

No. 10 of 2012

Tuesday, 19 June 2012

On the

City of Melbourne Amendment
(Enrolment) Act 2012

Community Based Sentences
(Transfer) Bill 2012

Evidence Amendment (Journalist
Privilege) Bill 2012

Marriage Equality Bill 2012

Working with Children Amendment
Bill 2012

The Committee



Chairperson
Mr Edward O'Donohue MLC
Member for Eastern Victoria



Deputy Chairperson
Hon. Christine Campbell MLA
Member for Pascoe Vale



Mr Colin Brooks MLA
Member for Bundoora



Mr Michael Gidley MLA
Member for Mount Waverley



Mr Don Nardella MLA
Member for Melton



Mr David O'Brien MLC
Member for Western Victoria



Mr Graham Watt MLA
Member for Burwood

Parliament House, Spring Street
Melbourne Victoria 3002

Telephone: (03) 8682 2895

Facsimilie: (03) 8682 2858

Email: andrew.homer@parliament.vic.gov.au

Committee Staff

Mr Andrew Homer, Senior Legal Adviser

Ms Helen Mason, Legal Adviser - Regulations

Mr Simon Dinsbergs, Business Support Officer

Ms Sonya Caruana, Office Manager

Terms of Reference - Scrutiny of Bills

The functions of the Scrutiny of Acts and Regulations Committee are –

- (a) to consider any Bill introduced into the Council or the Assembly and to report to the Parliament as to whether the Bill directly or indirectly –
 - (i) trespasses unduly upon rights or freedoms;
 - (ii) makes rights, freedoms or obligations dependent upon insufficiently defined administrative powers;
 - (iii) makes rights, freedoms or obligations dependent upon non-reviewable administrative decisions;
 - (iv) unduly requires or authorises acts or practices that may have an adverse effect on personal privacy within the meaning of the *Information Privacy Act 2000*;
 - (v) unduly requires or authorises acts or practices that may have an adverse effect on privacy of health information within the meaning of the *Health Records Act 2001*;
 - (vi) inappropriately delegates legislative power;
 - (vii) insufficiently subjects the exercise of legislative power to parliamentary scrutiny;
 - (viii) is incompatible with the human rights set out in the Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities;
- (b) to consider any Bill introduced into the Council or the Assembly and to report to the Parliament –
 - (i) as to whether the Bill directly or indirectly repeals, alters or varies section 85 of the *Constitution Act 1975*, or raises an issue as to the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court;
 - (ii) if a Bill repeals, alters or varies section 85 of the *Constitution Act 1975*, whether this is in all the circumstances appropriate and desirable;
 - (iii) if a Bill does not repeal, alter or vary section 85 of the *Constitution Act 1975*, but an issue is raised as to the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, as to the full implications of that issue;

Table of Contents

	Page Nos.
Alert Digest No. 10 of 2012	
City of Melbourne Amendment (Enrolment) Act 2012	3
Community Based Sentences (Transfer) Bill 2012	4
Evidence Amendment (Journalist Privilege) Bill 2012	5
Marriage Equality Bill 2012	7
Ministerial Correspondence	
Working with Children Amendment Bill 2012	9
Appendices	
1 – Index of Acts and Bills in 2012	13
2 – Committee Comments classified by Terms of Reference	15
3 – Ministerial Correspondence 2012	17

Useful information

Role of the Committee

The Scrutiny of Acts and Regulations Committee is an all-party Joint House Committee, which examines all Bills and subordinate legislation (regulations) introduced or tabled in the Parliament. The Committee does not make any comments on the policy merits of the legislation. The Committee's terms of reference contain principles of scrutiny that enable it to operate in the best traditions of non-partisan legislative scrutiny. These traditions have been developed since the first Australian scrutiny of Bills committee of the Australian Senate commenced scrutiny of Bills in 1982. They are precedents and traditions followed by all Australian scrutiny committees. Non-policy scrutiny within its terms of reference allows the Committee to alert the Parliament to the use of certain legislative practices and allows the Parliament to consider whether these practices are necessary, appropriate or desirable in all the circumstances.

The *Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006* provides that the Committee must consider any Bill introduced into Parliament and report to the Parliament whether the Bill is incompatible with human rights.

Interpretive use of Parliamentary Committee reports

Section 35 (b)(iv) of the *Interpretation of Legislation Act 1984* provides –

In the interpretation of a provision of an Act or subordinate instrument consideration may be given to any matter or document that is relevant including, but not limited to, reports of Parliamentary Committees.

When may human rights be limited

Section 7 of the *Charter* provides –

Human rights – what they are and when they may be limited –

- (2) A human right may be subject under law only to such reasonable limits as can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society based on human dignity, equality and freedom, and taking into account all relevant factors including—
 - (a) the nature of the right; and
 - (b) the importance of the purpose of the limitation; and
 - (c) the nature and extent of the limitation; and
 - (d) the relationship between the limitation and its purpose; and
 - (e) any less restrictive means reasonably available to achieve the purpose that the limitation seeks to achieve

Glossary and Symbols

'*Assembly*' refers to the Legislative Assembly of the Victorian Parliament;

'*Charter*' refers to the Victorian *Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006*;

'*Council*' refers to the Legislative Council of the Victorian Parliament;

'*DPP*' refers to the Director of Public Prosecutions for the State of Victoria;

'*human rights*' refers to the rights set out in Part 2 of the Charter;

'*IBAC*' refers to the Independent Broad-based Anti-corruption Commission

'*penalty units*' refers to the penalty unit fixed from time to time in accordance with the *Monetary Units Act 2004* and published in the government gazette (currently one penalty unit equals \$122.14).

'*Statement of Compatibility*' refers to a statement made by a member introducing a Bill in either the Council or the Assembly as to whether the provisions in a Bill are compatible with Charter rights.

'*VCAT*' refers to the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal;

[] denotes clause numbers in a Bill.

Alert Digest No. 10 of 2012

City of Melbourne Amendment (Enrolment) Act 2012

Introduced	5 June 2012
Second Reading Speech	6 June 2012
Royal Assent	13 June 2012
House	Legislative Assembly
Member introducing Bill	Hon. Jeanette Powell MLA
Portfolio responsibility	Minister for Local Government

Note: The Committee reports on this Act pursuant to section 17(c)(ii) of the *Parliamentary Committees Act 2003*.

Purpose

The Bill amends the *City of Melbourne Act 2001* inserting a new section 9B(4) which requires a person to have been an occupier of a rateable property for at least one month immediately before the entitlement date for an election at the City of Melbourne, in order to be entitled to apply for enrolment on the voters' roll for that Council as an occupier of the rateable property under section 9B of that Act.

Note: The entitlements of other occupiers, including residents on the State roll of electors, are provided under other sections of the Act and will not be altered by this amendment.

The Committee makes no further comment.

Community Based Sentences (Transfer) Bill 2012

Introduced	5 June 2012
Second Reading Speech	6 June 2012
House	Legislative Assembly
Member introducing Bill	Hon. Andrew McIntosh MLA
Portfolio responsibility	Minister for Corrections

Background

The Bill is for an Act to provide a scheme under which community-based sentences from other participating Australian jurisdictions can, at an offender's request, be formally transferred to be served in Victoria, and under which Victorian community based sentences can, at an offender's request, be formally transferred to be served in other participating jurisdictions.

Note: New South Wales, the Australian Capital Territory, Western Australia and Tasmania have enacted identical transfer legislation and are therefore participating jurisdictions.

Extract from the Second Reading Speech:

For a community-based sentencing order to be eligible for transfer, whether into Victoria or to another participating jurisdiction, the following registration criteria must be met:

- first, the offender must consent to the transfer;
- secondly, there must be a corresponding order in the receiving jurisdiction;
- thirdly, the offender must be able to comply with the order in the other jurisdiction; and
- finally, the sentence must be able to be safely, efficiently and effectively administered in the other jurisdiction.

An order will be considered to be a corresponding order if it corresponds or substantially corresponds (that is, a penalty and conditions of substantially the same nature) with a sentence or if it is declared to be a corresponding order by regulation.

Even if the registration criteria are met, the proposed transferee jurisdiction retains the discretion to reject or accept an application for transfer.

... Despite the sentence being transferred to another jurisdiction, the rights of the offender in relation to review or appeal of the conviction or imposition of the sentence in the originating jurisdiction are not affected.

The Committee makes no further comment.

Evidence Amendment (Journalist Privilege) Bill 2012

Introduced	6 June 2012
Second Reading Speech	7 June 2012
House	Legislative Assembly
Member introducing Bill	Hon. Robert Clark MLA
Portfolio responsibility	Attorney-General

Background

This Bill amends the *Evidence Act 2008* (the 'Act') to:

- further the implementation of the Uniform Evidence Act in Victoria to include amendments approved by the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General providing for mutual recognition of self-incrimination certificates across uniform jurisdictions and making other minor and technical amendments.
- insert a new Division 1C of Part 3.10 (Privileges)¹ to enact a new journalist privilege.

Note: It seeks to improve protection against disclosure of the identity of persons who give information to journalists in confidence. If a journalist has promised not to reveal an informant's identity, the Bill provides that the journalist (and his or her employer) cannot be compelled to give evidence that will disclose the informant's identity in any proceedings in a Victorian court, unless the court determines otherwise in accordance with a specified public interest test.

Extract from the explanatory memorandum:

This privilege provides that neither a journalist (nor his or her employer) can be compelled to give evidence in any court proceeding that would disclose an informant's identity if the journalist has promised not to disclose the informant's identity. However, the privilege is not absolute. The protection will not apply if, on the application of a party, the court is satisfied that the public interest in having the informant's identity disclosed outweighs both any likely adverse effect of the disclosure on the informant (or on any other person) and the public interest in the communication of facts and opinion to the public by the news media (including the ability of the news media to access sources of facts). The court must engage in a balancing exercise to determine whether to grant an application to question a journalist to identify a source.

... The privilege is limited to persons who are engaged in the profession or occupation of journalism.

... The new section 126K(1) makes it clear that the privilege only applies in circumstances where the journalist has promised an informant not to disclose their identity and that promise is made in the course of the journalist's work. Where this condition is met, the presumption of protection applies.

The new section 126K(2) allows a party to apply to the court for the evidence of identity to be given. When dealing with an application under this provision, the court is required to weigh up the public interest in disclosure of the identity of the informant against any likely adverse effect on the informant or any other person. The court is also required to weigh up the public interest in disclosure against the public interest in the communication of facts and opinion to the public by the news media and, accordingly also, in the ability of the news media to access sources of facts. If the court determines that the public interest in disclosure outweighs the opposing interests, the court may order disclosure of the identity.

¹ The Part deals with client legal privilege, privilege of religious confessions, privilege against self-incrimination, evidence excluded in the public interest and the exclusion of evidence of settlement negotiations.

In *Police v Campbell* [2010] 1 NZLR 483, Randerson J, Chief Judge of the New Zealand High Court, considered a range of interests when undertaking this balancing exercise, including the public interest in the investigation and prosecution of crime. relevant factors may include the nature of the proceeding (whether it is criminal or civil), the seriousness of the charge in a criminal proceeding, the accused's or defendant's right to know all relevant information to protect his or her right to a fair hearing, the nature of the information obtained from the informant, the manner in which it was obtained, and whether the relevant evidence can be obtained without compelling the journalist to give evidence. Ultimately, the court will determine the appropriate balance on a case-by-case basis.

Journalist Privilege does not apply to certain investigations under specified Acts

Extract from the Statement of Compatibility:

Parts 5, 6, 7, 8, 10 and 11 of the Bill provide that the journalist privilege is not available in the non-curial settings established under the *Independent Broad-based Anti-corruption Commission Act 2011*, the *Major Crime (Investigative Powers) Act 2004*, the *Ombudsman Act 1973*, the *Police Integrity Act 2008*, the *Whistleblowers Protection Act 2001*, and the *Victorian Inspectorate Act 2011*. As noted above, it is doubtful whether section 15(2) of the Charter Act affords protection from compelled disclosure of journalist's source. However, even if it did, the internal limitation under section 15(3) of the Charter Act means that the exclusion of the journalist privilege from these settings which concern the investigation of corruption and major crime is compatible with the Charter Act.

The Bill amends the *Coroners Act 2008* to bring the Coroners Court into line with all other courts in Victoria by replacing the operation of the common law privileges with the statutory privileges in Part 3.10 (Privileges) of the *Evidence Act 2008*.

The Committee makes no further comment.

Marriage Equality Bill 2012

Introduced	6 June 2012
Second Reading Speech	6 June 2012
House	Legislative Council
Member introducing Bill	Ms Sue Pennicuik MLC
Private Member's Bill	

Background

The purposes of the Bill are to provide for:

- marriage between adults of the same sex
- the dissolution and annulment of same-sex marriages
- the registration of same-sex marriage celebrants

The Bill amends the *Births, Deaths and Marriages Act 1996* to provide for certificates of marriage and the registration of same-sex marriages.

The Bill also makes consequential amendments to the *Interpretation of Legislation Act 1984* to provide that a marriage includes a same-sex marriage.

Committee comment

Rights and freedoms – Constitutional government – Whether Bill valid exercise of legislative power

The Committee notes that there are various views as to the ability of State Parliaments to pass legislation concerning marriage. On one view the amendments made to the *Marriage Act 1961* (Cth) in 2004 made it clear that that Act considered marriage to be between a man and a woman² leaving open the ability of other jurisdictions to legislate for same sex marriage. On another view, the amendment may have, by implication, closed the door to marriages other than between a man and a woman. If the later view is correct the Commonwealth legislation may cover the field as far as marriage in Australia is concerned. If the Commonwealth Act does indeed cover the field on all types of marriage then, to the extent of the inconsistency the Victorian Bill may be invalid.

The question of constitutional validity is a matter for Parliament's consideration.

Charter report

Presumption of innocence – Bigamy – Defendant must prove that he or she honestly and reasonably believed that his or her spouse was dead

Summary: The Committee will write to the Member seeking further information as to the compatibility of the reverse onus in clause 19(2) with the Charter right of defendants to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law.

The Committee notes that clause 19 provides that it is an offence for a married person to go through a form or ceremony of same-sex marriage. Clause 19(2) provides for a defence for a defendant who 'proves' that he or she believed that his or her spouse was dead and that there were reasonable grounds for that belief. The Committee observes that the effect of clause 19(2) is to reverse the onus

² *Marriage Act 1961 (Cth), s. 5 – 'marriage' means the union of a man and a woman to the exclusion of all others, voluntarily entered into for life.*

of proof on the issue of whether the defendant honestly and reasonably believed that his or her spouse was dead when he or she went through a form or ceremony of same-sex marriage.

The Statement of Compatibility does not address clause 19(2). In its *Practice Note No. 3*, the Committee remarks that for any provision of a Bill that ‘place[s] a legal onus of proof on an accused with respect to any issue in a criminal proceeding’, the Statement of Compatibility ‘should state whether and how that provision satisfies the Charter’s test for reasonable limits on rights’.

The Committee will write to the Member seeking further information as to the compatibility of the reverse onus in clause 19(2) with the Charter right of defendants to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law.³ Pending the Member’s response, the Committee draws attention to clause 19(2)

Protection of children – Dissolution of same sex marriage – Proper arrangements for children of the marriage

Summary: The Committee considers that the absence of a provision in clause 30 barring the dissolution of a same-sex marriage unless a court is satisfied that proper arrangements have been made for the children of the marriage may engage the Charter right of such children ‘without discrimination, to such protection as is in his or her best interests and is needed by him or her by reason of being a child.’ The Committee will write to the Member seeking further information.

The Committee notes that clause 30 provides that a dissolution order (permitting parties to a same-sex marriage to remarry) generally takes effect one month after the making of the order.

The Committee observes that the equivalent provision in the *Family Law Act 1975* (Cth) for opposite-sex marriages is subject to a provision that a divorce order cannot take effect until a court orders that, for all children of the marriage (including children treated by the parties to the marriage as a child of their family) who are under 18, the court is satisfied that:⁴

- (i) proper arrangements in all the circumstances have been made for the care, welfare and development of those children; or
- (ii) there are circumstances by reason of which the divorce order should take effect even though the court is not satisfied that such arrangements have been made.

The Committee considers that the absence of a provision in clause 30 barring the dissolution of a same sex marriage unless a court is satisfied that proper arrangements have been made for the children of the marriage may engage the Charter right of such children ‘without discrimination, to such protection as is in his or her best interests and is needed by him or her by reason of being a child.’⁵

The Committee will write to the Member seeking further information as to the compatibility of clause 30 with the Charter rights of children to such protection as is in their best interests. Pending the Member’s response, the Committee draws attention to clause 30.

The Committee makes no further comment.

³ Charter s. 25(1).

⁴ *Family Law Act 1975* (Cth), s. 55A.

⁵ Charter s. 17(2). Charter s. 3 defines ‘discrimination’ to mean ‘discrimination (within the meaning of the *Equal Opportunity Act 2010*) on the basis of an attribute set out in section 6 of that Act’. The attributes listed in s. 6 of that Act include ‘marital status’, ‘sexual orientation’ and ‘personal association (whether as a relative or otherwise) with a person who is identified by reference to any of the above attributes’.

Ministerial Correspondence

Working with Children Amendment Bill 2012

The Bill was introduced into the Legislative Assembly on 22 May 2012 by the Hon. Robert Clark MLA. The Committee considered the Bill on 4 June 2012 and made the following comments in Alert Digest No. 9 of 2012 tabled in the Parliament on 5 June 2012.

Committee's Comments

[Charter report]

Presumption of innocence – Suspension of an assessment notice when holder charged with certain offences – Position when charge is withdrawn or dismissed or defendant acquitted

Summary: Clause 10 provides that, when a person with an assessment notice is charged with a category 1 or 2 offence, the Secretary must suspend that assessment notice pending its re-assessment. The Committee will write to the Attorney-General seeking further information as to whether the Secretary has a discretion to not reinstate an assessment notice despite the withdrawal, dismissal or acquittal of the charge on which the notice's suspension was based.

The Committee notes that clause 10, inserting a new section 21B, provides that, when a person with an assessment notice is charged with a category 1 or 2 offence, the Secretary must suspend that assessment notice 'pending the carrying out and completion of a re-assessment under section 21'.¹

The Statement of Compatibility remarks:

I consider that these provisions are compatible with the human rights in the charter act. I acknowledge that suspension occurs automatically; that this may involve a significant restriction upon a person's ability to engage in their employment; and that the notification to the person's employer and agency with whom they are registered may affect the person's reputation...

The purpose and effect of the WWC provisions is not to impose additional penalties on offenders for a criminal offence but to protect children. While the presumption of innocence in section 25(1) will need to be respected by the secretary and VCAT in carrying out their re-assessments where a person is charged with an offence, the provisions are compatible with that right....

Category 1 and 2 offences are serious matters. Category 1 offences include serious sex offences committed by an adult against a child victim. Category 2 offences include serious violent and drug-related offences. The fact that a person has been convicted of or charged with such an offence raises very real concerns for the safety of children. I consider it is appropriate that the person is suspended from engaging in child-related work until the secretary or VCAT is satisfied that the person does not pose an unjustifiable risk to the safety of children.

For the reasons given the Statement of Compatibility, the Committee considers that barring a defendant from working with children while both charges against the person for serious offences and a mandatory re-assessment of the person's assessment notice are pending is

¹ Section 21 is an existing provision that requires a re-assessment of a notice in these circumstances.

compatible with the Charter right of defendants to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law.²

However, the Committee observes that an assessment notice may remain suspended under new section 21B after the charge has been dropped or the defendant has been acquitted. New sub-section 21B(2) provides:

If a person is being re-assessed because the Secretary was notified that the person has been charged with a relevant offence, the Secretary may reinstate that person's assessment notice if, after the suspension of the notice—

- (a) the charge against the person is withdrawn; or
- (b) the charge is dismissed by a court; or
- (c) the person is acquitted of the offence by a court.

The Committee notes that, while the Explanatory Memorandum to clause 10 states that if the circumstances in s. 21B(2)(a)-(c) apply, 'then the Secretary must reinstate that person's assessment notice', the actual wording of clause 10 appears to give the Secretary a discretion to not reinstate an assessment notice despite the withdrawal, dismissal or acquittal of the charge on which the suspension was based.³

The Committee will write to the Attorney General seeking further information as to whether the Secretary has a discretion under new section 21B(2) to not reinstate an assessment notice despite the withdrawal, dismissal or acquittal of the charge on which the notice's suspension was based. Pending the Attorney General's response, the Committee draws attention to clause 10.

Minister's response

Thank you for your letter of 5 June 2012 seeking my views on the issues raised in Alert Digest No. 9 of 2012 regarding the proposed sub-section 21B(2) set out in clause 10 of the Bill.

Proposed new sub-section 21B(1) provides that:

"Despite section 21(6), if the Secretary becomes aware that a person who has an assessment notice has been charged with or been convicted or found guilty of a category 1 or category 2 offence, the Secretary must suspend the person's assessment notice in accordance with this section pending the carrying out and completion of a re-assessment under section 21."

In relation to this provision, the Statement of Compatibility states that:

"The purpose and effect of the WWC provisions is not to impose additional penalties on offenders for a criminal offence but to protect children....."

Category 1 and 2 offences are serious matters. Category 1 offences include serious sexual offences committed by an adult against a child victim. Category 2 offences include serious violent and drug related offences. The fact that a person has been convicted of or charged with such an offence raises very real concerns for the safety of children. I consider it is appropriate that the person is suspended from engaging in child-related work until the Secretary or VCAT are satisfied that the person does not pose an unjustifiable risk to the safety of children."

² Charter s. 25(1).

³ From 2007-2010, the Secretary was permitted to refuse or revoke an assessment notice on the basis of charges that had been finally dealt with through withdrawal or dismissal (but not acquittal.) However, that permission was removed from the Act in 2010, with the then Attorney-General remarking that this Committee's predecessor had identified the Secretary's use of withdrawn or dismissed charges to make a negative assessment as raising a potential incompatibility with the Charter's right to be presumed innocent See *Alert Digest No 9 of 2010* (reporting on the Working With Children Amendment Bill 2010), p. 11.

The Committee has stated in the Alert Digest:

“For the reasons given in the Statement of Compatibility, the Committee considers that barring a defendant from working with children while both charges against the person for serious offences and a mandatory re-assessment of the person’s assessment notice are pending is compatible with the Charter right of defendants to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law.”

New sub-section 21B(2) gives the Secretary a discretion to reinstate an assessment notice that was suspended under sub-section 21B(1) if, after the suspension of the notice:

- (a) the charge against the person is withdrawn; or
- (b) the charge is dismissed by a court; or
- (c) the person is acquitted of the offence by a court.

The Committee has noted that the Explanatory Memorandum to clause 10 states that the effect of sub section 21B(2) is that the Secretary “must” reinstate the person’s assessment notice, whereas the proposed sub-section uses “may” and therefore appears to give the Secretary a discretion.

I confirm that the drafting in the Bill is correct and the Explanatory Memorandum’s use of “must” is incorrect. The intent is to give the Secretary a discretion whether or not to reinstate the assessment notice in circumstances where, prior to the completion of the reassessment triggered by the person being charged with a category 1 or category 2 offence, those charges are withdrawn or dismissed or the person is acquitted of the offence.

In my view, it is appropriate for the Secretary to have such a discretion rather than being under an obligation to reinstate the assessment notice regardless of the circumstances.

In some cases where charges are withdrawn or dismissed or the person is acquitted of the offence, the circumstances will show that the facts behind the charge and dismissal or acquittal provide no basis for considering that the person poses an unjustifiable risk to the safety of children. In such circumstances, it is to be expected that the Secretary would reinstate the assessment notice provided nothing else has emerged in the reassessment process showing the person poses an unjustifiable risk.

However, in other cases the charges may be withdrawn or dismissed or the person may have been acquitted in circumstances that, while precluding a successful prosecution or finding of guilt, nevertheless demonstrate or raise real concerns as to whether the person poses an unjustifiable risk to children. In those circumstances, it is to be expected that the Secretary would not reinstate the assessment notice and would instead let the reassessment process run its course to a decision whether to issue a new assessment notice or a negative notice. For example, a plea bargain may have led to a charge for a category 1 or 2 offence being withdrawn and guilt being pleaded to other charges. Or, for technical reasons, the prosecution may not have been able to prove the more serious charge, even though facts not in dispute may raise concerns about whether the person poses a significant risk to children.

In yet other cases, the reassessment process may have revealed matters not relating to the charge that raise concerns about whether the person poses a significant risk to children, and which may lead to a negative notice at the conclusion of the reassessment.

However, in all cases the Secretary must act reasonably in exercising his or her discretion under sub section 21B(2) and is subject to judicial review on administrative law grounds.

For these reasons, I consider it appropriate that the Secretary have a discretion whether or not to reinstate an assessment notice under sub-section 21B(2) pending the completion of the reassessment.

Yours sincerely

ROBERT CLARK MP
Attorney-General

Received 16 June 2012

The Committee thanks the Minister for this response.

Committee Room
18 June 2012

Appendix 1

Index of Acts and Bills in 2012

Alert Digest Nos.

Accident Compensation Amendment (Repayments and Dividends) Bill 2012	5
Appropriation (2012/2013) Bill 2012	8
Appropriation (Parliament 2012/2013) Bill 2012	8
Associations Incorporation Reform Bill 2011	1, 4
Australian Consumer Law and Fair Trading Bill 2011	1, 4
Building Amendment Bill 2012	2
Carers Recognition Bill 2012	2
City of Melbourne Amendment (Enrolment) Act 2012	10
City of Melbourne Amendment (Environmental Upgrade Agreement) Bill 2012	2
Community Based Sentences (Transfer) Bill 2012	10
Control of Weapons and Firearms Acts Amendment Bill 2011	1, 4
Courts and Sentencing Legislation Amendment Bill 2012	7
Disability Amendment Bill 2012	4, 5
Drugs, Poisons and Controlled Substances Amendment (Supply by Midwives) Bill 2012	4
Duties Amendment (Landholder) Bill 2012	8
Education Legislation Amendment (VET Sector, Universities and Other Matters) Bill 2012	8
Emergency Services Legislation Amendment Bill 2011	1
Evidence Amendment (Journalist Privilege) Bill 2012	10
Evidence (Miscellaneous Provisions) Amendment (Affidavits) Bill 2012	3
Forests Amendment Bill 2012	7
Freedom of Information Amendment (Freedom of Information Commissioner) Bill 2011	1
Gambling Legislation Amendment (Transition) Bill 2012	7
Health (Commonwealth State Funding Arrangements) Bill 2012	9
Health Professions Registration (Repeal) Bill 2012	6
Independent Broad-based Anti-corruption Commission Amendment (Examinations) Bill 2012	7, 8
Independent Broad-based Anti-corruption Commission Amendment (Investigative Functions) Bill 2011	1
Justice Legislation Amendment Bill 2012	4
Land (Revocation of Reservations) Bill 2012	6
Legal Profession and Public Notaries Amendment Bill 2012	4
Local Government (Brimbank City Council) Amendment Bill 2012	9
Marriage Equality Bill 2012	10
Monetary Units Amendment Bill 2012	8
National Energy Retail Law (Victoria) Bill 2012	6, 8
Parliamentary Salaries and Superannuation Amendment (Salary Restraint) Bill 2012	8
Police and Emergency Management Legislation Amendment Bill 2012	8
Port Bellarine Tourist Resort (Repeal) Bill 2012	5
Port Management Amendment (Port of Melbourne Corporation Licence Fee) Bill 2011	1
Port Management Further Amendment Bill 2012	7
Primary Industries Legislation Amendment Bill 2012	7
Residential Tenancies Amendment Bill 2012	9
Road Safety Amendment Bill 2012	8
Road Safety Amendment (Car Doors) Bill 2102	2
Road Safety Amendment (Drinking While Driving) Act 2011	1

Scrutiny of Acts and Regulations Committee

Royal Women's Hospital Land Bill 2012	6
State Taxation Acts Amendment Bill 2012	8
Statute Law Repeals Bill 2012	4
Statute Law Revision Bill 2012	4
Transport (Compliance and Miscellaneous) Amendment (Fares) Bill 2012	6
Victorian Inspectorate Amendment Bill 2012	5, 6
Water Legislation Amendment (Water Infrastructure Charges) Bill 2011	5
Water Amendment (Governance and Other Reforms) Bill 2012	4, 5
Working with Children Amendment Bill 2012	9, 10

Appendix 2

Committee Comments classified by Terms of Reference

This Appendix lists Bills under the relevant Committee terms of reference where the Committee has raised issues requiring further correspondence with the appropriate Minister or Member.

Alert Digest Nos.

Section 17(a)

(vi) inappropriately delegates legislative power

Health (Commonwealth State Funding Arrangements) Bill 2012 9

(viii) is incompatible with the human rights set out in the *Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006*

Associations Incorporation Reform Bill 2011	1
Australian Consumer Law and Fair Trading Bill 2011	1
Control of Weapons and Firearms Acts Amendment Bill 2011	1
Independent Broad-based Anti-corruption Commission Amendment (Examinations) Bill 2012	7
Marriage Equality Bill 2012	10
National Energy Retail Law (Victoria) Bill 2012	6
Victorian Inspectorate Amendment Bill 2012	5
Water Amendment (Governance and Other Reforms) Bill 2012	4
Working with Children Amendment Bill 2012	9

Section 17(b)

(i) and (ii) repeals, alters or varies the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court

Australian Consumer Law and Fair Trading Bill 2011 1

Appendix 3

Ministerial Correspondence 2012

Table of correspondence between the Committee and Ministers during 2012

Bill Title	Minister/ Member	Date of Committee Letter / Minister's Response	Alert Digest No. Issue raised / Response Published
Associations Incorporation Reform Bill 2011	Minister for Consumer Affairs	07-02-12 24-02-12	1 of 2012 4 of 2012
Australian Consumer Law and Fair Trading Bill 2011	Minister for Consumer Affairs	07-02-12 24-02-12	1 of 2012 4 of 2012
Control of Weapons and Firearms Acts Amendment Bill 2011	Minister for Police and Emergency Services	07-02-12 29-02-12	1 of 2012 4 of 2012
Water Legislation Amendment (Water Infrastructure Charges) Bill 2011	Minister for Water	28-02-12 14-03-12	12 of 2011 5 of 2012
Disability Amendment Bill 2012	Minister for Community Services	13-03-12 26-03-12	4 of 2012 5 of 2012
Water Amendment (Governance and Other Reforms) Bill 2012	Minister for Water	13-03-12 27-03-12	4 of 2012 5 of 2012
Victorian Inspectorate Amendment Bill 2012	Minister responsible for the establishment of an anti-corruption commission	27-03-12 16-04-12	5 of 2012 6 of 2012
Independent Broad-based Anti-corruption Commission Amendment (Examinations) Bill 2012	Minister responsible for the establishment of an anti-corruption commission	01-05-12 21-05-12	7 of 2012 8 of 2012
National Energy Retail Law (Victoria) Bill 2012	Minister for Energy and Resources	17-04-12 01-05-12	6 of 2012 8 of 2012
Working with Children Amendment Bill 2012	Attorney-General	05-06-12 16-06-12	9 of 2012 10 of 2012

Table of Ministers responses still pending

Bill Title	Minister/ Member	Date of Committee Letter / Minister's Response	Alert Digest No. Issue raised / Response Published
Health (Commonwealth State Funding Arrangements) Bill 2012	Minister for Health	05-06-12	9 of 2012
Marriage Equality Bill 2012	Ms Sue Pennicuik MLC	19-06-12	10 of 2012