcome that provision. I anticipate that after Mr Theophanous in his capacity as the parliamentary secretary has appointed to the board of one of the institutions someone who is connected to his faction and who then jumps ship and joins another faction or seeks — —

Hon. M. A. Birrell — There are no factions left.

Hon. B. C. BOARDMAN — That is true. I am looking forward to the minister's explanation when tabling his report to Parliament after having removed Mr Theophanous's factional appointment from the board of one of these institutions.

It is a welcome but unique provision, and it will provide an opportunity for the opposition to scrutinise some of the appointments. Unlike the situation with appointments to TAFE councils, the bill has no provision setting the tenure of board members. The opposition knows how rapidly Mr Theophanous changes his factions, so we could see a number of appointments to the boards of management of the institutions as the honourable member falls out with his factional colleagues and his appointments have to be dismissed and new members appointed.

The Liberal Party is also concerned that there is no budget allocation for administration. Proposed section 49B states that the board shall comprise no fewer than 9 and no more than 15 members. I suspect the members of the board will be appointed in a voluntary capacity because the board has the right to appoint staff, but no identifiable budget provision has been made as yet. I welcome the explanation from the minister on that provision.

The opposition welcomes the fact that the government is creating an additional education service that will provide benefits for the community, particularly for the disadvantaged and people who may not have access to educational services. Opposition members have raised valid concerns about some provisions in the bill that require a response from the minister, although I do not think that will occur.

In conclusion I reiterate my opening remark: the provision of education in Victoria is first class and has the potential to improve even further. The services should not be hamstrung by authoritarian or dictatorial ministerial control and should have a degree of independence. The philosophical differences on education between the main political parties are obvious. This is another example that confirms some of those differences.

Hon. D. McL. DAVIS (East Yarra) — In contributing to the debate on the Training and Further Education Acts (Amendment) Bill I record that the opposition does not oppose the bill. I shall make some general comments about the adult education sector before moving to the specifics of the bill. Honourable members will be familiar with the sector and the variations and varieties in it. It includes neighbourhood houses and community centres as well as larger providers, some of which are the subject of the bill.

I note the comments made by the Honourable Bruce Atkinson about the importance of the sector in providing a focus for lifelong learning, a focus that assists a number of groups of people. The Honourable Peter Hall mentioned the high participation rate of women and how this sector provides opportunities or pathways for women at home or returning to the work force who want to reskill. The sector has a significant role in providing those opportunities and pathways, which are important in ensuring people are able to make a wider contribution to society.

It is important to place on the record that in 1991 the Adult, Community and Further Education Act established regional councils that comprised some ministerial appointments, members of the community and other interested representatives to ensure a proper regional focus and a local and community focus. They were to represent the local community and enable appropriate decisions to be made about the distribution of funding to community and neighbourhood houses and other community centres and to foster adult education at the local level. That move was successful.

Honourable members will be aware of the history of many of the community centres and neighbourhood houses going back to the 1980s and early 1990s. Many arose with government assistance but just as many, probably more, arose without any government assistance and in some cases in the face of opposition from government and other local interests.

The former Labor government introduced the principal act and established a useful and productive mechanism through the regional councils. Before I came to Parliament I was fortunate enough to serve on the western regional council of the Adult, Community and Further Education Board and I later acted as chair of the central-western regional council. That taught me a lot about the diversity of the sector. The Honourable Bruce Atkinson made a number of important points about that diversity — they range from the universities of the third age, which have slowly come into the system over half a decade, to the smaller providers, who have great difficulty making ends meet and who fundraise to run their local courses and need every bit of financial and other assistance they can obtain.

One of the strengths of the system is that regional councils can often provide far more than financial assistance. They can often provide assistance in the form of coordination or of teaching people and committees of management about the links they need and provide them with a number of models showing how to conduct their centres, how to build strength in their sector and how to reach out into their communities. Of course, regional councils are not experts and centres regularly teach them about how programs can be best conducted.

Another strength of the sector is its innovation and development. It is important that legislation such as this preserve the innovation and experimentation we see in the courses and educational programs provided across the adult, community and further education (ACFE) sector. I think the bill seeks to do that. That diversity and innovation often provides a lead for programs that are later adopted more widely throughout the adult education sector, whether it be in the TAFE sector or in other parts of our education system.

The caveat I have is that there is a possibility that over time the mechanism set up by the bill to move a larger provider out of the standard system and away from a regional council will lead to some discoordination and the distancing of the slightly larger institutions from the activities in their regions despite their remaining under the control of the ACFE board. One of the main aims of the 1991 act was to ensure regional coordination and a regional focus without imposing a heavy-handed or bureaucratic administrative apparatus. The aim was to maintain a light level of coordination that would not crush the diversity or innovation of a region. With that caveat, I make the point that we do not oppose the bill.

Much has been said in the debate about the Council of Adult Education (CAE), which will become the Centre for Adult Education, and the migrant education centres, which will now be known as Adult Multicultural Education Services (AMES). The Honourables Peter Hall and Bruce Atkinson have canvassed the history of

those organisations, and I do not intend to revisit that. However, I want to pay tribute to both organisations. AMES has played a vital role in assisting new arrivals to Australia to integrate, to ensure that their skills are particularised and made relevant to the Australian workplace and to assist with other facets of their integration into Australian society and life. AMES has made a valuable contribution to the policy of multiculturalism in Australia and Victoria. It has done that in a way that has provided the right educational framework for many newer arrivals to Victoria.

The CAE has a slightly longer history but has provided a great deal of innovation and experimentation over the years. It has seen enormous development of adult education for all age groups. I spoke before about lifelong learning and the concept of pathways, and the CAE has played a valuable role in that. It is important. The central-western regional council I chaired contained the region's CAE, although it was a separate institution that received funding direct from the ACFE board. From time to time there was a healthy tension between the regional council and the CAE. I do not say that in a negative way but to make the point that having a large provider in a region will always create questions and coordination difficulties from time to time.

As this legislation is implemented there is a possibility that coordination will become an issue, particularly if newer stand-alone providers are created in the way allowed by the bill. The two large and important institutions with which the bill deals, AMES and CAE, are in many ways good models for other providers. I can well see the day when other providers will set up or expand their adult education courses in a way that may make them suitable for designation under the provisions of this bill, which would allow them to step out of the regional council system. Notwithstanding the importance of coordination, I am not necessarily opposed to that, but I think there are points to watch.

There are also points to watch as institutions become larger. As I said, one of the strengths of the adult education sector has been its diversity and experimentation. As institutions become larger and more bureaucratic they can lose some of that spontaneity and willingness to experiment. I would not want to see the adult education centres designated under this act become more like TAFE institutions in the sense that TAFE institutions have their own rigidity, focus and views. The aim of the implementation of the bill should be to maintain the uniqueness of the community and adult education sector, not to create a duplicate of the existing TAFE-type arrangement. That is important for the health and diversity of the sector and from a competitive point of view.

I know as a regional councillor that when we looked at funding applications we saw a number from TAFE institutions and they were invariably for similar courses. The courses conducted in TAFE institutions are many times more expensive and we often noticed that there was less innovation in them. The key is that the value for the community expenditure is great through the small providers because they are very efficient, they raise much of their own funding and they work with a great deal of volunteer assistance. These are important ways of allowing the community to get the maximum benefit for the money it spends in this important area.

I hope the government is committed to the promise it made before the last election when it said it would ensure local and community representation on boards. A number of board appointments made by the government in recent times have concerned me. I make the point that in this sector in particular it is vital that proper community representation be reflected on both regional councils and the boards of the CAE and AMES.

That regional representation and that proper community involvement are crucial aspects of the sector. It is therefore important that the diversity of the community be reflected on regional councils to ensure that people from wide educational, political and community backgrounds are appointed to them in sufficient quantity. The last thing needed is to appoint a series of people of identical views to regional councils. That will not strengthen the diversity of the sector in any way whatsoever.

I shall pick up on a point made by the Honourable Cameron Boardman about industrial relations issues. Industrial relations issues present the greatest difficulties to many of the smaller providers in the sector. Regional councils devote a good deal of their time to providing assistance, examples and education to the committees of management of many of the smaller providers during the course of their year on the presentation of financial statements and so forth. As centres grow and employ more teaching and coordination staff, important industrial relations issues arise that need to be dealt with sensitively.

However, I express my concern and endorse some of the comments made by the Honourable Cameron Boardman about the possibility of the government's new industrial relations changes having an untoward and unhelpful effect on the sector. It might find that it is bound up rigidly by more industrial relations regulations and that will make the sector less productive, less innovative and more costly when

delivering very important services to local communities.

I would not be surprised to see the costs of employing teaching and non-teaching staff in the sector increase considerably in the period following the introduction of the government's proposed industrial relations system. If that occurred it would be a great tragedy, and members of this house will certainly be looking closely at the sector to ensure that impact does not occur.

It is important to place on record a number of comments about industrial relations, in particular that the AMES and CAE are also likely to be impacted upon by the industrial relations changes. There is every reason for the government to be cautious in implementing its proposed changes. Honourable members on this side of the house want to ensure that those changes do not impact on either the CAE, the AMES or the smaller providers across the state. In particular it would strike rural and regional providers very hard because their resources are fewer as in many cases are the financial resources of the communities involved. Because the ability of communities to make up for the impact of industrial relations would be less, the impact would be greater.

In that context I reiterate that the coalition does not oppose the bill. It looks with regard and enthusiasm on the adult education sector and in particular the regional structure that has been so successful in providing the best model of adult education.

In passing, I mention what is now a famous Senate committee report entitled *Come in Cinderella* which examined the adult education sector across Australia. The report highlighted the Victorian system, and stated that it was the strongest adult community in the further education sector in Australia. It stated that the Victorian system was a model for other states because it delivered diversity and the advantages that were sought for pathways and lifelong learning that were not delivered in many other states.

The report is a reflection of the strong community involvement of neighbourhood houses — I note the involvement of the Hamer government in particular in some of the earliest neighbourhood houses. It highlighted Victoria's strength of links with the community — the local fundraising, the pathways created and the opportunity for so many people, particularly women, to make a contribution and to move back into employment or simply to broaden their education.

As the bill is implemented with the caveats I have made I make the point to the minister that it is important to keep in mind that Victoria has something in adult education that is precious and ought not be disturbed or damaged in any way.

I also make the point that the opposition will be closely watching to ensure that the measure is implemented responsibly and constructively so that Victoria's strengths are not in any way infringed upon.

Hon. E. J. POWELL (North Eastern) — I am pleased to put on record that the National Party will support the Training and Further Education Acts (Amendment) Bill. I would also like to record my very strong support for adult education in Victoria. It does a wonderful job and it is going from strength to strength. The National Party is pleased to support any bill that strengthens the adult education profile.

The main purpose of the bill is to amend the Adult and Further Education Act to provide for the establishment of adult education institutions and their governing bodies. The bill establishes the Adult Multicultural Education Services, or AMES as we know it, and the Centre for Adult Education, or CAE, as the first two adult education systems in Victoria. They are the two major public institutions in Victoria whose functions relate primarily to the adult education sector.

The bill also transfers the staff employed in the Department of Education, Employment and Training who are involved with the administration or provision of adult multicultural education services to AMES, which is to be governed by a body corporate to be known as the Board of Adult Multicultural Education Services. Similarly, with the establishment of the Centre for Adult Education, the staff, properties and liabilities of the Council of Adult Education will be transferred to the new centre, which will be governed by a body corporate to be known as the Board of the Centre for Adult Education.

As I said, the bill recognises the importance of continuing education for mature aged students. It is important to understand that learning does not cease when people finish their secondary or tertiary education, and those who wish to be healthy and active have to ensure that they have access to lifelong learning.

As a member of an all-party committee I took part in an inquiry into planning for positive ageing. The committee received submissions from the Council of Adult Education and also from the University of the Third Age (U3A), about which I will speak later. The

committee heard a great deal of evidence and received a number of submissions about substantially more women to participate in adult education than men, a subject to which the Honourable Peter Hall also referred. The committee recommended that more males be encouraged to participate in further education by having providers design courses that are more specific to males.

More women participate mainly because they find adult education a less formal way of upgrading their skills, and for those with small families it becomes possible to continue learning and keep their brains active. Older people prefer to be in adult education centres more than TAFE or tertiary institutions because they like the less formal atmosphere. They also need more flexible hours and courses. They are not chasing the more formal qualifications.

After completing their schooling and having their families, women are considering doing courses of particular interest to them — it might be a new language, Australian history, calligraphy, geography or whatever. Currently one of the most popular areas of learning would be computer courses in which people can gain or upgrade their skills. That is important for older people because, with the advent of the computer age since their time at school, many have not been able to access the skills they need and they recognise the generation gap. Many older people are saying they are taking adult education courses to learn about computers mainly for self-interest but also, and more importantly, to be able to talk to their grandchildren. Now they are using email to keep in touch with their families and finding new friends on the chat lines. The inquiry found that for a number of older people lifelong learning is very important.

The Council of Adult Education has been going for a long time, having been established by legislation in 1947 to pursue the development of adult education. It is the largest provider of adult and community education programs and services in Australia. There are some 45 adult education providers in north-eastern Victoria, the area that the Honourable Bill Baxter and I represent. The programs are offered in many different locations, including community education centres, neighbourhood houses and some larger centres. Neighbourhood houses are more community based and people can walk to them. Many more women are now able to access those centres to gain training in new skills.

In his speech the Honourable Bruce Atkinson referred to the importance of the University of the Third Age and the expansion in the numbers of people attending courses offered by U3As. The people from U3As who spoke to the parliamentary committee were strongly supportive of lifelong learning and said that we need to keep people in the third age longer. I asked them what 'third age' in University of the Third Age means. I will put their response on the record because it is important to understand the different stages of life as they describe them. The first age is the age of dependency and learning; the second is the age of contributing and working; the third is the age of retirement and self-sufficiency; and the fourth is the age of dependency and also ill health.

It is important that we keep more people in the third age as long as possible. Part of that is continuing to learn so that people are stimulated and kept active. It is important to put our money into providing programs for people to continue to be active by acquiring different skills and learning just for the sake of it. They should be able to do so in an informal environment with their peers and where they can make new friends and establish new networks. I acknowledge that the government has put money into U3As. However, more support and financial assistance should be provided for them, particularly in country Victoria, where they are fairly fragmented, with people meeting in houses and other places. It is important that they have a presence in a town so that the older people who might think about going to adult learning programs can do so in a less restrictive manner and a more comfortable atmosphere. We need to consider how we can support U3As, particularly with accommodation in country Victoria.

One of the adult education institutions established by the bill is Adult Multicultural Education Services, which was set up in 1951 and given responsibility for migrant education. AMES is now Australia's largest specialist provider of language programs. It also provides support for job seekers from diverse language backgrounds. AMES provides a language service program at the Shepparton campus of the Goulburn Ovens Institute of TAFE, which acts as the coordinator of language classes for other centres across the region. I congratulate the people at the Goulburn Ovens institute who do that work and those at AMES who provide those services.

I put on record some of the towns, areas and specific locations in a large region where the Goulburn Ovens institute is able to provide language classes. They include Ballarat, Bendigo, Albury-Wodonga, Warrnambool, Wangaratta, Benalla, central Gippsland, Mildura, Sale, Cobram, Kyabram, and in Shepparton the South Shepparton Community House, the Guthrie Street Child-care Centre and the Goulburn Ovens TAFE. People who are unable to attend classes can take courses by home tutor or distance learning. That facility

is particularly good for people who have small children or cannot get out for other reasons, including disabilities. Child care is also available for people who are eligible for AMES classes.

In the Goulburn Valley there are many Arabic-speaking refugees, to whom I will refer later. Eligibility for AMES classes is determined by the visa subclass criteria. Without going into too much technical detail, I point out that people who hold what are known as 866 visas are eligible for 510 hours of classes. In Shepparton and its regional areas, there is a large number of Arabic-speaking students as well as people of other nationalities accessing the AMES resources.

Currently the TAFE college at Shepparton has 70 enrolments of people who hold what are known as 785, or temporary protection, visas. Those 70 men and women are not eligible for AMES classes but are enrolled under other funding. It is important to note that although they are not eligible the TAFE college and the Shepparton ethnic council have sought funding so that those people can take English lessons. It is important that they be able to speak our language when they are trying to get jobs or assimilate successfully and positively in the community. AMES classes are provided also to 30 women who are bussed to venues throughout Shepparton and about 20 men who are also eligible.

The total number of people who are provided with AMES services throughout the year could be around 200. The reason why the exact figure is not known is that the refugees are a relatively mobile population because of settlement issues. Many people enter and exit courses throughout the year. Some people who come to the Goulburn Valley like the look of the area and stay. Some have many friends in the area and would like to settle there, but they have to move on because they cannot get jobs. They find that it is important for them to work and then they move on to perhaps bigger areas. Honourable members wish them all the best as they do so.

AMES is also available to students over a three-year period, but it can be extended to five years. In those instances, it is more frequently undertaken by females. Many of the refugees coming in have small children and it is difficult in those first three years for them to be able to access English language classes. Their priorities are to stay with their children and learn English later.

Refugees under the age of 16 arriving in Australia are not eligible for AMES as they are required to attend secondary school. That is often inappropriate for their needs. Those students are sometimes referred to TAFE for assistance, but it is often difficult to place them where they can be best served. It would seem that older children sometimes find it hard to fit in. Some of the reasons given to me by the children is that although they are under 16 years of age, many of them have come from very traumatic situations in countries that are going through wars. Some of them have not been to school for about two years, but they are expected to come into the Australian system and become students when they have been out of the school system for a long time. They also have seen many things in their lives that make them a little more vulnerable and susceptible to violence perhaps in some school situations. Some of those issues are being looked at.

For the reasons I outlined earlier, it is important that this service is available in country Victoria, which has a large multicultural population. The Shepparton and district ethnic council and Goulburn Ovens TAFE do a wonderful job.

The house heard the Honourable Sang Nguyen speaking of his experiences during his speech. It is important that those working with people from non-English-speaking backgrounds help them and treat them with compassion. The people who provide those services have a strong understanding of the need for people to be more sympathetic and helpful to people coming to a new country who have to learn new cultures, a new way of life and a new language. It is important that the AMES institute, which understands those sorts of issues, is also in country Victoria. I commend them for that.

There are 300 refugee families from Iraq in the Goulburn Valley, and that equates to about 2500 people. Cobram has another 50 families. In the past six weeks in the Goulburn Valley alone, 110 Iraqi refugees have arrived unannounced. Those people obviously need assistance with accommodation and also language classes. Because of the AMES and the Goulburn–Ovens TAFE, they are able to access those language classes and learn English. That allows them to look for work, to go to work and to actually speak to other people in the community. That is needed not only to obtain employment, but to help them settle positively into a community that perhaps is a bit alien and frightening to them.

The bill also establishes the boards of the two new institutes. They will consist of between 9 and 15 members. The Governor in Council will fix the numbers in each case. The institutes will be set up in a similar fashion to the TAFE boards in that at least half will be appointed by the minister. One will be a staff member of the institution, elected by staff; one will be a

student at the institution, elected by the students; one will be the director; and the remainder will be coopted by the board on the basis of relevant knowledge or skills. The boards will be subject to the Financial Management Act 1994 and will be required to report each year to the Parliament. The boards must also insure through the Victorian Managed Insurance Authority.

The bill also repeals the Employment Agents Act 1983. That act was passed about 17 years ago to establish a licensing arrangement for a wide range of employment agents. Because the act was never proclaimed and has therefore never been in operation, it is now considered to be redundant. That is one of the provisions in the bill.

Although the bill is not large, it raises the profile of adult education in Victoria. For that reason, the National Party supports it and wishes it a speedy passage through the Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

Read second time.

Third reading

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — By leave, I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

I thank the Honourables Bruce Atkinson, Theo Theophanous, Peter Hall, Sang Nguyen, Cameron Boardman, David Davis and Jeanette Powell for their contributions.

Motion agreed to.

Read third time.

Remaining stages

Passed remaining stages.

WATER INDUSTRY (AMENDMENT) BILL

Second reading

Debate resumed from 25 October; motion of Hon. C. C. BROAD (Minister for Energy and Resources).

Hon. ANDREA COOTE (Monash) — As a former member of the Melbourne Parks and Waterways (MPW) board, an interim board member of Parks Victoria and an inaugural member of the Parks Victoria board I speak with some knowledge about the Water Industry (Amendment) Bill. Although I do not oppose the bill, I will refer to a number of relevant matters associated with Victoria's parks. The main purpose of the bill is to abolish Melbourne Parks and Waterways and make adjustments to some of the administrative arrangements for park management.

I remind the house what the then Minister for Conservation and Land Management in the Kennett government, the Honourable Marie Tehan, said on 21 April 1998 in her second-reading speech on the Parks Victoria Bill in the other place:

> The bill will establish Parks Victoria as a public authority. In doing so it will create a world-class organisation able to deliver park management services for the state's parks, reserves and open space and other related management functions. A focus on sound environmental management will be a feature of Parks Victoria's role as a leading park management agency while providing compatible services for recreation and tourism.

Parks Victoria has met that charter extremely well and is seen among park services throughout the world as following world best practice.

It is somewhat perplexing to have read at this time last year in the ALP's policy on parks entitled 'Greener cities' that the present Minister for Environment and Conservation in the other place intended to revamp Parks Victoria into what would have been known as Melbourne Parks and Bays Service, which would have operated under its own legislation. Pressure has been brought to bear on the minister, including pressure from the Victorian National Parks Association. At page 5 of its 1999–2000 annual report the National Parks Advisory Council discloses that one of the report's recommendations is to:

> … retain Parks Victoria as a brand name as this has been very effectively marketed and represents a considerable investment.

It is to the minister's credit that she kept Parks Victoria as a single entity. I am pleased that under its new managerial role Parks Victoria will continue to do well.

The transition from MPW to Parks Victoria created an enormous number of staff problems that needed to be sorted out. Many issues had to be resolved. I pay tribute to both the former chief executive officer of MPW, Jeff Floyd, and the present chief executive of Parks Victoria and former director of the National Parks Service in the Department of Natural Resources and Environment, Mark Stone, for the smooth way they organised the amalgamation. They took into account the problems staff had to contend with, and most people would agree that the transition was well handled. Parks Victoria staff were happy about the integration.

I refer the house to Jeff Floyd's 1997 executive report, in which he states:

> The 1996–97 financial year has been a significant year for those involved in park management at the state level. Parks Victoria was established on 12 December 1996 to manage a significant part of the state's national, state and regional environmental, recreational and tourism assets. Together, these assets total nearly 4 million hectares, or 16 per cent of the area of Victoria, and attract some 25 million visits a year.

The service is to be congratulated. He further states:

> I am confident that Parks Victoria will rise to this challenge and will provide a model for all park management agencies for the future.

The Kennett government set Parks Victoria well and truly in place, and the process is continuing.

In May 1998 the then shadow minister, the present Minister for Environment and Conservation in the other place, said extraordinary things about what the then Parks Victoria Bill would do. I refer to her criticism of the proposed new service, as recorded in *Hansard*:

> It is a venue-based attraction with a recreation-based philosophy, rather than a philosophy of conserving Victoria's natural environment … The philosophy will turn Victoria's national parks into theme parks rather than maintaining them as areas of conservation of environmental treasures.

I dispute that, although the minister may have changed her mind now.

At the time the minister was concerned about managing fires in Victoria's parks. I refer to the 1997–98 Parks Victoria annual report, which states:

> Fighting the fires
>
> Four hundred and ninety-four trained Parks Victoria staff supported 2000 Department of Natural Resources and Environment staff to contain fires burning in three parks — Alpine National Park, Murray–Sunset National Park and Croajingolong National Park. Fifty-five additional Parks Victoria staff received firefighting training.

The firefighting service in Victoria is recognised worldwide. All Victorians should have been proud to see members of the state's firefighting team seconded to the United States of America to help fight recent fires there. I hope the minister has now changed her opinion about how Parks Victoria deals with fires.

When the legislation was first introduced the minister was concerned about rangers. Victoria's park rangers are first rate and are recognised worldwide for their work. Honourable members who have visited national parks know rangers are enthusiastic and willing to explain all aspects of their respective parks.

I am concerned that the then shadow minister, now the Minister for Environment and Conservation in the other place, said our national parks would become theme parks. Victoria's metropolitan parks are used daily by Victorians.

Hon. D. McL. Davis — By millions.

Hon. ANDREA COOTE — Indeed, as the Honourable David Davis said, they are used daily by millions. Some 13 million Victorians used metropolitan parks in the 1998–99 year according to the annual report of Parks Victoria. Many families learn how to use national parks by going, often with their small children, to metropolitan parks that are usually located near their homes. The parks provide a multitude of interesting attractions for families.

Good local parks include Brimbank, which is an excellent park with a good visitor centre. It has trails and walking tracks, and everybody who visits enjoys it. Jells Park is considered a benchmark for metropolitan parks. It too has a wealth of parkland, a wetland and many trees; I have planted trees there. I commend the Jells Park volunteers for the excellent work they do throughout the park. The initiative to have volunteers assist park management was encouraged by Minister Tehan, and I hope the present minister continues with that work.

The then shadow minister may have had in mind two controversial parks when she talked about theme parks. One is Werribee Park, which includes the mansion house Parks Victoria has managed well. That park is different in that it is more challenging and formal than many others. Parks Victoria also managed to get the Mansion Hotels group organised to build a small hotel there. Bob Hawke, whom the government would certainly know well, is a member of the board.

In an article about the opening of the hotel in Werribee Park in the *Herald Sun* of 22 June Bob Hart states:

> Hawkie and Bracksie resisted the pressure. The two believers drank beer and white wine …
>
> …
>
> The Premier, who is getting pretty slick at hotel openings, said all the right things about the handsome establishment.

In a media release from the Office of the Premier dated 16 August the Minister for Major Projects and Tourism spoke about Albert Park, another park about which the ALP became vitriolic when it was established as a park under the control of MPW. The release states:

> … public consultation would take place on the future development and usage of Albert Park by sporting groups, the

community and local business around the park to minimise any inconvenience.

He was referring to 'any inconvenience' at the grand prix. As the Premier has said, the grand prix is an exciting and worthwhile event. It would not have been held had the park been left in the dreary state it was in before MPW began managing it. The Minister for Major Projects and Tourism talks about sporting groups, but I remind the house that Albert Park housed a number of sporting groups when MPW became involved in the park's management and reorganisation. Each club or group had its own charter and used areas exclusively, almost as its own.

The enormous management reshuffle by MPW took all that into account. The park now hosts football, cricket, soccer, running, riding and rowing clubs and other activities. Women's netball has also become a large part of the activities at Albert Park. Everybody would agree that what was rather seedy and in a state of disrepair is now an excellent park.

Debate interrupted pursuant to sessional orders.

DISTINGUISHED VISITORS

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. Jenny Mikakos) — Order! On behalf of honourable members I welcome to the public gallery Mr Josef Cuscheiri, a member of the Maltese Parliament, and his delegation.

Sitting suspended 1.01 p.m. until 2.03 p.m.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Melbourne Sports and Aquatic Centre

Hon. I. J. COVER (Geelong) — Will the Minister for Sport and Recreation inform the house when one of the options for expanding the Melbourne Sports and Aquatic Centre to accommodate swimming at the 2006 Melbourne Commonwealth Games will be selected and work will commence?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I have mentioned in the house on a number of occasions that the facilities required for the Commonwealth Games will require substantial review and consideration, as is the case with aquatic facilities, and in particular, the Melbourne Sports and Aquatic Centre.

A number of issues must be resolved on any future proposals, in particular, what is appropriate for the centre's viability and any future developments concerning its ongoing viability to ensure that it is a lasting legacy for the Melbourne community as well as a substantial requirement for the Commonwealth Games.

Boating: licences

Hon. G. D. ROMANES (Melbourne) — Will the Minister for Ports advise the house what action the government is taking to improve safety on Victoria's waterways, particularly for recreational boats?

Hon. C. C. BROAD (Minister for Ports) — I am pleased to announce that the government has introduced legislation in the other house to require progressive licensing of operators of recreational powerboats over the next two years. The initiative delivers and expands on the government's pre-election commitment to introduce licensing of operators of personal watercraft.

Boat operator licensing will greatly improve safety on Victorian waters by ensuring that anyone operating a registered recreational boat has at least a basic knowledge of waterway rules and safe boat operation. The community would be concerned to learn that currently children as young as 12 years of age can operate a powered recreational boat without any appropriate knowledge and training. The government is not prepared to tolerate that situation and is now acting to bring Victoria into line with most other states, while recognising national and international approaches to boating safety.

As many as 250 000 Victorians will need to be licensed, and the new requirements will accordingly be introduced progressively. Operators of personal watercraft and other operators under 21 years of age will be licensed first, with remaining operators to be licensed by the 2002–03 boating season.

Already 40 000 Victorians hold interstate licences, and their current licences will be automatically recognised in Victoria. In the future, the licensing in Victoria will mean that instead of the revenue from those licences going to other states it will come to Victoria.

To further demonstrate its commitment to improved safety, the government will also be introducing a boating safety funding program to ensure that additional revenue raised from licensees will be put back into an expanded range of recreational boating safety initiatives and programs. In the first five years, nearly $16 million raised from licensing will be reinvested back into the boating community.

The initiative has wide community support and is endorsed by the Victoria Police, the State Boating Council, the Boating Industry Association and other key boating associations and bodies. In keeping with the government's commitment to greater stakeholder participation, the licensing regulations and methods for implementation will be developed through consultation with the community, boating groups and other stakeholders. I am sure that such an improvement in safety will have strong bipartisan support in this place.

Retail tenancies: review

Hon. BILL FORWOOD (Templestowe) — My question to the Minister for Small Business goes to the issue of the retail tenancies review the minister recently announced. Today at a luncheon on Investing in Victoria, the executive director of the Property Council of Australia, Jock Rankin, said about shopping centres:

> The investors are unit trusts and superannuation funds. Just last week one of each said to me that if tenancy in perpetuity came in they would not invest in Victoria.

Will the minister once and for all rule out the introduction of tenancy in perpetuity of retail tenancies in Victoria?

Hon. M. R. THOMSON (Minister for Small Business) — It is interesting that the shadow minister for small business and consumer affairs determines that he should ask a question on behalf of the Property Council of Australia.

The government has been open about conducting a review that ensures that everybody who has an opinion on the Retail Tenancies Act has the opportunity to have input. The government has also said that the terms of reference will include reasonable security of tenure and that the government is open to discussions about what that may mean. At no stage is the government talking about perpetuity; it is talking about reasonable security of tenure.

The government is doing something that is extremely responsible and something that its predecessor failed to do. The entire act is being reviewed to make it more workable so that it will lead to less litigation, take the lawyers out of the system and create a system of certainty for both the landlord and the tenant. The legislation will be balanced so that it has certainty for all players in the field.

Industrial relations: contractors

Hon. KAYE DARVENIZA (Melbourne West) — Will the Minister for Industrial Relations inform the house how the Fair Employment Bill now before the other place will apply to those currently working under contractual arrangements?

Hon. M. M. GOULD (Minister for Industrial Relations) — The Fair Employment Bill will plug the serious gaps in federal legislation and ensure that low-paid workers employed under contract arrangements are protected. Currently no minimum standards apply to these people. The Fair Employment Bill will provide low-paid contractors in Victoria with the protections that are well established in other states, including South Australia, New South Wales and Queensland.

As I informed the house earlier in the week, some contract workers such as outworkers are deemed under legislation to be employees. They have been so deemed in other states, and others may be so deemed by the proposed Fair Employment Tribunal after applications by the relevant parties. This issue is not about interfering in genuine independent arrangements. Rather, the tribunal will be given the discretion to see whether the relationship is truly based around that of employment. Others may be truly independent contractors. The bill will provide these contractors with access to the tribunal which can review the contracts if they are unfair.

Similar laws have existed in New South Wales and Queensland for years. This unfair contracts remedy will only be available to persons who perform work under a contract for services, so obviously normal commercial contracts, like one for the supply of stationery, for example, will not be covered. Unlike New South Wales and Queensland, unfair contract review in the bill will only apply to contractors and not to employees. The bill leaves matters to do with employment agreements to the federal Workplace Relations Act, so the Fair Employment Bill will not interfere with proper commercial arrangements. Rather, it will ensure that sham independent contractor arrangements can be checked to ensure they comply with decent, fair employment conditions.

Snowy River

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — I preface my question to the Minister for Energy and Resources by reminding her of Premier Bracks' election pledge that he would:

> make ministers answer questions directly, factually and succinctly.

I further remind the minister that she holds direct responsibility for the provision of additional

environmental flows for the Snowy River and that she has been only too eager to report that agreement had been reached with New South Wales to secure these flows — an agreement of such moment that she described it as historic. Given that the minister acknowledges her primary responsibility in this matter, and the critical nature of the agreement, why did she not sign it?

Hon. C. C. BROAD (Minister for Energy and Resources) — There has been a great deal of debate in the house about the agreement between the New South Wales and Victorian governments for the restoration of environmental flows to the Snowy River and the Bracks government's achievement of meeting its election commitment to restore flows to a level of 28 per cent.

The details of that agreement are outlined in a media statement released by the Premier on 6 October. As has been indicated to the house, the New South Wales and Victorian governments are currently awaiting the formal sign-off by the federal government, which we are looking forward to optimistically. My understanding is that today is the deadline for Senator Hill to forward his recommendations on the environmental impact statement relating to the corporatisation of the Snowy hydro scheme, and once that process has been completed, as was announced at the time, we expect to conclude an intergovernmental agreement between Victoria, New South Wales and the commonwealth, which will be signed by the appropriate representatives of the three governments.

The government is honouring a commitment that was requested by the commonwealth government, as I have previously indicated, in terms of any public discussion prior to the commonwealth completing its processes. The honourable member can continue to try and make an issue of who signed what and when, in an endeavour to beat up a story, and I note from his leader's comments in the other place that the party is having some difficulty, following the battering it took at the previous state election. The National Party is working to rebuild its image, and this is clearly one of the issues that the party is endeavouring to beat up in its mistaken view that it will assist in that process. It is sadly mistaken. This will not help it one iota. I look forward to completing this agreement when the commonwealth finishes its process.

Hon. R. M. Hallam — On a point of order, Mr President, I was very careful in the way I phrased my question to the minister. I know she finds it sensitive and awkward, but my question was very simple. I ask that you rule, as you have done in the past, that the minister's answer must be at least responsive to the question and apposite. Let me remind the house of the question I asked.

The PRESIDENT — Order! I am aware of the question.

Hon. R. M. Hallam — The question was: given the minister's responsibility, why did she not sign it at the time she announced it?

The PRESIDENT — Order! On the point of order, I listened very carefully to the minister's response. I believe it was responsive to the question raised by the honourable member. The answer sets out a different time scale than was perhaps anticipated by others, but I do not uphold the point of order.

Small business: business activity statements

Hon. E. C. CARBINES (Geelong) — Can the Minister for Small Business advise the house of the information she has received about small businesses meeting the 11 November deadline for their first business activity statements?

Hon. M. R. THOMSON (Minister for Small Business) — As honourable members are aware, the government has an extensive Listening to Small Business program operating, and I have been travelling throughout Victoria, talking to small businesses. One of the major issues that small businesses are raising with me is the 11 November deadline for the business activity statements (BASs).

We are only days away from businesses having to lodge their BASs with the Australian Taxation Office and there is some concern about conflicting information still coming from the tax office in that regard.

As a matter of fact, an article in the *Australian Financial Review* of 19 October headed 'GST fines threaten 400 000 businesses' reports that the Australian Society of Certified Practising Accountants, or CPA, and the National Tax and Accountants Association said their members were overwhelmed by additional GST paperwork. Accountants are being inundated with work, to the point where they cannot cope with having to process the BASs. They are seeking extensions of time on behalf of their clients to ensure that they do not have to pay fines for late BAS lodgment.

The National Tax and Accountants Association has sought an extension of the waiving of late penalties for 12 months while business accountants learn how to deal with the new system, especially in light of accountant shortages. The accountant shortages are likely to get

worse, not better. While the government is pleased to hear that the Australian Taxation Office has said that it will allow some — —

Hon. Bill Forwood — What are you doing?

Hon. M. R. THOMSON — If you wait you will find out.

An Honourable Member — She has written to Peter Reith!

Hon. M. R. THOMSON — No, she hasn't. While the Australian Taxation Office — —

Honourable members interjecting.

The PRESIDENT — Order! I suggest honourable members keep quiet and allow the minister to complete her answer.

Hon. M. R. THOMSON — While the Australian Taxation Office has said that it will treat late payments with some leniency, the government is concerned at the suggestion that it will be payments by tax agents only to which it will give some leniency. A number of small businesses are trying to tackle business activity statements themselves, and that leniency does not seem to be extended to them. I have written to the tax commissioner, Michael Carmody, asking him to make an exception for small businesses who are trying to struggle with their own business activity statements and give the extension to them as well as to those who are lodging their statements through tax agents.

The government wants to alert small businesses that they should contact the Australian Tax Office directly. It is important that they make personal contact and do not rely just on public statements by the tax office to the effect that they will be granted extensions.

A member of the CPA, Mr Ken Traill, said he has come across businesses that have missed their monthly business activity statements by one day and have received penalties. Clearly the cost of compliance, the uncertainty shown by the ATO in the information it has been giving and the shortage of accountants all point to the need for far greater federal government assistance for small business.

Snowy River

Hon. PHILIP DAVIS (Gippsland) — I direct my question to the Minister for Energy and Resources. In regard to the government's announced policy to cancel water entitlements and rights for Snowy River flows, will the minister advise whether there is an existing legislative authority for this action?

The PRESIDENT — Order! Is this different from yesterday's question?

Hon. PHILIP DAVIS — Yes.

Hon. C. C. BROAD (Minister for Energy and Resources) — The government is not proposing to do anything like what the honourable member is suggesting in his question. I have outlined in some detail to the house yesterday and on many other occasions the agreement the Victorian and New South Wales governments envisage, and there is nothing in the agreement between the New South Wales and Victorian governments that requires any additional powers or legislation. It will all be conducted within the existing framework for the management of water in this state and in New South Wales.

Drugs: parental guidance

Hon. JENNY MIKAKOS (Jika Jika) — Can the Minister for Youth Affairs inform the house of any initiative he is aware of that will enable parents to be better informed about the issue of drug abuse by teenagers?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Youth Affairs) — I thank the honourable member for her question. Recently I had the good fortune to launch this publication — —

Honourable members interjecting.

Hon. J. M. MADDEN — It would be worth the while of opposition members to become aware of this publication for the sake of their constituents. That is why I am drawing it to the attention of everybody in the house. The publication is entitled 'Drug abuse prevention — a parent's guide'.

Honourable members interjecting.

The PRESIDENT — Order! The house is becoming quite unruly. I ask the house to settle down so the minister can continue.

Hon. J. M. MADDEN — Thank you for your ruling, Mr President. Yes, they are unruly. I would like them to pay some attention to this, because drug abuse is a very serious matter.

I was fortunate to be able to launch 'Drug abuse prevention — a parent's guide' last Monday in Ballarat. It is a succinct document that is simple to read — which is handy for members of the opposition — and is in

plain English. It is a terrific resource for parents because there is a lot of misinformation out there concerning how to communicate with children about drug abuse prevention. It is a valuable resource.

Because some members did not initially hear what it is called, I will say it again. The publication is entitled 'Drug abuse prevention — a parent's guide'. It was produced by the Scout Association of Australia with some assistance from the Ballarat Abstinence Society. It was originally printed in 1993. Since then it has been revised, reformatted and printed in a glossy format. It is anticipated that 20 000 copies will be distributed in the Ballarat area and outlying regions throughout Victoria. If honourable members would like to obtain copies, I am sure that can be facilitated.

The publication covers a number of issues. They include protecting young people from drug abuse, parental roles in preventing drug abuse, parental communication techniques — which is very significant because the opposition has trouble with a lot of its communication techniques — and community support services.

What is impressive about the document is that it has been published through cooperation among a number of local groups in the Ballarat community. Honourable members may not be aware that the Scout Association of Australia, which does a fantastic job throughout Victoria and Australia — the Office of Youth has a great rapport with the Scout Association of Victoria through the Victorian Youth Development program — has a number of other publications that may be of interest to honourable members. No doubt they have constituents who have concerns relating to youth issues.

The publications include 'Youth suicide prevention', 'Relationships', 'Finding your son or daughter a job', 'Child abuse prevention', 'Issues in adolescent health', 'Young people, crime and society' and, most importantly — I think this is a terrific publication — 'Raising resilient young people'.

Electricity: Yallourn dispute

Hon. M. A. BIRRELL (East Yarra) — I refer the Minister for Industrial Relations to the fact that the Australian Industrial Relations Commission decision on Yallourn Energy was handed down today. What action will the minister or the government take to help end the workplace disruption at Yallourn in light of the AIRC decision, and what action will she therefore take to secure electricity in the coming summer period?

Hon. M. M. GOULD (Minister for Industrial Relations) — This afternoon an important decision was handed down by the Australian Industrial Relations Commission in the long-running dispute between unions and Yallourn Energy. It is important to note that the decision recommended that the parties enter into mediation to resolve the outstanding matters.

I advise the house that I and my department have been working hard to resolve the issue. The orders of the commission will not take effect until they are handed down in a few days time. I have been in touch with both parties on a regular basis, and I have been trying to assist them to come together and resolve the outstanding dispute, which has been going on since April last year. Under the Workplace Relations Act employers and unions can take protected action. That is the reason for the dispute.

As I have said, I have been in constant discussion with the company and the unions, and I have had numerous meetings in an endeavour to resolve this dispute which, I repeat, has been going on for so long because Peter Reith's Workplace Relations Act is conflict based, whereas the government is trying to get both parties to sit around the table and discuss their differences.

Hon. M. A. Birrell — Have you?

Hon. M. M. GOULD — We have been doing that and will continue to do that.

Energy efficient appliances

Hon. D. G. HADDEN (Ballarat) — Will the Minister for Energy and Resources advise the house of what action the government is taking to promote the use of energy efficient appliances.

Hon. C. C. BROAD (Minister for Energy and Resources) — In line with the Bracks government's commitment to energy conservation and improved energy efficiency, the government is participating in the Reach for the Stars program, a joint initiative of Sustainable Energy Authority Victoria, Sustainable Energy Development Authority New South Wales and the Australian Greenhouse Office.

The Reach for the Stars program is designed to raise consumer awareness of energy rating labels and to facilitate the increased promotion and sale of energy-efficient appliances. Through the Sustainable Energy Authority the government is playing a leading role in educating the community about energy rating labels on electric and gas appliances and promoting the environmental and economic benefits of purchasing energy-efficient appliances.

Honourable members interjecting.

Hon. C. C. BROAD — It has actually changed. This includes producing consumer buyer guides for distribution through advisory centres, including the new advisory centres that the government has opened in rural and regional Victoria — unlike the former government — as well as home shows and appliance retailers.

In addition, the Victorian government supports the annual Galaxy Energy awards, which recognise excellence in design, manufacture and the promotion of energy efficient household appliances and which are now one of the most important events on the white goods industry calendar. Award-winning companies and products receive industry recognition and a marketing advantage through the use of the Galaxy Energy Award logo.

The presentation ceremony for the awards will be held next week. A number of Victorian appliance suppliers and retailers have nominated for various categories of the awards, and I wish them well.

Following the awards night, award-winning companies and products will be promoted in national trade and consumer media, on the Sustainable Energy Authority's web site, at home shows, and in winners' brochures and consumer buyer guides that will be distributed through the authority's Energy Smart advisory centres and participating appliance retailers.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Answers

Hon. M. M. GOULD (Minister for Industrial Relations) — By leave, I move:

> That so much of the standing orders as require answers to questions on notice to be delivered verbally in the house be suspended for the sitting of the Council this day and that the answers enumerated be incorporated in *Hansard*.

I have answers to questions 845, 846, 856, 871, 875, 986, 987–93, 1027–9, 1040, 1042, 1043, 1078–85, 1117, 1118 and 1125.

I advise the house that in relation to the answer to question 871 asked by Mr Katsambanis and an attachment to a letter, the answer tabled today is exactly the same as the previous answers but contains an additional sentence that states:

> Due to factors outside the control of the department at the time this figure was calculated, the details of premium increases had not been advised.

Answer to question 1125 ordered to be considered next day on motion of Hon. W. R. BAXTER (North Eastern).

WATER INDUSTRY (AMENDMENT) BILL

Second reading

Debate resumed.

Hon. ANDREA COOTE (Monash) — Prior to the suspension of the sitting I was explaining to the house that during the debate on the amendments to the Parks Victoria Act in 1998 the then shadow minister, now the current Minister for Environment and Conservation, described the metropolitan parks as theme parks. I have great difficulty with that proposition, and I hope that, as I suggested prior to the suspension of the sitting, the minister has changed her mind. Jells Park and Brimbank Park are excellent parks that could hardly be called theme parks. Albert Park and Werribee Park, which are more high-profile parks that could have been construed as being more exotic, have been praised by the Premier and the Minister for Major Projects and Tourism.

Melbourne Parks and Waterways gave the national parks a good grounding under the excellent work of chief executive officer, Jeff Floyd. Business plans were put in place, strategies were developed and ongoing careful financial planning was done before the amalgamation of National Parks Victoria and Melbourne Parks and Waterways. National Parks Victoria has benefited from this.

I refer honourable members to the information and resource document available for parliamentarians. I recommended it to all members of this chamber. It was published in November 1999, only a few short months after the Bracks government was elected, so it can hardly be credited with the achievements mentioned in this resource document. I refer to some of the things Parks Victoria has achieved under the administration of the former Kennett government. I remind honourable members that there were more than 34 million visits to areas managed by Parks Victoria during 1999 and that 4 million hectares of parks and reserves are under its management. There are 11 marine and coastal parks and reserves, including 41 piers and jetties, that come under the administration of the Port Phillip Bay and Western Port authorities. They are well looked after and for the first time have detailed financial and business plans in place.

Parks Victoria employed 810 staff as at 1 November 1999, an enormous number, comprising largely former Melbourne Parks and Waterway and national parks

staff. The cooperation between the two organisations has been excellent. The staff of the former Melbourne Parks and Waterways have been encouraged to spend time in national parks, and former national parks staff have been encouraged to spend time in urban and metropolitan parks.

I think it was conducted very successfully, and I praise Mark Stone and Jeff Floyd for taking such care over that integration.

I would like to remind the chamber of Parks Victoria's achievements under the leadership of Minister Tehan. In 1999 more than 200 projects were run in 170 parks and reserves to control and eradicate weeds that were threatening ecosystems. More than 170 projects in 100 parks and reserves targeted animal pests such as foxes, rabbits, wild dogs and pigs. These projects were not necessarily confined to national parks and country areas. Honourable members would know that there are a lot of foxes in the metropolitan parks. In addition 850 koalas were relocated and there was a large tubal ligation program to stop the koalas breeding. It was a successful and humane program.

Another of the successes of Minister Tehan's time at Parks Victoria is a new 40-hectare park that is being established at Karkarook. It is an excellent initiative that was developed over time with CSR and Boral, who will hand over a park valued at $8 million that contains wetlands, recreational land and landscaped picnic areas. That is a success for the community and metropolitan parks. Yarra Bend is another park that received significant benefits from this good management system, as did the bicycle tracks around the parks and along the bays.

I remind all honourable members of the celebration of 100 years of parks in Victoria. Mount Buffalo National Park was one of our earliest parks, as was Wilsons Promontory National Park, and both have celebrated 100 years of being national parks. I praise our forebears for making us all appreciate the fact that we need national parks.

The highly successful Moomba and Melbourne festivals on the Yarra were also organised by Melbourne Parks and Waterways. I commend it for those activities. I have to say that Parks Victoria got its good grounding and very stable basis from Melbourne Parks and Waterways. I would like to leave the chamber with a slight feeling of regret about our saying a final farewell to Melbourne Parks and Waterways. This is the end of what was a very interesting era.

Hon. M. M. Gould — Wave them goodbye.

Hon. ANDREA COOTE — Yes, wave it goodbye. In closing I remind honourable members of Parks Victoria's vision, which was:

> An outstanding park and waterways system protected and enhanced for people forever.

We can look forward to seeing this legacy of the Kennett government move on into Parks Victoria into the 21st century.

Opposition Members — Hear, hear!

Hon. D. G. HADDEN (Ballarat) — I support the Water Industry (Amendment) Bill, which will abolish the Melbourne Parks and Waterways shell statutory authority and provide for the transfer of its assets, liabilities and any remaining property to the state. It will reallocate to the Secretary of the Department of Natural Resources and Environment the current management responsibilities of Melbourne Parks and Waterways for boating and other activities on the waterways and will give Melbourne Water responsibility for the management of the beds and banks of waterways in the metropolis.

The bill will also surrender Wattle Park to the Crown and permanently reserve it under the Crown Land (Reserves) Act. It will replace Melbourne Parks and Waterways with the minister as lessee of Melbourne Water's reservoir parks and provide for appropriate regulations as well as make consequential amendments to several acts to remove reference to Melbourne Parks and Waterways.

The bill will make several adjustments to park management administrative arrangements, including making the chief executive officer of Parks Victoria the director of national parks under the National Parks Act 1975 with the role of advising the minister and the department secretary on the operational elements of park management. Those amendments are contained in clauses 36 and 37 of the bill. Clause 36 will insert proposed new section 5 in the National Parks Act and Clause 37 will amend section 6 of that act. The bill will also make the secretary a member of the National Parks Advisory Council. Clause 41 provides for the Parks Victoria board to include a person or persons one of whom must have skills and experience in conservation.

By way of historic background, Wattle Park comprises 55.3 hectares of land and is bordered by Warrigal, Riversdale and Elgar roads in the parish of Nunawading. Wattle Park was originally purchased by the Hawthorn Tramways Trust in 1916 from Ms Eliza Welch and her relative, Ms Ball, for the purposes of a public park. The land has been vested in a succession of

public authorities including the Melbourne and Metropolitan Tramways Board, the Public Transport Corporation, the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works, and Melbourne Parks and Waterways and there is a restriction on the sale of land.

Wattle Park is covered by the Wattle Park Land Act 1991, which transferred the land at Wattle Park to the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works. Melbourne Water then transferred the land to Melbourne Parks and Waterways under the Water Industry Act. Since 1998 Parks Victoria has managed Wattle Park on behalf of Melbourne Parks and Waterways.

Proposed section 188 repeals the Wattle Park Land Act, and proposed section 189 enables the Wattle Park land to be surrendered to the Crown and to be deemed to be permanently reserved under the Crown Land (Reserves) Act 1978 for public purposes, in particular for conservation, recreation, leisure and tourism. Proposed section 190 will protect the status or continuity of any interest in Wattle Park Chalet and any golf course or tennis court at Wattle Park with respect to any lease, licence, agreement or arrangement to which Melbourne Parks and Waterways was a party. The bill will ensure that Wattle Park and its 55.3 hectares of magnificent parkland is fully protected and managed under the Crown Land (Reserves) Act for public purposes for the benefit of future generations of Victorians and visitors.

I wish to acknowledge the work of Mr Stensholt, the honourable member for Burwood in the other place. Wattle Park is an important part of Mr Stensholt's electorate. On behalf of the government he has fully consulted with the community and constituents. He has held local meetings in his electorate, and the community is delighted and enthusiastic about Wattle Park becoming Crown land. It will be preserved and enhanced for all into the future.

I also wish to acknowledge the work of Parks Victoria and its partnership with local groups such as the Friends of Wattle Park, the golf clubs and the many people living in the area who have done and no doubt will continue to do a tremendous job with their commitment to and enthusiasm for maintaining this very special place for everyone to enjoy. Wattle Park is a valuable asset for all Victorians, and no doubt with the fine support of those people that will continue. A special event called Wattle Day was held last month. It involved the community in cleaning up Wattle Park so it could be enjoyed by all.

I acknowledge Mr Stensholt's great efforts in supporting and assisting the Melbourne Metropolitan Transit Band's return to Wattle Park, where it plays and performs for the people. That had the support of the Minister for Transport, the Honourable Peter Batchelor in the other place, and of Yarra Trams. The concert to celebrate the 60th anniversary of Wattle Park is coming up on 19 November, and I am sure it will be a special event for the community.

I had the pleasure of visiting Wattle Park as a young child. One of our weekly drives on a Sunday was across to Wattle Park, and it holds a special place for me as well as for a very dear friend of mine — we grew up together at Rosanna — who was married at the Wattle Park Chalet. She now lives in Queensland. Wattle Park is certainly not foreign to me, although I now live in rural Victoria. I commend the bill to the house.

Hon. P. R. HALL (Gippsland) — I welcome the opportunity to make a couple of brief comments on the Water Industry (Amendment) Bill. Although one might think from its title that the bill should be all about water it is actually all about land. The main purpose of the bill is to 'provide for the power for Melbourne Parks and Waterways to surrender all its land to the state'. As I said, it is more a land bill than a water bill.

One of the principal provisions in the bill will abolish Melbourne Parks and Waterways. Melbourne Parks and Waterways was formed in 1993 as part of Melbourne Water with a specific charter to care for some of the parks associated with and surrounding water catchments in the outer metropolitan area as well as some inner city parklands also owned by Melbourne Water.

It was established as a separate authority in 1995, once again within Melbourne Water but as a separate component. In late 1996 to mid-1998 it operated under the trading name of Parks Victoria. In July 1998 Parks Victoria was officially created by statute, and at that point Melbourne Parks and Waterways employees were transferred to Parks Victoria. Since that time Melbourne Parks and Waterways has essentially operated as a shell organisation but it is still the official owner of some 4000 hectares of metropolitan parkland.

With the passage of the bill all the land currently owned by Melbourne Parks and Waterways will be surrendered to the Crown and permanently reserved under the Crown Land (Reserves) Act. That is a positive move. It ensures that those lands will always be used as parklands unless the act comes back before Parliament for amendment.

I will not go through the all the locations of the land, but the 4000 hectares includes Wattle Park, as mentioned by the Honourable Dianne Hadden, and 12 reservoir parks in the outer metropolitan area.

Like the Honourable Dianne Hadden I am familiar with Wattle Park. I remember it as a most pleasant park in the eastern suburbs of Melbourne with a convenient 9-hole public golf course I have had the pleasure of strolling around. It is a delightful facility in the heart of the eastern suburbs that many people have enjoyed for a long time.

The bill makes other amendments to the National Parks Act and the Parks Victoria Act but they essentially concern administrative matters and I do not need to comment on them in detail.

The National Party has an interest in the operation of Parks Victoria and parklands in the metropolitan area, particularly because many of our constituents make use of those parklands. We believe the proposed legislation is a step in the right direction, and I am therefore pleased to indicate the National Party's support for the bill.

Motion agreed to.

Read second time.

Third reading

Hon. C. C. BROAD (Minister for Energy and Resources) — By leave, I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

I thank the Honourables Andrea Coote, Dianne Hadden and Peter Hall for their contributions.

Motion agreed to.

Read third time.

Remaining stages

Passed remaining stages.

STATUTE LAW REVISION BILL

Second reading

Hon. C. C. BROAD (Minister for Energy and Resources) — I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The bill before the house, the Statute Law Revision Bill 2000, is essentially a housekeeping measure. While apparently mundane, such bills are vital to the orderly management of the state and of the statute book.

The bill performs three important tasks. It repeals redundant acts. Members will note that the bill repeals over 100 acts. Those acts are acts identified by Chief Parliamentary Counsel as being redundant. The vast majority of those acts are amending acts, which having performed their amending task are spent and serve no further purpose other than occupying space in the statute book. The other acts are interim appropriation acts which are also spent.

It codifies administrative arrangement orders. As members also would be aware, orders are made under the Administrative Arrangements Act 1983 to construe references to departments, ministers and officers to mean other departments, ministers and officers. As those orders do not amend the acts concerned, a large number of acts contain references which are now outdated and which cause considerable confusion when provisions are being interpreted.

In 1998 the Public Sector Reform (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill remedied that confusion by codifying more than 150 of the orders made since 1983. The bill before the house continues that approach by codifying the orders made since 1998.

Finally the bill corrects a number of ambiguities or omissions found in acts to ensure that the meaning is clear and reflects the intention of the Parliament.

I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. C. A. FURLETTI (Templestowe).

Debate adjourned until next day.

TATTERSALL CONSULTATIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL

Second reading

Debate resumed from 24 October; motion of Hon. C. C. BROAD (Minister for Energy and Resources).

Hon. D. McL. DAVIS (East Yarra) — I am pleased to contribute to the debate on the Tattersall Consultations (Amendment) Bill. I state firstly that the opposition does not oppose the bill.

The bill flows out of changes to the federal–state arrangements and in particular the GST legislation and the introduction of the GST on 1 July this year. As honourable members will be aware, an

intergovernmental agreement on commonwealth–state taxation arrangements was made and changes have resulted from that.

The bill refers to the National Taxation Reform (Consequential Provisions) Act, which gave effect to various provisions in the intergovernmental agreement. The opposition did not oppose the intergovernmental agreement, and for the record it should be noted that the opposition supports the new federal–state financial arrangements as they will deliver significant benefits to Australians in general and Victorians in particular. Notwithstanding that, I will refer to comments made by the Treasurer when the bill was passed in the other place and to comments he made elsewhere.

The purpose of the bill is to reinstate a duty rate of 36 per cent of turnover for Tattersalls overseas lottery sales and 34 per cent of turnover for Tattersalls overseas soccer football pools sales; to compensate Tattersalls for the GST paid on agency services provided to Tattersalls by its accredited representatives through a 0.7 per cent reduction in the lottery and soccer pool tax rates; and to clarify that Tattersalls lottery sales outside Victoria made by telephone or — as they are, increasingly — on the Internet are not subject to the 10 cent levy.

The intergovernmental agreement was the subject of some discussion. I note that in the other place the Treasurer deviated considerably from his second-reading speech notes to make a number of comments about the federal–state arrangements and fiscal equalisation in Victoria. The bill was passed in that interesting context which is a longstanding issue about which I will make further statements.

Prior to the introduction of the GST on 1 July, the Department of Treasury and Finance understood that all Tattersalls lottery sales would be subject to the GST. A small percentage of lottery sales are made in territories which are defined as being overseas. Rulings and statements by the Australian Taxation Office (ATO) have altered some of the treatment of those lottery sales. Tattersalls advises that of total ticket sales of $925 million, ticket sales amounting to $4 million are made overseas.

Honourable members will be aware that tickets sold in the South Pacific, Christmas Island and so on should properly be treated as overseas sales. Of course they are part of the impact of the GST on exports. Although it is a very small aspect of that impact, it is of some significance. The earlier interpretation of the ATO appeared to give some unintended benefit to Tattersalls in that regard. The bill makes it clear that now Tattersalls will be required to pay back about $150 000 to Victoria.

In addition, the bill has other provisions with quite different aims. The ATO has advised Tattersalls that commissions included in the calculation of the GST will need to be examined. That overturns the circumstance that applied earlier in the year when the house previously passed the relevant legislation. In that context it is important to state that that is a retrospective change. The house always views retrospectivity with concern. The Liberal Party maintains that retrospectivity should always be treated with caution and as a matter of principle should be handled with great care, given that the rights of people are involved. The Liberal Party does not oppose the bill, but that is a point of some interest.

In specific terms the bill makes a 0.7 per cent adjustment in the rate to 31.66 per cent for lotteries and 28.76 per cent for soccer pools. The consequences will be that Tattersalls lottery taxes will be reduced by about $6 million per annum. In that context it is important to note that the aim of the intergovernmental agreement is that the new taxation arrangements will be revenue neutral for the states, so that the total federal–state load in that area, as in other areas, is not unfair and does not change the total taxation load in the gaming areas.

Tattersalls is no different. There is a smaller component to the bill — a point of clarification — which is the 10-cent ticket tax on Tattersalls. As honourable members would be aware this was introduced under the last government and was later expanded to a 10-cent levy on all Tattersalls sales. It should be noted that Victoria does not have a constitutional capacity to apply a Victorian tax to people outside this state in any formal sense. In Victorian jurisdictions there is a 10-cent tax or levy on Tatts tickets, whether a ticket is issued or the sale is conducted by some electronic device. That applies whether they are issued by ticket in the old-fashioned sense or whether by phone or, more recently, by the Internet. In non-Victorian jurisdictions, Victoria does not have the power to impose that but, as honourable members would be aware, the amendment will clarify the situation.

If a person acquiring a ticket is a non-Victorian, no tax is paid. Tattersalls and the Department of Treasury and Finance advise that there is a mechanism in place to identify who is a Victorian and who is not. That involves the quoting of a postcode and the withholding of winnings if no postcode is quoted. That appears to work relatively well; certainly that is the advice we have received in briefings. However, questions were certainly raised at that time. The Honourable Roger

Hallam may have one or two comments to make on that point.

I refer honourable members to the Treasurer's comments on the goods and services tax in the other place and to the fact that GST revenue is returned to the states under intergovernmental agreements. That is appropriate because the GST was intended to replace a whole raft of state taxes and is a better tax that is more even across the economy and aims to take distortions out of taxing arrangements.

However, the Treasurer made the point that Victorians were not fairly treated in that return. Although all GST revenue is returned to the states, the formula for determining that is a longstanding one — I think it is fair to say — that goes back originally to the 1930s and intergovernmental agreements at that time to set up the Commonwealth Grants Commission and a program of fiscal equalisation that enabled states that had greater difficulty delivering equivalent services to deliver services to a more reasonable standard and one closer to the Australian average.

While they are laudable aims, the system has worked against Victoria and New South Wales for the best part of this century. It is not a new situation that has occurred with the fiscal equalisation that is inherent in the way the GST revenue is distributed. It is a system that has been part of federation for almost a century. It is a system that honourable members on both sides of politics find difficult to accept because the revenue consequences for Victoria are so severe.

It is a point well made that just 81 cents in every dollar of revenue that comes out of Victoria are returned to Victoria. It would be fair to say that previous treasurers, among them the Honourable Alan Stockdale, certainly made that point. Victorian governments of all political colours, most spectacularly in the last period of government, had considerable disagreement with various federal governments about the share of revenue that Victorians should receive through fiscal equalisation and the impact of it on the revenue sent back to Victoria. In the longer haul, notwithstanding the political context, it is something that all Victorians will have to deal with.

I have concerns about the way fiscal equalisation treats Victoria, and I know that is a longstanding issue. One need look only at the way Victoria is suffering in certain respects. That is partly due to the revenue flows to Victoria. Certainly the choices of any government of either political persuasion are limited by the available revenue. I do not think honourable members on either side of the house would disagree with that.

I return to the retrospective aspect of the bill and reinforce the view often held in the chamber that we need to treat that issue with care. In saying that, I note that in the bill Tattersalls is advantaged by one clause and disadvantaged by another. So, in a sense the bill cannot be seen to be focused in any way other than that there are two distinct effects — —

Hon. R. M. Hallam interjected.

Hon. D. McL. DAVIS — Cross-purposes was the phrase I had intended to use. I think 'competing effects' is an equally good phrase.

That leaves the opposition's position relatively clear. The bill has three main provisions and the opposition does not oppose it, although it has reservations about some aspects. Notwithstanding the fact that the bill arises from the intergovernmental agreement that sets out the new arrangements, which in principle we support, and that Victoria has suffered in terms of fiscal equalisation over the past 60 to 70 years, which of course should be remedied, the problem cannot fairly be laid at the foot of the current federal government which has shown great courage and good sense in introducing federal–state taxation reforms.

Although in many respects the intergovernmental agreement provides the states with a secure revenue flow it also increases the long-term reliance of the states on the federal government. My point is not about fiscal equalisation but to remind state governments that they must be cognisant of that fact and take it into account when they negotiate with federal governments of whatever political persuasion. The bill is not opposed by the opposition.

Hon. S. M. NGUYEN (Melbourne West) — My contribution to debate on the Tattersall Consultations (Amendment) Bill will centre on the purpose of the bill — that is, to give legislative effect to further changes required under Victoria's obligations set out in the Intergovernmental Agreement on the Reform of Commonwealth–State Financial Relations — the IGA. My contribution could also apply to the Public Lotteries Bill that will be debated later today.

A key reason for the bill is the impact of the GST. In June 1999, as part of the IGA involving the federal, state and territory governments, the Victorian government undertook to meet certain obligations. The IGA formalises important changes to commonwealth–state financial relations.

The following matters are central to the IGA. The states will share the revenue raised by the GST and wholesale taxes were abolished from 1 July 2000. Certain state

taxes — namely, financial institutions duty and stamp duty on quoted marketable securities — will be abolished on 1 July 2001. The states will adjust their gambling tax arrangements to make room for the GST and financial assistance grants and revenue replacement payments from the commonwealth to the states will cease. The GST will apply to government fees and charges that are not declared GST-free by determination of the commonwealth government and the states will cease to provide support for off-road diesel from 1 July 2000, while at the same time funding a new first home owner grant scheme. The commonwealth guarantees that no state budget will be worse off in the transitional years of national tax reform.

Most of the necessary changes have been enacted in the National Taxation Reform (Consequential Provisions) Act and the National Taxation Reform (Further Consequential Provisions) Act.

In the case of lotteries the tax rate has been adjusted from 36 per cent to 32.6 per cent of turnover. The corresponding adjustment for soccer football pools was from 34 per cent of turnover to 29.46 per cent. It was understood by the states that all Tattersall lottery sales, including overseas sales, would be subject to the GST. Under the Tattersall Consultations Act taxes and prizes are calculated with reference to the total value of subscriptions.

I refer to the reinstatement of the 36 per cent tax rate for overseas sales. Many people live in Australia but buy things when they travel or live overseas, and many people now have Internet access. People who live or work overseas gamble through Victoria's Tattersall system.

It was understood prior to the introduction of the GST from 1 July 2000 that Tattersall lottery sales would be subject to the GST. Only a small amount of tax is being collected by Victoria from people gambling with Tattersalls from overseas. Therefore, Victoria is required to adjust gambling tax arrangements to take account of the impact of the GST.

The legislation proposes to reinstate the 36 per cent tax rate for lotteries and the 34 per cent tax rate for soccer football pools as they relate to overseas sales by Tattersalls.

Tattersalls has become well known in our community, and most people play some form of lottery as part of their weekend entertainment. People bought Tatts tickets before the casino or other forms of gambling were introduced. Tattersalls became popular and the government made revenue from that form of gambling for many years.

For every dollar Victoria collects in GST it will receive approximately 81 cents through the Commonwealth Grants Commission process.

The third form of levy is telephone and Internet sales, which will become important in the future. People will have access through the Internet to lottery tickets, and the government will introduce a 10 cent levy, which is equivalent to the 10 cents that is collected by the Tattslotto agencies.

This bill and the next bill to be debated, the Public Lotteries Bill, are the result of a review of the impact of the GST. I commend the bill to the house.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — The first thing I want to say about the Tattersall Consultations (Amendment) Bill is that I am pleased the government has changed the sequence in which it and the bill that appears after it, the Public Lotteries Bill, are to be debated.

When I first saw those bills listed for debate they appeared in the other order. I told the Leader of the Government that that was illogical given that the bill we are now debating is to be repealed by the Public Lottereries Bill. It would have been arrant nonsense for the bill to be repealed to be debated after the bill that repeals it. At least the government has the sequence right, and I am pleased my advice was heeded.

The Tattersall Consultations (Amendment) Bill would have to be the ultimate housekeeping bill introduced in my term in this chamber. It would have to be the most cynical exercise I have ever come across. What it does, irrespective of how the honourable member who has just spoken tries to defend it, is amend the taxing arrangements that relate to Tattersall consultations, but it does so in a way that preserves the positions all the parties previously held. It is a most sophisticated roundabout. It is a Clayton's bill, because all it does is preserve the status quo.

Forget the rhetoric and the nice words here and in the other place, this bill simply preserves the position of the parties. Although the National Party does not oppose the bill, I want its effect to be held up to the light of day. I want Victorians to know exactly what the government has arranged on behalf of the community.

There are but two effects of this bill: the first is that it accommodates an unforeseen complication in the net impact of the GST on existing taxing arrangements in relation to Tattersalls. One should remember that in

anticipation of the GST this house considered a most sophisticated arrangement called the Intergovernmental Agreement on the Reform of Commonwealth–State Financial Relations, known as the IGA. It said in part with regard to reform measures that:

> The states and territories will adjust their gambling tax arrangements to take account of the impact of the GST on gambling operators.

Let us not worry about whether we retain the revenue stream, because the arrangement we have already agreed to provides precisely for that. That makes the comments that were recently attributed to the Treasurer in another place even more hypocritical.

The net effect on the operators under this bill is to be precisely nil. But — here is the tricky bit — while we are retaining the position of the operators we are able to paint a picture that says that the industry has not been exempted from the GST. This chicanery is driven by the twofold objective of retaining the position of the operators and telling the world at large that the industry has not been exempted from the GST.

The Intergovernmental Agreement on Reform of Commonwealth–State Financial Relations was ostensibly — I use the word advisedly — accommodated by the National Taxation Reform (Consequential Provisions) Act and the National Taxation Reform (Further Consequential Provisions) Act, which we debated in this chamber in the autumn sessional period in advance of the application of the GST.

I shall spend some time explaining how this magic pudding has been delivered. One must understand that the pre-GST taxing arrangements for both Tattersalls sweeps and soccer pools were clear. With respect to Tattersall consultations, the legislation required that 60 per cent be returned to the player in the form of prizes. The government received 36 per cent of the turnover, and that left Tattersalls with a 4 per cent margin on turnover to administer the competitions.

In respect of soccer pools the percentages were different historically. The player return was but a minimum 50 per cent. In other words those who put their dollar down could expect on average to receive only 50 per cent back by way of prize money. The government got 34 per cent — more than a third — and in this case Tattersalls was given a 16 per cent margin from which to administer the competition.

The complication is — along comes the GST! All thinking members of Parliament endorse the GST because it has been a massive step in the right direction for the nation and an issue of great pride for our federal colleagues, who had the courage to take on the issue in the first place.

However, with the GST comes the following complication: 'We cannot allow gaming to be exempt. Those terrible people in the gaming industry could not be given a walk-up start, so they are not to be exempted from the impact of the GST'. If they were, imagine the public outcry from those who see themselves as keepers of the public conscience. Imagine the outcry from those who have been consistently critical of the previous government and its so-called reliance on the gaming dollar — the same dollar Mr Nguyen says he is now keen to protect.

We heard again and again that the Kennett government was to be chastised for its so-called reliance on the gaming dollar. So we could not be seen to be providing a walk-up start for that industry. That is the first problem.

The second problem is that if we were to apply the GST across the board we would kill the golden goose. We could not just put 10 per cent on top of the dollar handed across the counter because there would be fewer sales and the income received by this government would be less. So here comes the duplicity: How do we arrange a scheme which says, 'No, we did not exempt them from the GST' but we protect the revenue stream at the same time? We could not even say, 'We will put the GST on the bit that is left after the players get their prizes', because that would be the equivalent of 4 per cent, and it was generally acknowledged that even putting a 4 per cent impost on the industry would have perhaps not killed the goose that lays the golden eggs but caused her some indigestion.

So it was decided that there was another way through it — a great exercise in political innovation. We would simply assume that the GST had been paid, assume that the sales revenue less the prize pool — that is, the 40 per cent — actually included the GST. It was very simple but very smart. That meant in this case that Tattersalls would have to pay one-eleventh of the 40 per cent directly to the Australian Tax Office.

That happens to be a tax rate of 3.64 per cent, and that is where this comes from. Then the question became: what reduced rate of tax does Victoria have to impose on Tattersalls directly to allow Tattersalls to retain the original income of 4 per cent of turnover? That was the trick to the entire process and the answer — and it is here in the bill for all to see — is 32.36 per cent, and it just so happens it is 29.46 per cent on soccer pools.

So let us spell out the new arrangement after the accommodation of the GST. In respect of Tattersall consultations the player still gets his or her 60 per cent on average return in the form of prizes. The state government is getting 32.36 per cent by way of direct taxation, but it just so happens it will get 3.64 per cent from the GST via the federal government. And it is important to be reminded that the intergovernmental agreement says that the revenue will be protected. I want to come back to that.

Here we have a scheme designed specifically to protect the original revenue flow, and that just means that in the case of Tattersalls what falls out the bottom is 4 per cent, and that is the percentage Tattersalls still gets to administer the scheme.

So the assumption is that, given that the GST is faithfully distributed to all the states, everybody goes back to square one. Everybody's pride is maintained, no-one can imply that the industry was given a walk-up start, yet everybody can feel good because the revenue stream stays exactly where it was.

Forgive my cynicism, but this is a sophisticated round robin, and what we have achieved has been done through smoke and mirrors. But just in case we should despair, we come across Murphy's Law, which says that whatever can go wrong will go wrong, and the complication in this case was that the government of Victoria had to anticipate the impact of the GST and prepare legislation in advance of its application. That is why we debated the bills to which the IGA was attached last autumn. We had to have the rules in place so that the GST and its revenues could be flowing from 1 July.

Complications have emerged from that. The first is that the GST comes back to the states via a concept known as horizontal fiscal equalisation. It is a lovely term designed to confuse the observer and to get away with a bit of chicanery on the way through. If that is not quite complicated enough, it is horizontal fiscal equalisation as determined and adjudged by the Commonwealth Grants Commission.

The second-reading speech says the Victorian government is basically no worse off, as all GST payments have been returned to the states. I suggest that the Treasurer should have stopped there because up until then he was going all right. That is a statement of fact, and I can demonstrate that by reference to the agreement signed between the jurisdictions. But he cannot help himself; he has to go that one step further, so he says:

> The Victorian government is basically no worse off as all GST payments are being returned to the states, although in the case of Victoria GST payments are less than they should be because of adverse Commonwealth Grants Commission relativities.

Further on he has another whinge about that. On the second-last page of the second-reading speech, and I am sorry they are not numbered, the Treasurer says:

> Victoria will be no worse off since all GST revenues are eventually returned to the states —

but here is the codicil —

> with the caveat that current Commonwealth Grants Commission relativities disadvantage Victoria …

Someone should take the Treasurer on for perpetuating that arrant nonsense. I hope he knows better, in which case this becomes pure cynicism. But just in case he does not, let me take the chamber to the actual document that outlines the agreement in this case and demonstrate just how cynical the comment of the Treasurer is and how it constitutes him wanting to have his cake and eat it too.

I turn to the transition arrangements that are attached to the agreement. Perhaps I should go back one step and say that I am quoting from the Intergovernmental Agreement on the Reform of Commonwealth–State Financial Relations, which is attached as a schedule to the National Taxation Reform (Consequential Provisions) Act 2000 and which starts at page 32 and runs for many pages. The very complex and extensive agreement negotiated between the jurisdictions of our nation goes to the precise issue that I am suggesting the Treasurer should have taken into account when he made the cynical comment.

At page 36 under the heading 'Transitional Arrangements' — I hope the Honourable Sang Nguyen is listening intently — clause 10 of the schedule states:

> In each of the transitional years following the introduction of the GST —

and we are most certainly still in the transition years —

> the commonwealth guarantees that the budgetary position of each individual state and territory will be no worse off than it would have been had the reforms set out in this agreement not been implemented.

Here is a direct guarantee, written in simple words and signed by the leaders of each of the jurisdictions across the nation, which says that what Mr Brumby is saying in this case is absolute nonsense. On page 49 of the same document that point is made even clearer. Under the heading 'Guaranteed Minimum Amount' — and this is most apposite to this debate — the document

says in respect of the formula by which that guaranteed minimum amount shall be deduced:

> Reduced revenues: the amount by which states and territories adjust gambling taxation arrangements to take account of the impact of the GST on gambling operators.

Here it is again in simple words. Here is the precise issue that the Treasurer wants to cause obfuscation on. I hope the Treasurer knows that what he did was a cynical exercise. I refer to the guarantee in the legislation, which says in part that any shortfall between a state's entitlement to GST revenue grants shall be offset to ensure that the state or territory is no worse off in that transition period. Of course there is room to argue about the application of horizontal fiscal equalisation. I am happy to have that argument. If the Treasurer were prepared to mount his case in logic and in the light of the actual legislation he may have found that he had a fierce supporter. But in my view the Treasurer has tried deliberately to cloud the issue.

Page 36 of the document states that the commonwealth will make transitional assistance payments to each state as necessary. The point I make, which is set out in clause 8, is that the distribution will take place 'in accordance with horizontal fiscal equalisation' — or HFE — 'principles subject to the transitional arrangements set out below'. It then states that the details of the payment arrangements are contained in appendix B, where they are spelt out even further.

My point is that I do not think anybody disputes the principle of HFE. But there is room to argue that Victoria does badly under HFE as it is interpreted and as it is applied by the Commonwealth Grants Commission. If the Treasurer had said that he was unhappy about the way the principle was applied, he would have had agreement across party lines. I think we would have supported him. Because there is room to argue, as Mr David Davis did earlier, that it is pretty tough to try to justify an 81 cent return in the dollar, which is the extent to which Victoria is subsidising the other jurisdictions. What galls me, as it does many other honourable members, is the extent to which the subsidisation runs to the benefit of Queensland.

Without making a meal of it, I indicate that I am not unhappy about the support we give to Tasmania or to South Australia. But I think Queensland has long outlived its claim for a massive subsidy at the expense of New South Wales and Victoria. If the Treasurer were to say that we have to go back to Canberra to re-argue the case about the extent of the subsidisation, I would support him. But I want it on the record that I am absolutely confident that the Treasurer is not arguing against the concept of HFE at all and that what he has done is a most cynical exercise.

The first complication is that the return of the GST component under the existing system has to run the gauntlet of the Commonwealth Grants Commission and of horizontal fiscal equalisation. But my point is that the terms of the agreement make the revenue stream absolutely secure. It particularly says that the balance adjustment shall include any reduction in revenue derived from gaming at a state level. So, while it was a complication, about which we have heard the standard complaint from the Treasurer, the complication has been overcome.

There is a second complication, and it is the one with which Mr Nguyen was trying to deal. It is true that a very small proportion of Tattersalls sales take place overseas and would therefore be — and should be — exempt from the GST. The rule book says that if they take place overseas they shall be exempt. That applies to every product, not just to lottery products.

The complication in this case was that Tattersalls did very nicely. The percentages had been adjusted in anticipation of the GST, and so to the extent that sales were derived outside the jurisdiction it received a windfall gain equivalent to the application of the GST in each case. The bill takes the taxing formula in those cases back to where it started — namely, to 36 per cent. The same thing applies to soccer pools, although the percentage that applies there is different. In that case the taxing formula is 34 per cent, about which we are told, 'Notwithstanding that there have been no sales of soccer pools to this point, we will adjust the percentages just in case there might be one made outside our jurisdiction'. The rules now state that the taxing rate to be applied to a soccer pool product sold outside Victoria shall be 34 per cent.

Because this windfall gain has been derived by Tattersalls since the day the GST came in — namely, 1 July this year — there has been an accumulation of that benefit. So the government, understandably, is fairly keen to change the rules to apply from 1 July. In normal circumstances I would be reticent to agree to retrospectivity in this form. But there is a saviour because, as the Honourable David Davis pointed out, some of the issues running are counteractive. By swings and merry-go-rounds the retrospective impact in dollar terms will be relatively less than it would appear at first glance.

I make the point as I did in my opening remarks that the bill will be repealed by the Public Lotteries Bill. The only reason the bill has credibility is because it dates

back to 1 July. The argument is that it is inappropriate to leave a remedy swinging when that remedy needs to be retrospective. That is the second complication, but it is not a big deal.

The third complication is a doozey. When the National Taxation Reform (Consequential Provisions) Bill was debated in the autumn session of Parliament, I said that the house was still waiting on the ruling of the Australian Taxation Office on the verification of some issues. That is not a criticism of the Australian Taxation Office because the entire rulebook had been re-written and there was enormous pressure in the marketplace for clarification on particular issues. The office was under enormous pressure and just did not have time to address all the issues.

Parliament assumed the GST applied to turnover, which was quite logical. When the Australian Taxation Office looked at the application of the GST in this instance, it said, 'Hang on, you've got it wrong!'. It said the GST does not apply just to the turnover, but should apply to the turnover plus the agents' commission. A problem arises. That ruling was made notwithstanding that the agents' commission had never been recognised by Tattersalls, had never been included in its annual reports, had never been included in its revenue streams and had never been recognised by government. Nonetheless the Australian Taxation Office decided that the GST should apply on the sum, including the commission.

The decision meant that the GST was levied on greater than the turnover recognised by Tattersalls. This meant that the state tax take had to be adjusted downwards to preserve the status quo, and maintain the original commitment of revenue neutrality. As I said, there was a major problem.

The GST is being applied on a commission that Tattersalls is not even sure it can measure. A deal was done and that deal was, for the sake of the exercise, that an average figure of 7.71 per cent commission be assumed. During the briefing it was reported that Tattersalls could get fairly close to the figure through its experience and its knowledge; that over the years the commission had ranged from 7.68 to 7.72 per cent; and that it would take a mean average. The taxation on that figure is one-eleventh; so we come to the figure of 0.7 percentage points.

The adjustment to the revenue stream comparing what comes directly to the government and what comes to the government through the GST and the commonwealth government has to be adjusted by 0.7 percentage points. The provision has to be backdated to 1 July because Tattersalls has been paying a GST penalty on the equivalent of the commission of each of the sales. We are told that a substantial sum is involved. Of course, Tattersalls is keen to have the legislation passed so it can recover that 0.7 percentage points. The net effect is that the state's direct tax take has to be reduced 0.7 percentage points to take into account the government's inaccurate anticipation of what the Commissioner of Taxation would say the revenue stream was against which the GST would be applied.

And finally to the 10-cent levy. In 1992 the government introduced a levy on all lottery products. It was commonly accepted as part of the Kennett–Stockdale recovery strategy. It is true that the 10-cent levy could not be applied to tickets sold outside the state boundaries because Victoria did not have the constitutional right to apply that and if it attempted to do so it would have been challenged in the courts to eventually make an adjustment. That led to the need for the first amendment.

Recently, more sales were being made by the telephone and the Internet, so there is no ticket and as such no ticket against which a levy can be imposed. A further amendment was introduced that assumed a ticket was issued each time a sale took place either by telephone or electronically. Again, Murphy's Law applied, because when the amendment was framed someone forgot to anticipate that the provision could not be applied if the sale by telephone or electronic means was outside the jurisdiction, so exactly the same problem arose — and a third amendment was required.

Another complication — one with which I sympathise, given that I was for some time an accredited agent of Tattersalls — is that agents became nervous about the extent to which that sales opportunity was expanding. If sales were taking place by telephone or electronically an agent was not necessarily involved, in which case guess who pocketed the equivalent of the commission? It caused considerable anxiety, but that was addressed by a previous amendment. I am not arguing about that because we got it wrong the last time round. The house is now fixing the latest problem but is also repealing the measure. I will have something to say about its repeal during the debate on the Public Lotteries Bill, because a few other things occur as hidden agendas.

Honourable members have been told that a housekeeping amendment is necessary to clarify that some sales are not subject to the 10-cent levy. How necessary is that housekeeping amendment given that apparently, if the Public Lotteries Bill is passed, this measure will be repealed? I raise a question mark about

the purpose of that throwaway line in the second-reading speech.

There is another conundrum because the 10-cent levy that is being finetuned by the provisions of this bill does not appear in the Public Lotteries Bill.

Hon. Andrew Brideson — Not directly.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM — We will come to that. The next bill abolishes it completely. This would have gone through to the keeper except some of us decided to do some sums. The question of the need for clarification that the levy was not applicable to some sales seems pretty pointless. If this bill is passed, at best it can apply only from 1 July this year to 1 July next year because the next bill, which will repeal this one, says that anything that is not proclaimed by 1 July next year is automatically proclaimed on that date. We have a maximum window of 12 months.

How big is the effect of this amendment we are talking about? It is very small indeed in respect of the exemption of the 10-cent levy on sales made by electronic means and telephone outside the jurisdiction. The whole thing seems pointless. I must have missed an entire chapter somewhere on the government's true intent, but such is life. We need to adjust the GST arrangements to accommodate an unhelpful Australian Taxation Office ruling in respect of agents' commission. That is effectively what the bill does, and I am happy to signify support of that.

However, I make the point that although we are not opposed to the bill, this is a very quaint way to skin the cat, and we will be looking at the carcass during debate on the next bill.

Hon. G. D. ROMANES (Melbourne) — I wish to speak on the Tattersall Consultations (Amendment) Bill, which amends the Tattersall Consultations Act. The purpose of the bill is to adjust taxation rates on gambling operators to bring the situation into line with the obligations the Victorian government accepted under the Intergovernmental Agreement on Reform of Commonwealth–State Financial Relations.

In the autumn session Parliament dealt with the National Taxation Reform (Consequential Provisions) Bill and the further consequential amendments bill, which reduced the lottery tax rate from 36 per cent to 32.6 per cent of turnover and the soccer football pools tax rate from 34 per cent to 29.46 per cent of turnover. The reduction in those taxation rates was, as other speakers have pointed out, designed to honour the obligations agreed by the various states and territories and the commonwealth for the advent of the GST. That agreement was signed in June 1999, and a central part of it was that the states would adjust their gambling tax arrangements to make room for the GST.

I make it clear that the government put forward the changes to the taxation rates in the autumn legislation on national taxation reform and has introduced this bill to honour the obligations it inherited from the previous government. It is doing that despite the fact that on many occasions and in many forums the Bracks Labor government has made it clear that it was and remains opposed to the GST.

As the Honourable Roger Hallam said, the changes made in the autumn session occurred ahead of other events and their unforeseen consequences. The changed rates were based on an understanding that there were no overseas sales in Tattersalls operations. We have since learnt that $4 million of Tattersalls $900-million turnover is derived from overseas sales. Under the taxation rules those sales should not be subject to GST. Full tax rates should apply rather than the reduced tax rates and the adjustments under the GST arrangements. This situation highlights the need to readjust the rates so they reflect the two situations — one where the GST is payable on gambling operations and one where it is not.

Change is further needed to reflect advice received from the Australian Taxation Office between the autumn and spring sittings and since the GST was introduced on 1 July. That advice was that under an ATO ruling commission should be included in the sales values for the purposes of calculating Tattersalls gross margins. That increases Tattersalls GST bill, and the rates set in the autumn sittings are not sufficient to fully compensate Tattersalls for the impact of the GST.

Mr Hallam pointed out that it has been calculated that Tattersalls commission rates would be covered with an adjustment of 0.7 per cent of a percentage point in the tax rates. That means an adjustment to 31.66 per cent on GST-payable lotteries and 28.76 per cent on GST-payable soccer pools. For the overseas sales the rates of 36 per cent for lotteries and 34 per cent for soccer pools would be reinstated.

Clause 4 deals with the issue of the 10 per cent subscription levy where a ticket is not issued. It relates to telephone and Internet products. Under the bill the 10 per cent subscription levy will not apply to non-Victorian jurisdictions — that is, to overseas and interstate jurisdictions where the Victorian government does not have the power to tax transactions.

Clause 5 relates to timing and provides that the changes will apply from 1 July 2000 when the GST was

introduced. Clause 5 replaces subsection (4) of section 12 of the Tattersall Consultations Act with new subsections (4), (5) and (6).

New subsection (5) provides that where Tattersalls has underpaid tax because of amended tax rates it must repay that tax within seven days after commencement. New subsection (6) provides for situations where Tattersalls has overpaid duty and an overpayment should be refunded — that is, it provides for the retrospective resolution of situations where there has been an overpayment or an underpayment.

The bill has a neutral impact on income in Victoria. As Mr Hallam said, it is there to protect revenue flows for Tattersalls in that situation. All GST revenues would be returned to the state. It provides for retrospective provisions to take into account the information that has become available to the state in the past few months and to cover the period since 1 July 2000.

Hon. R. M. Hallam — The strange thing is the protection in this bill and the raid in the next one.

Hon. G. D. ROMANES — It will, as Mr Hallam has said, eventually become redundant and be repealed if the Public Lotteries Bill is passed.

Hon. C. A. Furletti — It will not become redundant; it will be repealed.

Hon. G. D. ROMANES — Redundant and repealed, which is what I said, if the Public Lotteries Bill is passed by Parliament. It will therefore be required to be the regime within which the Tattersall Consultations Act operates within a period up until the Public Lotteries Bill, which will provide the new regulatory framework for lotteries, comes into effect.

Mr Hallam raised other issues but they relate to gambling revenues and percentage of revenues in response to issues on which other honourable members have commented. But those are broader policy issues for this government to consider in the future. They relate to the extent to which the government will endeavour to put in place strategies to change its dependence on gambling revenues. But that is a separate policy issue. As Mr Hallam said, this is a housekeeping measure to make further changes to ensure the intent of what was put in place in the autumn sitting is effective in the new situation. It is also honouring the commitment that this government made in signing the intergovernmental agreement in June 1999. I commend the bill to the house.

Motion agreed to.

Read second time.

Third reading

Hon. C. C. BROAD (Minister for Energy and Resources) — By leave, I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

I thank honourable members for their contributions to the debate on this important transition bill prior to it being replaced by new legislation.

Motion agreed to.

Read third time.

Remaining stages

Passed remaining stages.

MINERAL RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT (AMENDMENT) BILL

Second reading

Hon. C. C. BROAD (Minister for Energy and Resources) — I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Introduction

The house will recall that earlier this year the ministerial statement ‘Pillars for balanced growth — minerals and petroleum for the 21st century’ was presented. This statement represents the policy framework in which the government will administer the mineral and petroleum industries in Victoria. A key element of that policy statement was that the government would introduce amendments to the Mineral Resources Development Act 1990, to ensure it continues to provide Australia’s best and most contemporary legislative framework for the development and regulation of the mineral exploration and mining industry.

The Mineral Resources Development Act 1990, which I will refer to as the MRDA, was last amended in 1993 and it is timely to consider some finetuning to ensure that it remains relevant for all stakeholders. This is particularly necessary as the legislation now applies to the large open-cut brown coal mines of the Latrobe Valley (following their privatisation) as well as to the vast mineral sands resources that are being developed in the west of the state.

In particular the legislation must:

provide a framework to achieve balanced economic, social and environmental outcomes;

provide appropriate and timely processes relating to mineral exploration and mining.

Considerable discussion has already occurred with key stakeholders and the general consensus is that the act does not require major amendment although some community groups close to open-cut goldmines believe that there should be specific provisions that restrict this form of mining. However, there are several areas that could be improved to achieve more streamlined and appropriate procedures and provide more certainty for the community and for industry.

A public consultation process on the proposed amendments has recently been completed to ensure that all relevant issues have been appropriately addressed. The comments received have been considered in formulating these amendments.

Key minerals industry legislative principles

The fundamental principle underlying legislation for the administration of exploration and mining for minerals in all Australian jurisdictions is that minerals are owned by the Crown. This principle has been critical to the successful development of the mining industry throughout Australia. This principle enables governments to ensure that mineral production can be undertaken on behalf of all the community.

While the MRDA provides the administrative framework within which minerals activities are to be undertaken, the act does not control the processes that lead to a decision to allow mining at a particular location. A particular mining operation can only occur if it has been granted a permit under the Planning and Environment Act 1987 or an environment effects statement has been prepared and assessed under the Environment Effects Act 1978. Either of these approaches provides the opportunity for consultation and involvement of the community before a decision is made to allow a mine to proceed. The proposed amendments to the MRDA do not attempt to alter the approval processes that are appropriately managed under the relevant environmental and planning legislation.

Exploration activities are not subject to the same approval processes as mining as they have limited environmental and social impact and are generally of short duration. Mineral exploration is a high commercial risk activity with a low probability that any particular operation will lead to the discovery of a commercial ore body (generally characterised as one chance in 1000). Prior to the proclamation of the MRDA exploration licences in Victoria were subject to local government planning approval. This was identified as a major impediment to attracting mineral exploration in Victoria and caused unnecessary concern in communities. Experience with the MRDA processes administering exploration has not identified any major concerns regarding social or environmental impacts and it is not proposed to significantly amend provisions allowing for mineral exploration.

In line with the principles that are being applied to most contemporary legislation the proposed amendments to the MRDA are, where possible, objective based and not prescriptive. The act therefore does not prescribe any specific activity but leaves the detailed requirements for any project to be developed on a case-by-case basis. This allows proposals such as for open-cut goldmining to be considered on a case-by-case basis. However, the MRDA does restrict mining activities within 100 metres of any significant place unless the consent of the landowner or approval of the minister is obtained. This is generally known as the ‘100 metre rule’.

The purpose and objectives of the MRDA are clearly set out in the introduction to the act and these are considered to still be appropriate.

Background and general overview

The MRDA was originally proclaimed in 1991 and amendments were introduced 1993. These further amendments streamlined processes and improved access to land for exploration and mining purposes. Exploration investment has increased by over 300 per cent since 1992. While these developments are encouraging, the globalisation of the mineral industry has intensified competition for exploration and mineral development investment. A significant factor in encouraging investment is the efficiency and certainty of the legislative framework within which the industry must operate. It is therefore necessary to provide the optimal regulatory framework for Victoria in order to maximise investment.

It is important to recognise that, unlike most other areas in Australia, mining developments in Victoria have occurred and are likely to continue to occur close to settled areas. As a result the industry must manage the environmental and social impacts of mining to the standards expected in this community. Amendments are proposed to ensure that viable projects are encouraged while also safeguarding broader community and environmental interests.

The above factors represent the main rationale for the proposed amendments, the specific objectives of which are:

to ensure that claims for compensation for loss of amenity on account of mining operations are fair and equitable and do not create a significant open-ended commercial liability for mining companies;

to provide the ability to obtain compensation for mining impacts on Crown land in specified circumstances;

to improve the operation of the 100-metre rule for both the community and industry;

to make the necessary amendments to accord with the commonwealth Native Title Act 1993;

to remove unnecessary impediments to low-impact exploration activities;

to improve the general quality of applications received and provide for a more competitive system of licence application;

to provide a more open application process which will improve competition for licences;

to provide an enhanced mining register of significant license documents which is more amenable to searching by the public;

to amend the act in accordance with the recommendations of the national competition policy review of the MRDA; and

to make further administrative changes to enhance the operation of the act.

Issues

I would now like to talk to some of the key proposals in the bill.

Compensation for loss of amenity

Under the act the holders of a mining licence must negotiate with the owners or occupiers of affected private land to obtain consent for the work to be undertaken. These negotiations generally lead to an appropriate level of compensation agreed between the parties. However, where an agreement cannot be reached there is recourse to section 85 of the act, which lists what compensation is payable for and allows for compensation disputes to be heard by VCAT or the Supreme Court.

Section 85 of the act allows for compensation for loss of possession of the whole or any part of the land; damage to the surface of the land; damage to improvement; severance of the land from other land; loss of opportunity to make planned improvements; and any decrease in the market value of the land. As well as compensation for these impacts, compensation is also payable for loss of amenity, including recreation and conservation values[s.85(1)(e)].

Loss of amenity allows for a landowner or occupier to claim for what is often subjective loss not otherwise compensated for by the act. It also allows claims for compensation where it is claimed that adequate protection has not been achieved through the planning approvals process or by legislation such as the Environment Protection Act. It therefore provides an opportunity to claim compensation for the intangible losses that are often difficult to define.

It should be noted that when the compensation provisions were included in the MRDA it was proposed in the relevant green and white papers that they be closely aligned with the Land Acquisition and Compensation Act. The provisions in the MRDA relating to land purchase include a solatium of up to 10 per cent and this aligns with the reference act. However, the Land Acquisition and Compensation Act does not include specific provisions with respect to loss of amenity. Indeed no legislation in Victoria has a similar provision.

The structure of the amenity provision means that any landowner or occupier can claim for loss of amenity even if they are a large distance from the mine. While there is some justification for some landowners and occupiers to be able to claim for loss of amenity, the nature of this provision exposes the mining industry to open-ended, potentially high-cost legal actions to which no other industry is similarly exposed. Such an open-ended liability threatens the economic survival of mining companies even though they are operating completely within the conditions of their licence and approvals.

This is seen as a major disincentive to exploration and mining investment in Victoria. It should also be added that Victoria is the only state or territory with such a specific provision for compensation for loss of amenity, and mining is the only industry that faces such a legislative provision within Victoria. In other jurisdictions and for other industries within Victoria such an action would need to be taken under common law. The changes that are proposed do not affect the ability to raise a common-law claim against a mining company in Victoria. The act must therefore be

structured so that it does not become an open-ended threat to the very existence of the industry, while still providing for adequate protection for individuals who are genuinely affected by loss of amenity.

A number of options were examined, including:

removing the loss of amenity provision;

limiting loss of amenity compensation to situations where the mine operates outside agreed performance standards;

limiting liability for loss of amenity to a maximum prescribed amount per claim.

The first two options were not pursued as both would result in the elimination of claims for compensation for loss of amenity. The third option, to limit the maximum claim for loss of amenity, provides protection for the industry as well as allowing for genuine claims for loss of amenity.

A maximum value of $10 000 is appropriate to compensate for the loss of amenity. This takes into account the fact that compensation for other losses and damages is not limited. It also recognises that amenity issues such as noise, dust, vibration and working hours are controlled to levels set by the government to limit health and social effects. These limits applied in Victoria are as stringent as any applied elsewhere within Australia.

The government consultation paper proposed that compensation be limited to $10 000. As expected the mining industry sought the removal of the provision and community groups favoured retaining the provision without limiting the maximum claim. However, the government strongly believes that this proposal is the most effective means whereby open-ended liability for mining companies can be constrained while also providing for legitimate claims for loss of amenity.

Statement under section 85(5) of the Constitution Act 1975

I wish to make a statement pursuant to section 85 of the Constitution Act 1975 of the reasons why that section should be altered or varied by clause 70 of the Mineral Resources Development (Amendment) Bill.

Clause 70 of the bill states that it is the intention of section 89(3) inserted by section 60 of the Mineral Resources Development (Amendment) Bill to alter or vary section 85 of the Constitution Act 1975.

Section 89(3) provides for a limit to the amount of compensation that a court or tribunal may order to be paid for loss of amenity to $10 000.

The reasons for the limit are as I have already stated. Essentially, the government wants to constrain the potentially open-ended liability for mining companies, which is seen as a major disincentive to exploration and mining investment in Victoria.

If the government's intention in imposing the limit on loss of amenity claims is to be achieved, it is essential that the provision imposing that limit be beyond challenge in the Supreme Court. For this reason the government considers it appropriate to limit the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in the way set out in clause 70 of the bill.

Protection of land from long-term impacts

Provisions are proposed whereby the Crown is better able to protect itself from any unforeseen long-term environmental liability that may occur as a consequence of mining. This will principally be achieved through powers to maintain rehabilitation bond moneys beyond the life of a project to ensure that effective rehabilitation and management is achieved.

Mining often occurs on Crown land and there may be occasions when the subject land cannot be fully returned to its former or some commensurate state. Therefore, provisions are proposed (in line with the Petroleum Act 1998) whereby the minister may require that compensation be paid to the Crown (such as by purchase of the land or by a land exchange) if the land cannot be fully returned to its former or commensurate state. This is frequently the situation in the case of open-cut mining and tailings dam construction. Land that cannot be fully rehabilitated will still be subject to a rehabilitation plan and a rehabilitation bond will apply to the land.

A fundamental objective of this provision is that the Crown estate will not be diminished as a result of mining on Crown land. The government recognises that voluntary land exchanges, whereby a mining company transfers to the Crown an allotment of freehold land which is equivalent to the mining land, has been an effective feature of mining approvals in Victoria. The government wishes to continue to encourage this practice as a means of ensuring no net loss to the Crown and the legislative proposals will support this option. This proposal will also provide that compensation may be payable to occupiers of Crown land (infrequent though that may be) in an equivalent manner to occupiers of private land.

It is the government's intention in the implementation of this provision that any compensation provided should, to the maximum extent practical, be to the benefit of and located close to the community within which the specific mining operation is occurring. Further, it is the government's intention that in assessing the level of appropriate compensation, consideration be given to the value of infrastructure or other facilities that the particular project will provide to the community. Examples of this might include roads or electricity supply.

Native title

This submission proposes that the MRDA is amended to ensure that it is consistent and compatible with the Commonwealth Native Title Act 1993, thus ensuring that the amendments constitute a permissible future act under that act. In a general sense processes that are required and satisfied via the Native Title Act will not be duplicated under this act. Therefore there will be no additional cost burdens on the industry or additional requirements for native title claimants or holders.

Approvals for exploration and mining

I would now like to present the key provisions that will improve the processes for approving exploration and mining approvals. Whilst the MRDA is currently well regarded in this manner, experience has demonstrated that further improvements can be made to optimise processes.

There has also been concern expressed by some community groups particularly about the processes under the Environmental Effects Act 1978, commonly called the EES process. I must remind the house that the planning approval and EES processes that must be followed before approval to mine can be given are the responsibility of other legislation and not the MRDA.

The 100-metre rule

Firstly I would like to discuss the 100-metre rule under section 45. This currently provides that work may not be undertaken by a licensee within 100 metres of nominated structures without the approval of the owner, occupier, relevant person or agency. The act also allows the minister to approve such work to be done [s46] after consulting with the Mining and Environment Advisory Committee (MEAC).

MEAC is a body comprising departmental officers, representatives of mining, farming and one person representing the environment. This process has proven to be unwieldy and of little value, particularly where a mining proposal has been through a full public consultation process under the Environmental Effects Act 1978**.** This EES process will fully consider all the issues that need to be considered in assessing whether ministerial agreement to work within 100 metres will be given. The requirement to consult with MEAC is therefore an unnecessary duplication of process and it is proposed that in such a case the minister does not have to consult with MEAC before considering whether to give approval for work within 100 metres.

Where a proposal to work within 100 metres of a mine which has not undergone the EES process, the minister must consult with MEAC. However, MEAC is not usually able to provide effective local community consultation and comment to the minister. Consultation with the local community is desirable to ensure that all relevant issues are addressed. Therefore it is proposed that in such a case the minister will consult with the relevant local government and affected members of the local community as an alternative to MEAC before making any decision. These changes will increase the opportunity for the community to provide input into decisions as well as improving the transparency and effectiveness of this section of the act.

I would stress that where approval for exploration or mining occurs via either of these processes, the compensation provisions of the act still apply.

Low-impact exploration

Experience has demonstrated that formal work plan approval for some forms of low-impact exploration represents an administrative imposition with no real value. Therefore it is proposed that low-impact exploration will be authorised by the grant of an exploration licence and not require a further work plan approval as is currently the case. Low-impact exploration will be limited to exploration work that is undertaken without using mechanical equipment or mechanical tools. This is equivalent to the prospecting work that can currently take place under a miner's right without further approval. The definition of low-impact exploration will also provide for further exploration activities to be included as low impact where the Minister for Energy and Resources and the Minister for Environment and Conservation agree. It is stressed that current notification provisions and consent provisions for access to restricted Crown land are not affected. Also heritage, conservation and environmental values will not be compromised.

Other administrative and approvals reforms

Finally I would like to talk to some other administrative reforms that are introduced by this bill.

The proposed amendments provide for a more efficient and open approval process that will require all information in support of the application to be lodged at the initial stage of making the application. Combined with the inclusion of moratorium periods whenever applications and licences cease, this will provide for a more transparent and competitive application process. Additionally the tender process when used will apply so that a successful tenderer secures the relevant licence rather than a right to lodge an application with priority.

Provisions are proposed whereby work approvals on freehold land are not frustrated where, after exercise of due diligence, relevant landowners cannot be located and therefore compensation cannot be settled. This situation is not uncommon in some goldfield areas where blocks of land may have been alienated from the Crown several decades ago and subsequently never developed. Any landowner that subsequently emerges will be entitled to compensation in the normal manner.

It is proposed to enhance the current registration system to provide a more extensive record of interests in licences granted under the act. This will simplify searches undertaken by potential investors

A stronger penalty regime is proposed that will include in some instances a continuing daily penalty where a breach is ongoing. This is consistent with the general departmental shift towards increasing operator responsibility for compliance and is commensurate with the penalties included in the Petroleum Act 1998.

Before commending the bill to the house I wish to advise the house on a further issue of concern to some sections of the community. The government will shortly be consulting with farmers, miners and the community to determine whether the current definition of peat as a mineral is in the best interests of the overall community.

Finally I would like to thank all members of the public and industry who have provided comments and input at various stages of the development of this bill.

I now commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned for Hon. PHILIP DAVIS (Gippsland) on motion of Hon. Bill Forwood.

Debate adjourned until next day.

PUBLIC LOTTERIES BILL

Second reading

Debate resumed from 24 October; motion of Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation).

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — The purposes of the bill are threefold. Firstly, the bill amends the licensing arrangements relating to the conduct of public lotteries to accommodate the national competition policy review findings that will apply from 1 July 2004 when the existing Tattersalls licence expires and, therefore, exclusivity terminates. Secondly, the bill is designed in such a way as to acknowledge that the existing lotteries licence in New South Wales expires on 30 June 2007, and that the development of a national market should be pursued from that point in time. Thirdly, the bill is designed to allow a licence to be issued to specifically cover the conduct of a footy tipping competition.

I am pleased to advise the house that the National Party has resolved not to oppose the bill. I shall spend a couple of minutes talking about the reasons for that conclusion and the process by which the party arrived at that position.

At the outset, the National Party is prepared to acknowledge that the bill represents a reasoned and reasonable response to the national competition review process. In that context I refer to the minister's statement in the second-reading speech:

> … it is this government's intention to issue public lottery licences in force from 1 July 2007 by way of transparent, contestable competitive tender processes.

I underline the word 'transparent' and I will return to examine the concept of transparency in detail because there is much about the bill that is not only far less than transparent but clandestine. I will speak at length about the way the 10-cent ticket levy has been manoeuvred to the advantage of the government; it is certainly anything but transparent. I know the Honourable Carlo Furletti will take the house through the current tender process for the footy tipping competition and the extent to which that would fail the test of transparency.

The National Party supports the concept of national competition, and on that basis is prepared to support the bill. The bill also delivers on the footy tipping competition. National Party members acknowledge that that was a precise pre-election commitment. Although we do not necessarily support it simply on the basis of mandate, we acknowledge that the government made its intent clear.

The concept of the footy tipping competition is flawed. The revenue flow is incredibly optimistic. We would like to meet the officer who drew up the anticipated revenue streams because we think he must be living in another world, much less another jurisdiction, and that the government's hypocrisy with the introduction of a new form of betting is nothing short of breathtaking. However, we acknowledge that the Bracks government announced the introduction of a statewide footy tipping competition as part of its pre-election promise.

There are two main effects of the bill to which I shall refer individually because they are separate. The first effect is the updating of the Tattersall Consultations Act and the second is the accommodation of the footy tipping competition.

I turn to the update of the Tattersall Consultations Act. There are three fundamental differences in what is now to be prescribed by way of rule book comparing the bill with the current law. I shall also take each of those in turn because they are also separate.

The first of the fundamental differences is that of licence conditions, and in particular, the question of exclusivity. It is a matter of fact that currently Tattersalls enjoys a licence to conduct a state lottery and soccer pools. A clause makes that entitlement exclusive until 30 June 2004. The sales revenue is shared in the following proportions: with respect to Tattersalls the rule book says that the prize pool shall comprise 60 per cent, the government shall be entitled by way of direct taxation and GST to 36 per cent, leaving Tattersalls with a margin of 4 per cent to administer the competition. With soccer pools, if one refers to the existing rule book, the percentages are different. The prize pool is 50 per cent, the share to government from direct revenue stream and the GST is 34 per cent, leaving Tattersalls with a margin of 16 per cent turnover from which to administer the competition.

The Kennett government commissioned a national competition policy review of the Tattersall Consultations Act and acknowledged at the outset that it was ripe for review because it was obvious to Blind Freddy that because of its exclusive licence, competition had been restricted in a basic way.

Only one licence has been issued for both competitions since they were introduced in the state. The report delivered in January 1998 was mildly critical, not scathingly, of the existing arrangements. It was best described perhaps as being cosy. It recommended that the existing legislation be replaced with conforming generic legislation.

The Productivity Commission report subsequent to that national competition policy review went a step further. Not only was it critical of the existing arrangements to the extent that it reduced competition but it highlighted the potential benefits that could be derived from the development of a national market. That was the circumstance that unfolded under the previous government.

The review examined three models. I will have to go from memory because I could not find the report. However, I know I saw it in some form. The first model was consideration of open slather — in other words, licences would be issued to all comers. That would have been interesting. Secondly, the view canvassed the prospect of a number of operators, but that number being specifically limited by legislation. The third model was to capture a flexible legislative framework to manage the benefits of contestability. That, to all intents and purposes, was the option apparently adopted by the incoming government.

I am not in a position to know exactly the extent to which that recommendation is captured in the bill. However, I am prepared to say that so far as I am concerned it is not a bad outcome. It can be argued that the legislative change the house is now examining could hang on the recommendations of that review. Because the National Party supports both the review process and the objectives of national competition policy it believes there is a degree of credibility added to the bill when it is looked at in the light of a response to the national competition policy process.

It is a tad ironic for the roles to be reversed in this chamber when it comes to national competition policy. I probably remember better than most the extent to which Labor when in opposition carped about the Kennett government's so-called blind support of contestability. I remember the debates regarding the Auditor-General extremely well. I also remember the criticism again and again that the Kennett government was too heavily reliant upon the gaming dollar, but in the next breath the same critics come forward and — guess what? — one of the first things they decide to do is to introduce another form of gaming in the state. They were the same people who criticised the Kennett government for its so-called reliance on the gaming dollar. The government is seeking credibility on the basis that the legislation is in response to the national competition policy review, the very same thing it criticised not that long ago.

It is clear that the bill is designed to specifically harness the prospect of a national market. I do not mind that. I am not pious about these issues. However, it is a tad

ironic coming from Labor to the extent that the bill is designed to improve or increase the share of the gaming dollar in Victoria. That is the conclusion one must draw if one pursues the concept of a national model.

Therefore I say again that although we will not oppose the bill, the hypocrisy is breathtaking. We start from the point, and always have, that the revenue derived from the state-run lottery and from soccer pools, and from other forms of gaming as well, is an important reality for the state's budget. Again it is a matter of record that gambling taxes in total in the current year are expected to be $1.7 billion, which is about 15 per cent of our total tax take. It is a massive contribution, particularly to our health sector.

This bill sets the scene for a nationally contested market. It does so unashamedly. That is one of the stated intentions expressed both in the purposes of the bill and in the supporting second-reading speech. It anticipates the expiry of existing exclusive licences currently enjoyed in New South Wales, where exclusivity will terminate in June 2007, and in Queensland, where exclusivity for the current operator will terminate in 2009.

And that is why we are told — I don't have to rely on any in-depth research; we are told in the second-reading speech — the renewal of the current licence contemplated in the bill is to go to 2007. It is specifically to accommodate the current New South Wales legislation.

The rationale is that if we were able to harness the market currently enjoyed by New South Wales and Victoria, that would be about 55 per cent of the existing national market, and if we could entice Queensland to become part of the same process we are talking about 75 per cent of the national market. So let us not be coy about the intent of the legislation, let us not be lulled into a false sense of security. This is Labor actually trying to improve its take from the gaming sector. No other construction can be put on it. If one reads the second-reading speech and the objectives of the bill one sees that that is what it is about.

The interesting thing in that context is that the bill does not abandon the concept of an exclusive licence being granted in the state of Victoria. It specifically says that the law of the state shall provide for licences — plural.

It raises a few questions. The new legislation provides that the minister is able to determine the number of public lottery licences that may be issued under clause 17 and — here is a new power for the minister — he may impose any conditions thought fit under clause 28. Therefore in practical terms, taking all the huff and puff away, the only thing that may change is the licence duration. The existing act says that the licence may not be for a period greater than 10 years and may be extended from time to time by a period of not more than 10 years, whereas the bill specifies a maximum of seven years and a once-only extension for a maximum of 12 months, and then a new licence must become contestable.

In reality the only thing that we know will change is the duration of the licence. All the rest might simply amount to a continuation of the existing circumstance. We might simply be reimposing the status quo. It will depend upon the negotiations and the instructions issued by the minister. Let us get this on the record: this is not some major breakthrough, some exciting shift in direction. At the end of the day the only thing we know will change is the duration of the licence.

The second issue is the role of the Victorian Casino and Gaming Authority, because for the first time the authority gets a formal guernsey in the licensing process. Under clause 24 any application for a licence must be referred by the minister to the authority for a report as to the applicant's good repute and suitability.

The Secretary of the Department of Treasury and Finance has a similar reporting role in respect of applicants having a sound and stable financial background. We learn that both the authority and the secretary can recommend disciplinary action including licence cancellation — a pretty bold move — where the operator no longer meets the criteria. In other words, both the authority and the secretary of the department have an ongoing role in monitoring the performance of the licensee under clauses 44 and 45.

I want to reinforce my comments about the issue of cancellation. This is a new power granted to the minister, and it represents a dramatic departure from the existing act. Under the existing legislation the licence of an operator can be revoked only where the minister proves to the satisfaction of the Supreme Court that the operator has wilfully contravened a condition of the licence. That is a pretty tough testing process. But that has all gone, and now we have a brand-new power that enables the minister to cancel a licence without reference to anyone. I will come back to that point again and again because it will have extraordinary ramifications and implications for the results of the negotiations relating to the licence fee.

I have no argument whatsoever with the new role of the Victorian Casino and Gaming Authority — that makes sense — but I am very, very nervous about the extent to

which a formal responsibility has, through this bill, been laid at the feet of the Secretary of the Department of Treasury and Finance.

I do not know of any other circumstance where responsibility of this sort is moved from a minister to a senior public servant. I think it is a question of shifting responsibility. I have not seen it occur in this sort of context before, and I am really concerned about not just the effect of it in this case but the precedent it establishes.

The next major difference between the current act and the bill concerns taxing arrangements. The taxing arrangements in the Public Lotteries Bill are incredibly complex and they have changed on no fewer than three occasions in recent times. In an attempt to demonstrate to the chamber the effect of those changes I have prepared a table that tracks them, and I seek leave to have the table incorporated in *Hansard* and to direct my comments to it during the second-reading debate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. G. B. Ashman) — Order! Has the table been shown to Hansard and the President?

Hon. R. M. HALLAM — It has been delivered to the minister, to the President and to Hansard, and I have copies available for other honourable members.

Leave granted; table as follows:

PUBLIC LOTTERIES BILL

TAXING ARRANGEMENTS:

			TATTERSALLS CONSULTATIONS	SOCCERPOOLS
STEP 1	**Original arrangement:**			
	Player return		60.00%	50.00%
	State Government		36.00	34.00
	Tattersalls		4.00	16.00
			100.00%	100.00%
STEP 2	**In anticipation of GST:**			
	Player return		60.00%	50.00%
	State Govt.	(direct)	32.36	29.46
		GST	3.64	4.54
	Tattersalls		4.00	16.00
			100.00%	100.00%
STEP 3	**Following ATO ruling on agency commission:**			
	Player return		60.00%	50.00%
	State Govt.	(direct)	31.66	28.76
		GST	4.34	5.24
	Tattersalls		4.00	16.00
			100.00%	100.00%
STEP 4	**New rates under Public Lotteries Bill:**			
	(Shifting rates to "player loss")			
	A. Where GST NOT payable			
	Player return		60.00%	50.00%
	State Govt. (direct)			
	90% of player loss (40%)		36.00	
	68% of player loss (50%)			34.00
	Tattersalls		4.00	16.00
			100.00%	100.00%
	B. Where GST is payable			
	Player return		60.00%	50.00%
	State Govt. (direct)			
	79.40% of player loss (40%)		31.76	
	57.52% of player loss (50%)			28.76
	GST			
	1/11 of player loss & comm'n			
		(47.7%)	4.34	
		(57.7%)		5.24
			96.10	84.00
	Tattersalls retains		3.90!!	16.00
			100.00%	100.00%

Hon. R. M. HALLAM — In the course of the previous debate on the Tattersall Consultations (Amendment) Bill I heard a government member say that part of the thrust of that bill — it was not argued but was reinforced by a government member — was to protect Tattersalls, particularly the revenue stream it enjoys. I made a comment as an aside about that at the time; while I had no argument with it, I saw it as an accurate depiction of the effect of the bill.

The bit that bemuses me is why the government would go to so much trouble to protect the revenue stream of Tattersalls in one bill and surreptitiously raid it in the next. The bit that sticks in my craw is that the raid is not mentioned in the second-reading speech. It is only when someone is prepared to work out the percentages that one sees how the funny-money deal is constructed. That is why I have taken the time to prepare the table.

I shall go through the table step by step to demonstrate how the chicanery has been played out. It shows that the original arrangement, which I have described as step one, was for a player return of 60 per cent, a state government yield of 36 per cent and a percentage for Tattersalls of 4 per cent from which to manage the competition. Because the GST was coming in, legislation was introduced in the autumn sessional period to split the state government's share to accommodate the GST impact. The GST was to be 3.64 per cent, and in anticipation of the GST the legislation reduced the tax stream going to the state government to 32.36 per cent, specifically to maintain the revenue shares that were previously applicable.

Then there was the complication of the Australian Taxation office saying, 'Hang on, the GST should apply not just to your definition of turnover; you should apply it to the agents' commission as well'. So the sums had to be done again.

The table provides the clearest way to demonstrate that. The GST was increased from 3.64 per cent to 4.34 per cent. Therefore a bill needed to be introduced to reduce the direct state government taxation from 32.36 per cent to 31.66 per cent. The most important feature of the table is that it demonstrates that after the Tattersall Consultations (Amendment) Bill, which was passed a few moments ago is enacted, Tattersalls gets to retain 4 per cent of turnover.

While there has been some shifting of sand and a flurry of activity under the surface — a terrible mixture of metaphors! — Tattersalls will still receive 4 per cent of turnover. Now this bill is before the house. The second-reading speech states:

> A licensee will pay taxes levied on the basis of player loss. This brings lotteries into line with all other gambling forms, except bookmakers.

That is the logic the house is asked to accept. The tax regime will now be shifted so that tax levies will be based on the concept of player loss rather than on turnover. The speech continues:

> These tax rates will apply to Tattersalls consultations upon repeal of the Tattersall Consultations Act —

that is, the amending bill with which the house has just dealt —

> The tax rates for lotteries other than footy tipping licence —

there seems to be a word missing there —

> have been chosen to be comparable with the turnover tax rates currently levied upon Tattersalls, for the given payout rate of 60 per cent.

If one took that on face value one could be forgiven for expecting that the share of the revenue would remain static. But that is what honourable members are told. That is why I am so cross with the government about the extent to which it set out to muddy the water. The speech then explains, with more of its logic:

> … This is to ensure sales in jurisdictions that are not subject to the GST face the same effective tax rates as sales in those jurisdictions that are subject to the GST.

Yes, but that does not take you anywhere. It states further:

> This approach is consistent with that proposed for the turnover tax regime in the current Tattersall Consultations Act, and meets the state's obligations under the intergovernmental agreement.

That is wrong. That is a falsification. If honourable members follow through the table I will demonstrate the extent to which that is wrong. The speech says further — here is the out and here are the weasel words:

> Slight adjustments have also been made to take account of the recently identified need to make GST-related adjustments relating to the treatment of commission —

I have no argument with that —

> and for the removal of the 10-cent ticket levy on certain Tattersalls games.

Minister, I want you to get ready, because when the house goes into committee I will ask you to explain why the author of the second-reading speech saw the need for the words 'certain Tattersalls games'. I will ask you a lot of other questions about the 10-cent levy, but I want to know precisely why that terminology was used.

When one follows through the percentages which now apply in the new bill and which appear in clause 54 — I expect honourable members will see that I have taken the figures in my table directly from the bill — one sees the figure of 79.4 per cent for player loss in clause 54(2)(c)(1).

Take one eleventh of player loss and commission, which is 4.34 — use the table, Minister. I have assumed the same commission that was given in the context of the previous bill. Honourable members were told that an agreement had been reached with Tattersalls whereby the commission was assumed to be 7.7 per cent. One eleventh would therefore be 0.7 per cent. Using exactly the same figures — hey-presto! — at the bottom of the table I discover that Tattersalls does not get 4 per cent of turnover but 3.9 per cent of turnover. A number of questions will be asked relating to that, Minister. The first is: why was that not disclosed in the second-reading speech? Why was that allowed to go through to the keeper?

I note that if I use the percentages supplied by the bill in respect of soccer pools, the yield to all the stakeholders is maintained. So this is a deliberate ploy to claw back the 10-cent levy.

I do not mind that. I would be happy to debate that issue, but the government did not announce it, and that is what makes me hot under the collar. The National Party had to scrounge it this way by doing the percentages.

I also note that a letter dated 29 September was sent to the accredited agents under the hand of the Minister for Gaming in the other place. I refer to the letter in the context of several aspects of the bill. The letter reads in part:

> The new act will retain many of the main features of the current environment, with minimal impact upon agents.

I remind honourable members that the letter is addressed to the agents and should be seen in that light.

> However, the government has taken the opportunity in this legislation to abolish the 10-cent ticket levy …

It does not say that the legislation will abolish the 10-cent ticket levy on certain Tattersalls games. At least the government was prepared to tell the agents that the 10-cent levy was to be abolished. It let Parliament find out for itself! That would be bad enough, but guess what, the 10-cent ticket levy has not been abolished. The government is lying through its teeth. What it has done is remove the 10-cent ticket levy with a blaze of publicity directed at the agents and then, through the backdoor, claw it back from the percentage enjoyed by Tattersalls.

Was Tattersalls told about this shift in the percentage? If it was not told a number of questions emerge. If Tattersalls was told even more questions arise. Because that implies that the existing licence enjoyed by Tattersalls is to be changed by the bill. If that is the case I want to know about the pay-off for the loss of exclusivity, the pay-off for the introduction of a new supervision fee and the pay-off for imposing the cost of the audit provisions on the licensee. A range of questions flow. I want to know whether the 3.9 per cent now to flow to Tattersalls will flow immediately upon the passage of the bill. If it does the government is in real trouble because these provisions smell to high heaven.

I come back again to the letter sent to the agents, those who fall into the category of ‘Dear accredited representative’ according to the Minister for Gaming. During the committee stage I will ask when the bill will apply from. Does it mean the government has negotiated a new licence agreement with Tattersalls? Does it mean Tattersalls has agreed to a cut of 2.5 per cent in its share of the cake? Understand that that is what it is. This is not 10 cents in $100; this is a shift, as the table demonstrates, from a commission of 4 per cent of turnover to 3.9 per cent of turnover for ever and a day under the existing licence, if we are to believe what we have been told. That is 10 cents in $4, which is 2.5 per cent.

I do not know what Tattersalls profit margin is, but it may be that we are talking about half its profits. This is not a cosy deal on the side but a substantive change in the terms of the existing licence. What has wound me up is that the National Party had to find this out by working through the percentages. The government put us off the scent by using words that were ambiguous.

Hon. C. A. Furletti — Rubbery.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM — Yes, weasel words to put us off the scent. If that is the case, look out! I am hostile about this. I welcome the debate about negotiating a new licence, but I get wound up when I find out I have been sold a pup. That is what the government is doing. I put the minister on notice that a range of questions will be asked during the committee debate. I indicate that the implications of the bill are absolutely pivotal to my attitude on how the bill should be treated and whether it will be passed. For instance, if the new commission is to apply immediately a range of other conditions of the licence should be questioned.

I refer to the football tipping competition and the licence the bill now provides to the Bracks government. The first question to the minister is whether the football tipping competition constitutes another public lottery under clause 52 and whether therefore the minimum player return is 60 per cent. The answer to that question will affect my thinking about the way the bill should be handled in this chamber. If it is another public lottery the minimum player return will be 60 per cent.

Clause 54 sets out the public lottery tax. The prescribed percentage player loss in relation to the Australian Football League (AFL) footy tipping competition is 58.41 per cent, and 67.50 per cent where the GST is not payable. Why is there a fundamental difference between the percentages cited for the footy tipping licence compared to either the soccer pool or the public lottery? The percentage of player loss for the soccer pool is 57.52 per cent where GST is payable and 68 per cent where GST is not payable, and for the public lottery it is 79.40 per cent where GST is payable and 90 per cent where GST is not payable.

There is a fundamental difference in percentages. It would have been appropriate for the second-reading speech to explain the difference, but it is silent on that issue. I have presumed the difference in percentages is to accommodate a share to the AFL. I would like to know the answer to that. If it does provide a share to the AFL, what is that share? If a cosy deal has been done with the AFL how is that percentage to be used?

I have an interest in country football, and I heard the government talk about the way the new footy tipping competition would help country football.

Hon. R. A. Best — Or women's sport?

Hon. R. M. HALLAM — I have not come to that yet. I would like to know what the deal is. If the opposition is to give its blessing to the bill, what is the kickback to the AFL?

Hon. Andrew Brideson — It is not mentioned in the bill.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM — It is not mentioned anywhere. A range of questions arise as a direct result of the differences in the percentages and the fact that the second-reading speech is silent on the issue.

What does the government expect us to do? Blithely agree to a piece of legislation that leaves all those questions up in the air? Or worse still, agree to a piece of legislation accompanied by a second-reading speech that is structured in such a way as to throw us off the scent? These are the questions we want answers to. They will be specific and there will be plenty of them. I am determined that we will find out what has been done behind closed doors.

Apart from the hypocrisy of the government bringing in this legislation after its constant criticism of the Kennett government being too heavily reliant on gaming revenue, I am not assuaged by the commitment to direct the revenue from this footy tipping competition to sports and health. I note that an amendment was moved in the other house and I acknowledge the extent to which the government accommodated my concern about this. The bill was amended to include a subclause that states:

> It is the intention of the Parliament that amounts paid into the consolidated fund in respect of AFL tipping competitions be applied for the purposes of grassroots sports and for any one or more of the following purposes: health, women's sport and sports medicine.

I am prepared to put on the record that that is a step in the right direction because when the bill first arrived it was silent on that matter. Notwithstanding all the commitments made by the Labor Party in opposition, when the bill arrived in its first cut there was no commitment about the application of the revenue stream.

I am also interested to discover why all the amendments provided to me in advance of the debate in the other place were not included in the bill. The Minister for Sport and Recreation's adviser was kind enough to give me the fourth draft of those amendments, but not all of them survived. I would be interested to learn why the last one in the draft fell off the agenda.

In passing I make the point that the existing revenue is totally hypothecated to the hospitals and charities fund. I am a bit bemused by the extent to which the government is sensitive about including the same sorts of conditions to the revenue stream coming from the footy tipping competition. I will be chasing that issue during the committee stage.

We say that the concept itself is totally flawed, that already out in the marketplace there are two formal avenues for those who are interested in the product being promoted by the government. We make the point that to the extent the new one — the one being proffered in this bill — is successful, it must pull some of the revenue from the two existing avenues. We think for a start that it is likely to capture the office competition, and the government is prepared to acknowledge that, although I might add not in the second-reading speech.

I went back to some documentation produced by Labor prior to the election. It is another election commitment entitled 'Building Victoria's sporting life'. Concerning the extent to which the new footy tipping competition will impact on existing schemes — the competitions conducted on a casual basis across nearly every office and workplace in the state — the Labor Party document says:

> Labor will mainstream what already occurs in many workplaces. This will not represent additional gambling.

See the sensitivity: 'This will not represent additional gambling'. Even if it does not, the alternative is even more delicious. If it does not increase gambling, the only effect will be that the government will gets its grubby hands on a percentage. The competition will be shifted from the office and the workplace into an institutionalised scheme and the government will get at least 40 per cent of the turnover. We are yet to hear from the government as to whether it will be 40 per cent or 50 per cent, but it will be at least 40 per cent. What sort of scheme is that?

If we look at the other alternative in the marketplace, called Footy Tip 8, there is an even better indication of how grandiose the anticipated revenue stream from the government's new scheme is. If we are to believe what Labor said in opposition, this will be an Aladdin's Cave. In the same document I quoted a moment ago under the heading 'A national footy tipping competition' we learn that the first 70 per cent of the projected revenue will be allocated to health portfolio expenditure and that this is expected to be $14.58 million over three years from 2000–01 to 2002–03. The other 30 per cent is to be shared between sports medicine, with 22 per cent, and women in sport, with 8 per cent.

I did the quick calculations. It means that on average over the first three years the government is expecting net revenue of $20.8 million. I do not know where those figures came from but I have had a quick look at the alternative product in the marketplace and, based on what I can glean from the competitors, I reckon what the government has anticipated represents 20 or 30 times more turnover than is currently being attracted by a scheme already out there in the marketplace. I might be wrong, and I would love to have the minister correct me. I think it is maybe 20 times the turnover.

This is fairies at the bottom of the garden stuff, but the government has told individual organisations that they should get ready to rely on the revenue flow. Sporting groups are presuming that they will survive on the revenue flow referred to in this document. On my reckoning they have Buckley's of getting anywhere near that. I would love to hear the government's synopsis of the scheme.

I want to know where the AFL's share is going, whether there is anything in this for country football and whether there is any deal on what the AFL will enjoy. I will ask the Minister for Sport and Recreation specific questions about the reporting process because I want to know whether the government intends to report on this scheme at the end of the season. I want to know whether at the end of the football season we can get an idea of how the scheme went.

One might also say that I am worried about the competition in another context because when I look at the application form for the competitive scheme promoted by Tabcorp, guess what? I see the AFL insignia all over it. I think I am entitled to presume that there is some sort of contractual arrangement between the Australian Football League and Tabcorp. Nothing is mentioned in the second-reading speech. Are we to believe that Tabcorp has simply been run over? Will it get a chance at the licence?

In any event Tabcorp already has a scheme, and I have not heard anybody complain that the scheme is ultra vires. I have not heard anybody say that the scheme is not consistent with Tabcorp's licence. I believe Tabcorp paid about $600 million for its licence — $597 million to cover both a wagering and gaming licence. How much of that could be attributed to sports betting? There has to be something there because no-one has raised a question mark about the existing footy tipping competition. It has been legal and has been deemed to be intra vires. So what is Tabcorp's role in all this? Are we to believe a new licence is to be issued and the devil take the hindmost?

If that is the case two fundamental questions remain. How will the new product survive with a 60 per cent player return when the one out in the marketplace, which is producing very little by way of comparative income, has under the term of the licence an 80 per cent player return? What poor dopey football follower would decide to take part in a competition where the player return was 20 per cent less than one that is already out there? What dopey minister would have the house believe that there will be $20 million for the plucking by simply putting a new product out into the marketplace? I cannot believe the incredible assumptions the government is making about revenue.

The National Party sees the whole thing to be totally flawed. We have concluded that there is nothing much more going for it than that it was a good idea at the time. Labor, with the luxury of opposition, made all

those grandiose promises and then got stuck with them. It did not expect to land in government. This is a glaring example of how that has come back to haunt the government.

I want to know about the deals done behind doors. I am not persuaded that we should support the bill in its current form unless we are given the information that anyone else in the marketplace would require before making a commercial decision. Honourable members are responsible for the administration of the public purse.

Among the questions I will pose in the committee stage are the following: when will the new tax rates be applied; does Tattersalls have the right of recovery regarding the reduction in commission that was slipped in via the back door; is the footy tipping competition to be another public lottery and therefore have a 60 per cent guaranteed minimum player return; why are the taxing percentages lower for the football tipping competition; what share has gone to the AFL; what strings are attached to that share with the AFL; and will the outcome be reported at the end of the season for all to see? I also want to know why the amendments that were provided to me in advance of the debate in the upper house were changed.

In conclusion, I indicate that subject to my getting some reasonable answers about those questions and many more that I will be posing in the committee stage, the National Party will not oppose the bill.

Hon. G. D. ROMANES (Melbourne) — I am pleased to hear that the National Party will not oppose the Public Lotteries Bill. The bill reflects the government's response to an independent national competition policy review of the Tattersall Consultations Act. It gives effect to the main findings of that national competition policy review, which found that the Tattersall Consultations Act does not conform to national competition policy principles of removing restrictions on competition. All honourable members know that the current operator of lotteries products in Victoria, Tattersalls, has enjoyed that monopoly for about 40 years.

The national competition policy review recommended the replacement of the current regime with conforming generic lotteries legislation. Mr Hallam spoke about the initiation of that review by the former government, and that review has come up with various recommendations. I am sure the opposition would be highly critical of this government if it failed to act on those recommendations to put legislation into place that would bring the state into conformity with national competition policy in this field and thereby attract sanctions.

The bill is designed to replace the Tattersall Consultations Act as the legislation regulating lotteries such as the existing Tattslotto-type products. Unlike the Tattersall act, the proposed legislation allows the government to issue a licence to an operator other than Tattersalls, which has enjoyed a monopoly for four decades or more.

However, as mentioned previously, while the bill gives the government flexibility in the number of licences it wants to grant, the government has the option if it decides to exercise it of continuing the practice of issuing a single licence. The bill provides for a transition period by honouring the current entitlement of Tattersalls to a monopoly until 30 June 2004. Tattersalls is also granted a three-year extension of its current licence subject to a suitable outcome of a negotiated fee for the extra three years. The three-year extension would bring the Victorian and New South Wales lotteries licences into sync because the licences would then expire simultaneously in 2007. Exclusivity arrangements in place in both states would cease to exist from that date, enabling New South Wales and Victoria to cooperate in facilitating a national market in the lotteries area.

One of the main aspects of the bill is that it provides the mechanism by which the government will meet its election commitment to introduce an AFL footy tipping competition. As Mr Hallam remarked, that was a very public commitment in the election campaign of August to September 1999 and was greeted positively by the community.

In some ways I see myself as not the most appropriate person to be talking about footy tipping competitions, having had a passing and not very long involvement in tipping competitions at my previous place of employment. About three years ago I decided that I would join the office footy tipping competition but found that at the end of every week when 5 o'clock came and I had not got my tips in I had to scramble around, find out who was playing and make a stab in the dark as to which teams I might support for the coming matches.

My poor knowledge of football left me towards the bottom of the ladder in the office competition at the end of that year. The next year I thought I would be a bit smarter and enlist the support of my youngest son who is a fervent follower of football games each week, so I asked him to help me in the competition. At the end of each week I would contact him by phone before I got

our footy tips in, but there was one hitch to it. Along with all other males in our household he supported Collingwood and we had to tip Collingwood every week, so once again I ended up at the bottom of the ladder in the office footy tipping competition.

So my involvement with footy tipping competitions has not been very serious. However, I recognise how important footy tipping competitions are to thousands of others who participate each week during the Australian Football League season in speculative activity about who will or will not win in the coming week, given that nowadays footy is no longer played exclusively on weekends.

The AFL footy competition to be set in place will fulfil a need for many people in Victoria and possibly in other parts of Australia as well. Many people who do not have access to office footy tipping competitions will be able to participate in the spirit of a broader state-run national footy tipping competition. On the point made by Mr Hallam about the possibility of capturing many of those office footy tipping competitions, I suspect many employers would be quite pleased for that to happen, given the time and energy that goes into those competitions during office hours each week in various parts of the state.

Hon. R. M. Hallam — I agree, except that they might not be too pleased when they see the percentages!

Hon. G. D. ROMANES — That is another issue.

Part 2 of the bill addresses the conduct of the new regime and part 3 the licensing. The bill sets the life of a licence at no more than seven years, with the possibility of a once-only 12-month extension under certain circumstances. It provides that licences cannot be renewed although holders can bid for a new licence.

The minister can issue a licence after he or she is satisfied that both the Victorian Casino and Gaming Authority and the Department of Treasury and Finance have conducted proper probity and commercial checks on an applicant. The issue of licences will follow clear and transparent processes, as with the competitive tender for the footy tipping licence. I am sure many members are aware of the process already under way that involves an expression of interest from those who wish to tender for operation of the footy tipping competition. That will be followed by probity checks and subsequent invitations to bid, which is the standard tender process.

For the first time the regulation of lotteries will come under the supervision of the Victorian Casino and Gaming Authority. That will increase the regulation in that area. The bill provides for inspection, regulation enforcement and prosecution of offences powers to be vested with that authority.

The bill bans the sale of lottery tickets to children under 18 years of age, which extends the current ban on scratch tickets and therefore ensures consistency in gambling legislation. The bill removes the 10-cent ticket tax and merges that into the overall tax rates set out in clause 54. It converts the current turnover tax regime to a player loss tax, which is consistent with all major forms of gambling. The merger of the 10-cent ticket tax was one of the recommendations from the national competition policy review. The minimum return to players of 60 per cent for lotteries and 50 per cent for soccer pools is retained. The question Mr Hallam has raised about revenues from the footy tipping pools and other matters will be addressed during the committee stage.

Honourable members have before us a framework for issuing lottery licences that reforms and modernises the regulation of lotteries in Victoria. The new framework will position Victoria for participation in future competition in the lotteries and footy pools areas at a national level. I commend the bill to the house.

Hon. ANDREW BRIDESON (Waverley) — Excessive gambling may cause financial, personal, or family problems and it can become addictive. Is it not ironic that today the government released a new system of warning people about the downside of gambling on the very day honourable members are debating a bill that will put another gambling product on the market? How hypocritical of the government!

Honourable members have just heard a short speech from the Honourable Glenyys Romanes, who failed to address any of the real issues espoused by the Honourable Roger Hallam in his remarkable, professional and very astute contribution tonight. She also showed a lack of in-depth knowledge of what will really happen with the passage of the bill. I also suspect members of the cabinet — let alone those on the government back bench — did not have the full details put before them.

I am sure they have been hoodwinked by the Minister for Gaming — perhaps we should rename him the Minister for Hypocrisy — or maybe it is the bureaucrats who have hoodwinked the government. I hope we get some answers during the committee stage. The Liberal Party does not oppose the bill, but like the National Party it has serious concerns about many

elements of the bill. In committee opposition members will be seeking answers.

It is important to put on the record that the debate on the bill in the Assembly was extremely brief. There were only three speakers — the shadow opposition spokesman on gaming, the honourable member for Hawthorn; the Leader of the National Party; and a member of the government who spoke for a very short time. That reinforces the important role that is played by the upper house. It is critical that it reviews proposed legislation. It is incumbent upon this chamber to probe, to question, to seek the truth and to keep the government to its pre-election promise of being open, honest, transparent and accountable. The Honourable Roger Hallam has certainly put the government on notice of that.

A letter sent by the Minister for Gaming on 29 September to all accredited Tattersalls representatives shows the absolute hypocrisy of the minister and the government. In that letter the minister says the government has taken the opportunity to abolish the 10-cent levy in this bill and that the effect of that would be 'to ease the cost of the most popular lottery for the general community'. He went on to say:

> The government expects agents to benefit from higher community demand for lottery tickets in response to the removal of the ticket levy.

So there is absolute proof that the government is trying to increase lottery ticket sales and, following on from that, is attempting to increase the government take.

The Honourable Roger Hallam referred to the 1999–2000 financial report for the state of Victoria, which shows that taxation revenue in the past 12 months has increased by $920 million, or 10.5 per cent. So much for the anti-gambling regulations of this government!

In response to that letter to the accredited representatives, the Licensed Agents Association of Victoria states in its recent newsletter:

> Members will have received a letter from the Minister for Gaming … which refers to the removal of the ticket tax and which suggests that the reduction in transaction value for the customer means they will spend more.
>
> That's not a proposition that any agent would agree with and it is a proposition that we rejected in discussions with Treasury and even in final discussions with the minister's advisers when they were drafting the letter.

I think that speaks for itself.

The Honourable Roger Hallam has outlined in great detail the issues he wants to raise in committee. I put the government on notice that if the opposition parties are not satisfied that they are getting honest responses they will invoke standing order no. 178, which provides for progress to be reported. We do not want to delay the passing of the bill, but we do expect the government to play the game honestly and fairly and to give honest and truthful answers.

One of the issues raised by the Honourable Roger Hallam was that the bill says nothing about the Australian Football League receiving any sort of revenue. In his media release of Thursday, 3 August, entitled 'National footy tipping competition gets green light' the Minister for Gaming states:

> The competition will provide additional funding for sports programs and will also provide a revenue stream to the AFL.

We want to know what that revenue stream will consist of, how much it will be and how it will be applied. We will also be seeking answers to other issues related to that.

When the minister appeared before the Public Accounts and Estimates Committee on 8 August he was asked a number of questions about the national football tipping competition. He said in response to a question from the Honourable Gordon Rich-Phillips that the income from the national footy tipping competition would be a benefit, would go to sports development and health and would guarantee an income share for the Australian Football League. Nowhere is that provided for in the bill; nowhere is it stated in the second-reading speech. That is something on which we definitely want an answer.

The opposition parties also want to know what the link is between the introduction of the football tipping competition and the extension of Tattersalls licence. Why is this generic bill being introduced in its current form and at this time? We want to know whether premiums will be applied to football tipping. We want to know what the supervision charge will be. We want to know why there is a proposal for the extension of time for the promoter — that is in clause 90, part 8 — when the licence is valid till 2004. That will effectively see Tattersalls given a three-year extension.

The opposition wants to know why the government is not guaranteeing exclusivity for the Tattersalls licence. That has important implications for the value of the anticipated premium. The opposition contends the government is devaluing the licence.

What are the details of the agreement regarding the premium between the promoter, Tattersalls, and the minister? To cut to the quick, what is the deal?

Many other questions will be raised during the committee stage. The Liberal Party will not oppose the bill, although it should reserve judgment on that until it gets some accurate responses from the government.

Hon. S. M. NGUYEN (Melbourne West) — The Public Lotteries Bill will repeal the Tattersall Consultations Act. Prior to the election last year the then shadow minister proposed the establishment of a footy tipping competition. Many Victorians follow the football keenly and from time to time that enthusiasm can be seen in the workplace and elsewhere. People who like football enjoy entering a footy tipping competition. It is good that the government will control tipping competitions.

Hon. R. M. Hallam — How will you control it?

Hon. S. M. NGUYEN — People want to play footy tipping.

Hon. R. M. Hallam — You are just trying to get a percentage out of it.

Hon. S. M. NGUYEN — No, even if people do not go to the footy they want to be involved in a tipping competition — they may not follow a footy team but want to play a game or be in a competition.

I come from a non-English-speaking background and many of my friends follow the footy but they do not bet on matches. They like to follow the game every week. A tipping competition is an opportunity for them.

Hon. R. M. Hallam — You are actually promoting it.

Hon. S. M. NGUYEN — We are not promoting it. People can place small bets for fun. They will say to each other, 'How is the footy going?'.

I will speak briefly about the bill because it is important to allow both sides of the house to put their cases. The bill creates a new act. Unlike the Tattersall Consultations (Amendment) Bill debated earlier today, the bill will allow the government to issue a licence to an operator other than Tattersalls. Tattersalls has enjoyed a monopoly for 40 years. The bill will remove the 10-cent ticket tax and will convert the current turnover tax regime to that of a player loss tax.

The bill also requires for the first time that the amount of commission a player pays in the price of a ticket be included on the ticket. The bill will give the government the mechanism to grant the licence to run a footy tipping competition from 2001. The revenue will be directed to health and grassroots sporting organisations.

The licence will be issued for not longer than seven years and cannot be renewed, although existing licence-holders can bid for new licences. The government wishes to make tipping competitions more competitive. The minister can issue a licence after satisfying himself or herself that the Victorian Casino and Gaming Authority and the Department of Treasury and Finance have carried out proper checks on the applicant.

The bill will provide funding to sports organisations. It is important that they receive money from competition revenue. The community needs sports funding so that participants can be attracted to different sports.

The bill will ban the sale of lottery tickets to children aged under 18 years. Young people should not be able to access gaming venues or places that house gambling machines. I have talked to many people about educating elderly people and parents. Sometimes the older people ask young people — perhaps their children or young relatives — to buy lottery tickets on their behalf. In the future those parents and older relatives or friends will need to understand it is illegal for young people to buy tickets for them.

Tattersalls is important to Victoria but it must become more competitive. I commend the bill to the house.

Hon. C. A. FURLETTI (Templestowe) — It is with some concern that I make a brief contribution to the debate on the Public Lotteries Bill. I share the concerns of the Honourable Roger Hallam who has drawn and quartered and analysed the legislation in an appropriate way.

Hon. G. D. Romanes — Hung.

Hon. C. A. FURLETTI — No, not hung. I hope during the committee stage answers will be forthcoming when one goes beyond the veneer and behind the smoke-and-mirrors aspect of the bill.

The bill purports to be a rewrite of the Tattersall Consultations Act and involves the repeal of that act and the establishment of a new public lotteries regime to take effect at the end of the current licence to Tattersalls, the existing promoter. It involves an expansion of gaming in Victoria. That is a complete reversal of the philosophy of the government, which attacked the previous government for its

implementation — almost to a T — of Labor Party legislation as drafted and proposed by the Cain and Kirner governments. Nevertheless the government now proposes to expand gaming by introducing a third level of lottery and a third piece of legislation to provide for that new lottery.

The legislation is introduced ostensibly as part of the national competition policy review, which must be addressed by the end of this calendar year. When one analyses the current scenario with Tattersalls, one sees that in real terms its position is as secure as it can be until 30 June 2004. There is also provision for an extension of its licence until 2007.

In the briefing I asked whether it was the minister or somebody else who was to delegate and I was informed that it was specifically the minister who would negotiate a premium to be paid by Tattersalls for the extension of the term.

Hon. R. M. Hallam — A very dangerous precedent.

Hon. C. A. FURLETTI — Yes, it is interesting. The question that comes to mind is: why does it have to be done now? The act sets out that the negotiated premium should be arrived at by agreement before 30 June 2002. If one takes that first, we have at least almost two years in which to conduct those negotiations on a normal commercial basis. Why does it have to be in legislation?

The other aspect is, given that the licence does not expire until 2004, what is there to prevent continued negotiations in that time? Why the urgency? Why is it so imperative that this particular part of the negotiation of a licence, which has been held since 1954, has to suddenly be included in a bill that introduces what some people have described as a dog of a competition, a footy tipping competition that pays less than any other current competition? I shall not pursue those areas of investigation, but I put the minister on notice that during the committee stage I will ask a number of questions about certain aspects of the bill.

I turn to section 6AAA of the Tattersall Consultations Act, which is to be amended by the Tattersall Consultations (Amendment) Bill that was passed by this house a few hours ago. When I was briefed on this matter I was informed that the 10-cent levy for tickets raises some $10.4 million in revenue. It was married with the change of source of government revenue from turnover to the player loss amount, and that change was to be broadly revenue neutral.

I was amazed that when the Honourable Roger Hallam tabled his calculation sheet it was clear that the government is misleading not only the ordinary Victorian in the street, the accredited agent and the punter who buys these things, but also the house. It all starts to make sense when one analyses what is to transpire. The shift in revenue source will be broadly revenue neutral. It is an incidental shift. The government has shifted from the punter but has not abolished the tax. Where has it been taken from? It has been taken from Tatts. Why is that taking place at this time?

Hon. R. M. Hallam — Does Tatts get a chance to claw it back again?

Hon. C. A. FURLETTI — That is right. Will it? The role of the minister in the bill is extraordinary. It is the politicising of a system to an extent that has not occurred before. I have always prided myself in having been part of the previous government when it was essential that there be an intermediary between the government and the gaming operators. The Victorian Casino and Gaming Authority was set up as such and was always regarded as being the independent body that controlled gaming in this state. What do we now have? We now have a minister who has a number of roles. Firstly, he has the role to determine the number of public lotteries licences that will be in place — I stress the plurality in the word ‘licences’; to determine the nature and type of public lotteries that will be authorised, which means there could be more than one type of lottery at any time; and to determine all applications for licences and the conditions to apply as well as the right to amend those conditions.

The minister alone will have the power to determine objections to applications and the right to accept surrender of licences, whether it is in the public interest and consistent with the tenor of the original licence. We then come to the interesting parts, such as the amount of premium payment to be paid. The amount of premium is to be negotiated by the minister. The minister controls what disciplinary action will be taken on the recommendation of a public servant. It is extraordinary!

What concerns me is that there is no supervision, no independent intermediary and no control whatsoever over the minister. He has absolute discretion — very wide parameters — and we will be watching, as we hope will the Auditor-General.

There is no provision such as that controlling bingo for the ultimate right of appeal to the Supreme Court; no reviews of the minister’s determinations; no right of appeal against the minister’s sentences; in fact, no right of appeal against anything the minister does. He or she

is judge, jury and executioner, and that is something about which the public of this state should be concerned.

We need to address an issue that I do not believe has been touched on by previous speakers; it relates more to a philosophical argument. I refer to the government's response to the 35th report of the Public Accounts and Estimates Committee entitled *Commercial in Confidence Material and the Public Interest*, in particular to recommendation 5.3, in which the committee said that commercial in confidence provisions reduce the scrutiny available to Parliament and the community over government decision making and use of public funds, and that their use as a tool in managing the government's relationship should be avoided.

The government agreed to that and issued new guidelines which indicated that, consistent with key principles, a government open to scrutiny is more accountable.

Recommendation 5.11 states that all government contracts are subject to legal requirements concerning disclosure and are prima facie public. The government also agreed to that. Recommendation 6.1 is along similar lines.

Given the government's philosophy for openness, transparency and a commitment to making public documents available, I refer the house to a document issued in August of this year entitled 'Licence to conduct an Australian Football League footy tipping competition — expressions of interest. The government provided that document to those who had an interest in bidding for the footy tipping competition. It can be seen that the purpose of the expression-of-interest process is to register parties to whom the invitation to bid for a licence may be sent. In other words, there is a culling or preselection process. Firstly, the government decides who may get the documents; secondly, it sends the documents off to them; and thirdly, it determines whether it will consider their expression of interest appropriate. Paragraph 7 of that document states:

> Potential bidders must not contact any officers, employees, agents or advisers of the state, members of Parliament and their staff or political parties to discuss any aspect of the bid process. This is crucial to preserve the integrity of the bid process.

It is a gag, because issuing this document when the bill was before Parliament certainly restricted me and other members of Parliament who were interested in communicating with anybody who had an interest in the bidding process from consulting, from receiving information about the bidding process, and even from speaking to them on the telephone, because they were scared that they would be disqualified from participating if they spoke to us.

This open and accountable government has submitted to the people who might be interested in a bidding process one of the tightest confidentiality deeds I have seen in my 30 years of legal practice. It is a deed that would petrify anybody. Had I been in the position of advising somebody on this issue I would have said, 'I'm not sure that you should sign it'. This is the open, transparent and accountable government that is running the state of Victoria! I endorse the comments of previous speakers and, subject to the answers being forthcoming during the committee stage, the opposition will not oppose the bill.

Motion agreed to.

Read second time.

Committed.

Sitting suspended 6.30 p.m. until 8.03 p.m.

Committee

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I take the opportunity to address some of the concerns raised in the debate, particularly quite a number raised by the Honourable Roger Hallam.

Mr Hallam raised concerns about the omission from the second-reading speech of additional detail relating to the changes to the tax regime applying to Tattersalls under the new act. It is not the government's intention to keep Parliament uninformed about the tax changes. For the record I will now outline the government's approach to tax under the bill.

The government decided to remove the 10-cent ticket levy on Tattslotto tickets sold in Victoria. On removing this tax on lottery tickets the government determined that it should continue to raise broadly the same revenues from lotteries as it does now. The 10-cent ticket levy currently applies only to certain Tattersalls products. The levy is being removed from all products to which it applies. The Department of Treasury and Finance calculated the appropriate adjustment to the tax rate to be an increase from 79.15 per cent to 79.40 per cent. This will not — —

An Honourable Member — Is that 79?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN — Yes, 79. This will not entail a variation to the licence conditions, but rather a variation of the tax rates. The tax rates and the tax mix applying to Tattersalls products have varied from time to time under the current licence.

The taxation regime outlined in the bill will apply to Tattersalls upon proclamation of the relevant provisions of the bill. Proclamation will occur once both the government and Tattersalls are satisfied that Tattersalls has put in place a range of measures to ensure its compliance with the bill. Those requirements include satisfying the Victorian Casino and Gaming Authority that its financial systems can accurately deal with the change to apply a loss tax regime, that the licence adequately reflects the framework of the new bill, and that the VCGA is satisfied that the written rules of Tattersalls lotteries conform to the requirements of the bill. This must be no later than 1 July 2001.

In relation to football tipping, the government has not made a secret deal of the fact that the footy tipping policy will provide, among other things, a revenue stream to the AFL. The footy tipping competition is a public lottery within the meaning of the bill. It means that the return to player is a minimum of 60 per cent. The breakdown of the remaining player loss is as follows: the government tax of 67.5 per cent, including indirect GST revenue; 7.5 per cent to the AFL; and 25 per cent to the operator. The figure relating to the AFL share does not appear in the bill, and therefore also not in the second-reading speech, as the bill deals with the return to player and the tax rates.

The minimum return to the AFL is set out in information provided to potential bidders, and it will be a licence condition. The bill requires that the minister must table in the Parliament ordered financial statements for the activities of the holder of the footy tipping licence. In this way the public will be fully informed of the activities conducted under the licence.

Hon. R. M. Hallam — That does not answer my question, you realise.

Hon. J. M. MADDEN — You will have your chance to ask those questions if you require after this.

I am not prepared to discuss issues around estimates of turnover, revenue and taxation at this time as the bidding process is under way, and to do so may prejudice its outcome.

The Department of Treasury and Finance is managing the bid process at arm's length from government. The role of the minister to date has been limited to giving his approval of the expression of interest and invitation to bid documents. The minister has referred all inquiries directed to him following the announcement of the bid process to the Department of Treasury and Finance.

The bid process is under way and will be completed following the passage of the bill. The department advises me that the process is competitive — that is, that a number of parties are interested in obtaining licences. However, the department has not provided any information to ministers on the identity or the number of bidders, nor has it provided any financial or commercial information relating to any bidder.

Following the bid process the department will provide a written report to the minister detailing the outcome of the bidding process and recommending the successful bidder. Following that recommendation the minister will issue a licence.

The minister will also have the report of the probity auditor confirming that the approved process has been complied with and that all parties have received fair and equitable treatment.

In closing, I make it perfectly clear that the government has made no deals with Tattersalls or any other potential licensee. To imply that Tattersalls and the government have somehow conspired to strike a deal that is against the interests of ordinary Victorians is without foundation and is offensive.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — I thank the minister for his response, because it goes to several of the issues I intend to canvass in the course of the committee debate. What the minister has just put on the record raises as many questions as it offers by way of elucidation.

I go to the thrust of clause 2. In respect of the commencement of the act the clause states that unless the government determines otherwise, the provisions in the bill shall come into effect on 1 July next year. I want to know what that means. Does that mean that by 1 July next year the new rate of commission shall apply to Tattersalls — namely, 3.9 per cent?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — By 'commission' I take it that Mr Hallam means the statutory margin. If that is the case, the answer is yes.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — Yes to what? That the percentage derived by Tattersalls shall be reduced from 4 per cent to 3.9 per cent by 1 July of next year?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised the answer is yes.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — At least one thing is established. The bill is changing the conditions of the existing licence. Is the minister prepared to confirm that is in fact the case?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised the tax rates are in the original legislation, not this bill.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — I am bemused by the response because the table prepared for the chamber indicates the percentage change to the commission earned by Tattersalls is a product of the bill. I again refer the minister to the table I carefully walked honourable members through earlier. If the committee uses the percentages set out in the bill, those percentages produce a reduced margin for Tattersalls. I want the minister to say clearly what the effect of the bill is. I ask the minister whether he is prepared to acknowledge that the computations contained in the table produced for the house are accurate.

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I ask Mr Hallam to refine his question so I am clear on what he is asking the committee.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — I am happy to do that because the issue goes to the nub of the concern I have with the legislation. My concern is that a change in the commission to be enjoyed by the operator has been affected by the percentages included in the bill. The second-reading speech makes no mention that Tattersalls will accept a lower percentage. The figures in the table produced for the chamber are based on the percentages set out in the bill. The computation of those figures indicates that the commission to Tattersalls has been reduced.

I ask the minister to confirm whether the computations in the table are accepted by the government.

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised the table appears to be accurate.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — I note that the minister said ‘appears’. I am not being pedantic, but this is the issue I am canvassing with the minister. Is the minister saying the government offers no challenge to the computations in the table or is he reserving judgment? It is important that the committee understand what it is dealing with. I have tried to find a way through the issues and have produced the table — slaved over it — and I seek to know whether the government accepts it.

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised that for the purposes of the debate we accept the figures in good faith.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — I thank the minister for that, because it takes the committee a giant step forward. The government now recognises that the percentages included in the bill have the indirect effect of changing the commission payable to the operator of the Tattersall Sweep Consultation. Is that accepted by the government?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I can only repeat what I said before: I am advised that we are prepared to accept that on face value and in good faith.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — My next question is: if in fact the effect of reducing the commission to Tattersalls was implicit in the percentages included in the bill, why did the second-reading speech not identify that effect?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised that during the drafting of the second-reading speech it was not considered material, and that there was no intention of hiding it from the Parliament in any way.

Hon. W. R. Baxter — A fundamental change?

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — It was not material! Here we have a fundamental change to the commission earned by the operator — a 2.5 per cent reduction and maybe a halving of the profit margin of the operator — and the government thought that was not worthy of a mention in the second-reading speech.

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I can only repeat that I am advised that at the time of the drafting of the second-reading speech it was not considered sufficiently material to be included in the speech.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — I am delighted to have that on the record because that indicates more than anything I could say just where this government is coming from.

Hon. Jenny Mikakos — Look at your track record. Look at the former Government Whip’s site and the licences on there.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM — I am enjoying this, do you want to put a bit more on the record? You are well behind scratch.

The CHAIRMAN — Order! Mr Hallam will speak through the Chair.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM — Thank you, Mr Chairman. If the bill is to have effect in respect of the commission earned by Tattersalls at the point of proclamation, can the minister confirm that the other conditions that relate to and have an impact on that licence will also have effect at the point at which the bill comes into effect? I speak in particular of the power of cancellation under clause 45, of the supervision charge under clause 53, of the premium payment under clause 30, the request by the licensee for amendment of licence under clause 38, and the additional cost of the audit under clause 62.

My question is: if the new rates of commission are to apply to the existing licence as a result of the passage of the bill, do all the other changes of conditions of licence apply likewise?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — It was a fairly lengthy question and a number of issues were raised. The question was understood but I wonder if Mr Hallam could repeat the details he gave in the first part of it.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — I am happy to do that because it is absolutely crucial to the point I am trying to make. The minister has said on behalf of the government that the application of the percentages in respect of the revenue stream in this bill, which have the side effect of changing the earnings of the operator — —

Hon. C. A. Furletti — Dramatically.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM — We will leave that to one side. The percentages will have effect as soon the bill is proclaimed. We are told that the latest point of proclamation will be 1 July next year. I understand what the minister is saying and the import of that. I ask the minister to clarify for the benefit of the committee whether the other changes that relate to the terms of the existing licence will also have effect at the point of proclamation. I gave the minister a list of examples of the changes I allude to. I am happy to take the committee through them one at a time and very slowly if that will help, but they are of immense importance.

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — There are some relatively complex issues here and I would like to ensure that they are clarified. I have been advised that it is preferable to go through them one at a time.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — I am happy to do that because it is of fundamental importance to the point that concerns the National Party. The minister has said that as a direct result of the bill we are debating tonight there will be a reduction in the commission earned by the operator. I want to know whether the same time line will apply to the other changes in respect of licence conditions. I am trying to educe from the minister whether the changes in this bill, which are very dramatic indeed, apply automatically to the existing licence enjoyed by Tattersalls.

I am happy to take the changes before the committee one at a time. The first one on my list is clause 45, which goes to the new-found power of the minister to cancel the licence. As I explained in the currency of the second-reading debate, previously the minister had to establish to the satisfaction of the Supreme Court that the existing licensee had breached a fundamental condition of the licence. That is all gone and we now have a clause that says the minister shall have the power of cancellation without reference to anyone. I need to know whether that will also have an impact on the terms and conditions of the existing licence.

The CHAIRMAN — Order! Minister, your time is expiring, do you have a response?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised that in relation to clause 45 the answer is no. The entitlement to the licence for Tattersalls under clause 90 of the new bill spells out that the minister may impose conditions under the TCA.

Hon. R. M. Hallam — TCA? I am sorry, what is that?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN — The Tattersall Consultations Act and the regulations.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — I am trying to get to the practical effect of the bill that is currently before the house. What the minister is saying, as I understand it — and I will seek confirmation — is that upon the passage of the bill the commission to be enjoyed by Tattersalls will be changed but there is agreement that some other mechanism will ensure that the power of cancellation by the minister would not apply to the current licence.

Hon. J. M. Madden — I ask Mr Hallam to reframe the question.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM — I will do it one step at a time because it is crucial. What I am trying to establish is the effect of this bill specifically upon the licence in place tonight. The minister has said that upon proclamation of the bill the commission will change as a result of the percentage set out in the bill, so we have actually got to that point. I want to know what it is that the government has agreed to in the background that would see the power of cancellation not applying when the bill is proclaimed.

Hon. J. M. Madden — Mr Hallam, I do not want to drag this out, but there was a fairly lengthy preamble. I ask you to repeat the last line of your question.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM — I understand, Minister. It is crucial, and I applaud you for taking care, because it is absolutely central to the concerns of the opposition about the bill. Let me go back one step. You bring into the chamber a bill that will change dramatically the terms and conditions under which a licence is issued for public sector lotteries, but there is actually a licence in situ. We have an operator who enjoys a licence already issued by the Victorian government. I am trying to establish the effect of the bill on the licence already in place.

What you have given us, and I acknowledge it, is that the commission will be reduced. I am trying to establish what other conditions will impact upon the current licence as a result of the passage of the bill. The issue I used as an example was the power of cancellation; there are many others. I am trying to establish how the bill will impact upon a licence already in place.

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised that there is a difference for a number of specific items.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — Okay, I understand that. I am trying to establish precisely what the difference is. It is not clear to me from my reading of the bill how the changes it brings into operation actually impact upon the existing licence.

I acknowledge that if we pass the bill the minister gets the power to impose whatever conditions he thinks are appropriate. I knowledge that, but I am trying to get to the impact of the bill upon the existing licence. On behalf of the committee I want to know what the government thinks that impact will be, because it is crucial to the way we address issues further down the track.

If you say to me, 'We have no intention of imposing these conditions on the existing licensee', I would ask you, Minister, to demonstrate some sort of proof of that and we will go on to the next issue. All I am trying to do is establish what the government intends the changes to the bill to do to the current licence.

The CHAIRMAN — Order! Minister, we are again awaiting your response.

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised that clause 30 — the premium payment — does not apply to the current licence. If Mr Hallam would like me to go through each of the others I can do so, but it will take some time and it may be best if we go through it clause by clause.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — I have a solution to that, Minister. I am happy to have another go. Let's cut to the kill. Are you able to report to the committee those provisions of the current licence, apart from the commission, which will be directly affected by the passage of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN — Order! Minister, we are now awaiting a response.

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised that clause 45 would apply to the current entitlement.

Hon. R. M. Hallam — Let us take this carefully, please. Did you say clause 45?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN — Yes. I am advised that clause 45 would apply to the current entitlement if disciplinary action was warranted.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — What you are saying, Minister, is that the power of cancellation — —

The CHAIRMAN — Order! Mr Hallam!

Hon. R. M. HALLAM — Sorry, Mr Deputy Chairman. I am trying to assist the committee. I am not trying to paraphrase, but the minister is effectively saying that the power of cancellation could in certain circumstances be applied to the current licence.

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised that the answer is yes.

Hon. R. M. Hallam — That is good. Thank you.

Hon. J. M. MADDEN — Further to my response prior to that remark, clause 53, the supervision charge — —

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — Hang on. I am sorry, Chairman. Minister, does that mean the

supervision charge is changed by the current bill in respect of the existing licence?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised that the answer is yes.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — Thank you. Let's go on to the next one. It applies.

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — Clause 54, tax — I have already addressed that.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — We knew about that, thank you.

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — Clauses 61 and 62 — again I am advised they mirror existing provisions 8C and 8D of the Tattersall Consultations Act.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — On a point of clarification, Minister, are you saying that clauses 61 and 62 are replications of existing sections and therefore there is no change to the conditions of the existing licence?

Hon. J. M. Madden — Would Mr Hallam repeat the question?

Hon. R. M. HALLAM — The minister said that clauses 61 and 62 are replications of existing sections of the law of the land. I am looking for a sign that the minister is indicating to the committee that there will effectively be no change by the implementation of clauses 61 and 62.

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised that the clauses are essentially the same.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — Does that mean that the documentation relating to the impact of the cost of audit which, according to the bill, shall now fall upon the licensee will be exactly the same as it is under the current legislation?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised that the clauses are identical to the sections except for the words 'licensee' and 'promoter', so essentially there is no difference between the clauses and the sections.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — For the clarification of the committee, let me go to the precise issue that arose from the minister's earlier comment when he indicated that clauses 61 and 62 are replications of existing law. Can I have confirmation that today, prior to the passage of the bill, the cost of any audit on the operator is borne by the operator as a matter of course?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised that I would need to take that question on notice.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — I am happy for the minister to do so because that is but one of the suite of changes that are of interest to me. It is now on the public record that the government acknowledges that the bill proposes changing the conditions of the existing licence, particularly for tax rates and the power of cancellation, notwithstanding that it is at the discretion of the minister. What is the position concerning the existing licence — not the future licence — for the supervision charge provided for by clause 53 of the bill?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised that the supervision charge will come into place once the act has been proclaimed.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — That is not quite clear enough, I am sorry. I need to know whether the supervision charge will come into place in respect of the existing licence at the point of proclamation.

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised that it will, in relation to the current licence.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — We have from the minister tonight an acknowledgment that the bill will change quite dramatically the terms and conditions of a licence already in existence. So we have a licensed operator, enjoying a licence, and the introduction of a bill that will change the terms and conditions of that licence. I ask: what has been offered to the licensee by way of incentive or inducement to accept those changes?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised that the answer is quite clear: nothing.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — So the government is asking the committee to believe that here is a licensed operator running a commercial enterprise and along comes the government and changes the ground rules in the currency of the licence, and the government then on challenge is asking the committee to believe that the licensee just rolls over — that there was no discussion about a dramatic change in the reward attached to that licence? I cannot believe the minister is asking the committee to believe the licensee

was offered nothing by way of incentive or reward or compensation for a shift in an existing licence. The minister has just taken 2.5 per cent off the top of the commission. By his own admission the minister has exposed the licensee to supervision charges that are open-ended and which he is asking us to believe the licensee is happy to accept.

I will go back one step. Is the minister asking the committee to believe the current licensee is happy to accept the changed conditions of the licence?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — Again, Mr Hallam, I am advised that nothing was offered and nothing was sought, and Tattersalls was prepared to accept those changes.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — I am happy to have that on the record. Let the record also show that in respect of the new tax rates and the backdoor effect — the effect that the government was not prepared to announce to Parliament in relation to the changed commissions — according to the figures provided by the Honourable Carlo Furletti we understand that the levy that has been surreptitiously pulled out of the equation is worth about $10 million a year. Leaving aside all of the other retrospective changes to the terms and conditions of the licence, is the minister saying that Tattersalls actually agreed to a $10 million reduction in its annual commission without any comment?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised that it was prepared to accept the increased tax rate on the Treasury's modelling.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — So what the government is asking us to believe is that Tattersalls, for some reason unknown to the committee, actually accepted a $10 million cut in its annual commission? That is what the minister is asking us to believe. Leave aside the cost associated with the new open-ended supervision charge — this is just in respect of the surreptitious changes to the percentages. The minister has just done Tattersalls for $10 million a year and he is asking the committee to accept that it rolled over.

I give the minister one last chance. Is he prepared to advise the committee of any other component to the agreement with Tattersalls that has not been disclosed in compensation for at least a $10 million cut in the commission in respect of Tattersall consultations per annum?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — Mr Hallam, I am happy to continue answering questions and to go through the bill.

Honourable members interjecting.

The CHAIRMAN — Order!

Hon. J. M. MADDEN — I am happy to do that. In relation to the questioning, I accept that the committee is trying to deliver the bill through the chamber in a conciliatory way. I can continue to answer questions in this fashion, or it may suit the committee to go through the bill clause by clause. It may be easier to answer elements of the bill that way.

I can repeat answers or Mr Hallam can ask the questions again and I can answer them. However, if the committee stays on clause 2 and generally questions aspects of the bill, I ask Mr Hallam to be more succinct with his questioning. I accept the argument he is trying to apply with the preamble to each question, but I cannot answer the preamble because that would be debate. I can only answer succinct questions if they are delivered through the Chair.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — I thank the minister for his advice. We are in fact debating clause 2, which goes to the question of commencement. This debate is all about the date from which the bill will apply. What we have deduced from the debate, not from the second-reading speech, is that the government wants us to believe that it has actually reduced the commission earned by Tattersalls by $10 million per annum and introduced a supervision charge — goodness knows what that will cost — and Tattersalls has blithely agreed.

Mr Chairman, I think that that is apparently accepted as the state of play, and I am happy to move on to the next clause. I make the point to the committee that I am absolutely amazed that the government would want us to believe the line that has been fed to the committee this evening.

Hon. ANDREW BRIDESON (Waverley) — Some time ago I think the minister said that the bill would be proclaimed only if agreement was reached between the party and the government. What happens if no agreement can be reached, either by the action of one party or the other?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised that the bill will be proclaimed no later than 1 July 2001.

Hon. R. M. Hallam — At latest?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN — At latest, and that any agreement would relate to the technical application of

elements. It is not considered there will be any difficulties with it.

Hon. C. A. FURLETTI (Templestowe) — To follow up that answer, Minister, I put the hypothetical: what if there are difficulties and agreement is not reached?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised that the act is clear, that it will be proclaimed.

Hon. C. A. FURLETTI (Templestowe) — How can it be proclaimed, with due respect, Minister, if you do not have agreement on the rates and conditions on which the agreement is based?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised that the issues you raise are not subject to the issue of proclamation.

Hon. C. A. FURLETTI (Templestowe) — Perhaps I misunderstood your answer to the earlier question because some time has elapsed. I remember thinking at the time that to accredit the proclamation of an act of Parliament on an agreement with a third party from outside — —

Hon. Andrew Brideson — On a commercial agreement.

Hon. C. A. FURLETTI — Yes, on a commercial agreement — it was somewhat unusual. I think you, Minister, then went on to indicate that it was subject to the government and Tattersalls being satisfied that compliance with the bill was in place and subject to Tattersalls satisfying the rules that the minister was to put in place. That seemed to be a fairly complex, convoluted and extraordinary way of arriving at the proclamation of an act of Parliament.

I know you have not been here for long, Minister, but proclamation is about royal assent. The simple question is: what is to transpire if agreement is not reached? Will it be a matter of ministerial decree in compelling the licensee to accept the minister's declaration.

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised that the finer issues that need to be resolved do not relate to commercial arrangements but to technical arrangements made prior to the proclamation.

Hon. C. A. FURLETTI (Templestowe) — Will the minister explain the difference between 'commercial' and 'technical'? We can be here all night, Minister, but I am trying to get a response.

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I believe I gave the opposition some of those examples earlier when I spoke in my opening remarks about clause 2. The technical issues relate to, for example, ensuring that the financial systems of the Victorian Casino and Gaming Authority can accurately deal with the change to a player loss tax regime. They are those sorts of technical issues.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — I will rephrase the question, given that we have some confusion between what constitutes a commercial and a technical issue. If the issues the minister has described have not been resolved prior to the point of proclamation, what happens?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised that the VCGA has consulted with Tattersalls and that Tattersalls expects it can deliver those technical arrangements. Tattersalls does not believe that that time line cannot be reached.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — I am not challenging any of that, but like the Honourable Carlo Furletti I find it an amazing turn of events. The committee has before it a piece of legislation that the government is now telling us will be proclaimed based on the outcome of some commercial negotiation involving a third party. I have every respect for Tattersalls and I know the authority perhaps better than the minister, but that does not change the fact that we may not have agreement come the date of proclamation.

My question is as simple as that posed by the Honourable Carlo Furletti: what happens if worse comes to worst and agreement is not reached? What happens to the bill? Does the minister then have his way, irrespective of the views of the authority or the operator?

The committee can go on dealing with this issue all night, Minister. There is no point in your saying it will depend on some sort of commercial negotiation in the marketplace. I want something better than that. I want to know what will happen as a direct result of the legislation now before the committee.

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I believe I separated the issues between technical and commercial. I repeat that I have been advised that consultation is taking place with Tattersalls and it has indicated that those technical arrangements can be set in place prior to the date of proclamation.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — Then, for the benefit of the committee, is the minister prepared to

table correspondence to the effect that the third party that is now involved in the process of proclamation is prepared to give the commitment that the process of the legislation will not be impeded?

The CHAIRMAN — Order! It would simply be made available; it cannot be tabled.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM — With respect, Mr Chairman, I am not sure just having it made available is satisfactory. The minister is saying that the passage of the bill will depend on an agreement that involves a third party. I want to know that the minister has something other than a warm inner glow in respect of the third party — that is, the operator.

The situation is rather ironic because I am unable to talk to the operator as he has been banned from talking because of a contract in which he has an interest. The minister may smile, but he put a condition on the contract that has forbidden the party from talking to me. I want something better than a nod and a wink. I want to know whether the passage of the bill is dependent on the view of a third party and whether what the committee is being asked to assess is the opinion of that third party. This is not a cowyard, Minister, it is a legislature!

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — Mr Chairman, I seek a ruling on that matter.

The CHAIRMAN — Order! There is no mechanism in this place for tabling the document except under business of the house. It cannot be done during the committee stage.

Hon. J. M. MADDEN — I am advised that the proclamation does not require explicit agreement of the third party.

Hon. C. A. FURLETTI (Templestowe) — I am pleased to hear that that is the case. I would have been concerned had proclamations of acts of Parliament been dependent upon the consent of a third party — apart from the Governor, of course.

What will happen, Minister, if the agreement that you say you have not made with Tattersalls falls over and Tattersalls does not reach the conditions the minister will stipulate between now and then? The minister knows these things can happen. A player can run out onto the football ground and break a leg. What will happen in that case? It is a simple question and narrowly defined: what happens if all the preconditions are not met and 1 July 2001 arrives?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I repeat that the date for the proclamation is no later than 1 July 2001. I have already given a number of replies. If opposition members want to put up the worst case scenario about every element of the legislation, they can, but I repeat that Tattersalls has indicated that it expects to have those technical systems in place by the date of proclamation.

Hon. C. A. FURLETTI (Templestowe) — Minister, you have made a written agreement with Tattersalls in that regard, have you?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised that the department has consulted with Tattersalls and believes it will have the technical arrangements in place so that the act can be proclaimed no later than 1 July 2001.

Hon. C. A. FURLETTI (Templestowe) — We are not getting anywhere, but let the record show that the answer has not been provided by the minister.

Hon. Jenny Mikakos — He has provided the answer.

The CHAIRMAN — Order!

Honourable members interjecting.

Hon. Jenny Mikakos — On a point of order, Mr Chairman, it is becoming apparent that opposition members are treating the committee with complete disrespect. They are being extremely repetitive. The same question has been asked in a slightly different guise on each occasion, and the minister has adequately answered it on numerous occasions. If the opposition does not accept the answer we are wasting the time of the committee. Opposition members would do well to accept the fact that the minister has answered the question more than adequately on numerous occasions.

Hon. K. M. Smith — On the point of order, Mr Chairman, the matter of whether a question is repetitive depends upon the answer that is given. The committee stage is a time when members of Parliament have an opportunity to seek clarification on difficulties with a bill so they can be satisfied at the end of that stage that they have the answers and can support the bill. I believe there is no point of order.

The CHAIRMAN — Order! On the point of order, the custom and history of this place is that during the committee stage honourable members are able to go through bills in intimate detail, and that has been done for many years. There is no point of order.

Hon. C. A. FURLETTI — The point I was making to the minister is that unfortunately the unexpected does occur, as it did last September when the government was elected. If we are looking for disasters to occur, that was one for the people of Victoria.

Hon. J. M. Madden — On a point of order, I am happy to sit here all night. My children are in bed at this time of night and I will not see them until tomorrow morning, so I am happy to stay here until tomorrow morning. I would expect members asking questions on the bill to relate them to the bill and not debate issues about other legislation or other matters of government. I believe the Honourable Carlo Furletti, who likes to speak at length prior to asking questions — normally we allow him that licence — in this instance is not speaking to the bill.

Hon. C. A. FURLETTI — The point I was making, which I made on at least five previous occasions, was that I am seeking a simple answer. The Honourable Jenny Mikakos suggests I received an answer. The fact is that I have not received an answer to the question of what would happen if what is expected to occur does not occur. I was simply relating that to an event of last September.

The CHAIRMAN — Order! On the point of order, the answer is the same as for the last point of order. This committee session is free-ranging and it goes through each provision of the bill as committee members require. There is no point of order.

Hon. C. A. FURLETTI — I appreciate the Chairman's experience in these matters and thank him for expressing it in that way.

Given that the government has expected there will be a $10 million loss to Tattersalls on one particular change of condition — —

Hon. Jenny Mikakos — On your estimate.

The CHAIRMAN — Order!

Hon. C. A. FURLETTI — There has been no dispute on that quantification. Will the minister indicate to the committee the cost to Tattersalls of all the changes to the conditions? With a simple answer the committee can move on to the next matter?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised that the answer is not quantifiable; therefore I cannot provide the answer.

Hon. C. A. FURLETTI (Templestowe) — Does the minister acknowledge that it is an amount of somewhat more than $10 million?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I believe I have given that answer. I cannot make assumptions on the likely earnings in relation to what Tattersalls may take. That would require me to see into the future. I cannot do that. I can only indicate to you that the answer remains.

Hon. C. A. FURLETTI (Templestowe) — I admit, Minister, that you cannot even see into the present, but you have acknowledged — —

Hon. J. M. Madden — On a point of order, Mr Chairman, again I ask that Mr Furletti speak to the bill. He is directing abuse at me, and I ask him to withdraw that remark.

Hon. C. A. FURLETTI — On the point of order, Mr Chairman, I did not intend any offence, but it appears to me that anybody who hypothesises about seeing into the future has obviously got a problem. I am not asking the minister to see into the future. I have asked him to respond to what I regard as a sensible question.

Given that the minister has accepted that there is a minimum of $10.4 million, which is a figure that has been provided by the department, I asked: given that there are substantial conditions, which the minister admits have varied, will that amount be considerably more? That was the question. I am not asking you to quantify it. I accept that it is unquantifiable. I ask for a simple — —

The CHAIRMAN — Order! The minister has raised a point of order and indicated that he was offended by whatever remark was made — I must admit it was unclear to us at this end of the table — and I request that Mr Furletti withdraw.

Hon. C. A. FURLETTI — I did not hear the minister. If it offended him, I withdraw. I am not sure whether the minister's capacity to comprehend has allowed him to retain the question I put to him. Do you want me to repeat the question?

The CHAIRMAN — Order! Repeat the question.

Hon. C. A. FURLETTI — Thank you, Mr Chairman. The question I put was a relatively simple one. I did not ask the minister to look into the future as to the amounts that may be lost, and nor did I ask for a specific amount. I asked the minister: given that there is an acknowledged loss of $10.4 million to

Tattersalls, does the government concede that the further changes to the conditions to the licence that Tattersalls holds will cost Tattersalls considerably more than the $10 million conceded by the government?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — The other cost to Tattersalls would be in relation to the supervision charge, and that charge will be calculated to recover reasonable costs and expenses in VCGA monitoring, but it is not expected to be large.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — I am sorry, I cannot let that go as simply as that. We need to get some idea of the dimension of the impost the bill will have on the conditions of the existing licence. Can I take it from what the minister just said that the government concedes that the impact in terms of direct commission is in the vicinity of $10.5 million per annum?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised that I cannot lock into any potential figure, because again that would be speculative.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — Then is the minister prepared to take my question on notice and report to the committee when he is able to provide a figure that is not speculative?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I can undertake to provide the Treasury modelling.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — I genuinely thank the minister for that commitment. Can I also ask whether in the same spirit of cooperation he is prepared to offer evidence of agreement by the existing licensee that goes not only to the issue of commission but also the other changes contained in the bill?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised there is no agreement, so in that sense I cannot undertake to provide Mr Hallam with an agreement.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — I am at a loss. I thought the minister said that the existing licensee was relaxed about the changes in the bill. Now the minister is telling us that he has no evidence of any agreement by the licensee. Let us clear the air. Does the minister want us to believe there is no indication of agreement by the existing licensee in respect of the changes to the existing licence introduced by the bill?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised that discussions and briefing took place with Tattersalls through the department, and that Tattersalls was prepared to accept the decisions of the government.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — Having told the committee that the licensee was prepared to accept the modelling, which we say on the evidence that we are able to deduce at arm's length — and we do not have access to the intricate details of the agreement — will cost at least $10 million a year, is the minister saying that there was no correspondence, that the agreement between the current licensee and the officers of the Department of Treasury and Finance was a nod and a wink? Is the minister actually asking the committee to believe that there was no record at all of the licensee's reaction to the fact that they asked it to drop $10 million a year?

Hon. C. A. Furletti — And is this the way the Labor Party does business?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised that because the legislation is generic legislation Tattersalls was briefed and discussions took place, and again it was prepared to accept the decision of the government.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — I beg the indulgence of the committee, but I cannot believe what the committee has just been told by a minister of the Crown. I will go back one step and ask: does the current licensee know that the reduction in commission as a result of this bill represents a $10 million reduction in income each year?

Hon. Jenny Mikakos — On a point of order, Mr Chairman, I fail to see what this line of questioning has to do with clause 2.

The CHAIRMAN — Order! There is no point of order. The questions are well within the bounds of the committee. Before the minister answers, I point out that the committee is discussing clause 2, which deals with the commencement of the act. All the questions that have been asked up to this time are relevant to the commencement and the conditions that apply under clause 2.

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised that Tattersalls has not seen the modelling, but it was aware of the tax rate and it accepted the implications.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — I am very confused. The minister is now telling us that Tattersalls has not seen the Department of Treasury and Finance modelling, if my understanding is accurate. I thought

that but a few moments ago he said the current licensee accepted the Department of Treasury and Finance model. What is it to be — that it saw the modelling and agreed to a $10 million drop in its cut or that the department has not shown it the modelling? There is a fundamental difference in what the minister is asking the committee to believe.

Let us get this very clear. I want to know whether the ramifications of the bill have been conveyed to the licensee and whether the licensee knows more than the opposition parties do and understands what the implications of the bill will be.

Hon. D. McL. Davis — On its business.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM — Mr Davis, I am becoming very frustrated. The bill came to the chamber without any explanation of the implications of the changes in the percentages of commission. The minister did not offer anything by way of explanation. I am trying to establish whether the licensee was offered any explanation. Did the department sneak up on it as well? Does Tattersalls know that there will be a $10-million drop in its commission as a result of the bill?

My question is as plain as I can make it: is Tattersalls accepting of the Department of Treasury and Finance (DTF) modelling or did it not see it?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised that the department has not provided the modelling but that Tattersalls was briefed on the new tax rate, as was the opposition. I cannot speak for Tattersalls, but I assume it has conducted its own analysis of the new rate. I repeat that it has accepted the implications.

Honourable members interjecting.

The CHAIRMAN — Order! Mr Hallam will address the Chair.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — I am being assisted in the background. I am trying to find out what that assistance is.

The CHAIRMAN — Order! That is not appropriate.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM — Mr Chairman, the committee is being invited to believe that the government pursued a change in the commission rate, that it brought to Parliament a bill incorporating that change, that it did not see it as necessary to advise Parliament of the effect of the change, that the operator of the current licence was not given the benefit of the modelling undertaken by DTF but that the operator nonetheless agreed to the change in the commission rate.

If that is what the minister is asking the committee to believe — and that is a fair summation of where we have got to — I seek his endorsement to that effect and we will move on to clause 3.

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised that the short answer is yes.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 3

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — This will be very brief, I hope. Clause 3 includes a definition. One of my earlier questions was whether the Australian Football League tipping competition was a public lottery. I am pleased to put on the record that the minister quickly cleared up that issue: the footy tipping competition constitutes a public lottery and therefore the player return is 60 per cent under clause 52.

My question is relatively simple: all that being the case, why was that not clarified in the second-reading debate?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised that it was clearly defined in the act and was not considered necessary for the second-reading speech.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — Perhaps the minister will advise the committee where it is clearly defined in the act.

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I draw Mr Hallam's attention to page 2 of the bill, clause 3(1), which states:

> "**AFL footy tipping competition**" means a public lottery in which the prizes are distributed on the basis of results of matches played in the Australian Football League.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — I thank the minister for his explanation. I presumed that was the clause upon which he was relying. I am delighted to have it confirmed.

Clause agreed to; clauses 4 to 12 agreed to.

Clause 13

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — My query about clause 13 goes to the interpretation of the word

'knowingly'. I will read the clause for the sake of the committee. It states:

> A person must not knowingly accept an entry in a public lottery from a person under the age of 18 years.

I know there is some case law and some precedents in that matter, but I want to know where the onus of proof will fall under the bill. Will it be the responsibility of the accredited representative to satisfy himself or herself as to the age of the prospective client?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised that this is consistent with other laws in relation to age and identification.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — I thank the minister for his explanation. I will not pursue the matter other than to ask whether the minister can give the committee an indication of whether an accredited representative not knowing the age of a prospective client would be a defence to any subsequent action.

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised that if the proprietor took reasonable steps to ascertain the age of a person, and that person indicated by one means or another that he or she was 18 years of age or older when that was not the case, that that would not be the fault of the proprietor in that instance.

Clause agreed to; clauses 14 to 16 agreed to.

Clause 17

Hon. C. A. FURLETTI (Templestowe) — Can the minister indicate to the committee the criteria that the minister will use to determine the number of public lottery licences that may be issued in the foreseeable future?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised that the minister would take into consideration a range of issues that relate to the best interests of the public.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — Can we go one step beyond the printed word? Clause 17 provides the minister with extraordinarily broad powers. It is the minister who on the basis of this clause is able to determine however many public lottery licences he decrees shall apply in Victoria. Will the minister provide some idea of what process the minister would use to come to that conclusion? Will the minister provide the committee with an idea of whom he might consult and to what extent he might rely on assistance provided by, for example, the Victorian Casino and Gaming Authority? Is this to be a directly political pronouncement?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised that he may well take advice from the Department of Treasury and Finance and the Victorian Casino and Gaming Authority as well as seeking a consideration of the broader community interests, and may even consult with the sector.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — I thank the minister for clarification of the issue, and I am relaxed about the prospect of the minister seeking advice from a broad sector of the community, but I am bemused to hear the minister say that a minister of the Crown, in determining the number and type of public lottery licences, should rely upon advice from the Department of Treasury and Finance. Does the minister want to have a second go on that point?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I ask Mr Hallam in what context he would like me to have a second go.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — I am relaxed about the Department of Treasury and Finance providing advice in respect of probity issues, but what the minister is now putting to the committee is that the Department of Treasury and Finance should have an influence with regard to the number and type of public lottery licences issued. In what connection would advice from the Department of Treasury and Finance be apposite to a question of how many and what types of public lottery licences would be issued?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised that the Department of Treasury and Finance might well provide advice on the optimum number of licences. There would be an optimum number, because anything over and above a certain limit could possibly undermine existing licences.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — I will not press the point, but I am relieved to capture the thrust of what the minister is saying by reflecting that what he is talking about is the question of viability of individual licences rather than the notion of some public good that would be determined by advice coming from the Department of Treasury and Finance. I thank the minister; that is a relief.

Clause agreed to; clause 18 agreed to.

Clause 19

Hon. C. A. FURLETTI (Templestowe) — With respect to clause 19 and generally with respect to applications for licences, given that Tabcorp paid almost $600 million for its gaming rights, which I understand included exclusivity to operate sports betting under the Gaming and Betting Act, will the grant of licences under this section result in any claims for compensation by Tabcorp under the provisions of its current licence?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised there has been no indication that at this point of time that is likely.

Hon. C. A. FURLETTI (Templestowe) — For the record, I will move on: does the government have any concerns about that possibility?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised that that could potentially be a very sensitive issue. I am also advised not to give any further answer on that.

Hon. C. A. FURLETTI (Templestowe) — I was not aware that we were dealing with the right to silence in committee. Minister, given the provisions that exist, has the government also considered the possibility of the establishment of footy tipping on the Web — that is, Internet footy tipping, which of course would affect licences afforded under the bill and also under the Gaming and Betting Act?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — As there were a number of interruptions I ask the honourable member to repeat the question succinctly.

Hon. C. A. FURLETTI (Templestowe) — I will rephrase the question. Has the government considered the possibility of the establishment of footy tipping competitions on the Web — that is, Internet footy tipping — and its impact on the licences that will be granted under the bill and those that have already been granted under the Gaming and Betting Act?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised that there is nothing in the bill that would prohibit the licensee from using the Internet for footy tipping.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — I raise two issues, and I pick up the sensitivity of the issue under clause 19, given the minister's response to the question from Mr Furletti. I ask for one point of clarification in respect of that: does that mean the government is not confident that the passage of the bill will not create a cause of action by an existing licensee?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I really could not speak on behalf of an existing licensee in relation to an issue like that.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — That is not much comfort because the legislation sets out the terms and conditions under which a new application for licence may be made. It is very specific and it is extensive. I am asking whether the passage of the legislation might impinge on the conditions of any existing licence. Can the minister at least give us a commitment that existing licences will be remote from the passage of clause 19?

Hon. J. M. Madden — I ask the honourable member to repeat the last part of the question.

Hon. R. M. HALLAM — I am trying to establish the implications for existing licences that will flow from the passage of the legislation. I understand the sensitivities, and all those sorts of things. Does the government see any ramifications on existing licences from the passage of the bill?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised we do not believe there would be any material impact on any other licensee.

Hon. A. P. OLEXANDER (Silvan) — Has the government sought or received any legal advice related specifically to the possibility that he just mentioned?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — The answer is yes.

Clause agreed to; clauses 20 to 23 agreed to.

Clause 24

Hon. R. M. HALLAM (Western) — Clause 24 relates to a report to the minister by the Victorian Casino and Gaming Authority and goes further to the issue of a licence application. It refers to the way in which the authority shall attest in respect of each applicant or each associate as to their good repute, character and integrity. I understand all that and have no argument with it.

I note under clause 24(1)(c) that that report and those issues in respect of each applicant shall relate to:

> each executive officer of the applicant and any other person determined by the Authority to be concerned in or associated with the ownership, management or operation of the applicant's business …

That is an extraordinarily broad broom. Minister, how far down the management structure will that operation apply? I hope we are not talking about anybody who

happens to obtain employment with the operator on perhaps a casual basis. I am looking for an indication of how onerous that process will be. How far down the management chain does it go?

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I am advised that would be a matter for the authority, but it would be generally consistent with other areas of gaming.

Clause agreed to.

Progress reported.

FISHERIES (AMENDMENT) BILL

Introduction and first reading

Received from Assembly.

Read first time for Hon. C. C. BROAD (Minister for Energy and Resources) on motion of Hon. J. M. Madden.

AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRY DEVELOPMENT (AMENDMENT) BILL

Introduction and first reading

Received from Assembly.

Read first time for Hon. C. C. BROAD (Minister for Energy and Resources) on motion of Hon. J. M. Madden.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Adjournment

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I move:

> That the Council, at its rising, adjourn until Tuesday, 14 November.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. M. MADDEN (Minister for Sport and Recreation) — I move:

> That the house do now adjourn.

Electricity: Yallourn dispute

Hon. M. A. BIRRELL (East Yarra) — I raise a matter with the Minister for Industrial Relations. Over the past 2 hours Victoria has been thrust into an emergency that has endangered the lives of individuals and the livelihoods of many people throughout the state.

As a result of the illegal and thug-like behaviour of a number of members of the labour movement, electricity has been turned off in virtually all parts of this state with no notice. As a consequence, streetlights have been out, endangering the lives of people trying to go about their normal business. People using medical equipment have found that their equipment has been turned off mid-operation; businesses, of course, have been completely inconvenienced; and ordinary citizens have found that their lives have, once again under a Labor government, been totally disrupted.

I call on the Minister for Industrial Relations to start taking responsibility for this type of crisis and stop blaming others for the government's lack of leadership and incompetence.

In question time today the Liberal Party asked the government to take a stand and to be involved in the Yallourn dispute, only to find the Minister for Industrial Relations say she would not do anything for a couple of days. We call on the government to stop standing by its Labor mates who caused this disruption and to stand up to them. It should stop putting off the hard decisions required to get these people to do their work and supply electricity for ordinary human beings who have been disrupted. This union has shown it will not accept the decision of the independent umpire, the Australian Industrial Relations Commission. Worse, it has shown it is prepared to take the law into its own hands. That is a dangerous act that has harmed individuals and the reputation of the state.

At the heart of this behaviour is the fact that the Labor government has let the industrial climate degrade so much in Victoria that this type of thuggery can occur. These strikes deserve something more than arrogant indifference and a callous lack of action by the Minister for Industrial Relations and the Minister for Energy and Resources. I call on the ministers to do something rather than failing to act.

Electricity: Yallourn dispute

Hon. PHILIP DAVIS (Gippsland) — I remind the Minister for Energy and Resources that earlier this year, despite warnings that electricity blackouts would occur and despite warnings of blackouts in November last year, the government procrastinated and took no action and the lights went out in February. Under the guise of a ministerial task force, the minister reviewed the situation and handed down a report in September

entitled 'Security of electricity supply task force'. The opposition pointed out that the government had failed to address the principal cause of the blackouts of February, which was the industrial relations dispute at Yallourn. The opposition predicted then that the Victorian community would face significant difficulties this coming summer. It has not even got to summer and the lights have gone out. I call on the minister to now invoke the emergency provisions of the Electricity Industry Act.

Electricity: Yallourn dispute

Hon. BILL FORWOOD (Templestowe) — I raise for the attention of the Minister for Small Business an issue that goes to the strike that has crippled Victoria in the last 2 hours causing blackouts around the state, chaos on the roads and chaos in people's lives.

Minister, your job as Minister for Small Business is to advocate on behalf of small business, to represent the interests of small business, to ensure they get a fair hearing and a fair go in the state of Victoria. They were crippled earlier this year when, through a total lack of responsibility and action, the Labor government failed to act when the power went off and again they are being crippled by the unbelievable action of people in the Latrobe Valley, action condoned by the government.

Honourable members interjecting.

The PRESIDENT — Order!

Hon. M. A. Birrell — They are your people and you did nothing to stop them.

Hon. C. C. Broad interjected.

Hon. BILL FORWOOD — Tonight the minister has the opportunity to stand up for small business in Victoria. She has the opportunity in this chamber to get on her feet and condemn this strike and, with her ministerial colleagues, take some action.

Honourable members interjecting.

The PRESIDENT — Order! Hansard cannot possibly have heard that.

Hon. R. M. Hallam — I think they heard that but did not understand it.

The PRESIDENT — Order! I think that is right.

Hon. BILL FORWOOD — The minister has the opportunity to stand in this place tonight and condemn the unions for their actions.

Opposition Members — Hear, hear!

Electricity: Yallourn dispute

Hon. R. A. BEST (North Western) — The issue I would like to raise is also with the Minister for Small Business and concerns the issue of the power cuts that have occurred throughout Victoria tonight. Like most people I enjoy the opportunity of a beer on a Friday night and my local publican contacted me tonight. He said that over the past month he has invested $300 000 renovating his hotel, the Reservoir Hotel in Bendigo. He has been trying to attract a new clientele and new business to his hotel, which is a family hotel run by himself and his family, and tonight he has had to turn people away, refund money paid for meals and close his bottle shop. He has not had one customer through the bottle shop in the past 2½ hours.

Most honourable members would be aware that most pubs in Bendigo sponsor cricket clubs. The Holmes family and the Reservoir Hotel sponsor a number of cricket clubs and there were more than 40 people in the bar tonight, not to mention the people they were serving meals to in the lounge. The 40 people walked out when the system the pub uses for pouring beer collapsed because of the electricity shutdown. The publican began serving beer out of bottles but the fridges got hot and he ended up with no-one in his bar, bistro or bottle shop. This is a small business that has invested $300 000 in upgrading the premises to attract more trade and business.

It is one of those cases where ordinary Victorians say enough is enough. My question for the minister is: given the circumstances of tonight, what compensation is she prepared to provide to that hotel operator for the loss of trade he has suffered?

Electricity: Yallourn dispute

Hon. W. R. BAXTER (North Eastern) — I address a matter to the attention of the Minister for Industrial Relations. Since Monday much of the electorate I represent has received extraordinary and unseasonably heavy rain. Some areas have received up to 6 inches and other parts 3 inches today. That has caused a good deal of distress because of the damage being done to crops that were ripening and were nearly ready for harvest. Pumps were operating in many places to get the water off the crops. I have just been telephoned by a very distressed farmer in Nathalia telling me that the power is off and he understands that it is not because of any act of God but simply as a result of man-made decisions. I expect also that because the hydro-electric power stations at Dartmouth and in the Snowy River

area have been commissioned to provide some power to the state — —

Hon. E. G. Stoney — And Eildon.

Hon. W. R. BAXTER — And Eildon. That is likely to exacerbate the flooding now occurring in north-eastern Victoria because of the high rivers and the exceptional rainfall this week.

An extraordinary situation is developing, and it is being grossly exacerbated by the action of rogue unionists. I call on the Minister for Industrial Relations to use that special relationship she claims the Labor Party has with unions and to work through the night until the lights are switched back on.

Responses

Hon. M. M. GOULD (Minister for Industrial Relations) — I have to say that some of the Honourable Mark Birrell's comments about my answer to a question earlier this afternoon were misleading.

I put on the record clearly that members of the Bracks government — including me — do not support the wildcat strike action that has been taken by members of the Construction, Forestry, Mining and Energy Union (CFMEU) in the Latrobe Valley. We condone — —

Hon. M. A. Birrell — That was Freudian!

Honourable members interjecting.

The PRESIDENT — Order! Settle down.

Hon. M. M. GOULD — We condemn the actions of these wildcat workers. A Supreme Court injunction has been placed on those workers tonight.

Honourable members interjecting.

Hon. M. M. GOULD — That Supreme Court action has been placed on those workers tonight.

Honourable members interjecting.

The PRESIDENT — Order! The house wants to hear the minister's response and the Hansard reporter wants to hear the minister's response so it can be recorded. I ask the house to settle down.

Hon. M. M. GOULD — We assisted in getting the companies together and arranged for them to meet Justice Beach tonight. We condemn the wildcat strike, the unauthorised strike, by workers down in the valley. A hearing is scheduled for later this evening in the commission to fulfil the decision of the commission handed down early this afternoon, which did not have any orders attached to it. That is what I advised the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon. I advised the house this afternoon that there were no orders attached to the decision of Commissioner Lewin, and that he had instructed the parties to agree on an order. They were to report back to him on 10 November, when the period of protected action under the agreement would be terminated. It is proposed before the night is out that that decision will be invoked forthwith, but it is Mr Reith's Workplace Relations Act — —

Honourable members interjecting.

Hon. M. M. GOULD — It allows — —

The PRESIDENT — Order! I ask the house to settle down. The house cannot proceed unless the proceedings can be recorded, and if the Hansard staff cannot hear, they cannot record them. I ask honourable members to settle down, contain themselves, and let the minister finish her answer.

Hon. M. M. GOULD — The actions of the CFMEU in holding a wildcat strike in the valley are totally unacceptable. It is not appropriate for it to put working people's jobs in jeopardy as a result of the unlawful action it has taken tonight. The Bracks government condemns the actions of the union. I condemn them, and the trade union movement condemns the action of those wildcat strikers. The government is working with the — —

Honourable members interjecting.

Hon. M. M. GOULD — This was unlawful — —

Honourable members interjecting.

Hon. J. M. Madden — It's what you want, isn't it? You are confrontational.

The PRESIDENT — Order! The Minister for Sport and Recreation is not helping. He should keep out of it.

Hon. M. M. GOULD — In conclusion, as I said, the government believes the action is totally unacceptable. It is unlawful action by the union. The government condemns the action of those workers and urges them to go back to work. However, the opposition knows full well that it was done — the commission hearing was all done — in line with Mr Reith's Workplace Relations Act.

The Honourable Bill Baxter raised a matter along the same lines as that raised by Mr Birrell. I stand by the comments I made on that matter. The government will be working very hard to get the workers back to work because the unlawful action they have taken tonight has affected Victorian workers. The government condemns that action.

Hon. C. C. BROAD (Minister for Energy and Resources) — The Honourable Philip Davis referred to the events in February and suggested that the government took no action at that time.

Honourable members interjecting.

Hon. C. C. BROAD — He knows that that is not correct. He knows that in February the government invoked emergency powers under the Electricity Industry Act.

Honourable members interjecting.

The PRESIDENT — Order! The minister has just started her response. I suggest the house let her complete it.

Honourable members interjecting.

Hon. C. C. BROAD — Thank you, Mr President. Some members on the other side know only how to shout.

Honourable members interjecting.

Hon. C. C. BROAD — The interjections of the Leader of the Opposition tonight underline his real purpose. It is not concern about the people of the state. It is abuse.

Honourable members interjecting.

The PRESIDENT — Order! If this goes on I will shut down the house and we can come back in a fortnight's time.

Hon. M. A. Birrell interjected.

The PRESIDENT — Order! Matters have been put to ministers. The ministers are now being given a chance to make their responses. I suggest that the minister be heard in relative silence.

Hon. C. C. BROAD — Thank you, Mr President. I welcome your intervention in calling on the opposition to cease their abuse.

Honourable members interjecting.

Hon. C. C. BROAD — I am trying to answer the question, and will if the Leader of the Opposition shuts up! We all know there are twice as many on the other side — —

Honourable members interjecting.

The PRESIDENT — Order! The house is being unfair to the minister by not allowing her to articulate her response. I suggest the members on my left take a deep breath and allow the minister to answer the question.

Hon. C. C. BROAD — Thank you, Mr President, I am very willing to answer the question. As I was saying, in February the government invoked powers under the Electricity Industry Act. The invoking of those powers was a great deal more than the previous government ever did in relation to the dispute.

Honourable members interjecting.

Hon. C. C. BROAD — From April 1999 the previous government did precisely nothing to resolve that dispute. In contrast, the new government took action in February and required the restoration of power, which occurred immediately.

Honourable members interjecting.

Hon. C. C. BROAD — The honourable member has also asserted that the government took no action following those events. He knows that to be untrue also, because he knows that the government set up a task force which I chaired, which has reported publicly and which recommended a large number of actions which we have debated in the house and which the government is implementing.

Honourable members interjecting.

The PRESIDENT — Order!

Hon. C. C. BROAD — In relation to the events that occurred tonight — which I am happy to outline to the house if members of the opposition will only be quiet for one moment — I have recommended to the Governor to proclaim part 3A of the Electricity Industry Act 1993. I am pleased to say that, on my recommendation, the Governor has signed those orders and that in accordance with those orders the government now has wide-ranging powers to ensure the effective supply of electricity to the state. The government has acted in accordance with those orders to place the maximum level of restrictions and to advise the state that all non-essential use of power by

households and industry is to be curtailed in order to ensure the effective supply of electricity for the state.

The answer to the question, which the opposition clearly does not want to hear because it is not the answer it was expecting, is that the government has acted.

An Opposition Member — Now you're a mind-reader as well!

Hon. C. C. BROAD — It is not very hard to read the minds of those opposite!

The government has taken the maximum appropriate action available to ensure the supply of electricity to the state, even though that clearly disappoints members of the opposition.

Hon. M. R. THOMSON (Minister for Small Business) — The Honourable Bill Forwood asked me to condemn the strike, and I certainly do so.

The Honourable Ron Best raised the question of the hotelier in Bendigo. The government is concerned about the discomfort and loss to businesses in the area. It does not condone this strike; it condemns the strike, and is acting as quickly as it can to fix the situation.

Motion agreed to.

House adjourned 10.24 p.m. until Tuesday, 14 November.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Answers to the following questions on notice were circulated on the date shown.
Questions have been incorporated from the notice paper of the Legislative Council.
Answers have been incorporated in the form supplied by the departments on behalf of the appropriate ministers.
The portfolio of the minister answering the question on notice starts each heading.

Tuesday , 31 October 2000

Health: Human Services — Workcover premiums

869. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Industrial Relations (for the Honourable the Minister for Health): In respect of the Department of Human Services

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Department and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Department for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Department provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Department budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

(a) The WorkCover Initial Premium for 1999/00 was $15,511,883 (as at 15 July 2000). The 1999/00 Confirmed Premium has not yet been determined by WorkCover.

(b) The rateable remuneration on the basis of which the 1999/00 Initial Premium was calculated was $450,509,540.

(c) The WorkCover claims costs for the 1999/2000 as specified in the 2000/2001 initial premium notice was $1,936,936.

(d) The WorkCover Initial Premium for 2000-2001 is $15,567,527 (as at 15 July 2000, including 10% GST)

(e) The rateable remuneration on the basis of which the 2000/01 Initial Premium was calculated was $454,089,896.

(f) The WorkCover industry classifications and their rateable remuneration for the Department for 2000-2001 in respect of each industry classification are:

Industry Classification		Amount
J7112W	State Government Administration	$120,462,250
F4754V	Farm Produce Wholesale Nec	$166,026
I6324F	Residential Property Operators Non-Private	$15,369,633
I6336R	Technical Services Nec	$1,756,363
I6341J	Legal Services	$676,687
I6366C	Protection & Private Enquiry Services	$65,400
K8146L	Psychiatric Hospitals	$297,244
K8176X	Community Health Centres (Medical)	$2,258,061
K8177A	Community Health Centres (Paramedical)	$610,172
K8311F	Welfare & Charitable Homes Nec Private	$734,419
K8312J	Welfare & Charitable Homes Nec Non-Private	$162,735,576
K8316T	Community Support Services Nec	$135,215,455
K8493F	Prisons & Reformatories	$13,832,177

(g) The Department provided an estimate of rateable remuneration of $454,089,896 to its WorkCover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration of 3 July 2000.

(h) The Department calculated a budget prior to 30 June 2000 for WorkCover premiums for 2000-2001 of $11,400,200.

Planning: Infrastructure — Workcover premiums

870. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Industrial Relations (for the Honourable the Minister for Planning): In respect of the Department of Infrastructure:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Department on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Department and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Department for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Department provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Department budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

(a) The WorkCover Initial Premium for 1999/00 was $224,384 (as at 15 July 2000). The 1999/00 Confirmed Premium has not yet been determined by WorkCover.

(b) The rateable remuneration on the basis of which the 1999/00 Initial Premium was calculated was $39,714,055.

(c) The WorkCover claims costs for the 1999/2000 as specified in the 2000/2001 initial premium notice was $6,343.

(d) The WorkCover Initial Premium for 2000-2001 is $273,731 (as at 15 July 2000, including 10% GST)

(e) The rateable remuneration on the basis of which the 2000/01 Initial Premium was calculated was $43,854,000.

(f) The WorkCover industry classifications and their rateable remuneration for the Department for 2000-2001 in respect of each industry classification are:

Industry Classification		Amount
J7112W	State Government Administration	$40,910,000
I6336R	Technical Services Nec	$2,944,000

(g) The Department provided an estimate of rateable remuneration of $43,854,000 to its WorkCover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration on 3 May 2000.

(h) The Department calculated a budget prior to 30 June 2000 for WorkCover premiums for 2000-2001 of $381,000.

Energy and Resources: Natural Resources and Environment — Workcover premiums

872. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources: In respect of the Department of Natural Resources and Environment:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Department on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Department and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Department for 2000-01 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Department provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Department budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

In respect of the Department of Natural Resources and Environment

(a) The WorkCover Initial Premium for 1999/2000 was $3,717,645 (as at 15 July 2000). The 1999/2000 Confirmed Premium has not yet been determined by WorkCover.

(b) The rateable remuneration on the basis of which the 1999/00 Initial Premium was calculated was $235,843,144.

(c) The WorkCover claims costs for 1999/2000 as specified in the 2000/2001 initial premium notice was $454,606.

(d) The WorkCover Initial Premium for 2000/2001 is $4,152,658 (as at 15 July 2000, including 10% GST).

(e) The rateable remuneration on the basis of which the 2000/2001 Initial Premium was calculated was $235,631,599.

(f) The WorkCover industry classifications and their rateable remuneration for the Department for 2000/2001 in respect of each industry classification are:

Industry Classification		Amount
J7112W	State Government Administration	$130,674,479
A0206J	Services to Agriculture Nec	$1,756,769
A0304L	Forestry & Service to Forestry	$19,785,994
C3370R	General Engineering	$245,220
F4861A	New Motor Vehicle Dealers	$109,087
I6335L	Surveying Services	$5,290,168
K8461L	Research & Scientific Institutions	$70,693,560
K8494J	Fire Brigades & Associated Services	$7,053,963

Note: The industry classification for F4861A, New Motor Vehicle Dealers is a WorkCover classification relating to plant maintenance activities for forestry operations in the Gippsland Region.

(g) The Department provided an estimate of rateable remuneration of $233,416,599 to its WorkCover agent in respect of 2000/2001 rateable remuneration on 13 April 2000. This amount was subsequently adjusted to $235,631,599 to include Aboriginal Affairs Victoria.

(h) The Department calculated a budget prior to 30 June 2000 for WorkCover premiums for 2000/2001 of $5,005,700.

Premier: Premier and Cabinet — Workcover premiums

873. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Industrial Relations (for the Honourable the Premier): In respect of the Department of Premier and Cabinet:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Department on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Department and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Department for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Department provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Department budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

(a) The WorkCover initial premium for 1999-2000 was $58,418.16 (inclusive of a 5% discount). As a result of the centralisation of responsibility for employment of Ministerial staff and the establishment of the Metropolitan Ambulance Service Royal Commission, the Department received an additional premium in 1999-2000 for $20,846.59. The Department has not been advised of the confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) The rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium was calculated was $32,849,560. The addition of 6 new workplaces in May 2000 resulted in total estimate of remuneration of $38,120,817. The confirmed annual remuneration for 1999/2000 was $33,649,580.

(c) The claim costs for 1999-2000 were $10,246. It should be noted that a claim initiated in 1998-1999 continues to incur significant claim costs which are impacting on the Department's premium.

(d) The 2000-2001 initial premium is $145,463.77 (inclusive of 5% discount and GST).

(e) The estimate of rateable remuneration for the 1999-2000 initial premium was $44,895,910.

(f) The industry classifications within the Department are as follows:

Industry Classification	**Rateable Remuneration**
State Government Administration	$43,103,726
Newsagents, Stationers & Booksellers	$1,792,184

(g) The Department provided an estimate of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration ($44,895,910) to its WorkCover agent in May 2000.

(h) The budget estimate for the WorkCover premium for 2000-2001 was $118,058.

Please note that the above information does not include information from Government House or the Arts institutions which have separate arrangements for WorkCover.

State and Regional Development: Workcover premiums

874. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Minister for State and Regional Development): In respect of the Department of State and Regional Development:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Department on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Department and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Department for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Department provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Department budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

(a) The WorkCover Initial Premium 1999/00 was $91,318 (as at 15 July 2000). The 1999/00 Confirmed Premium has not yet been determined by WorkCover.

(b) The rateable remuneration on the basis of which the 1999/00 Initial Premium was calculated was $34,687,361.

(c) The WorkCover claims costs for 1999/2000 as specified in the 2000/2001 initial premium notice was $40,303.

(d) The WorkCover Initial Premium for 2000-2001 is $186,167 (as at 15 July 2000, including 10% GST)

(e) The rateable remuneration on the basis of which the 2000/01 Initial Premium was calculated was $44,399,113.

(f) The WorkCover industry classifications and their rateable remuneration for the Department for 2000-2001 in respect of each industry classification are:

Industry Classification		Amount
J7112W	State Government Administration	$5,517,443
I6362V	Market & Business Consultancy Services	$33,991,133
L9149R	Sport and Recreation	$4,890,537

(g) The Department provided an estimate of rateable remuneration of $44,399,113 to its WorkCover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration on 13 June 2000.

(h) The Department calculated a budget prior to 30 June 2000 for WorkCover premiums for 2000-2001 of $307,000.

Health: Advanced Dental Technicians Qualifications Board — Workcover premiums

883. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Industrial Relations (for the Honourable the Minister for Health): In respect of the Advanced Dental Technicians Qualifications Board:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Board on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Board and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Board for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Board provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did Board budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The Board no longer exists as it was succeeded by the Dental Practice Board as from 1 July 2000. The time and resources required to extract the relevant information requested cannot be justified on grounds of limited public interest value and inappropriate use of departmental resources.

Health: Anti-Cancer Council of Victoria — Workcover premiums

884. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Industrial Relations (for the Honourable the Minister for Health): In respect of the Anti-Cancer Council of Victoria:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Council on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Council and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Council for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Council provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Council budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The Anti-Cancer Council of Victoria is a separately reporting entity and details of its financial operations are not held within my Department. The time and resources required to extract the relevant information requested cannot be justified on grounds of limited public interest value and inappropriate use of departmental resources.

Health: Chiropractors Registration Board of Victoria — Workcover premiums

885. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Industrial Relations (for the Honourable the Minister for Health): In respect of the Chiropractors Registration Board of Victoria:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Board on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000/2001.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Board and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Board for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Board provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Board budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The Chiropractors Registration Board of Victoria is a separately reporting entity and details of its financial operations are not held within my Department. The time and resources required to extract the relevant information requested cannot be justified on grounds of limited public interest value and inappropriate use of departmental resources.

Health: Consultative Council on Obstetric and Paediatric Mortality and Morbidity — Workcover premiums

886. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Industrial Relations (for the Honourable the Minister for Health): In respect of the Consultative Council on Obstetric and Paediatric Mortality and Morbidity:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Consultative Council on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Consultative Council and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Consultative Council for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Consultative Council provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Consultative Council budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The Consultative Council on Obstetric and Paediatric Mortality and Morbidity is not a separate reporting entity and its figures are included in those of the Department of Human Services. The Consultative Council is not a separate location for WorkCover purposes and therefore specific details of the calculation of the WorkCover premium are not available. It is included in the industry classification "State Government Administration".

Health: Consultative Council of Anaesthetic Mortality and Morbidity — Workcover premiums

887. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Industrial Relations (for the Honourable the Minister for Health): In respect of the Consultative Council of Anaesthetic Mortality and Morbidity:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Consultative Council on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Consultative Council and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Consultative Council for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Consultative Council provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Consultative Council budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The Consultative Council of Anaesthetic Mortality and Morbidity is not a separate reporting entity and its figures are included in those of the Department of Human Services. The Consultative Council is not a separate location for WorkCover purposes and therefore specific details of the calculation of the WorkCover premium are not available. It is included in the industry classification "State Government Administration".

Health: Dental Board of Victoria — Workcover premiums

888. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Industrial Relations (for the Honourable the Minister for Health): In respect of the Dental Board of Victoria:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Board on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Board and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Board for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Board provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Board budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The Board no longer exists as it was succeeded by the Dental Practice Board as from 1 July 2000. The time and resources required to extract the relevant information requested cannot be justified on grounds of limited public interest value and inappropriate use of departmental resources.

Health: Dental Technicians Licensing Committee — Workcover premiums

889. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Industrial Relations (for the Honourable the Minister for Health): In respect of the Dental Technicians Licensing Committee:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000/2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Committee on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Committee and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Committee for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Committee provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Committee budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The Committee no longer exists as it was succeeded by the Dental Practice Board as from 1 July 2000. The time and resources required to extract the relevant information requested cannot be justified on grounds of limited public interest value and inappropriate use of departmental resources.

Health: Food Safety Council — Workcover premiums

890. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Industrial Relations (for the Honourable the Minister for Health): In respect of the Food Safety Council:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Council on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Council and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Council for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Council provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Council budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The Food Safety Council is not a separate reporting entity and its figures are included in those of the Department of Human Services. The Council is not a separate location for WorkCover purposes and therefore specific details of the calculation of the WorkCover premium are not available. It is included in the industry classification “State Government Administration”.

Health: Health Services Commissioner — Workcover premiums

891. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Industrial Relations (for the Honourable the Minister for Health): In respect of the Health Services Commissioner:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Commissioner on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Commissioner and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Commissioner for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Commissioner provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Commissioner budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The Health Services Commissioner is not a separate reporting entity and the figures are included in those of the Department of Human Services. There is not a separate location for WorkCover purposes and therefore specific details of the calculation of the WorkCover premium are not available. It is included in the industry classification "State Government Administration".

Health: Infertility Treatment Authority — Workcover premiums

892. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Industrial Relations (for the Honourable the Minister for Health): In respect of the Infertility Treatment Authority:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Authority on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Authority and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Authority for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Authority provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Authority budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The Infertility Treatment Authority is not a separate reporting entity and its figures are included in those of the Department of Human Services. The Authority is not a separate location for WorkCover purposes and therefore specific details of the calculation of the WorkCover premium are not available. It is included in the industry classification "State Government Administration".

Community Services: Intellectual Disability Review Panel — Workcover premiums

893. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Small Business (for the Honourable the Minister for Community Services): In respect of the Intellectual Disability Review Panel:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Panel on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Panel and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Panel for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Panel provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided

(h) What amount did the Panel budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001

ANSWER:

The Intellectual Disability Review Panel is not a separate reporting entity and its figures are included in those of the Department of Human Services. The Panel is not a separate location for WorkCover purposes and therefore specific details of the calculation of the WorkCover premium are not available. It is included in the industry classification “State Government Administration”.

Health: Intern Training and Accreditation Committee — Workcover premiums

894. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Industrial Relations (for the Honourable the Minister for Health): In respect of the Intern Training and Accreditation Committee:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Committee on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Committee and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Committee for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Committee provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Committee budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The Committee was abolished upon the proclamation of the Health Practitioners Acts Amendment Act 2000 on the 20 July 2000. The time and resources required to extract the relevant information requested cannot be justified on grounds of limited public interest value and inappropriate use of departmental resources.

Health: Medical Radiation Technologists Board of Victoria — Workcover premiums

896. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Industrial Relations (for the Honourable the Minister for Health): In respect of the Medical Radiation Technologists Board of Victoria:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Board on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Board and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Board for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Board provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Board budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The Medical Radiation Technologists Board of Victoria is not a separate reporting entity and its figures are included in those of the Department of Human Services. The Board is not a separate location for WorkCover purposes and therefore specific details of the calculation of the WorkCover premium are not available. It is included in the industry classification “State Government Administration”.

Health: Mental Health Review Board of Victoria — Workcover premiums

897. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Small Business (for the Honourable the Minister Community Services): In respect of the Mental Health Review Board of Victoria:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Board on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Board and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Board for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Board provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Board budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The above matter was incorrectly addressed as it belongs to the Health portfolio. In responding for the Honourable the Minister for Health I am advised that The Mental Health Review Board of Victoria's WorkCover figures are included in those of the Department of Human Services. The Board is not a separate location for WorkCover purposes and therefore specific details of the calculation of the WorkCover premium are not available. It is included in the industry classification "State Government Administration".

Health: Metropolitan Ambulance Service — Workcover premiums

898. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Industrial Relations (for the Honourable the Minister for Health): In respect of the Metropolitan Ambulance Service:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Service on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Service and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Service for 2000-01 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Service provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Service budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

(a) The WorkCover Initial Premium for 1999/00 was $1,167,473 (as at 15 July 2000). The 1999/00 Confirmed Premium has not yet been determined by WorkCover.

(b) The rateable remuneration on the basis of which the 1999/00 Initial Premium was calculated was $66,674,161.

(c) The WorkCover claims costs for the 1999/2000 as specified in the 2000/2001 initial premium notice was $15,355.

(d) The WorkCover Initial Premium for 2000-2001 is $1,968,787 (as at 15 July 2000, including 10% GST)

(e) The rateable remuneration on the basis of which the 2000/01 Initial Premium was calculated was $70,282,630.

(f) The WorkCover industry classifications and their rateable remuneration for MAS for 2000-2001 in respect of each industry classification are:

Industry Classification		Amount
K8175W	Ambulance Services	$70,282,630

(g) MAS provided an estimate of rateable remuneration of $70,282,630 to its WorkCover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration on 30 June 2000.

(h) MAS calculated a budget prior to 30 June 2000 for WorkCover premiums for 2000-2001 of $1,695,850

Health: Nurses Board of Victoria — Workcover premiums

899. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Industrial Relations (for the Honourable the Minister for Health): In respect of the Nurses Board of Victoria:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Board on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Board and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Board for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Board provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Board budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The Nurses Board of Victoria is a separately reporting entity and details of its financial operations are not held within my Department. The time and resources required to extract the relevant information requested cannot be justified on grounds of limited public interest value and inappropriate use of departmental resources.

Health: Optometrists Registration Board of Victoria — Workcover premiums

900. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Industrial Relations (for the Honourable the Minister for Health): In respect of the Optometrists Registration Board of Victoria:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Board on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Board and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Board for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Board provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Board budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The Optometrists Registration Board of Victoria is a separately reporting entity and details of its financial operations are not held within my Department. The time and resources required to extract the relevant information requested cannot be justified on grounds of limited public interest value and inappropriate use of departmental resources.

Health: Osteopaths Registration Board of Victoria — Workcover premiums

901. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Industrial Relations (for the Honourable the Minister for Health): In respect of the Osteopaths Registration Board of Victoria:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Board on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Board and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Board for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Board provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Board budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The Osteopaths Registration Board of Victoria is a separately reporting entity and details of its financial operations are not held within my Department. The time and resources required to extract the relevant information requested cannot be justified on grounds of limited public interest value and inappropriate use of departmental resources.

Health: Pathology Services Accreditation Board — Workcover premiums

902. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Industrial Relations (for the Honourable the Minister for Health): In respect of the Pathology Services Accreditation Board:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Board on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Board and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Board for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Board provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Board budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The Pathology Services Accreditation Board is not a separate reporting entity and its figures are included in those of the Department of Human Services. The Board is not a separate location for WorkCover purposes and therefore specific details of the calculation of the WorkCover premium are not available. It is included in the industry classification “State Government Administration”.

Health: Pharmacy Board of Victoria — Workcover premiums

903. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Industrial Relations (for the Honourable the Minister for Health): In respect of the Pharmacy Board of Victoria:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Board on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Board and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Board for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Board provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Board budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The Pharmacy Board of Victoria is a separately reporting entity and details of its financial operations are not held within my Department. The time and resources required to extract the relevant information requested cannot be justified on grounds of limited public interest value and inappropriate use of departmental resources.

Health: Physiotherapists Registration Board — Workcover premiums

904. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Industrial Relations (for the Honourable the Minister for Health): In respect of the Physiotherapists Registration Board:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Board on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Board and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Board for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Board provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Board budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The Physiotherapists Registration Board is a separately reporting entity and details of its financial operations are not held within my Department. The time and resources required to extract the relevant information requested cannot be justified on grounds of limited public interest value and inappropriate use of departmental resources.

Health: Podiatrists Registration Board of Victoria — Workcover premiums

905. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Industrial Relations (for the Honourable the Minister for Health): In respect of the Podiatrists Registration Board of Victoria:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Board on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Board and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Board for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Board provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Board budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The Podiatrists Registration Board of Victoria is a separately reporting entity and details of its financial operations are not held within my Department. The time and resources required to extract the relevant information requested cannot be justified on grounds of limited public interest value and inappropriate use of departmental resources.

Health: Poisons Advisory Council — Workcover premiums

906. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Industrial Relations (for the Honourable the Minister for Health): In respect of the Poisons Advisory Council:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Committee on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Committee and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Committee for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Committee provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Committee budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The Poisons Advisory Council is not a separate reporting entity and its figures are included in those of the Department of Human Services. The Council is not a separate location for WorkCover purposes and therefore specific details of the calculation of the WorkCover premium are not available. It is included in the industry classification “State Government Administration”.

Health: Psychologists Registration Board of Victoria — Workcover premiums

907. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Industrial Relations (for the Honourable the Minister for Health): In respect of the Psychologists Registration Board of Victoria:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Board on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Board and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Board for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Board provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Board budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The Psychologists Registration Board of Victoria is a separately reporting entity and details of its financial operations are not held within my Department. The time and resources required to extract the relevant information requested cannot be justified on grounds of limited public interest value and inappropriate use of departmental resources.

Health: Psychosurgery Review Board of Victoria — Workcover premiums

908. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Industrial Relations (for the Honourable the Minister for Health): In respect of the Psychosurgery Review Board of Victoria:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Board on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Board and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Board for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Board provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Board budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The Psychosurgery Review Board of Victoria's WorkCover figures are included in those of the Department of Human Services. The Board is not a separate location for WorkCover purposes and therefore specific details of the calculation of the WorkCover premium are not available. It is included in the industry classification "State Government Administration".

Health: Radiation Advisory Committee — Workcover premiums

909. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Industrial Relations (for the Honourable the Minister for Health): In respect of the Radiation Advisory Committee:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Committee on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Committee and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Committee for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Committee provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Committee budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The Radiation Advisory Committee is not a separate reporting entity and its figures are included in those of the Department of Human Services. The Committee is not a separate location for WorkCover purposes and therefore specific details of the calculation of the WorkCover premium are not available. It is included in the industry classification "State Government Administration".

Health: Rural Ambulance Service Victoria — Workcover premiums

910. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Industrial Relations (for the Honourable the Minister for Health): In respect of the Rural Ambulance Service Victoria:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Service on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Service and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Service for 2000-01 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Service provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Service budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The Rural Ambulance Service Victoria is a separately reporting entity and details of its financial operations are not held within my Department. The time and resources required to extract the relevant information requested cannot be justified on grounds of limited public interest value and inappropriate use of departmental resources.

Health: Specialists Practitioners Qualification Committee — Workcover premiums

911. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Industrial Relations (for the Honourable the Minister for Health): In respect of the Specialists Practitioners Qualification Committee:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Committee on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Committee and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Committee for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Committee provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Committee budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The Committee was abolished upon the proclamation of the Dental Practice Act 1999 on I July 2000. The time and resources required to extract the relevant information requested cannot be justified on grounds of limited public interest value and inappropriate use of departmental resources.

Health: Victorian Health Promotion Foundation — Workcover premiums

912. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Industrial Relations (for the Honourable the Minister for Health): In respect of the Victorian Health Promotion Foundation:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Foundation on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Foundation and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Foundation for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Foundation provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Foundation budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The Victorian Health Promotion Foundation is a separately reporting entity and details of its financial operations are not held within my Department. The time and resources required to extract the relevant information requested cannot be justified on grounds of limited public interest value and inappropriate use of departmental resources.

Community Services: Youth Parole Board — Workcover premiums

913. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Small Business (for the Honourable the Minister for Community Services): In respect of the Youth Parole Board:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Board on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Board and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Board for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Board provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Board budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The Youth Parole Board is not a separate reporting entity and its figures are included in those of the Department of Human Services. The board is not a separate location for WorkCover purposes and therefore specific details of the calculation of the WorkCover premium are not available. It is included in the industry classification “State Government Administration”.

Community Services: Youth Residential Board — Workcover premiums

914. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Small Business (for the Honourable the Minister for Community Services): In respect of the Youth Residential Board:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Board on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Board and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Board for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Board provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Board budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The Youth Residential Board is not a separate reporting entity and its figures are included in those of the Department of Human Services. The board is not a separate location for WorkCover purposes and therefore specific details of the calculation of the WorkCover premium are not available. It is included in the industry classification “State Government Administration”.

Premier: Community Support Fund grants

949. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Industrial Relations (for the Honourable the Premier): What are the details of all grant applications assessed as not meeting the guidelines of the Community Support Fund since 1 June 2000.

ANSWER:

Since 1 June 2000 a total of 93 applications have been assessed as not meeting the funding guidelines of the Community Support Fund.

Premier: Community Support Fund grants

950. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Industrial Relations (for the Honourable the Premier): What is the date that each grant assessed as not meeting the guidelines of the Community Support Fund since 1 June 2000 was received by the Community Support Fund.

ANSWER:

Since 1 June 2000 a total of 93 applications have been assessed as not meeting the funding guidelines of the Community Support Fund.

Transport: public transport user surveys — concessions

951. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Minister for Transport):

(a) How many surveys were conducted in 1999-2000 to determine the proportion of Melbourne metropolitan public transport users who are travelling on concession tickets and how many are planned to be conducted in 2000-2001.

(b) On what date(s) did or will each survey cover.

(c) To whom was any such contract for a concessions survey awarded and what was the total cost to the Department of Infrastructure, the Public Transport Corporation or any other Victorian Government Department or Agency in 1999-2000, and what is the expected cost to each agency for any 2000-2001 concessions survey.

(d) What proportion of concession survey costs do the — (i) rail; (ii) tram; and (iii) bus franchisees or operators in Melbourne pay.

(e) How many persons were surveyed on each occasion a concessions survey was undertaken in 1999-2000.

(f) What percentage of passengers on Melbourne metropolitan trains, trams and buses, respectively, were found by each survey in 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 to date to be travelling on concession tickets and is any breakdown available for the percentage of passengers on each mode travelling on — (i) children's concession fares – 2 hour tickets; (ii) children's concession fares – all day tickets; and (iii) Seniors Card concession fares – 2 hour tickets; (iv) Seniors Card concession fares – all day tickets; (v) pensioner concession fares – 2 hour tickets; and (vi) pensioner concession fares – all day tickets.

(g) Does the percentage of passengers in (f) above in each category vary between zones 1, 2 and 3; if so, how.

(j) What percentage of concession passengers on Melbourne metropolitan trains, trams and buses, respectively, pay a full adult fare that is purchased as a 2 hour, all day, monthly or yearly ticket.

ANSWER:

The confidentiality agreements under which the Revenue Clearing House was established currently constrain the release of information relevant to this question.

Planning: Architects Registration Board of Victoria — Workcover premiums

961. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Sport and Recreation (for the Honourable the Minister for Planning): In respect of the Architects Registration Board of Victoria:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Board on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Board and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Board for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Board provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Board budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The Architects Registration Board of Victoria reports to Parliament each year as part of its own external reporting requirements. However, the time and resources required to extract the relevant information cannot be justified on the grounds of limited public interest value and inappropriate use of departmental resources.

Planning: Building Advisory Council — Workcover premiums

962. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Sport and Recreation (for the Honourable the Minister for Planning): In respect of the Building Advisory Council:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Council on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Council and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Council for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Council provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Council budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The Building Advisory Council is not a separately reporting entity and its figures are included in those of the Building Control Commission. The time and resources required to extract the relevant information requested cannot be justified on the grounds of limited public interest value and inappropriate use of departmental resources.

Planning: Building Appeals Board — Workcover premiums

963. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Sport and Recreation (for the Honourable the Minister for Planning): In respect of the Building Appeals Board:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Board on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Board and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Board for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Board provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Board budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The Building Appeals Board is not a separately reporting entity and its figures are included in those of the Building Control Commission. The time and resources required to extract the relevant information requested cannot be justified on the grounds of limited public interest value and inappropriate use of departmental resources.

Planning: Building Practitioners Board — Workcover premiums

965. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Sport and Recreation (for the Honourable the Minister for Planning): In respect of the Building Practitioners Board:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Board on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Board and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Board for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Board provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Board budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The Building Practitioners Board is not a separately reporting entity and its figures are included in those of the Building Control Commission. The time and resources required to extract the relevant information requested cannot be justified on the grounds of limited public interest value and inappropriate use of departmental resources.

Planning: Building Regulations Advisory Committee — Workcover premiums

966. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Sport and Recreation (for the Honourable the Minister for Planning): In respect of the Building Regulations Advisory Committee:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Committee on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Committee and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Committee for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Committee provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Committee budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The Building Regulations Advisory Committee is not a separately reporting entity and its figures are included in those of the Building Control Commission. The time and resources required to extract the relevant information requested cannot be justified on the grounds of limited public interest value and inappropriate use of departmental resources.

Planning: Heritage Council — Workcover premiums

967. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Sport and Recreation (for the Honourable the Minister for Planning): In respect of the Heritage Council:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Council on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Council and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Council for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Council provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Council budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The Heritage Council reports to Parliament each year as part of its own external reporting requirements. However, the Workcover details are included in the Department of Infrastructure's invoice. The time and resources required to extract the relevant information requested cannot be justified on the grounds of limited public interest value and inappropriate use of departmental resources.

Ports: Marine Board of Victoria — Workcover premiums

968. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Ports: In respect of the Marine Board of Victoria:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Board on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Board and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Board for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Board provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Board budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The Marine Board of Victoria reports to Parliament each year as part of its own external reporting requirements. However, the WorkCover details are included in the Department of Infrastructure's invoice. The time and resources required to extract the relevant information requested cannot be justified on the grounds of limited public interest value and inappropriate use of departmental resources.

Planning: Plumbing Industry Advisory Council — Workcover premiums

971. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Sport and Recreation (for the Honourable the Minister for Planning): In respect of the Plumbing Industry Advisory Council:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Council on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Council and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Council for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Council provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Council budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The Plumbing Industry Advisory Council is not a separately reporting entity and its figures are included in those of the Plumbing Industry Commission. The time and resources required to extract the relevant information requested cannot be justified on the grounds of limited public interest value and inappropriate use of departmental resources.

Transport: V/Line Passenger Corporation — Workcover premiums

977. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Minister for Transport): In respect of the V/Line Passenger Corporation:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Corporation on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Corporation and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Corporation for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Corporation provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Corporation budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The V/Line Passenger Corporation reports to Parliament each year as part of its own external reporting requirements. However, the time and resources required to extract the relevant information requested cannot be justified on the grounds of limited public interest value and inappropriate use of departmental resources.

Transport: City Circle Tram Promotion Committee — Workcover premiums

978. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Minister for Transport): In respect of the City Circle Tram Promotion Committee:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Committee on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Committee and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Committee for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Committee provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Committee budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The City Circle Tram Promotion Committee is not a separately reporting entity and its figures are included in those of the Department of Infrastructure. The time and resources required to extract the relevant information requested cannot be justified on the grounds of limited public interest value and inappropriate use of departmental resources.

Transport: Public Transport Access Committee — Workcover premiums

980. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Minister for Transport): In respect of the Public Transport Access Committee:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Committee on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Committee and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Committee for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Committee provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Committee budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The Public Transport Access Committee is not a separately reporting entity and its figures are included in those of the Department of Infrastructure. The time and resources required to extract the relevant information requested cannot be justified on the grounds of limited public interest value and inappropriate use of departmental resources.

Transport: Public Transport customer Charter Committee — Workcover premiums

981. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Minister for Transport): In respect of the Public Transport Customer Charter Committee:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Committee on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Committee and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Committee for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Committee provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Committee budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The Public Transport Customer Charter Committee is not a separately reporting entity and its figures are included in those of the Department of Infrastructure. The time and resources required to extract the relevant information

requested cannot be justified on the grounds of limited public interest value and inappropriate use of departmental resources.

Ports: State Boating Council — Workcover premiums

982. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Ports: In respect of the State Boating Council:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Council on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Council and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Council for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Council provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Council budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The State Boating Council is not a separately reporting entity and its figures are included in those of the Department of Infrastructure. The time and resources required to extract the relevant information requested cannot be justified on the grounds of limited public interest value and inappropriate use of departmental resources.

Transport: Victorian Bicycle Advisory Council — Workcover premiums

983. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Minister for Transport): In respect of the Victorian Bicycle Advisory Council:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Council on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Council and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Council for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Council provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Council budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The Victorian Bicycle Advisory Council is not a separately reporting entity. The time and resources required to extract the relevant information requested cannot be justified on the grounds of limited public interest value and inappropriate use of departmental resources.

Transport: Victorian Motorcycle Advisory Council — Workcover premiums

984. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Minister for Transport): In respect of the Victorian Motorcycle Advisory Council:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Council on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Council and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Council for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Council provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Council budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The Victorian Motorcycle Advisory Council is not a separately reporting entity. The time and resources required to extract the relevant information requested cannot be justified on the grounds of limited public interest value and inappropriate use of departmental resources.

Transport: Victorian Road Freight Advisory Council — Workcover premiums

985. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Minister for Transport): In respect of the Victorian Road Freight Advisory Council:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Council on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Council and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Council for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Council provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Council budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The Victorian Road Freight Advisory Council is not a separately reporting entity. The time and resources required to extract the relevant information requested cannot be justified on the grounds of limited public interest value and inappropriate use of departmental resources.

Consumer Affairs: Business Licensing Authority — Workcover premiums

994. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Consumer Affairs: In respect of the Business Licensing Authority:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Authority on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Authority and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Authority for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Authority provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Authority budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

For WorkCover purposes the Business Licensing Authority is not a separately - reporting entity and its figures are included in those of Department of Justice. The figures for the Department of Justice appear in the response to Question on Notice No. 871, a copy of which is attached. To provide the information requested would require an inordinate amount of time and resources that are not available.

ATTACHMENT

Attorney-General: Justice — Workcover premiums

871. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Small Business (for the Honourable the Attorney-General): In respect of the Department of Justice:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Department on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Department and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Department for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Department provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Department budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

(a) The WorkCover Initial Premium for 1999/00 was $4,347,409 (as at 15 June 2000). WorkCover has not yet determined the 1999/00 Confirmed Premium.

(b) The rateable remuneration on the basis of which the 1999/00 Initial Premium was calculated was $206,152,000.

(c) The WorkCover claims costs for the 1999/2000 as specified in the 2000/2001 initial premium notice was $521,171.

(d) The WorkCover Initial Premium for 2000-2001 is $5,010,705 (as at 17 July 2000, including 10% GST)

(e) The rateable remuneration on the basis of which the 2000/01 Initial Premium was calculated was $215,466,000.

(f) The WorkCover industry classifications and their rateable remuneration for the Department for 2000-2001 in respect of each industry classification are:

Industry Classification		Amount
J7112W	State Government Administration	$60,049,000
J7120W	Justice	$102,308,000
K8316T	Community Support Services Nec	$12,152,000
K8493F	Prisons & Reformatories	$40,957,000

(g) The Department provided an estimate of rateable remuneration of $215,466,000 to its WorkCover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration on 29 May 2000.

(h) The Department calculated a budget prior to 30 June 2000 for WorkCover premiums for 2000-2001 of $4,215,000.

Consumer Affairs: Defence Reserves Re-Employment Board — Workcover premiums

995. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Consumer Affairs: In respect of the Defence Reserves Re-Employment Board:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Board on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Board and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Board for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Board provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Board budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

For WorkCover purposes the Defense Reserves Re-Employment Board is not a separately - reporting entity and its figures are included in those of Department of Justice. The figures for the Department of Justice appear in the response to Question on Notice No. 871, a copy of which is attached. To provide the information requested would require an inordinate amount of time and resources that are not available.

[Hansard reference: For attachment — Answer to question on notice 871 — see page 1078.]

Consumer Affairs: Estate Agents Council — Workcover premiums

996. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Consumer Affairs: In respect of the Estate Agents Council:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Council on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Council and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Council for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Council provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Council budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

For WorkCover purposes the Estate Agents Council is not a separately - reporting entity and its figures are included in those of Department of Justice. The figures for the Department of Justice appear in the response to Question on Notice No. 871, a copy of which is attached. To provide the information requested would require an inordinate amount of time and resources that are not available.

[Hansard reference: For attachment — Answer to question on notice 871 — see page 1078.]

Consumer Affairs: Motor Car Traders Guarantee Fund Claims Committee — Workcover premiums

997. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Consumer Affairs: In respect of the Motor Car Traders Guarantee Fund Claims Committee:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Committee on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Committee and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Committee for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Committee provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Committee budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

For WorkCover purposes the Motor Car Traders Guarantee Fund Claims Committee is not a separately - reporting entity and its figures are included in those of Department of Justice. The figures for the Department of Justice

appear in the response to Question on Notice No. 871, a copy of which is attached. To provide the information requested would require an inordinate amount of time and resources that are not available.

[Hansard reference: For attachment — Answer to question on notice 871 — see page 1078.]

Consumer Affairs: Patriotic Funds Council — Workcover premiums

998. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Consumer Affairs: In respect of the Patriotic Funds Council:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Council on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Council and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Council for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Council provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Council budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

For WorkCover purposes the Patriotic Funds Council is not a separately - reporting entity and its figures are included in those of Department of Justice. The figures for the Department of Justice appear in the response to Question on Notice No. 871, a copy of which is attached. To provide the information requested would require an inordinate amount of time and resources that are not available.

[Hansard reference: For attachment — Answer to question on notice 871 — see page 1078.]

Consumer Affairs: Prostitution Control Act Advisory Committee — Workcover premiums

999. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Consumer Affairs: In respect of the Prostitution Control Act Advisory Committee:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Committee on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Committee and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Committee for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Committee provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Committee budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

For WorkCover purposes the Prostitution Control Act Advisory Committee is not a separately - reporting entity and its figures are included in those of Department of Justice. The figures for the Department of Justice appear in the response to Question on Notice No. 871, a copy of which is attached. To provide the information requested would require an inordinate amount of time and resources that are not available.

[Hansard reference: For attachment — Answer to question on notice 871 — see page 1078.]

Consumer Affairs: Residential Tenancies Bond Authority — Workcover premiums

1000. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Consumer Affairs: In respect of the Residential Tenancies Bond Authority:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Authority on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Authority and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Authority for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Authority provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Authority budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

For WorkCover purposes the Residential Tenancies Bond Authority is not a separately - reporting entity and its figures are included in those of Department of Justice. The figures for the Department of Justice appear in the response to Question on Notice No. 871, a copy of which is attached. To provide the information requested would require an inordinate amount of time and resources that are not available.

[Hansard reference: For attachment — Answer to question on notice 871 — see page 1078.]

Environment and Conservation: Ecorecycle Victoria — Workcover premiums

1030. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Minister for Environment and Conservation): In respect of EcoRecycle Victoria:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for EcoRecycle Victoria on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of EcoRecycle Victoria and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of EcoRecycle Victoria for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did EcoRecycle Victoria provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did EcoRecycle Victoria budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

In respect of EcoRecycle Victoria:

(a) The WorkCover initial premium for 1999/00 was $8,634.44 and the confirmed premium (verbal advice only received) is $8,788.89.

(b) The rateable remuneration on the basis of which the 1999-2000 initial premium was calculated was $1,343,467.00. The rateable remuneration on the basis of which the 1999-2000 confirmed premium was calculated was $1,374,124.00.

(c) There were no WorkCover claim costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-01 initial premium notice.

(d) The WorkCover initial premium for 2000-01 is $13,069.16.

(e) The rateable remuneration on the basis of which the 2000-01 initial premium was calculated was $1,612,160.00.

(f) The WorkCover industry classification is State Government Administration.

(g) EcoRecycle Victoria did not provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its WorkCover agent in respect of 2000-01

(h) EcoRecycle calculated a budget prior to 30 June 2000 for WorkCover premiums for 2000-01 of $8,280.00.

Environment and Conservation: Environment Conservation Council — Workcover premiums

1031. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Minister for Environment and Conservation): In respect of the Environment Conservation Council:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Council on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Council and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Council for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Council provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Council budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

The Environment Conservation Council is not a separately reporting entity and its figures are included in those of the Department of Natural Resources and Environment. To provide the information requested would require an inordinate amount of time and resources which are not available.

Environment and Conservation: Environment Protection Authority — Workcover premiums

1032. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Minister for Environment and Conservation): In respect of the Environment Protection Authority:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Authority on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Authority and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Authority for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Authority provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Authority budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

In respect of the Environment Protection Authority:

(a) The WorkCover initial premium for 1999/00 was $131,376.05. The 1999/00 confirmed premium has not yet been determined by WorkCover.

(b) The rateable remuneration on the basis of which the 1999/00 initial premium was calculated was $16,177,325.00. . The rateable remuneration on the basis of the 1999/00 confirmed premium was calculated was $16,680,748.08.

(c) The WorkCover claims costs for the 1999/2000 as specified in the 2000/2001 initial premium notice were $5,801.00.

(d) The WorkCover initial premium for 2000-2001 is $199,926.69.

(e) The rateable remuneration for the Authority on the basis of which the 2000/01 initial premium was calculated was $19,412,079.00.

(f) The WorkCover industry classification for the Authority for 2000-2001 is I6366R, Technical Services N.E.C.

(g) The Authority did provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its WorkCover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration. A verbal estimate was provided in May 2000 and the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided was $19,412,079.00.

(h) The Authority calculated a budget prior to 30 June 2000 for WorkCover premiums for 2000-2001 of $160,000.00.

Environment and Conservation: Environment Protection Board — Workcover premiums

1033. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Minister for Environment and Conservation): In respect of the Environment Protection Board:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Board on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Board and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Board for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Board provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Board budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

The Environment Protection Board is not a separately reporting entity and its figures are included in those of the Environment Protection Authority. To provide the information requested would require an inordinate amount of time and resources which are not available.

Environment and Conservation: National Parks Advisory Council — Workcover premiums

1034. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Minister for Environment and Conservation): In respect of the National Parks Advisory Council:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Council on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Council and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Council for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Council provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Council budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

The National Parks Advisory Council is not a separately reporting entity and its figures are included in those of the Department of Natural Resources and Environment. To provide the information requested would require an inordinate amount of time and resources which are not available.

Environment and Conservation: Parks Victoria — Workcover premiums

1035. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Minister for Environment and Conservation): In respect of the Parks Victoria:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for Parks Victoria on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of Parks Victoria and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of Parks Victoria for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did Parks Victoria provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Parks Victoria budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

In respect of Parks Victoria:

(a) The WorkCover Initial Premium for 1999/00 was $412,596 (as at 15 July 2000). The 1999/00 Confirmed Premium has not yet been determined by WorkCover.

(b) The rateable remuneration on the basis of which the 1999/00 Initial Premium was calculated was $40,457,587.

(c) The WorkCover claims costs for the 1999/2000 as specified in the 2000/2001 initial premium notice were $104,950.

(d) The WorkCover Initial Premium for 2000-2001 is $730,231 (as at 15 July 2000).

(e) The rateable remuneration on the basis of which the 2000/01 Initial Premium was calculated was $44,483,756.

(f) The WorkCover industry classifications and their rateable remuneration for Parks Victoria for 2000-2001 in respect of each industry classification are:

Industry Classification		Amount
J7112W	State Government Administration	$26,907,243
G5724X	Services to Water Transport Nec	$54,760
I6186V	Corporate Head Office Administration, Non Private	$11,012,553

Industry Classification		Amount
K8252T	Museums & Art Galleries	$1,751,873
L9141V	Parks & Zoological Gardens	$3,485,219
L9233C	Accommodation	$1,272,108

(g) Parks Victoria provided an estimate of rateable remuneration of $44,483,756 to its WorkCover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration on 28 May 2000.

(h) Parks Victoria calculated a budget prior to 30 June 2000 for WorkCover premiums for 2000-2001 of $600,000.

Environment and Conservation: Reference Areas Advisory Committee — Workcover premiums

1036. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Minister for Environment and Conservation): In respect of the Reference Areas Advisory Committee:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Committee on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Committee and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Committee for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Committee provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Committee budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

The Reference Areas Advisory Committee is not a separately reporting entity and its figures are included in those of the Department of Natural Resources and Environment. To provide the information requested would require an inordinate amount of time and resources which are not available.

Environment and Conservation: Royal Botanic Gardens Board — Workcover premiums

1037. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Minister for Environment and Conservation): In respect of the Royal Botanic Gardens Board:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Board on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Board and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Board for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Board provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Board budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

In respect of the Royal Botanic Gardens Board:

(a) The WorkCover initial premium for 1999-2000 was $43,029.17, and the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 was $36,185.09.

(b) The rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium for 1999-2000 was calculated was $5,436,682.00, and the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 was calculated was $5,703,177.13.

(c) The WorkCover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice were $27,346.00.

(d) The WorkCover initial premium for 2000-2001 was $58,034.44.

(e) The rateable remuneration for the Board on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated was $6,712,388.00.

(f) The WorkCover industry classification of the Board is L9138f.

(g) The Board did provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its WorkCover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration. The estimate was provided on 20 April 2000 and the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided was $6,899,243.00.

(h) The Board estimated prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in WorkCover premiums for 2000-2001 an amount of $62,370.00.

Environment and Conservation: Scientific Advisory Committee — Workcover premiums

1038. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Minister for Environment and Conservation): In respect of the Scientific Advisory Committee:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Committee on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Committee and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Committee for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Committee provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Committee budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

The Scientific Advisory Committee is not a separately reporting entity and its figures are included in those of the Department of Natural Resources and Environment. To provide the information requested would require an inordinate amount of time and resources which are not available.

Environment and Conservation: Surveyors Board — Workcover premiums

1039. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Minister for Environment and Conservation): In respect of the Surveyors Board:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Board on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Board and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Board for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Board provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Board budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

The Surveyors Board is not a separately reporting entity and its figures are included in those of the Department of Natural Resources and Environment. To provide the information requested would require an inordinate amount of time and resources which are not available.

Environment and Conservation: Trust for Nature — Workcover premiums

1041. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Minister for Environment and Conservation): In respect of the Trust for Nature:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Trust on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Trust and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Trust for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Trust provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Trust budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

In respect of the Trust for Nature:

(a) The WorkCover initial premium for 1999-2000 was $6,632.91. The confirmed premium for 1999-2000 is not yet available.

(b) The rateable remuneration on the basis of which the 1999-2000 initial premium was calculated was $591,663.00. The rateable remuneration on the basis of which the 1999-2000 confirmed premium was calculated was $694,381.00.

(c) The WorkCover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice were $15,131.00.

(d) The WorkCover initial premium for 2000-01 is $5,581.80.

(e) The rateable remuneration on the basis of which the 2000-01 initial premium was calculated was $681,000.00.

(f) The WorkCover industry classification is J7112W.

(g) The Trust for Nature did provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its WorkCover agent in respect of 2000-01. The estimate was provided on 28 April 2000 and the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided was $681,000.

(h) The Trust for Nature calculated a budget prior to 30 June 2000 for WorkCover premiums for 2000-01 of $7,031.00.

Environment and Conservation: Victorian Coastal Council — Workcover premiums

1044. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Minister for Environment and Conservation): In respect of the Victorian Coastal Council:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Council on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Council and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Council for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Council provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Council budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

The Victorian Coastal Council is not a separately reporting entity and its figures are included in those of the Department of Natural Resources and Environment. To provide the information requested would require an inordinate amount of time and resources which are not available.

Environment and Conservation: Victorian Regional Coastal Boards — Workcover premiums

1045. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Minister for Environment and Conservation): In respect of the Victorian Regional Coastal Boards:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Boards on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Boards and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Boards for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Boards provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Boards budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

The Victorian Regional Coastal Boards are not separately reporting entities and their figures are included in those of the Department of Natural Resources and Environment. To provide the information requested would require an inordinate amount of time and resources which are not available.

Environment and Conservation: Zoological Parks and Gardens Board Victoria — Workcover premiums

1047. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Minister for Environment and Conservation): In respect of the Zoological Parks and Gardens Board Victoria:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Board on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Board and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Board for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Board provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Board budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

In respect of the Zoological Parks and Gardens Board:

(a) The WorkCover initial premium for 1999-2000 was $270,504.29 and the confirmed premium was $338,726.25. The increase was primarily due to Zoo Board Claims experience.

(b) The rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium for 1999-2000 was calculated was $14,962,035.00. The rateable remuneration on the basis of which the confirmed premium will be calculated is $14,357,260.00.

(c) The WorkCover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice were $152,890.00.

(d) The WorkCover initial premium for 2000-2001 is $459,701.43.

(e) The rateable remuneration for the Board on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated is $15,537,263.00.

(f) The WorkCover industry classification of the Board is L9141V - Parks and Gardens.

(g) The Board did provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its WorkCover agent in respect of 2000-2001. The estimate was provided on 27 April 2000 and the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided was $15,537,263.00.

(h) The Board estimated prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay an amount of $480,000.00 in WorkCover premiums for 2000-2001.

Environment and Conservation: Alpine Advisory Committee — Workcover premiums

1056. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Minister for Environment and Conservation): In respect of the Alpine Advisory Committee:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Committee on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Committee and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Committee for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Committee provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Committee budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

The Alpine Advisory Committee is not a separately reporting entity and its figures are included in those of the Department of Natural Resources and Environment. To provide the information requested would require an inordinate amount of time and resources which are not available.

Environment and Conservation: Historic Buildings Management Committee — Workcover premiums

1057. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Minister for Environment and Conservation): In respect of the Historic Buildings Management Committee:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Committee on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Committee and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Committee for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Committee provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Committee budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

The Historic Buildings Management Committee is not a separately reporting entity and its figures are included in those of Parks Victoria. To provide the information requested would require an inordinate amount of time and resources which are not available.

Environment and Conservation: Victorian Mineral Water Committee — Workcover premiums

1058. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Minister for Environment and Conservation): In respect of the Victorian Mineral Water Committee:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Committee on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Committee and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Committee for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Committee provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Committee budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

The Victorian Mineral Water Committee is not a separately reporting entity and its figures are included in those of the Department of Natural Resources and Environment. To provide the information requested would require an inordinate amount of time and resources which are not available.

Women's Affairs: Queen Victoria Women's Centre Trust — Workcover premiums

1077. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Small Business (for the Honourable the Minister for Women's Affairs): In respect of the Queen Victoria Women's Centre Trust:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999–2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999–2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999–2000 as specified in the 2000–01 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000–01.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Trust on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000–01 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Trust and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Trust for 2000–01 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Trust provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000–01 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Trust budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000–01.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

In respect of the Queen Victoria Women's Centre Trust:

(a) The WorkCover initial premium for 1999-2000 was $6,948.32 and the WorkCover confirmed premium for 1999-2000 was $7,233.58.

(b) The rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium for 1999-2000 was calculated was $286,760.00 and the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 was calculated was $305,586.00.

(c) The WorkCover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice were $542.00.

(d) The WorkCover initial premium for 2000-2001 is $4,814.67.

(e) The rateable remuneration for the Trust on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated was $139,100.00.

(f) The WorkCover industry classification of the Trust is Community support service NEC.

(g) The Trust did provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its WorkCover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration. The estimate was provided by on 10 May 2000 and the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided was $139,100.00.

(h) The Trust estimated prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay an amount of $4,000.00 in WorkCover premiums for 2000-2001.

Treasurer: Electrical Appeals Board — Workcover premiums

1090. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Treasurer): In respect of the Electrical Appeals Board:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999–2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999–2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999–2000 as specified in the 2000–01 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000–01.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Board on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000–01 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Board and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Board for 2000–01 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Board provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000–01 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Board budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000–01.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

This is not a portfolio responsibility of the Treasurer. The question should be asked of the Minister for Energy and Resources.

Treasurer: Emergency Services Superannuation Board — Workcover premiums

1091. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Treasurer): In respect of the Emergency Services Superannuation Board:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999–2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999–2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999–2000 as specified in the 2000–01 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000–01.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Board on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000–01 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Board and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Board for 2000–01 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Board provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000–01 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Board budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000–01.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

This is not a portfolio responsibility of the Treasurer. The question should be asked of the Minister for Finance.

Treasurer: Gas Appeals Board — Workcover premiums

1092. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Treasurer): In respect of the Gas Appeals Board:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999–2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999–2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999–2000 as specified in the 2000–01 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000–01.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Board on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000–01 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Board and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Board for 2000–01 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Board provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000–01 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Board budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000–01.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

This is not a portfolio responsibility of the Treasurer. The question should be asked of the Minister for Energy and Resources.

Treasurer: Government Superannuation Office — Workcover premiums

1093. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Treasurer): In respect of the Government Superannuation Office:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999–2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999–2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999–2000 as specified in the 2000–01 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000–01.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Office on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000–01 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Office and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Office for 2000–01 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Office provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000–01 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Office budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000–01.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

This is not a portfolio responsibility of the Treasurer. The question should be asked of the Minister for Finance.

Treasurer: Office of Gas Safety — Workcover premiums

1095. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Treasurer): In respect of the Office of Gas Safety:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999–2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999–2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999–2000 as specified in the 2000–01 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000–01.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Office on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000–01 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Office and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Office for 2000–01 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Office provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000–01 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Office budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000–01.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

This is not a portfolio responsibility of the Treasurer. The question should be asked of the Minister for Energy and Resources.

Treasurer: Office of the Administrator — Workcover premiums

1096. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Treasurer): In respect of the Office of the Administrator:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999–2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999–2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999–2000 as specified in the 2000–01 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000–01.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Office on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000–01 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Office and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Office for 2000–01 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Office provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000–01 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Office budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000–01.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

As the question does not specify a particular office, to obtain the information requested Mr Katsambanis may wish to submit a question with the name of a particular office.

Treasurer: Office of the Chief Electrical Inspector — Workcover premiums

1097. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Treasurer): In respect of the Office of the Chief Electrical Inspector:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999–2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999–2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999–2000 as specified in the 2000–01 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000–01.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Office on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000–01 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Office and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Office for 2000–01 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Office provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000–01 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Office budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000–01.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

This is not a portfolio responsibility of the Treasurer. The question should be asked of the Minister for Energy and Resources.

Treasurer: Office of the Regulator-General — Workcover premiums

1098. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Treasurer): In respect of the Office of the Regulator-General:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999–2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999–2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999–2000 as specified in the 2000–01 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000–01.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Office on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000–01 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Office and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Office for 2000–01 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Office provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000–01 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Office budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000–01.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

This is not a portfolio responsibility of the Treasurer. The question should be asked of the Minister for Finance.

Treasurer: Parliamentary Trustee — Workcover premiums

1099. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Treasurer): In respect of the Parliamentary Trustee:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999–2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999–2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999–2000 as specified in the 2000–01 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000–01.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Trustee on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000–01 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Trustee and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Trustee for 2000–01 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Trustee provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000–01 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Trustee budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000–01.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

This is not a portfolio responsibility of the Treasurer. The question should be asked of the Minister for Finance.

Treasurer: Transport Accident Commission — Workcover premiums

1101. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Treasurer): In respect of the Transport Accident Commission:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999–2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999–2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999–2000 as specified in the 2000–01 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000–01.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Commission on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000–01 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Commission and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Commission for 2000–01 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Commission provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000–01 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Commission budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000–01.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

This is not a portfolio responsibility of the Treasurer. The question should be asked of the Minister for WorkCover.

Treasurer: Victorian Casino and Gaming Authority — Workcover premiums

1103. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Treasurer): In respect of the Victorian Casino and Gaming Authority:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999–2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999–2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999–2000 as specified in the 2000–01 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000–01.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Authority on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000–01 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Authority and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Authority for 2000–01 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Authority provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000–01 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Authority budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000–01.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

This is not a portfolio responsibility of the Treasurer. The question should be asked of the Minister for Gaming.

Treasurer: Victorian Government Purchasing Board — Workcover premiums

1105. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Treasurer): In respect of the Victorian Government Purchasing Board:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999–2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999–2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999–2000 as specified in the 2000–01 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000–01.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Board on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000–01 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Board and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Board for 2000–01 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Board provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000–01 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Board budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000–01.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

This is not a portfolio responsibility of the Treasurer. The question should be asked of the Minister for Finance.

Treasurer: Victorian Managed Insurance Authority — Workcover premiums

1106. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Treasurer): In respect of the Victorian Managed Insurance Authority:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999–2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999–2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999–2000 as specified in the 2000–01 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000–01.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Authority on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000–01 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Authority and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Authority for 2000–01 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Authority provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000–01 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Authority budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000–01.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

This is not a portfolio responsibility of the Treasurer. The question should be asked of the Minister for Finance.

Treasurer: Victorian Rail Track — Workcover premiums

1107. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Treasurer): In respect of Victorian Rail Track:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999–2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999–2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999–2000 as specified in the 2000–01 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000–01.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Victorian Rail Track on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000–01 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Victorian Rail Track and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Victorian Rail Track for 2000–01 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Victorian Rail Track provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000–01 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Victorian Rail Track budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000–01.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

This is not a portfolio responsibility of the Treasurer. The question should be asked of the Minister for Transport.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Answers to the following questions on notice were circulated on the date shown.
Questions have been incorporated from the notice paper of the Legislative Council.
Answers have been incorporated in the form supplied by the departments on behalf of the appropriate ministers.
The portfolio of the minister answering the question on notice starts each heading.

Wednesday , 1 November 2000

State and Regional Development: trade fairs and missions program

855. THE HON. M. A. BIRRELL — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Minister for State and Regional Development): Further to the answer to question no. 631 given in this house on 29 August 2000:

(a) What events are on the minister's approved "schedule of proposed events for 2000–01."

(b) What events were actually funded in July 2000 (citing the recipient of funds and the purpose of the grants in each case).

ANSWER:

A schedule of proposed events is attached showing those events I have approved for the year 2000. Events for 2001 are subject to further discussions with industry bodies.

As none of the listed events occurred in July 2000, no funds were paid for these events in that month.

TRADE FAIRS 2000	
Month	**Events**
August 2000	Australian Foundry Conference and Trade Show (NZ)
September 2000	Malaysian International Building Exposition Automechanika (Germany)
October 2000	The BIG 5 Show 2000 (UAE)
November 2000	Indonesian Hospital Association Congress & Exhibition (PERSI) Philconstruct 2000 (Philippines) Automotive Aftermarket Industry Week (USA) Marine Equipment Trade Show (METS) — (Holland)
OUTWARD TRADE MISSIONS – 2000	
Month	**Events**
October 2000	Rail Component Suppliers Trade Mission to Europe Trade Mission to Northern Italy
November 2000	Auto Stop Exhibition (UAE) Association for Manufacturing Excellence Annual Conference (USA)
INWARDS BUYER MISSIONS – 2000	
Month	**Events**
Oct – Dec 2000	Toyota-India Tooling Trade Mission
November 2000	Wine Buyers for Wine Australia Committee for the Capitals of the Great Wines Region Network

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Answers to the following questions on notice were circulated on the date shown.
Questions have been incorporated from the notice paper of the Legislative Council.
Answers have been incorporated in the form supplied by the departments on behalf of the appropriate ministers.
The portfolio of the minister answering the question on notice starts each heading.

Thursday, 2 November 2000

Health: winter bed strategy

845. THE HON. M. T. LUCKINS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Industrial Relations (for the Honourable the Minister for Health):

(a) Will the minister provide details of the number and location of beds opened under the winter bed strategy to 29 August 2000.

(b) How many days has each bed funded under the winter bed strategy has been effectively staffed and in use full-time use to 29 August 2000.

ANSWER:

(a) The Honourable Monica Gould, Minister for Industrial Relations (for the Honourable the Minister for Health) the answer is that 360 beds were funded under the Winter Emergency Demand Strategy (WEDS). The beds were opened progressively from May 2000 as follows:

- 242 beds (67%) were opened as at the end of May 2000
- 310 beds (86%) were opened as at the end of June 2000
- 321 beds (89%) were opened as at the end of July 2000
- 337 beds (94%) were opened as at the end of August 2000

(b) The time and resources required to extract the relevant information requested cannot be justified on the grounds of limited public interest value and inappropriate use of Department resources.

Education: Vic Parenting primary schools pilot project

846. THE HON. M. T. LUCKINS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Sport and Recreation (for the Honourable the Minister for Education):

(a) Will the minister provide details of any agreement to fund any part of the Vic Parenting primary schools pilot project proposed by the Children's Taskforce in conjunction with the Victorian Parenting Centre.

(b) What are the names the names of all schools identified for this pilot project.

ANSWER:

I am informed as follows:

(a)

Under a Service Agreement signed in June 2000, the Department of Education, Employment and Training has provided the Victorian Parenting Centre (VPC) with the sum of $55,000 to support the employment for one year of a coordinator during the pilot operation of the VicParenting Primary Schools Program.

(b)

Schools involved in the VicParenting Pilot Program

Government Schools
Altona Primary School
Ascot Vale Primary School
Crib Point Primary School
Darley Primary School
Bacchus Marsh Primary School
Elizabeth St Primary School, Moe
Greenbrook Primary School, Epping
Kangaroo Flat Primary School
Kyneton Primary School
Longwarry Primary School
Montmorency South Primary School
Mornington Park Primary School
Mount View Primary School
Pinewood Primary School
Ranfurly Primary School, Mildura
Somerville Primary School
Somerville Rise Primary School
Syndal South Primary School

Non government schools
Eltham College, Eltham
St Bridget's Primary School, Greythorn
St Columba's, Ballarat North
St James Parish Primary School, Sebastapol

Arrangements are proceeding for the involvement of two further schools: Benalla Primary School and Newtown Primary School.

Arts: festival funding

856. THE HON. ANDREA COOTE — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Industrial Relations (for the Honourable the Minister for Arts): With regard to the festival and events programs (including the Major Festivals Fund, the Festivals Development Fund and the Local Festivals Fund):

(a) How much money has metropolitan Melbourne's festivals and events calender received from this fund since October 1999.

(b) How has regional Victoria's festivals and events calender benefited from this fund since October 1999.

(c) How many regional festivals have travelled to metropolitan areas.

(d) How many metropolitan festivals have travelled to regional areas.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

Details of grants made under Arts Victoria's Festival and Event Program since October 1999 are as follows:

MAJOR FESTIVALS

Melbourne Festival of the Arts	$2,560,000
Melbourne International Comedy Festival	$1,000,000

MAJOR FESTIVALS	
All other Metropolitan Festivals	$ 692,000
Regional Festivals	$ 51,800
LOCAL FESTIVALS	
Metropolitan Festivals	$ 79,900
Regional Festivals	$ 186,950
FESTIVAL DEVELOPMENT FUND	
Metropolitan Festivals	$ 8,800
Regional Festivals	$ 5,000

The Government's "Sharing the Festivals" policy aims to ensure regional and rural audiences have access to metropolitan events. The Melbourne International Festival, the Melbourne Fringe Festival, the Melbourne Comedy Festival and the Melbourne International Film Festival are all involved in extending elements of their programs to regional areas.

Attorney-General: Justice — Workcover premiums

871. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Small Business (for the Honourable the Attorney-General): In respect of the Department of Justice:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Department on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Department and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Department for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Department provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Department budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

(a) The WorkCover Initial Premium for 1999/00 was $4,347,409 (as at 15 June 2000). WorkCover has not yet determined the 1999/00 Confirmed Premium.

(b) The rateable remuneration on the basis of which the 1999/00 Initial Premium was calculated was $206,152,000.

(c) The WorkCover claims costs for the 1999/2000 as specified in the 2000/2001 initial premium notice was $521,171.

(d) The WorkCover Initial Premium for 2000-2001 is $5,010,705 (as at 17 July 2000, including 10% GST)

(e) The rateable remuneration on the basis of which the 2000/01 Initial Premium was calculated was $215,466,000.

(f) The WorkCover industry classifications and their rateable remuneration for the Department for 2000-2001 in respect of each industry classification are:

Industry Classification		Amount
J7112W	State Government Administration	$60,049,000
J7120W	Justice	$102,308,000
K8316T	Community Support Services Nec	$12,152,000
K8493F	Prisons & Reformatories	$40,957,000

(g) The Department provided an estimate of rateable remuneration of $215,466,000 to its WorkCover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration on 29 May 2000.

(h) The Department calculated a budget prior to 30 June 2000 for WorkCover premiums for 2000-2001 of $4,215,000. Due to factors outside the control of the Department, at the time this figure was calculated the details of premium increases had not been advised.

Treasurer: Treasury and Finance — Workcover premium

875. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Treasurer): In respect of the Department of Treasury and Finance:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Department on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Department and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Department for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Department provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Department budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

(a) The WorkCover Initial Premium 1999/00 was $107,846 (as at 15 July 2000). The 1999/00 Confirmed Premium has not yet been determined by WorkCover.

(b) The rateable remuneration on the basis of which the 1999/00 Initial Premium was calculated was $39,188,746.

(c) The WorkCover claims costs for the 1999/2000 as specified in the 2000/2001 initial premium notice was $53,804.

(d) The WorkCover Initial Premium for 2000-2001 is $141,565 (as at 15 July 2000, including 10% GST)

(e) The rateable remuneration on the basis of which the 2000/01 Initial Premium was calculated was $33,670,840 as at 15 July 2000, excluding the 10% GST.

(f) The WorkCover industry classifications and their rateable remuneration for the Department for 2000-2001 in respect of each industry classification are:

Industry Classification		Amount
J7112W	State Government Administration	$33,670,840

(g) The Department provided an estimate of rateable remuneration to its WorkCover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration on 2 June 2000.

(h) The Department calculated a budget prior to 30 June 2000 for WorkCover premiums for 2000-2001 of $339,000.

Attorney-General: Crown Counsel — Workcover premiums

986. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Small Business (for the Honourable the Attorney-General): In respect of the Crown Counsel:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for Crown Counsel on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of Crown Counsel and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of Crown Counsel for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did Crown Counsel provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did Crown Counsel budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

For WorkCover purposes the Office of the Crown Counsel is not a separately - reporting entity and its figures are included in those of the Department of Justice. The figures for the Department of Justice appear in the response to

Question No. 871. To provide the information requested would require an inordinate amount of time and resources that are not available.

[Hansard reference: for answer to question on notice 871 see page 1111.]

Attorney-General: Judicial Remuneration Tribunal — Workcover premiums

987. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Small Business (for the Honourable the Attorney-General): In respect of the Judicial Remuneration Tribunal:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Tribunal on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Tribunal and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Tribunal for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Tribunal provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Tribunal budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

For WorkCover purposes the Judicial Remuneration Tribunal is not a separately - reporting entity and its figures are included in those of the Department of Justice. The figures for the Department of Justice appear in the response to Question No. 871. To provide the information requested would require an inordinate amount of time and resources that are not available.

[Hansard reference: for answer to question on notice 871 see page 1111.]

Attorney-General: Legal Practice Board — Workcover premiums

988. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Small Business (for the Honourable the Attorney-General): In respect of the Legal Practice Board:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Board on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Board and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Board for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Board provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Board budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

(a) The WorkCover initial premium for 1999-2000 was $8463.71, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 was $8,112.23.

(b) The rateable remuneration on the basis of which the 1999-2000 initial annual premium was calculated was $895,736.

(c) The WorkCover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice were $0.

(d) The WorkCover initial premium for 2000-2001 was $14,723.86.

(e) The rateable remuneration for Legal Practice Board on the basis of which the 2000-2001 initial premium was calculated was $1,037,097.

(f) The WorkCover industry classification of Legal Practice Board is J7120W.

(g) The Legal Practise Board did not provide an estimate to it's WorkCover agent, however WorkCover provided an estimate to the Board which was within the Board's salary range for this financial year. The estimate of rateable remuneration provided was $1,037,097.

(h) The Legal Practice Board estimated prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay $19,500 in WorkCover premiums for 2000-2001. Due to factors outside the control of the Department, at the time this figure was calculated, the details of premium increases had not been advised.

Attorney-General: Legal Profession Tribunal — Workcover premiums

989. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Small Business (for the Honourable the Attorney-General): In respect of the Legal Profession Tribunal:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Tribunal on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Tribunal and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Tribunal for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Tribunal provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Tribunal budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

(a) The WorkCover initial premium for 1999-2000 was $6,977.41, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 was $7,817.81.

(b) The rateable remuneration on the basis of which the 1999-2000 initial annual premium was calculated was $809,267.

(c) The WorkCover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice were $0.

(d) The WorkCover initial premium for 2000-2001 was $13,522.62.

(e) The rateable remuneration for Legal Professional Tribunal on the basis of which the 2000-2001 initial premium was calculated was $960,000.

(f) The WorkCover industry classification of Legal Professional Tribunal is J7120W.

(g) The Legal Professional Tribunal did not provide an estimate to it's WorkCover agent, however WorkCover provided an estimate to the Tribunal which was within the Tribunal's salary range for this financial year. The estimate of rateable remuneration provided was $960,000.

(h) The Legal Professional Tribunal estimated prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay $13,000 in WorkCover premiums for 2000-2001. Due to factors outside the control of the Department, at the time this figure was calculated, the details of premium increases had not been advised.

Attorney-General: Municipal Electoral Tribunal — Workcover premiums

990. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Small Business (for the Honourable the Attorney-General): In respect of the Municipal Electoral Tribunal:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Tribunal on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Tribunal and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Tribunal for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Tribunal provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Tribunal budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

For WorkCover purposes the Municipal Electoral Tribunal is not a separately - reporting entity and its figures are included in those of the Department of Justice. The figures for the Department of Justice appear in the response to Question No. 871. To provide the information requested would require an inordinate amount of time and resources that are not available.

[Hansard reference: for answer to question on notice 871 see page 1111.]

Attorney-General: Solicitor-General — Workcover premiums

991. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Small Business (for the Honourable the Attorney-General): In respect of the Solicitor-General:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Solicitor-General on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Solicitor-General and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Solicitor-General for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Solicitor-General provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Solicitor-General budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

For WorkCover purposes the Office of the Solicitor-General is not a separately - reporting entity and its figures are included in those of the Department of Justice. The figures for the Department of Justice appear in the response to Question No. 871. To provide the information requested would require an inordinate amount of time and resources that are not available.

[Hansard reference: for answer to question on notice 871 see page 1111.]

Attorney-General: Victims of Crime Assistance Tribunal — Workcover premiums

992. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Small Business (for the Honourable the Attorney-General): In respect of the Victims of Crime Assistance Tribunal:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Tribunal on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Tribunal and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Tribunal for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Tribunal provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Tribunal budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

For WorkCover purposes the Victims of Crime Assistance Tribunal is not a separately - reporting entity and its figures are included in those of the Department of Justice. The figures for the Department of Justice appear in the response to Question No. 871. To provide the information requested would require an inordinate amount of time and resources that are not available.

[Hansard reference: for answer to question on notice 871 see page 1111.]

Attorney-General: Victoria Legal Aid — Workcover premiums

993. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Consumer Affairs (for the Honourable the Attorney-General): In respect of Victoria Legal Aid:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for Victoria Legal Aid on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of Victoria Legal Aid and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of Victoria Legal Aid for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did Victoria Legal Aid provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did Victoria Legal Aid budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

(a) The WorkCover initial premium was $181,912.36, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 was $125,055.95

(b) The rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium was calculated was $14,560,950, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 was $11,752,502.

(c) The WorkCover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice was $0.

(d) The WorkCover initial premium for 2000-2001 was $212,489.55 (GST inclusive).

(e) The rateable remuneration for Victoria Legal Aid on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated was $12,168,231.

(f) The WorkCover industry classification of Victoria Legal Aid is Legal Services (I6341J).

(g) Victoria Legal Aid provided an estimate of rateable remuneration to its WorkCover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration on 26 April 2000. The estimate of rateable remuneration provided was $12,168,231.

(h) Victoria Legal Aid estimated prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay $191,998 in WorkCover premiums for 2000-2001. Due to factors outside the control of the Department, at the time this figure was calculated the details of premium increases had not been advised.

Environment and Conservation: Alpine Resorts Coordinating Council — Workcover premiums

1027. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Minister for Environment and Conservation): In respect of Alpine Resorts Coordinating Council:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Council on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Council and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Council for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Council provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Council budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

In respect of the Alpine Resorts Coordinating Council:

(a) The WorkCover initial premium for 1999-2000 was $100.00, and the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 was $100.00.

(b) The rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium for 1999-2000 was calculated was $22,406.00, and the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 was calculated was $18,572.00.

(c) There were no WorkCover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) The WorkCover initial premium for 2000-2001 was $149.00.

(e) The rateable remuneration for the Council on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated was $25,200.00.

(f) The WorkCover industry classification of the Council is J7112W.

(g) The Council did provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its WorkCover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration. The estimate was provided on 28 March 2000 and the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided was $25,200.00.

(h) Prior to 30 June 2000, no amount was estimated by the Council that it would be required to pay in WorkCover premiums for 2000-2001.

Environment and Conservation: Alpine Resort Management Boards — Workcover premiums

1028. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Minister for Environment and Conservation): In respect of the Alpine Resort Management Boards:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Boards on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Boards and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Boards for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Boards provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Boards budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

In respect of the Alpine Resort Management Boards:

(a) What was the WorkCover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

Authority	Answer	
	Initial	Confirmed
Falls Creek	$41,193.09	Not known
Lake Mountain	$6,974.11	$3,618.03
Mount Baw Baw	$4,928.44	$3,152.65
Mount Buller	$23,696.77	Not known
Mount Hotham	$39,530.00	Not known
Mount Stirling	$1,429.00	$535.00

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

Authority	Answer	
	Initial	Confirmed
Falls Creek	$1,081,297.00	Not known
Lake Mountain	$334,522.00	Not known
Mount Baw Baw	$239,454.00	Not known
Mount Buller	$1,012,000.00	$1,509,092.00
Mount Hotham	$1,286,372.00	Not known
Mount Stirling	$80,960.00	$44,145.00

(c) What were the WorkCover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

Authority	Answer
Falls Creek	Nil
Lake Mountain	$77.00
Mount Baw Baw	$2,500.00
Mount Buller	Nil
Mount Hotham	$1,797.00
Mount Stirling	Nil

(d) What is the WorkCover initial premium for 2000-2001.

Authority	Answer
Falls Creek	$68,554.50
Lake Mountain	$10,243.19
Mount Baw Baw	$8,720.01
Mount Buller	$37,173.21
Mount Hotham	$72,648.68
Mount Stirling	$2,158.00

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Boards on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

Authority	Answer
Falls Creek	$1,297,557.00
Lake Mountain	$28,052.00
Mount Baw Baw	$12,480.00
Mount Buller	$1,422,336.00
Mount Hotham	$1,543,647.00
Mount Stirling	$91,000.00

(f) What is the WorkCover industry classification or classifications of the Boards and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Boards for 2000-2001 in response of which each industry classification is applicable.

Authority	Answer
Falls Creek	L9149R
Lake Mountain	L9149R
Mount Baw Baw	L9149R
Mount Buller	L9149R
Mount Hotham	L9149R
Mount Stirling	L9149R

(g) Did the Boards provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its WorkCover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

Authority	Answer	
	Date Provided	Estimate
Falls Creek	9 August 2000	$1,339,676.00
Lake Mountain	26 April 2000	$401,426.00
Mount Baw Baw	5 April 2000	$287,345.00
Mount Buller	8 May 2000	$1,308,549.00
Mount Hotham	September 2000	$1,543,647.00
Mount Stirling	25 May 2000	$91,000.00

(h) What amount did the Boards budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in WorkCover premiums for 2000-2001.

Authority	Budget/Estimate
Falls Creek	$45,000.00
Lake Mountain	$8,400.00
Mount Baw Baw	$5,950.00
Mount Buller	$38,000.00
Mount Hotham	No amount budgeted as budget under review
Mount Stirling	$4,004.00

Environment and Conservation: committees of management for Crown land reserves — Workcover premiums

1029. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Minister for Environment and Conservation): In respect of the Committees of Management for Crown Land Reserves:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Committees on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Committees and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Committees for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Committees provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Committees budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

There are currently about 1,400 locally elected Committees of Management appointed by the Minister for Environment and Conservation under the *Crown Land (Reserves) Act 1978*. The majority do not employee staff. To obtain this information from the Committees of Management would require an inordinate amount of time and resources which are not available.

Environment and Conservation: Timber Promotion Council — Workcover premiums

1040. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Minister for Environment and Conservation): In respect of the Timber Promotion Council:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Council on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Council and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Council for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Council provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Council budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

In respect of the Timber Promotion Council:

(a) The WorkCover initial premium for 1999-2000 was $1,672.21, and the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 was $1,684.99.

(b) The rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium for 1999-2000 was calculated was $446,039.00, and the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 was calculated was $448,215.00.

(c) There were no WorkCover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) The WorkCover initial premium for 2000-2001 was $2,135.84.

(e) The rateable remuneration for the Council on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated was $535,247.00.

(f) The WorkCover industry classification of the Council is I6362V – Market & Business Consultancy Services.

(g) The Council did not provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its WorkCover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration.

(h) The Council estimated prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in WorkCover premiums an amount of $2,200.00.

Environment and Conservation: Victorian catchment management authorities — Workcover premiums

1042. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Minister for Environment and Conservation): In respect of the Victorian Catchment Management Authorities:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Authorities on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Authorities and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Authorities for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Authorities provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Authorities budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

In respect of the Victorian Catchment Management Authorities:

(a) What was the WorkCover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

Authority	Answer	
	Initial	Confirmed
Corangamite CMA	$4,826.95	$5,473.79
East Gippsland CMA	$46,619.94	Not known
Glenelg-Hopkins CMA	$2,676.31	Not known
Goulburn Broken CMA	$84,905.49	$77,693.00
Mallee CMA	$4,463.07	Not known
North Central CMA	$7,884.17	Not known
North East CMA	$34,270.27	Not known
West Gippsland CMA	$33,180.73	Not known
Wimmera CMA	$4,720.30	Not known

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

Authority	Answer	
	Initial	Confirmed
Corangamite CMA	$714,470.00	$807,226.00
East Gippsland CMA	$765,050.00	$774,860.00
Glenelg-Hopkins CMA	$404,460.00	$515,038.00
Goulburn Broken CMA	$1,454,895.00	$1,396,066.00
Mallee CMA	$661,000.00	$625,000.00
North Central CMA	$1,162,000.00	Not known
North East CMA	$1,314,401.00	Not known
West Gippsland CMA	$2,303,486.00	$2,258,438.00
Wimmera CMA	$694,778.00	Not known

(c) What were the WorkCover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

Authority	Answer
Corangamite CMA	NIL
East Gippsland CMA	$22,669.00
Glenelg-Hopkins CMA	NIL
Goulburn Broken CMA	$24,000.00
Mallee CMA	NIL
North Central CMA	$125,457.00
North East CMA	NIL
West Gippsland CMA	$2,939.00
Wimmera CMA	NIL

(d) What is the WorkCover initial premium for 2000-2001.

Authority	Answer
Corangamite CMA	$7,592.75
East Gippsland CMA	$65,754.83

Authority	Answer
Glenelg-Hopkins CMA	$2,292.54
Goulburn Broken CMA	$137,501.00
Mallee CMA	$6,923.21
North Central CMA	$13,991.80
North East CMA	$48,349.02
West Gippsland CMA	$49,565.18
Wimmera CMA	$5,618.22

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Authorities on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

Authority	Answer
Corangamite CMA	$872,500.00
East Gippsland CMA	$1,499,020.00
Glenelg-Hopkins CMA	$869,564.00
Goulburn Broken CMA	$1,648,028.00
Mallee CMA	$793,200.00
North Central CMA	$1,346,500.00
North East CMA	$1,402,934.00
West Gippsland CMA	$2,769,233.00
Wimmera CMA	$650,000.00

(f) What is the WorkCover industry classification or classifications of the Authorities and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Authorities for 2000-2001 in response of which each industry classification is applicable.

Authority	Answer	
Corangamite CMA	J7112W	
East Gippsland CMA	J7112W E4136K	$818,500.00 $680,520.00
Glenelg-Hopkins CMA	J7112W	
Goulburn Broken CMA	E4254X	
Mallee CMA	J7112W	
North Central CMA	J7112W	
North East CMA	J7112W E4136K	$848,256.00 $554,678.00
West Gippsland CMA	E4136K	$1,098,994.00
	J7112W	$1,670,239.00
Wimmera CMA	J7112W	

(g) Did the Authorities provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was the estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

Authority	Answer	
	Date Provided	Estimate
Corangamite CMA	27 April 2000	$872,500.00
East Gippsland CMA	26 April 2000	$1,499,020.00
Glenelg-Hopkins CMA	Yes, date not confirmed	$485,352.00
Goulburn Broken CMA	22 June 2000	$1,648,028.00
Mallee CMA	28 September 2000	$684,359.00
North Central CMA	9 March 2000	$1,346,500.00
North East CMA	April 2000	$1,402,934.00
West Gippsland CMA	27 April 2000	$2,769,233.00
Wimmera CMA	23 March 2000	$650,000.00

(h) What amount did the Authorities budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in WorkCover premiums for 2000-2001.

Authority	Answer
Corangamite CMA	$6,000.00
East Gippsland CMA	$55,000.00
Glenelg-Hopkins CMA	$8,000.00
Goulburn Broken CMA	$93,000.00
Mallee CMA	$6,500.00
North Central CMA	$26,900.00
North East CMA	$37,000.00
West Gippsland CMA	$64,350.00
Wimmera CMA	$5,000.00

Environment and Conservation: Victorian Catchment Management Council — Workcover premiums

1043. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Minister for Environment and Conservation): In respect of the Victorian Catchment Management Council:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999-2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999-2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000-2001.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Council on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Council and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Council for 2000-2001 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Council provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Council budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000-2001.

ANSWER:

The Victorian Catchment Management Council is not a separately reporting entity and its figures are included in those of the Department of Natural Resources and Environment. To provide the information requested would require an inordinate amount of time and resources which are not available.

State and Regional Development: Albury-Wodonga Corporation — Workcover premiums

1078. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Minister for State and Regional Development): In respect of the Albury-Wodonga (Victoria) Corporation:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999–2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999–2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999–2000 as specified in the 2000–01 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000–01.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Corporation on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000–01 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Corporation and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Corporation for 2000–01 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Corporation provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000–01 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Corporation budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000–01.

ANSWER:

The Albury Wodonga (Victoria) Corporation does not employ staff. The Corporation's Board members are covered by the Commonwealth workers' compensation scheme, as their sitting fees are paid by Corporation's Commonwealth counterpart, the Albury-Wodonga Development Corporation.

Small Business: Coordinating Council on Control of Liquor Abuse — Workcover premiums

1079. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Small Business: In respect of the Coordinating Council on Control of Liquor Abuse:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999–2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999–2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999–2000 as specified in the 2000–01 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000–01.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Council on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000–01 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Council and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Council for 2000–01 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Council provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000–01 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Council budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000–01.

ANSWER:

The Coordinating Council on Control of Liquor Abuse is not a separately-reporting entity and its figures were included in those of the Department of State and Regional Development which were provided in the answer to Question No. 874. To provide the information would require an inordinate amount of time and resources which are not available.

Racing: Bookmakers and Bookmakers Clerks Registration Committee — Workcover premiums

1080 THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Sport and Recreation (for the Honourable the Minister for Racing): In respect of the Bookmakers and Bookmakers' Clerks Registration Committee:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999–2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999–2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999–2000 as specified in the 2000–01 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000–01.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Committee on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000–01 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Committee and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Committee for 2000–01 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Committee provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000–01 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Committee budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000–01.

ANSWER:

The Bookmakers and Bookmakers' Clerks Registration Committee is not a separately-reporting entity and its figures were included in those of the Department of State and Regional Development which were provided in the answer to Question 874. To provide the information requested would require an inordinate amount of time and resources which are not available.

Racing: Greyhound Racing Control Board — Workcover premiums

1081. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Sport and Recreation (for the Honourable the Minister for Racing): In respect of the Greyhound Racing Control Board:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999–2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999–2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999–2000 as specified in the 2000–01 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000–01.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Board on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000–01 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Board and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Board for 2000–01 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Board provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000–01 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Board budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000–01.

ANSWER:

In respect of the Greyhound Racing Control Board –

(a) The initial WorkCover premium for 1999-2000 was $19,524.40. The confirmed premium is yet to be received.

(b) The rateable remuneration on which the initial premium was calculated for 1999-2000 was $1,258,301.00.

(c) The WorkCover claims cost for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 was nil.

(d) The WorkCover initial premium for 2000-2001 is $34,230, including GST.

(e) The rateable remuneration on which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated is $1,819,770.

(f) The WorkCover industry classification of the Board in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration is L9149R – Sport and Recreation NEC (including Promoting, Administration and Teaching).

(g) An estimate of rateable remuneration for 2000-2001 was provided on 10 May 2000, the estimate being $1,819,770.

(h) Prior to 30 June 2000, the Board's budget for its 2000-2001 WorkCover premium was $31,531.

Racing: Harness Racing Board — Workcover premiums

1082. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Sport and Recreation (for the Honourable the Minister for Racing): In respect of the Harness Racing Board:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999–2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999–2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999–2000 as specified in the 2000–01 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000–01.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Board on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000–01 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Board and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Board for 2000–01 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Board provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000–01 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Board budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000–01.

ANSWER:

In respect of the Harness Racing Board –

(a) The initial WorkCover premium for 1999-2000 was $28,010. The confirmed premium was $17,751.

(b) The rateable remuneration on which the initial premium was calculated for 1999-2000 was $3,625,005. The rateable remuneration on which the confirmed premium was calculated was $3,760,534.

(c) The WorkCover claims cost for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 was nil.

(d) The WorkCover initial premium for 2000-2001 is $29,044, including GST.

(e) The rateable remuneration on which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated is $3,934,622.

(f) The WorkCover industry classification of the Board in respect of 2000-2001 rateable remuneration is L9145C – Horse Racing.

(g) An estimate of rateable remuneration for 2000-01 was provided on 29 March 2000, the estimate being $3,934,622.

(h) Prior to 30 June 2000, the Board's budget for its 2000-2001 WorkCover premium was $62,161. This figure was a conservative estimate allowing for the impact on the premium in the event of a WorkCover claim arising during the year.

Sport and Recreation: Melbourne and Olympic Park Trust — Workcover premiums

1083. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Sport and Recreation: In respect of the Melbourne and Olympic Park Trust:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999–2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999–2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999–2000 as specified in the 2000–01 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000–01.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Trust on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000–01 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Trust and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Trust for 2000–01 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Trust provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000–01 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Trust budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000–01.

ANSWER:

In respect of the Melbourne and Olympic Parks Trust –

(a) The initial WorkCover premium for 1999-2000 was $111,478.79, which includes a 5% discount for early payment. The confirmed premium is not yet known.

(b) The rateable remuneration on which the initial premium was calculated for 1999-2000 was $7,652,306. The confirmed premium has not yet been received.

(c) The estimated cost of WorkCover claims for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice is $10,670.

(d) The WorkCover initial premium for 2000-2001 is $145,472.69, including GST but has a 5% discount for payment in advance.

(e) The rateable remuneration on which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated is $9,182,767.

(f) The WorkCover industry classification of the Trust is L 9149 L (Sport and Recreation N.E.C including Promoting, Administering and Teaching).

(g) The estimate of rateable remuneration, which was provided by the Trust to its WorkCover agent in respect of 2000-2001, was $8,043,395 on 25 August 2000.

(h) The Trust estimated that it would pay $112,409 in WorkCover premiums for 2000-2001 prior to 30 June 2000.

Racing: Racing Appeals Tribunal — Workcover premiums

1084. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Sport and Recreation (for the Honourable the Minister for Racing): In respect of the Racing Appeals Tribunal:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999–2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999–2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999–2000 as specified in the 2000–01 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000–01.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Tribunal on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000–01 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Tribunal and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Tribunal for 2000–01 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Tribunal provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000–01 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Tribunal budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000–01.

ANSWER:

The Racing Appeals Tribunal is not a separately-reporting entity and its figures were included in those of the Department of State and Regional Development which were provided in the answer to Question No. 874. To provide the information requested would require an inordinate amount of time and resources which are not available.

Sport and Recreation: State Sports Centre Trust — Workcover premiums

1085. THE HON. P. A. KATSAMBANIS — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Sport and Recreation: In respect of the State Sports Centre Trust:

(a) What was the Workcover initial premium and, if known, confirmed premium for 1999–2000.

(b) What was the rateable remuneration on the basis of which the initial annual premium and, if known, the confirmed premium for 1999–2000 were calculated.

(c) What were the Workcover claims costs for 1999–2000 as specified in the 2000–01 initial premium notice.

(d) What is the Workcover initial premium for 2000–01.

(e) What is the rateable remuneration for the Trust on the basis of which the initial premium for 2000–01 is calculated.

(f) What is the Workcover industry classification or classifications of the Trust and if there is more than one industry classification, what is the rateable remuneration of the Trust for 2000–01 in respect of which each industry classification is applicable.

(g) Did the Trust provide an estimate of rateable remuneration to its Workcover agent in respect of 2000–01 rateable remuneration; if so, when was that estimate provided and what was the estimate of rateable remuneration so provided.

(h) What amount did the Trust budget or estimate prior to 30 June 2000 that it would be required to pay in Workcover premiums for 2000–01.

ANSWER:

In respect of the State Sport Centres Trust –

(a) The WorkCover initial premium for 1999-2000 was $43,925.02, which includes a 5% discount for early payment.

(b) The rateable remuneration on which the initial premium was calculated for 1999-2000 was $2,322,729.

(c) The estimated cost of WorkCover claims for 1999-2000 as specified in the 2000-2001 initial premium notice is $12,000.

(d) The WorkCover initial premium for 2000-2001 is $57,249, excluding GST but has a 5% discount for payment in advance.

(e) The rateable remuneration on which the initial premium for 2000-2001 is calculated is $2,787,275.

(f) The WorkCover industry classification of the Trust is L 9149 R – (Sport and Recreation N.E.C. including Promoting, Administering and Teaching).

(g) The estimate of rateable remuneration in respect of 2000-2001, which was provided by the Trust to its WorkCover agent in May 2000, was $2,787,275.

(h) The Trust estimated that it would pay $50,000, excluding GST in WorkCover premiums for 2000-2001 prior to 30 June 2000.

Small Business: AIRC hearing — assistance to small retail businesses

1117. THE HON. BILL FORWOOD — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Small Business: What support, if any, were small retail businesses given by the government in preparation for the AIRC hearing on the SDA log of claims.

ANSWER:

The Victorian Government, in accordance with its stated industrial relations policy, considers that it is purely a matter for the involved parties, including employers and unions and the Commission, to determine access to industrial awards.

The State Government's Business Channel, www.business.channel.vic.gov.au offers a number of referral options to small retail businesses, including employer associations and access to information and possible assistance on such matters.

Those clients who accessed the Business Channel, the Small Business Victoria website, or rang the Victorian Business Line were provided with details of employer associations who could be contacted for further advice.

Small Business: Small Business Advisory Council

1118. THE HON. BILL FORWOOD — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Small Business: In respect of the Small Business Advisory Council:

(a) What terms of reference have been established.

(b) What guidelines have been established for members.

(c) Which member of the Council will represent the Council on the Infrastructure Planning Council.

(d) Which small business or organisation does each of the Council members represent.

(e) How many applicants applied to sit on the Council.

(f) What selection process was used to select the Council members.

(g) What is the tenure of each member on the Council.

ANSWER:

Appropriate terms of reference have been developed for the Small Business Advisory Council which are consistent with the Government's policy parameters expressed in its policy *Taking Care of Small Business*. Council members have been addressed by both the Premier and myself on the Council's work.

The intention has been to establish a Council of predominantly small business operators and the vast majority are, therefore, small business people rather than office holders representing particular organisations.

Approximately 160 applications for Council membership were received. Members have been carefully selected from a very competitive field, having regard to the Government's intention that they should overwhelmingly comprise small business operators, including operators from regional Victoria. Members have been appointed for a two year term.

The Chair of the Council is also on the Infrastructure Planning Council.

Environment and Conservation: tree spraying

1125. THE HON. W. R. BAXTER — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Minister for Environment and Conservation):

(a) What sums were expended in each of the past three financial years in spraying peppercorn trees on roads in northern Victoria.

(b) Under which program were these funds allocated.

(c) Is it intended to remove the now unsightly dead trees.

(d) Is it intended to control regrowth that is now occurring.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

The information requested in this question is identical to that asked in question on notice no. 867. The Hon. Mr Baxter is referred to the response to that question tabled on 4 October 2000 (copy attached).

ATTACHMENT

Environment and Conservation: tree spraying

867. THE HON. W. R. BAXTER — To ask the Honourable the Minister for Energy and Resources (for the Honourable the Minister for Environment and Conservation):

(a) What sums were expended in each of the past three financial years in spraying peppercorn trees on certain roads in Northern Victoria.

(b) Under which program were these funds allocated

(c) Is it intended to remove the now unsightly dead trees.

(d) Is it intended to control regrowth that is now occurring.

ANSWER:

I am informed that:

As the roads along which spraying of peppercorn trees was conducted have not been specified, the minister is unable to answer the question.