Speech by

Tim Nicholls

MEMBER FOR CLAYFIELD

Hansard Tuesday, 30 October 2007

WORKERS' COMPENSATION AND REHABILITATION AND OTHER ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

Mr NICHOLLS (Clayfield—Lib) (12.47 pm): At the outset let me say that the coalition will be supporting the Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation and Other Acts Amendment Bill. I will, however, during the course of the debate be asking questions about some of the assumptions underpinning the policy behind the changes to the benefits payable under the legislation.

I also thank the minister and departmental staff for the briefing provided to me and other interested members on 15 October. I raised a number of issues at that briefing and the minister's staff did undertake to provide some answers to those. I still have not received those answers but I trust that they will be forthcoming during the debate. They were not of significant substance at the time. They included details such as the number of people expected to be affected by the changes to the step-down provisions, the number of long-term claimants whose claims go beyond the two-year period and the number of people expected to benefit from the changes to the maximum lump sum payments. So they were more of statistics and interest than of actual substance to the amendments being put forward.

Mr Mickel: Nevertheless, I want to make sure that by the end of the debate we have those.

Mr NICHOLLS: I acknowledge the minister's comments. It is not something of major—

Mr Mickel: No. If we gave you that commitment, we will honour that commitment.

Mr NICHOLLS: I thank the minister. Workers compensation was introduced in 1916 by the Ryan Labor government. I must say that workers compensation is not something that either as a lawyer or as an elected representative I have actually had a lot to do with, so I have been on a learning curve in attending to this bill. If some of what I repeat is inaccurate, I will gratefully accept correction—although on some points I may not be so grateful about the correction that I am sure will be coming anyway.

Nonetheless, it is interesting to read some of the previous debate in *Hansard* in relation to workers compensation and to look at some of the history. For my own edification and for the record, I will outline my understanding of it. Workers compensation was introduced in 1916 by the Ryan Labor government to provide a scheme of insurance to ensure workers received compensation for injuries suffered at work. At the time, the legislation was at the forefront of schemes designed to look after people in often harsh and difficult workplaces. Education was less comprehensive than it has subsequently become and workers were less able to protect themselves. It was, as we all know, in many respects a less civilised world, particularly in relation to the workplace. The legislation was both necessary to provide a fair compensation scheme and necessarily prescriptive. It set out rules and requirements for employers to follow, given that it was novel legislation and there was a degree of opposition to it when it was introduced.

Over the years the legislation has changed. It has evolved and grown. We have seen the workers compensation scheme develop. As I said, in the course of researching the bill I have heard and read some of the debates about workers compensation—contributions by members from both sides of the House when those changes occurred. The history of debate on the legislation is characterised by claim and counterclaim by all sides of politics. There is no doubt that nothing excites the unions and their representatives in this place more than changes to workers compensation. Similarly, there is no doubt that

nothing excites comments by employer groups and employers more than changes to this compensation. That is why I think we have seen some considerable and heated debate about it in the past.

One of the questions I have to ask, though, in relation to workers compensation is: why over the past 12 months have we seen continual efforts by the Labor government in Queensland to make workers compensation an election issue? WorkCover versus Comcare has been raised by the minister and by the member for Waterford on a number of occasions this year. Most recently we saw WorkChoices raised by the minister in this House. I suppose it is an election year and I suppose we can expect to see these things being raised. I have to say to the minister—and I do not know whether he will be gratified to hear this—that these issues are having an impact out there. I was at an information booth on Saturday morning and was asked a question about journey claims in relation to WorkCover and Comcare. As I said earlier, the coalition will be supporting this legislation. It certainly is a live issue that is being debated in some areas. I guess it is no wonder that the Labor government chooses the election campaign as the time to try to ramp up the issue.

This legislation follows a process of review. Mr Jim Kennedy was commissioned in March 2007 to provide a limited report to the minister on the financial sustainability of the WorkCover insurance scheme. It is on the basis of that report that the minister has introduced this legislation to change the benefits payable to injured workers, dependants and others who might be entitled under the workers compensation legislation. I have not seen that Kennedy report. I am not sure if it has been made publicly available; I have not been able to find it anywhere. I do ask the minister if he will table that report so that members can inform themselves about the basis for these amendments. It is a limited report that I think goes to some of the underlying financial assumptions about the future capacity of the fund to meet future claims.

Queensland should feel proud to have one of the best workers compensation systems in Australia. WorkCover Queensland already charges employers the lowest premiums on average, and this bill will continue to benefit Queensland businesses by maintaining lower average premiums. Benefits payable to Queensland employees who are unfortunately injured at work are also extremely generous. Who do the workers and employers of Queensland have to thank for the happy state of affairs that they enjoy? It is none other than the Queensland coalition! We must remember that it was not that long ago that Queensland's workers compensation system did everything but look after our state's employers and employees.

Only 11 short years ago, Queensland's workers compensation scheme under a coalition government took its first steps on the road to recovery after years of neglect under a Goss led Labor government. It was only after the 1995 state election that the parlous state of WorkCover was slowly revealed. Despite rigorous questioning at estimates committee hearings, the Goss Labor government refused to come clean and reveal the extent of the unfunded liabilities for future claims against the fund. When the truth came out it became apparent that over a period of two years the scheme went from being fully funded to horrendously underfunded, putting workers at risk of having no compensation payments for injuries sustained at work, putting employers at risk of continually spiralling increases in premiums and putting employment and future growth of the state at risk. That was the legacy of the Goss Labor government in 1995.

It is not just me saying that. In fact, many people say that. The report of WorkCover Queensland entitled *Status review: the successful balance* states—

In the mid 1990s, the Queensland workers' compensation system was entrenched in a bureaucratic minefield of drawn out claims decision making time frames, with premium rates among the highest in Australia and yet a crippling $320 million deficit. The scheme was barely surviving in an environment of complex procedures and lengthy approval processes.

Besieged by complaints from all sections of the workers' compensation 'community'—injured workers, employers, lawyers, the medical profession and others—the State Government established an Inquiry, headed by Queensland businessman Jim Kennedy ... His subsequent report, tabled in Parliament in July 1996, made 79 recommendations and was the catalyst for major reform of the Queensland workers' compensation scheme.

...

A prime goal of the recommendations was to create a fund that should compare 'favourably' with other states.

It created WorkCover and went on to provide the premiums and the funding that was necessary to get the scheme back in the black. Coincidental was the coalition's agreement to fund, out of consolidated revenue, the moneys necessary to bring that system back into the black.

What did the coalition do to make sure that workers could rely on a fair compensation system and that employers were not victims of Labor's increased-premiums-at-any-cost policy that was evident at the time? In 1996 the newly elected coalition government established the commission of inquiry to be headed by Queensland businessman Jim Kennedy to investigate the potential extent of unfunded liabilities of the then Workers Compensation Board of Queensland. This is the same Jim Kennedy who has carried out another two reports into the scheme, the same Jim Kennedy who was pilloried in speech after speech by Labor members when the new legislation was brought in during 1996. He was described as an employer's representative and it was said that he was only interested in the employer's side of things and that he would not be able to put the scheme forward. This is the same Jim Kennedy who has just released the

report the minister is now relying on in terms of providing the additional benefits proposed by this legislation.

Even the history page on WorkCover Queensland's web site describes the Workers Compensation Board as a government owned, debt-riddled and poorly performing bureaucracy which Mr Kennedy was given the tough challenge of turning into a commercial business. When Mr Kennedy handed over the report six months after he had been commissioned to carry out his investigations he discovered $320 million in unfunded liabilities and recommended a total of 79 changes to the current scheme. Among the most significant amendments Kennedy recommended was the abolition of the Workers Compensation Board, which was to be replaced by a fully independent statutory authority known as WorkCover Queensland. Out of 79 changes, 73 were incorporated in the Workcover Queensland Act 1996 giving Queensland's workers compensation system a much-needed makeover.

It was certainly interesting to read the contributions by members of the House at that time in relation to those amendments and changes. I think they were probably pretty strenuous times for everyone who was in the House at the time. I do note the contribution made by the member for—

Mr Bombolas: Chatsworth.

Mr NICHOLLS: No, but I am looking forward to the member for Chatsworth making a contribution. The member for Gladstone was placed in a very difficult position at that time. She saw that there was a dire need for work to be done to re-establish the scheme on a solid financial footing to provide cover, but she was torn by the obvious concerns of her constituents—in the main, people who would be covered by workers compensation. At that time she had to strike a very difficult balance in the face of, I am sure, some fairly fierce lobbying from all sides.

So 73 of the 79 changes that Kennedy recommended were incorporated into the WorkCover Queensland Act 1996, giving Queensland's workers compensation system a much-needed makeover. In the first year, Queensland's new government owned, commercially run statutory authority had already improved from a $320 million deficit to a deficit of just $126 million—a recovery of $194 million. In just one year, a Queensland coalition government was able to do what a Labor government had failed to do year after year—that is, provide Queensland workers with a viable workplace compensation system.

In 1998 the then member for Clayfield, Santo Santoro, summed up Queensland's workers compensation system after years of being ignored and hidden by a Labor government.

Government members interjected.

Mr NICHOLLS: How did I know that saying that would raise those comments? My colleagues over in the Annexe owe me money. I said that I would get a reaction in fewer than three seconds when I said something like that. I have won! I would like to thank all members opposite for enabling me to walk out of this place a richer person this evening. I know that their contribution to the Clayfield re-election fund will be well and truly appreciated.

In 1998 Santo Santoro summed up Queensland's workers compensation system after years of being ignored and hidden by a Labor government. He said—

The coalition in Opposition, supported by both big and small business, continually warned the then Goss Labor Government of the deleterious effects of its policies on the state of the fund. These warnings were continually ignored by the Goss Labor Government—so much so that in June 1995 the Workers Compensation Board of Queensland, under Labor's administration, reported a deficit of $114.3m. Within 12 months this reported unfunded liability spiralled to $319.8m, due largely to a sharp increase in the number of common law claims and Labor's mismanagement.

Sitting suspended from 1.01 pm to 2.30 pm.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Hoolihan): Before calling the member for Clayfield, I would like to acknowledge in the gallery teachers, parents and students from Calliope State School in the electorate of Gladstone, which is represented in this House by Liz Cunningham.

Mr NICHOLLS: The member for Gladstone I think it might be. Did you say Calliope?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I said Calliope State School in the electorate of Gladstone.

Mr NICHOLLS: I join you in welcoming them, Mr Deputy Speaker. It is a pleasure to have schoolchildren here.

Mr Bombolas: Stick to the script.

Mr NICHOLLS: I take that interjection from the member for Chatsworth. There is no autocue available here.

Just before the luncheon adjournment, I was informing the House of the great work that the Queensland coalition had done in 1997 and 1998 to bring the Queensland workers compensation scheme to a state where it would be able to be fully funded after years of being run into the ground by the Goss Labor government.

Ms Struthers: You're kidding!

Mr NICHOLLS: There are obviously some members who were not in the House before lunch and who were not paying attention to their TV screens while in their office. It probably warrants being repeated now that I know people are a little unsure of what happened.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I would remind the member about repetition.

Mr NICHOLLS: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. The scheme was $320 million in debt, in unfunded liabilities, in 1996. It was the coalition government that introduced the new scheme which enabled the WorkCover board to put in place policies to ensure there was a fully funded scheme so that the workers of Queensland, if injured at work, were fairly and reasonably compensated. That was the work of the Queensland coalition government. The minister who introduced that was my predecessor but one, Santo Santoro.

Government members interjected.

Mr NICHOLLS: I cannot keep collecting from my colleagues in relation to the responses I get from members opposite when I mention that name.

What we have seen is the coalition acting to preserve workers' rights, to make sure they have adequate compensation and to make sure that employers are not driven to the wall by ever-increasing and spiralling premiums. We have seen it happen time and time again that a coalition government has to come in and fix up the mistakes of Labor. We saw it with the workers compensation scheme, we saw it with the repayment of Labor's $96 billion worth of debt, we saw it with Labor's $10 billion black hole and we saw it with the unemployment rate, which the coalition had to fix up federally. Time and time again it is the coalition that is required to do the hard yards, to do the hard work and to apply the intellectual rigour that is necessary to ensure the people of Queensland and Australia are well protected moving into the future.

This bill follows that lead of the coalition. It is interesting to note that there have been some changes to it. There were changes in 1999 upon the re-election of a Labor government in terms of the definition of 'injury' and the definition of 'worker'. I think there were some issues in relation to deafness and industrial hearing accidents as well as—

Mr Moorhead interjected.

Mr NICHOLLS: Mr Deputy Speaker, they are so keen to speak, I can just feel it! There were also some issues in relation to journey claims. The member for Waterford has been banging on about it over there and really going at it hammer and tongs. I was going to get to it, member for Waterford. I was going to give him credit where credit was due. He should just hold his horses. There is a spirit of generosity that those on that side of the House would not be used to but which I am willing to extend to the member for Waterford on the way through. So journey claims were also introduced. The person who was asked to look at those issues was again Mr Kennedy—the same Mr Kennedy who was pilloried by the then opposition when the legislation was brought in in 1997 to establish WorkCover and to bring the scheme back on track in terms of its ability to meet its requirements, including its prudential requirements.

The legislation that we have now, the Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Act 2003, brought in other changes. But the essence of the scheme had been in place since 1997, when the board was put in place. The 2003 amendments created Q-COMP as a separate regulatory authority but maintained the essence of the scheme with WorkCover. It maintained the principles of running it on a commercial basis but without the necessity for a commercial return to provide the best service that it possibly can for Queensland employees and to make sure that they are adequately covered.

That leads me to my next point, which is the basis for the changes that we are talking about today and their financial sustainability. I turn to the annual report for WorkCover Queensland of 2006-07. There are some figures in that report which I think need some explanation. Perhaps the parliamentary secretary and the minister can provide some clarification on these figures. I do not pretend to have any particular insight into how these figures are recorded in the business of workers compensation insurance, but I do note that the gross claims expense in 2006-07 has increased from $144 million to $1.126179 billion in the course of a year. Page 46 of the document refers to outstanding claims liability of $1,565.5 million. It then goes on to say that the sufficiency remains unchanged at 80 per cent of the Australian Prudential Regulatory Authority rate, but that seems to be an enormous increase in claims expense that has been recorded from one year to another. In fact, that has led to an increase in the net claims incurred to just over $1 billion, from $231 million the previous year. That has led to an underwriting result, according to this, of a loss of $323 million as opposed to a benefit of $576 million in 2006.

Equally, it is interesting to see that, without the benefit of the investment income of $411 million in 2006-07, which is the year this annual report is prepared, the operating result would have been substantially worse than the $82 million that has been recorded there. I also looked at the return on investments figure, which shows, I think, a 14.1 per cent return on investment for 2006-07 and a 14.3 per cent return the year before. Quite clearly, the fund has been operating at a supercharged level of return on its investments. Quite clearly, those returns on investments have been used to underscore the operating results on page 48, which has led to that $82 million operating result before paying tax equivalents to the

state government. If we had not had that supercharged result in terms of the return on investments, this scheme would have had a negative operating result for the year.

I understand that the scheme contains a reserve and it allows for fluctuations. Some years are better and some years are worse, but I have to say that gross claims expense, that increase in net claims incurred and the reliance on that investment income to continue at its current rate are, I think, sufficiently concerning to ask the question and to seek an explanation. There may very well be an explanation that makes perfect sense. I would be grateful if the minister could provide us with that information.

When we consider the benefits that are being proposed by this legislation—and some of them are quite substantial in terms of increases—it is important to understand that the fund has the capacity to be able to continue to meet those obligations into the future. We have not seen Mr Kennedy's report to the minister. That is one issue that needs clarification at the very least.

I would also ask whether the most recent Kennedy report to the minister actually takes into account a lower rate of return—whether they work on the board factoring in an average rate of return of seven per cent rather than working on currents all the time. So they base their futures on a steady state rather than the supercharged or super bad version. I ask for clarification on those issues.

If we look at the figures, the question that necessarily has to be asked is whether the minister can guarantee that the changes that are being proposed in this legislation so far as they relate to workers compensation and the payments regime will be sustainable and for how long into the future they will be sustainable and whether they will require an increase in premiums or whether it is hoped that premiums can be reduced. Further, when answering those questions can the minister explain whether there is an opportunity to reduce premiums as well. The last two sets of changes to the workers compensation scheme have increased the benefits for employees quite substantially. Over that time the premium has been reduced. Is the minister looking at options for the board to be able to announce reductions in premiums, acknowledging that the board has reduced premiums quite substantially over the past three or four years?

We believe that these changes will benefit the employers and employees. We think they are good changes. They will help to ensure that the system continues to provide benefits and rehabilitation programs for injured employees and for the premiums to be maintained at a low level and perhaps continually kept low.

Queensland WorkCover is currently the only scheme that manages claims in-house. It has maintained the lowest rates in Australia for the past seven years. I am happy to give credit where credit is due in that respect. Currently, Queensland experiences an average premium rate of $1.15 for every $100 in wages paid with a reduction of 3c—I think it claims to be three per cent in the annual report but it is 3c according to the information provided in the briefing—for employers who make the payment in full at the beginning of the period in which the insurance is first sought. It is a benefit for early payment or prompt payment of the full year's claims. There are a variety of methods for claims being made. I seek clarification from the minister of whether it is 3c or three per cent. The figure given to me was $1.15 reduced to $1.12. That reduction in premiums has been achieved by controlling expenses, concentrating on rehabilitation and return-to-work initiatives, and through the income received from investment by WorkCover.

I turn to the provisions of the bill. Clauses 8 through 12 amend sections 150 to 159 by removing the one- and two-year step down of the benefit entitlements for injured workers from 26 weeks to two years, improving the amount of compensation received by employees. Currently, employees receive 85 per cent of their normal weekly earnings or 80 per cent of Queensland ordinary time earnings for their first 26 weeks under the scheme. This then drops to 75 per cent and 70 per cent respectively for the following 26 weeks—that is to the end of the first year. Then the next year it drops to 65 per cent and 60 per cent respectively, which continues form the beginning of the third year to the fifth year if it can be demonstrated that the injury could lead to a work related impairment of 15 per cent or more. I have to say that I thought I got out of the law.

Mr Lawlor interjected.

Mr NICHOLLS: After they told me how the member for Southport leaving had benefited the legal profession and its insurance premiums I thought it was of benefit that I got out as well.

By removing the step-down periods and averaging out the benefit entitlements to 75 per cent of the normal weekly earnings or 70 per cent Queensland OTEs not only is the system simplified for employees but injured workers are assured a steady, reliable income during the period that they are incapacitated. That is a good thing. If the scheme can afford to do that and if the economy can afford to do that then there is no reason that it cannot be done and should not be done.

There are also benefits to employees from clause 7, which reduces the length of time within which WorkCover can accept or reject statutory claims. There is currently a 40-day period for normal claims and a 60-day period for psychiatric claims. Those time frames have been reduced to 20 days. The minister indicated in his second reading speech that those time frames are regularly being met by WorkCover. I think that is a good thing. If we can do that and make it payable faster I think that is fine, provided we are

not sacrificing any rigour in the assessment of those claims because injured workers still have bills to pay and mouths to feed and they rely on that income to come through.

Clause 16 amends section 192, which increases the maximum lump sum compensation payable for employees with physical injuries from $182,620 to $218,400. I am not sure whether that is the current figure. A different figure was given to us in the briefing. That is the figure that is in the explanatory notes. It reduces the work related impairment threshold from 50 per cent to 30 per cent. I think that is the first time that has been reduced in quite some time.

Amongst other significant benefits to workers is clause 15, which inserts new chapter 3, allowing insurers to advance lump sum compensation to a worker experiencing financial hardship without that worker having to make an election in relation to a future claim for damages for the injury that they suffered. They can get payment while they are making their decision as to whether they need to make a claim for damages outside the compensation scheme provided for in the act.

I have a question in relation to clause 18 of the bill. Clause 18 repeals section 203. Section 203 currently provides for a reduction in the amount payable on death. It says that the section applies if any of the payments have been made for an injury sustained by a worker that resulted in the worker's death and the payment of compensation, redemption payment and payment of lump sum. That follows what we would say are the normal insurance principles that a person cannot recover twice. If a person has an insurance premium and they receive a lump sum they cannot then receive payments on account of that lump sum. The full amount of the entitlement reduces it. The new clause reduces it. I am sure that will be warmly accepted, but I ask about the rationale behind that and why that change is being made. Why does the government consider that section 203, which provides for the normal insurance principle of reduction, should not apply? I ask the government to provide information as to why it feels clause 203 should no longer apply.

The other important step that the legislation takes in assisting to keep premiums low and to help workers get back to work is to concentrate on some new rehabilitation and return-to-work initiatives. Clauses 25 through to 27 provide a general direction to Q-COMP to have a greater focus on the administration of scheme-wide rehabilitation and return-to-work programs. This bill also sees—and I was given this figure in the briefing—about $500,000 a year being allocated to the rehabilitation and return-to-work programs.

In the amendments being put forward there is amendment to the powers of the minister. It enables the minister to give a direction as to who is a suitable scheme provider of that service. I would be interested in knowing whether the minister can enlighten us as to who he believes would be a provider of those scheme-wide rehabilitation and return-to-work programs. Are they run through trade and technical organisations or run through the unions? Who will run those schemes? Who will receive the payments for carrying out those schemes? Based on the information that we have received in the briefing, there is no good reason not to support those. I have also spoken to quite a few of the groups involved in the consultation process and note that there is fairly widespread industry and community support in terms of those issues.

Turning to the Workplace Health and Safety Act, this really sees national standards for licensing adopted to bring the Queensland legislation into line with the health and safety standards already being rolled out in other jurisdictions. It establishes a licensing review committee under clause 60 of the legislation. That brings the act into line with the disciplinary system provided for in the Electrical Safety Act 2000 which already has a similar type of committee called the Electrical Licensing Committee which is in charge of disciplinary actions against licence holders.

There are quite a number of sections—sections 64A through to 64ZA—which set out the role of the Licensing Review Committee which basically follow the role of the Electrical Licensing Committee in regulating the decisions made and disciplinary actions taken. I will not go through them all because they have been pretty well covered in the legislation. It provides powers to the committee to follow procedures for a fair course of investigation. There were some issues raised in relation to transparency and concerns about the investigations being carried out by various investigators. This legislation overcomes those concerns and brings some transparency to the process in terms of those investigations.

It also provides an opportunity to seek to appeal a decision of the licensing committee to the Industrial Court if someone feels aggrieved by that decision. There are some other changes in relation to a head of power to regulate occupational licences for workers aged 18 and over. Currently, those are dealt with under a contractual system. That contractual system is being phased out and is being replaced by the national standard—that is, the national standard for the licensing of persons performing high-risk work. What an exciting and inventive name that is! That brings Queensland's legislation into alignment with the standard already being sought at the national level.

There are some provisions which the honourable member for Surfers Paradise will address in relation to clause 72 of the legislation which inserts a new section 185D for information sharing between state authorities. In the past we have seen instances with amusement rides and fairgrounds where an

accident or an event has occurred in another state that is not necessarily recorded in the history of people who are applying for licences in Queensland, and this allows—that is the ready example—for that information to be shared so that if there is something wrong in another state it can be reported to us. Equally, if there is something that we in Queensland have concerns about we can report it to other states. Given the movement of carnivals and those sorts of things, that is a worthwhile and sensible amendment to make.

There are some changes directly affecting the Electrical Safety Act in relation to the obligations of licence holders and their employers. I seek some clarification of that. We did go through it in the briefing, but I want to be clear. At the moment, to carry out electrical work an electrical contractor must be licensed, but what about if electrical work is being carried out as part of some other broad sort of work—say, a house being built and someone wiring in a security system and a fire alarm system and perhaps doing some other electrical work? I seek clarification as to whether the building contractor himself must have the necessary licence or whether the electrical contractors themselves can have that licence. I seek clarification of that particular point—that is, the circumstances in which the new licence proposed by the legislation would be required. Does that mean that, for example, a registered builder who has the appropriate licences under the legislation would also be required to have some other form of licence in relation to the installation of electrical fittings, devices and goods in those circumstances? The work itself still has to be carried out by the appropriate licence holders, and there are some other consequential changes which bring that in. There are some consequential changes to the Industrial Relations Act in relation to record keeping so that employers must keep their records for five years. That brings the act into line with tax legislation in terms of record keeping.

There is quite a raft of changes. The most significant ones are the ones in relation to workers compensation and the benefits that are being afforded. Obviously the scheme is producing a good return on its investments. Obviously the scheme has been managed well since the catalyst year of 1997. There may be some differences in some parts of the philosophy in terms of the definitions of ‘worker’ and those things, but I think most would agree that it is providing benefits. It is continuing to be well run. In light of those latest WorkCover figures, the concern is that the capacity is still there and the presentation of Mr Kennedy’s report to the minister carried out after March this year would go some way to alleviating any residual concerns that people might have. As I said earlier, the coalition will be very happy to support this legislation’s passage through the House.