



EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Members present:

Ms LM Linard MP (Chair)
Mr JJ McDonald MP (via teleconference)
Mr BM Saunders MP (via teleconference)
Mrs SM Wilson MP (via teleconference)
Mr MP Healy MP (via teleconference)
Mr N Dametto MP (via teleconference)

Staff present:

Ms E Jameson (Acting Committee Secretary)
Ms A Groth (Assistant Committee Secretary)

PUBLIC BRIEFING—INQUIRY INTO THE CRIMINAL CODE AND OTHER LEGISLATION (WAGE THEFT) AMENDMENT BILL 2020

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

MONDAY, 27 JULY 2020

Brisbane

MONDAY, 27 JULY 2020

The committee met at 10.05 am.

CHAIR: I declare open this public hearing for the Education, Employment and Small Business Committee inquiry into the Criminal Code and Other Legislation (Wage Theft) Amendment Bill 2020. I acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we are meeting today and pay my respects to elders past, present and emerging. My name is Leanne Linard. I am the chair of the committee and the member for Nudgee. The other members joining us on the phone today are Mr Jim McDonald, member for Lockyer and deputy chair; Mr Michael Healy, member for Cairns; Mrs Simone Wilson, member for Pumicestone; Mr Bruce Saunders, member for Maryborough; and Mr Nick Dametto, member for Hinchinbrook.

On 15 July this year the Minister for Education and Minister for Industrial Relations, the Hon. Grace Grace introduced the bill to the parliament. The bill was referred to the committee for examination with a reporting date of 28 August this year. The committee will be briefed by representatives from the Office of Industrial Relations, the Department of Education and the Department of Justice and Attorney-General in relation to the bill. These proceedings are similar to parliament and are subject to the Legislative Assembly's standing rules and orders. In this regard I remind members of the public that under the standing orders the public may be admitted to or excluded from the hearing at the discretion of the committee. The proceedings are being recorded by Hansard and broadcast live on the parliament's website. All those present today should note that it is possible you may be filmed or photographed during the proceedings and images may also appear on the parliament's website or social media pages. I ask everyone present to turn mobile phones off or to silent mode. The program for today has been published on the committee's webpage and there are hard copies available from committee staff.

The purpose of today is to assist the committee with its examination of the bill. I remind committee members that departmental officers are here to provide factual or technical information. Any questions seeking an opinion about policy should be directed to the minister or left to debate on the floor of the House.

**JAMES, Mr Tony, Acting Assistant Director-General, Department of Education,
Office of Industrial Relations**

**MOXHAM, Mr Rhett, Acting Director, Industrial Relations Strategic Policy,
Department of Education, Office of Industrial Relations**

**ROBERTSON, Mrs Leanne, Assistant Director-General, Department of Justice and
Attorney-General**

**RYLKO, Ms Julie, Director, Strategic Policy and Legal Services, Department of
Justice and Attorney-General**

CHAIR: I welcome representatives from the Department of Education and the Department of Justice and Attorney-General. Thank you kindly for your written briefing on the bill which will be available soon on the committee's webpage. I invite you to brief the committee after which committee members will have some questions for you.

Mr James: Thank you, Chair. I also acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we are meeting. As you note, the departmental brief was provided to the committee on Friday and in addition to that I would like to take the opportunity to make a brief introduction. The Criminal Code and Other Legislation (Wage Theft) Amendment Bill 2020 is being developed to give effect to recommendation 15 and recommendation 8 of the parliamentary inquiry into wage theft in Queensland which was released by this committee in November 2018. In brief, recommendation 15 is to introduce legislation criminalising wage theft and recommendation 8 is to establish a quick, simple and low-cost process to resolve civil claims for unpaid wages.

As this committee has identified during the inquiry, wage theft cost Queensland workers approximately \$1.22 billion in wages and \$1.12 billion in unpaid superannuation each year. The inquiry report found that the existing civil penalty regime was not functioning as an effective deterrent. This finding is consistent with similar findings from inquiries conducted in Victoria and by the Australian Senate.

The first purpose of the bill is to address the criminalisation of wage theft. The Criminal Code is the primary source of criminal law in Queensland and contains broad offences applicable to criminal behaviour in numerous contexts. While the existing offence of stealing has application to stealing by an employee from their employer and provides for a specific and higher maximum penalty for such conduct, the application of the same stealing offence to wage theft by an employer is not clear because of how property rights over wage entitlements are established. The amendments provide clarity that wages and other employment related amounts become the worker's property when these are payable under the act, industrial instrument or an agreement and are therefore a thing capable of being stolen under the Criminal Code. This captures a broad range of how wage theft may occur, including unpaid hours or underpayment of hours, unpaid penalty rates, unreasonable deductions, unpaid superannuation, withholding of other entitlements and sham contracting. These examples were noted in the explanatory notes and are also detailed by the inquiry committee report at page 22 of that wage theft inquiry report.

An offence of wage theft can be applied to an individual employer and a corporation and can also include anyone who knowingly aids or conspires in the offence. This could be a senior officer or a director of a corporation. The wage theft provisions in the Criminal Code are directed at wilful and deliberate conduct. Prosecution for wage theft does not apply to honest mistakes made in the payment of wages. The bill does not change the requirements or defences applying to stealing, where the prosecution needs to prove it is a deliberate and fraudulent act.

The bill provides for increased penalties, increasing the maximum for stealing or fraud by an employer against an employee to 10 years and 14 years imprisonment respectively. This is consistent with the current penalties for offending as an employee against an employer. For corporation offenders, unlimited fines can be imposed. The Queensland Police Service will be responsible for the investigation of allegations of wage theft. Complaints of wage theft can be referred to the Queensland police. The institution of wage theft prosecution proceedings are a matter for the police and the Director of Public Prosecutions.

The bill's second purpose is to provide a simple, informal, low-cost avenue for all wage recovery matters in Queensland. The bill proposes this be done through the specialised jurisdiction of the Industrial Magistrates Court. For national system employers and employees the Fair Work Act determines which courts are vested with jurisdiction to hear fair work wage recovery matters. In addition to the federal circuit court, the Fair Work Act provides jurisdiction for the Queensland District Court, the Magistrates Court and the Industrial Magistrates Court. The Industrial Court of Queensland and the Queensland Industrial Relations Commission are not an eligible court under the Fair Work Act. At present Fair Work Act wage recovery claimants utilise either the federal circuit court or the Queensland Magistrates Court to pursue their claims.

The wage theft inquiry committee found that wage recovery processes in these tribunals can be costly, legally complex and time consuming and may deter workers from taking action to report and recover lost wages. Difficulty navigating the claims process, lengthy court time frames, technical and legal formality through the process and costs of legal representation were identified by the committee as significant barriers to seeking recovery of unpaid or underpaid wages and entitlements. To overcome these issues the bill amends the Industrial Relations Act 2016 to facilitate the use of the Industrial Magistrates Court for wage recovery matters to achieve the committee's recommendation for a simple, timely recovery process without undue technical or legal formality. The Industrial Magistrates Court is a court established under the IR Act for the purposes of hearing and deciding industrial relations proceedings, including claims for unpaid wages. Under provisions of the Industrial Relations Act and the industrial tribunal rules, the industrial magistrate can hear wage recovery matters without regard to legal forms and technicalities which will better facilitate the resolution of wage related disputes.

While the Federal Court and the Queensland Magistrates Court will remain eligible courts to hear wage claims because these are available under the Fair Work Act, the revised processes and support to be available through the Industrial Magistrates Court will encourage matters to be dealt with more quickly and simply in that jurisdiction. These processes include a simplified small claims procedure. The threshold for a small claims procedure under the Fair Work Act is for claims up to \$20,000 and proceedings are conducted in an informal manner without regard to legal forms or

technicalities. Parties will only be represented by a lawyer where the court grants such leave. The bill also creates a parallel small claims process for state jurisdiction employees up to the existing Industrial Relations Act threshold of \$50,000 for matters which may also be brought to the Queensland Industrial Relations commission.

The bill also establishes a conciliation process at the front end of the wage recovery action to allow the parties to try to reach a prompt resolution or, where a resolution cannot be reached, to try to narrow the issues in dispute before appearing before the court with the claim. As the Fair Work Act does not provide for the conciliation, the bill does not import a precondition for mandatory conciliation to the Industrial Magistrates Court's exercise of the federal jurisdiction. While parties can opt out of the conciliation process, including it in the wage recovery process enables parties that genuinely wish to participate to reach agreement or narrow the issues in dispute prior to the hearing.

Activities to support commencement of the wage recovery amendments include: redesigning the court's website to clearly signpost this process; and creating new forms designed to simplify requirements to bringing a claim. A redesigned claim form will ensure that as much relevant information as possible is provided at the outset of the proceedings avoiding lengthy discovery processes. Other guidance material will be developed to assist those who use the Industrial Magistrates Court.

While the wage recovery provisions of the bill will benefit employee claimants, they are also intended to assist employers, particularly those in small businesses and small business owners, by reducing the time and expense of defending claims. The conciliation process will provide an avenue for prompt resolution of wage claims without the need to prepare or file a defence of a claim or attend a court.

I will leave it at that. I thank the committee for the opportunity to appear today. I and my fellow officers will endeavour to answer all questions that you may have about the bill.

CHAIR: Thank you very much. We will now open for questions. I will give the first opportunity to the deputy chair.

Mr McDONALD: My interest is with how the civil and criminal aspects of these new offences will work. When should a person alert the police if they believe they have been a victim of wage theft? Is that before or after a Fair Work claim?

Mr James: I will make clear that there are two distinct actions to be taken. There is a civil procedure for the recovery of wages and then there is a criminal procedure for allegations of wage theft. The standards of proof required in both forums are different. In a civil proceeding it is on the balance of probabilities and in a criminal proceeding it is beyond reasonable doubt. A person, an inspector or a union representative can refer allegations of wage theft to the police for investigation and then it becomes a matter for the Queensland Police Service in terms of the investigation, prioritisation and institution of any criminal proceedings.

Remember that wage theft has a high standard. It is about deliberate and wilful egregious behaviour to deprive an employee of their entitlements. It is not aimed at an honest mistake which can occur in some cases with regard to the payment of wages. It is really very clearly directed at wilful or deliberate conduct. In answer to your question, a person can lodge a complaint to the police if they feel they are a victim of wage theft.

Mr McDONALD: I think a lot of education might need to occur in that space because I am not clear whether people should go to Fair Work or whether they will understand the thresholds that you have talked about in terms of the standard of proof. Can you explain how the offences will be dealt with in terms of which matters are heard in the Industrial Court and which matters in the Magistrates Court?

Mr James: You are right. There will need to be support. That is something that came out of the committee inquiry into wage theft—that is, punters do require support and guidance. That is one of the clear objectives of what is being done with this wage theft bill. It is to clearly signpost to persons who may be victims of wage theft or underpayment where they may go to seek restitution of their wages. It also sends a very clear message to those who undertake deliberate or wilful theft of employees' wages and entitlements that they are subject to criminal proceedings.

Recovery of wages through a civil recovery procedure is done in the Industrial Magistrates Court. Prosecution for wage theft is done under the Queensland Criminal Code. They are two separate actions. One does not necessarily follow the other. I could take a civil recovery action to recover my wages and utilise the conciliation proceedings for that in order for me to get my wages

repaid if it is found that that needs to occur. That may be unintentional or because of a misunderstanding. That is a different story to what is in criminalisation which is a deliberate and wilful act. Does that respond to your question?

Mr McDONALD: Yes, it certainly does. With regard to the Industrial Magistrates Court, if an employer is convicted of a new stealing offence, could the Industrial Magistrates Court consider this as part of a wage recovery claim?

Ms Rylko: Just to clarify that, in relation to criminal offences, they are indictable offences of stealing and fraud that we are talking about, particularly stealing. Those offences, as Tony referred to, are heard under the Criminal Code provisions. An indictable offence must be dealt with in the District Court normally. There are some provisions that allow a charge of stealing to be dealt with in the Magistrates Court. It depends on the value involved and whether the defendant pleads guilty or not. To clarify, the Industrial Magistrates Court is created under the Industrial Relations Act and does not have criminal jurisdiction under the Criminal Code.

Mr McDONALD: I understand. I just thought they may be able to use that conviction as part of the wage recovery claim.

Mr James: It has certainly been my experience through the Industrial Magistrates Court that those matters are held with less technicality and less formality and that would be a much quicker, I would suggest, process to recover wages—that is, seeking a civil restitution order and civil penalty attached.

CHAIR: We will move now to the member for Maryborough.

Mr SAUNDERS: One of the things that concerns me is whether the department and the police will be working with Fair Work. One of the things that we hear very strongly through this office is that people cannot get through to Fair Work Australia. The other thing that worries me is that people are frightened to come forward, especially in smaller communities or regional cities like ours where the word gets around that you are a troublemaker et cetera. They are two concerns I have with wage theft. The biggest concern is the police and the state bodies working with Fair Work considering that it is very difficult to get anything through Fair Work Australia.

Mr James: The wage theft bill sends a very strong message regarding the criminalisation of wage theft in Queensland and sets out the recovery process that will help Queenslanders who are unfortunately suffering the ill effects of wage theft. It is not meant to replace the Fair Work Ombudsman. It is certainly meant to send a very strong signal to the community that wage theft is not an appropriate or condoned action.

Going to your second objection regarding people being frightened to make complaints, I would agree. I would say that that is part and parcel of society that unfortunately there is that view. However, sending a strong message that wage theft is not an acceptable practice will only help those people come forward and seek recovery. The small claims process and the processes in the Industrial Magistrates Court are meant to be simplified. They are meant to be technically less formal and less rigorous. That should help parties to come to a speedier solution or outcome in the event of a dispute.

In terms of working with the police, I cannot speak for the Fair Work Ombudsman, but it would be reasonable to suggest that if an employer were a recidivist offender and it could be made clear that that person is making wilful and deliberate decisions to rip workers off and that was brought to the attention of police through the Fair Work Ombudsman's office or through employees or any other means, that would be a matter for the police to investigate.

I am not able to say that the Fair Work Ombudsman will make referrals. However, I know with my Office of Industrial Relations we do have very a good relationship with the Fair Work Ombudsman. I accept that there are issues with getting onto them. They are a matter for them and not for me. We do have a strong relationship with the Fair Work Ombudsman, particularly in the areas of, for example, labour hire and licensing where we work very closely with the Fair Work Ombudsman to address the more egregious behaviours of employers in relation to employment.

Mr SAUNDERS: Prior to the Fair Work Act coming in we had industrial inspectors. Will there be any additional training for the police or will there be specialist police throughout the state? From what I heard when the committee was inquiring into this issue and from what I have heard since as a local member of parliament, wage theft is—I would not say it is rampant—built into some business models. Will there be specialised training for police officers like that provided to the old industrial inspectors throughout regional Queensland?

Mr James: The police already investigate incredibly complex and difficult matters in terms of fraud, corporate crime and what have you. We are very confident that the police are capable and equipped to investigate these matters. Certainly in the development of support material for the community as to how to access wage recovery processes, I do intend to continue to work with the Queensland Police Service in terms of those matters.

CHAIR: We will move to the member for Pumicestone.

Mrs WILSON: There were six Queensland government recommendations to be actioned from the wage theft parliamentary committee report. Can you tell me to date how many of those recommendations have been actioned?

Mr James: From my recollection there were 17 recommendations from that report. A large number of them were directed to the Commonwealth government as the holders of the Fair Work jurisdiction. I am aware that the minister has written to preceding federal ministers for industrial relations on a number of occasions to refer those matters and the report on. As you know, the Commonwealth has indicated that it is also investigating the criminalisation of wage theft. I am not in a position to say where that is at at the moment. They have also taken action that aligns with a number of the recommendations out of that report.

There were a number of other recommendations that related to state's jurisdiction. One of them was recommendation 6, off the top of my head—I can go back and check that. It was regarding the procurement policies of the Queensland government to stamp out wage theft. I understand that they have certainly been implemented in the new Queensland procurement policy.

Recommendations 1, 2 and 3 were around education and support. I do know that there has been a lot of work done with Trade & Investment Queensland to inform foreign backpackers and students who come here to advise them of their industrial obligations and entitlements. There has been some work regarding the re-establishment of the industrial relations education committee. The old IREC, prior to wage theft, had a much larger remit in that the state sector was a much larger sector than it is now.

Mrs WILSON: I do understand there were 17 recommendations in all, but of those 17 recommendations there were specifically six for Queensland. Taking out the two we are looking at at the moment, are you able to let me know whether those four other recommendations that were specifically for the Queensland government to implement or action have been completely actioned to date? I am happy for you to take that on notice.

Mr James: Recommendation 1 states—

The Committee recommends the Queensland Government conduct a public education campaign to assist in the fight against wage theft, including outlining information on the findings from this inquiry and the measures the Queensland Government is taking in response, and how and where affected workers can go for help to recover their lost wages.

I believe that is what we are doing now. I believe that the profile of wage theft in the Queensland community is far greater now than it was at the time of the original inquiry.

Recommendation 2 states—

The Committee recommends the Queensland Government re-establish the tripartite Industrial Relations Education Committee under the auspices of the Office of the Industrial Relations to conduct visits ...

As I have said, Chair, there has been some work on that. The IREQ has not been reformed yet on the understanding that we are still working through some of the issues around the functions of IREQ and what the members will do, but that is in train.

Recommendation 3 states—

The committee recommends the Queensland Government, through the Department of Education, work with the higher education sector in Queensland to ensure international students have access to relevant information ...

That is where I said we have worked strongly with the Department of Education and Trade and Investment Queensland to introduce knowledge and awareness. I know there have been a number of interactions, publications and website information to support that recommendation.

Recommendation 5 states—

The committee recommends the Queensland Government ensure its current procurement policies allow for appropriate and proportionate action to be taken against companies that have underpaid workers.

As I said, I refer the member to the new Queensland Procurement Policy, which makes specific provision for wage theft. I believe those are the four recommendations that apply directly to the state other than the ones we are discussing today.

Mrs WILSON: Thank you so much for that. What organisation is the prosecuting body, and how are complaints dealt with by workers who feel they have not been paid?

Mr James: The prosecuting body would be the Queensland police or the Director of Public Prosecutions. That is for the criminal offence as an indictable offence. For the recovery of wages underpayments, an individual employee can launch an action and it will be a simple process to launch an action. It can be launched by a representative of that employee's union or it could be launched by their own legal advisers as well, given that access to the tribunals by legal representation is by leave of the tribunals.

CHAIR: I am just watching the time. We will move to the member for Cairns.

Mr HEALY: Thank you to everybody who is appearing today. I am enjoying listening to what is happening. I think this legislation is well overdue. That was reflected in our community public consultation when we travelled around the state. You can see it is desperately needed. How will the bill affect victims of wage theft who have signed a settlement or nondisclosure agreement in relation to a claim for wage theft?

Mr James: In answer to that, you cannot agree away an award entitlement. I cannot agree to accept less than the award. An employer cannot agree to pay less than the award. If an employee had signed some sort of full and final settlement when they left, I would suggest that that will not hold if the employee was to subsequently lodge a complaint. For example, if the employee agreed they would not receive their holiday pay, I would suggest that employee would have a claim for holiday pay if it is valid under their industrial instrument and they can take it through the Industrial Magistrates Court. I imagine those things would be part of the evidence that would come into the consideration of the industrial magistrate or in the conciliation process by the very experienced industrial relations commissioners who are the conciliators in these matters.

Ms Rylko: The amendments in the bill to the Criminal Code apply in relation to the existing offences of stealing and fraud. There are a range of provisions outlined in the departmental brief to the committee that provide information about how those offences will operate and that the amendments in relation to an act or omission do not act retrospectively. I just wanted to draw the committee's attention to that point.

Mr James: I think what we are saying there is that the Criminal Code provisions apply prospectively from the date of assent. They are in now.

CHAIR: Member for Cairns, do you wish to ask a supplementary question? I get from your tone that that may not have totally clarified it for you.

Mr HEALY: No, that was sort of okay. I am making the assumption that it is not retrospective. Under the proposed new offence of stealing by employers who can be charged with that offence—there are some very large organisations out there—once it has been proven who is the sole responsible agent?

Mr James: An individual or a corporation can be charged with the criminal offence of wages theft, and the offence can also be applied to a director or a senior officer of the corporation if it can be linked that they conspired or aided and abetted in the commission of the offence.

On the first question, member, so that I am clear with you, if I have been underpaid now I can continue to take action for the recovery of my wages. The wage theft provisions, the recovery provisions, will be implemented from a date to be proclaimed. That is simply to allow us to set up the relevant signposting and finalising the forms and what have you upon the passage of the bill. That will be retrospective. You can recover wages that are owed at the point when they became due.

Mr HEALY: That is clear. Thank you very much.

CHAIR: We will move to the member for Hinchinbrook.

Mr DAMETTO: Thank you to everyone who has given evidence today. My question was pretty much capped off by the member for Maryborough, but if I could add. It was stated that the police will be capable and equipped to deal with the criminal component of this new criminal offence. Will they be adequately resourced to take on these new offences? As we saw out there during the wage theft inquiry, quite a lot of people were willing to come forward about this, so I am anticipating in the future police are going to have quite an influx of people wanting to complain and press criminal charges against their employer. Will they be resourced to do this?

Mr James: I thank the member for the question. Resourcing for these is a matter for the Queensland Police Service. It has been difficult for us to estimate the resource load for this. Remembering that the recovery of wages is something that is instituted by the individual or their union

or their advocate in the Industrial Magistrates Court for the recovery of wages, I would expect from experience that that is where the bulk of recovery actions will be had. The criminalisation of wage theft is for egregious, wilful and deliberate behaviour of stealing an employee's wage, but I believe that the Queensland police force is certainly very capable, does already do very complex investigations and it is a matter that I am assured will be monitored.

Mr DAMETTO: Thank you very much for that answer.

CHAIR: In the remaining few minutes I just have a few questions and a statement to thank you for bringing forward these amendments. They are reflective of what the committee heard in its first inquiry. It was a significant and far-reaching inquiry with regard to losses that have been incurred to workers individually and the state from wage theft.

With regard to your language about deliberate and wilful, I appreciate the threshold that is contained in this criminal offence. I would make the comment that reckless behaviour beyond what would be expected from a reasonable person—there have been some moves with respect to some offences in the Criminal Code in more recent times to bring in reckless behaviour as well. I appreciate it is an interesting definition between reckless which is so reckless as to be almost deliberate. We will not get into a debate about the thresholds, although we do have our wonderful JAG officers here who could do it.

I think of greater utility, Tony, is actually to understand. We heard a lot from young people who were confused about the ability to bring an action for recovery. They may not have had someone to assist them in the process. If a young worker realised they were a victim of wage theft and were being underpaid, could you step out for the committee the practical process through which they would go, who they would ring to recover that? Say it is \$1,000 they have discovered they have not been paid. Putting aside the criminal offence and just dealing with the recovery, please.

Mr James: The processes that I would recommend to that person should they ring my office: first of all, I would establish whether they were in the state or the Commonwealth system. Normally they would be in the Commonwealth system because that is what effectively covers private sector workers. The Fair Work Ombudsman is the first point of call and they should be making inquiries with the Fair Work Ombudsman, but I would advise the employee or the worker to actually ask their employer. Actually confront the employer and make their claim in a calm, civil way backed up by whatever evidence they have that would support their claim. For example, they may wish to look at the award itself—they could get advice from the Fair Work Ombudsman or other areas—and by all means have a discussion with the employer. Even put it in writing to the employer so there is a clear pathway that they have attempted to resolve this matter. Give the employer a reasonable time, seven days, to respond.

Failing that, the new wage recovery procedures are such that the person could go to their local union. All positions have coverage to a local union, and I would suggest that an employee could avail themselves if they were a member or if they wanted to seek advice from their local union. Alternatively, they could seek their own legal advice or they could simply consult what will be the Industrial Magistrates Court and fill out a form that is lodged through the Industrial Registrar's office. That form sets up the process, which is a conciliation hearing, which is where the employee and the employer are called before an experienced industrial commissioner to conciliate the matter.

CHAIR: At a cost of the form?

Mr James: At a cost of nothing. There may be a filing fee for the industrial magistrate's action which kicks off the conciliation.

CHAIR: Is that a minimal fee?

Mr James: It is a very minimal fee. It may be around \$40 or \$60.

CHAIR: \$60 to \$65?

Mr James: It is \$60, yes. That is how I would suggest it goes. I would say the employee should confront the employer if they can. If they cannot, they may seek an advocate to ask the employer, and that could be their union. Then they should be able to lodge a very simple form, and at the same time they could also confront the Fair Work Ombudsman to consider taking their action.

CHAIR: Thank you very much. The time has expired so we will not have time for supplementary questions. Should the committee have any further questions, we will write to you seeking further information. On behalf of the committee, I thank you for the additional information you have provided

today. Thank you to each of the officers who have attended. Thank you also to our Hansard reporters. A transcript of these proceedings will be able on the committee's parliamentary web page in due course. I declare this public briefing for the committee's inquiry into the Criminal Code and Other Legislation (Wage Theft) Amendment Bill 2020 closed.

The committee adjourned at 10.44 am.