

CORRECTED VERSION

RURAL AND REGIONAL COMMITTEE

Inquiry into the opportunities for people to use telecommuting and e-business to work remotely in rural and regional Victoria

Melbourne — 28 October 2013

Members

Mr D. Drum
Mr G. Howard
Mr A. Katos

Mr I. Trezise
Mr P. Weller

Chair: Mr P. Weller
Deputy Chair: Mr G. Howard

Staff

Executive Officer: Ms L. Topic
Research Officer: Mr P. O'Brien

Witnesses

Mr P. Wilson, chair,

Mr P. Begley, national manager, government and media relations, Australian Human Resources Institute.

The CHAIR — Welcome, Peter and Paul, to the Rural and Regional Committee of the Parliament in Victoria inquiry into the opportunity for people to use telecommuting and e-business to work remotely in rural and regional Victoria. I hereby advise that all evidence taken at this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege as provided under relevant Australian law. I also advise that any comments made outside the hearing may not be afforded such privilege. For the benefit of Hansard, could you both give your name and business address?

Mr WILSON — Sure. My full name is Peter Snowden Wilson, and I am the chairman of the Australian Human Resources Institute at level 13, 565 Bourke Street, Melbourne.

Mr BEGLEY — And I am Paul Begley, level 13, 565 Bourke Street, Melbourne — the same.

The CHAIR — Good. Would you like questions during your presentation or at the end?

Mr WILSON — I am happy to take it either way, Chair. We have an about 11-page submission here, and I thought that if you were comfortable, I could just go and pick out some of the high notes. If the honourable members want to ask me questions during that, that is fine, or at the end — whatever you would like to do, basically.

The CHAIR — All right. You lead off. Thank you.

Mr WILSON — Okay. We see this as telework, and it is certainly providing services remotely to businesses. This is quite an important topic, and the background to that is that in 2010 my institute, which is the leading professional institute for human resources practitioners, set up a steering committee of about half a dozen top HR directors from leading companies to look at where the world of work was going and what was driving that and how we should respond to it. It covered a lot of factors, including the changing demographics — more participation of women — but also the desire for more flexible work.

In saying that, I suppose IT developments have enabled a distinction in the workplace which has become more important now — the difference between independent work, where we can work by ourselves, wherever we happen to find that, and interdependent work, where you need to work together. It used to occur in one building, and in some places — like question time in the house — it has to be in the one building; everybody has to see and hear what is going on. But for a lot of work patterns you can work independently, including late at night. ‘Telework’ is the term, but it is about the technology around enabling that. It has become very popular.

On page 2 of our submission we start to quote the SmartCompany research, which has a hyperlink there, and also the Australian Communications and Media Authority. About half of the adult workforce are working away from home, either out of hours or during hours with permission, and they are doing this because the technology enables it — not just working remotely but being connected. The question is: how does that work? What are the issues? The demand, certainly, for people with greater work-life balance or if they are working in a remote area is that they want to be able to work that way where it is independent work, not interdependent work.

Clearly smaller businesses have difficulty with doing that. If you picture an organisation with 10 people, you do not have the diversity in a lot of jobs to enable people not to be there. We found, as shown at the top of page 3, that 39 per cent of employers with less than 20 staff allowed their employees to work from home at least one day a week. As the businesses get bigger, the proportion of businesses that allow that increases, which is quite unsurprising when you think of the diversity of the workforce.

The benefits, which we show in the middle of page 3 with the dot points, include that it improves flexibility. We also have work on distraction factors at work, and clearly being at home by yourself, if you are in the right mindset, means you can focus and get things done more effectively than you can with all the clatter going on at work, interruptions and the like.

The disadvantages are there, but they are not as considerable. Access to communication is an issue. Clearly in country areas access to high-quality telecommunication connections is an issue. Lines dropping out on you or being unclear and those sorts of problems are stronger in remote areas than in city areas. Twenty per cent found reduced access to colleagues to be a problem in terms of interdependent work. When you need to work in groups, if you are working remotely you basically cannot do that or you can do it via Skype or a connection that is not as easy.

In some instances it affects mental health. The mental health stats say that one in five adults has some sort of mental health illness each year and one in two in their working lifetime. Top of the pops is anxiety, followed by depression. Clearly part of the issue in the workplace is the connected space you are in when you are at work dealing with colleagues. That can be quite important if there is a mental health issue. It is not a one-way street. We are not here today to tell you that telework is a marvellous opportunity, everybody should take it on and there are no problems with it. There are some issues, and that is one that has come out in our research.

Going on to page 4, there have been a number of commentators come into the space. We quoted a Thomson Reuters report, in which a colleague of ours, one of my senior members, Martin Nally, who now runs his own group called hranywhere — he was also formerly the HR director for Coles and Kmart, so he has run very large organisations — makes the point that part of evolving social attitudes, particularly amongst younger people, is that they are after a bit of slack in how they work. They will get the job done, but they see work and life merging together, and they want some ability to operate flexibly, and that sometimes means working away from the workplace. That is the main point there.

What are some of the impediments? I cover this on page 5. Clearly — and I just touched on it — unreliable technological access, lines dropping out, lack of high-quality access and download times being too slow are the obvious ones. There is also an issue in leadership and management in organisations. All of us like to feel connected and appreciated for what we do, and when you have people working remotely that can be difficult. Particularly with an old command-and-control leadership structure it is very difficult because one of the keys to working remotely and well is having an engaging and inclusive work style where people know that even though they are away for a time they are supported, and I will come to that particular issue later on.

It does not fit everybody. Marissa Mayer, the new CEO of Yahoo!, has banned remote work at Yahoo!, and so has Google. They are prominent names and purveyors of modern technology, and they have taken the view — wrongly, many would argue — that for interdependent work, socialising and being in a very creative space you need to be together and cannot be working alone. There is another view that having some flexibility in working from home makes sense, but Yahoo! and Google have taken the view that that is not for them. I think there are different views amongst employers, but by and large the evidence of our members — we have 20 000 members, including 500 of Australia's leading companies — is that they have all, consistent with the new national employment standards, moved to provide flexible work options for their people, which includes working from home.

There is an issue, which we have been one of the few to stress, that came out in the 2011 Queensland Telstra case, where a female worker who had permission to work from home three days a week was at home and — imagine this — was wearing fluffy slippers on a polished wood staircase, heard the phone ringing in the kitchen downstairs, ran downstairs and tumbled. She caused herself a permanent injury and had mental health problems as a result. Telstra, one of the great advocates of the benefits of telework, ultimately retrenched her, and she took a successful case to Fair Work Australia to get compensation for the balance of her working life.

The point I have made, which I cover at the bottom of page 8 in a quote I made to the *Financial Review*, is that telework carries with it a right of people to work at home and an obligation to do that work but also a right and obligation on employers. Part of the obligation is similar to that in remote working areas, which as members of Parliament you would know about, seeing it in your own areas, whether it is someone working remotely on a farm or at a mine: there is an obligation on the employer to always provide a fit and proper workplace. If you give somebody permission to work from home, my understanding of employment law is that the employer has an obligation to check that the employment space, whether it be the kitchen or the study or whatever, is fit for purpose; to do occupational health and safety audits; and to provide some support for the people working from home, who might have saved themselves 2 or 3 hours a day commuting and may be working more productively. But it is not just a one-way street. There is an obligation to check that it is a fit and proper place to work so that situations like the Telstra case are avoided where possible.

Mr HOWARD — In regard to the Telstra case, I imagine an employer, if it is doing the right thing, as we have heard from others, will want to see a photo, if it cannot see physically, of the place where the person is going to work — that they have an ergonomic chair or something. This particular example you have raised is a bit outside that. You would not necessarily think you would ask, 'Are you going to be wearing fluffy slippers? Are you going to have to move from an upstairs place to a downstairs place?', so how do you deal with those

sorts of things that are outside the general sphere of what you would expect to be and what you normally think of in the workplace as being the office or whatever the person has established in their home?

Mr WILSON — There is no certainty here. I have formerly been head of safety for Amcor and also for ANZ bank, and one of the things you do as part of the safety imperative is have workshops and discussions amongst people in different types of workplaces about what the likely risks are. At Amcor we had a discussion and one of the executive assistants said, ‘I’m concerned that the high winds in the car park might blow over one of the conifers and hit somebody’, and she was laughed at. Then two weeks later they did have high winds and a tree crushed a Toyota Corolla, so they got on to mitigating the risk with the trees around the car park.

People at the coalface of work have marvellous capacity to see the risks. It might not have been the woman in the fluffy slippers who came down the stairs, but clearly if you had a focus group about working from home, talking about the sorts of risks and the things that can happen — the risk of slippery floors, coming out of a bathroom, hearing a work phone downstairs when you are upstairs — you would certainly act to mitigate and eliminate the primary risks. You will not eliminate them, but you act to mitigate them by discussion and sensible training. I am talking about one or two days a year, in a 220-day working year, when an employer could facilitate this amongst workers and get rid of a lot of the primary risks of working at home. It is not failsafe, but the evidence from oil and gas platforms, where people work alone, or from those working on trail bikes rounding up sheep, is that there are certain behaviours that employers go through in those situations, talking to people on the trail bike or on the rig about how they conduct themselves when they are alone. It has proven to be quite positive for improving safety records.

Mr DRUM — I feel very strongly about this. I have heard that businesses can now effectively be held liable for the conditions within someone’s house. I cannot get over the fact that it is okay for that person to live safely in that house, but now that they have put their baby to sleep and have to go online for 3 or 4 hours to do some work for a local accountant all of a sudden the risks that are associated with living in that house now rest with the accountant, the bank or whoever the employer is. To me that seems so wrong. In a practical sense, it seems literally wrong that the risk that is associated with any house, on any day of the year and at any time of night, all of a sudden now transfers from the individual over to an employer. Are you effectively saying that that is the law?

Mr WILSON — I am effectively saying it will be challenged more and more. I am not saying what you have said. You have said ‘every risk in a house, 24/7, 365’. I am not saying that. I am saying that if an employer deems the study of someone working from home as part of the workplace, they have an obligation to do for that part of the workplace what they do at the office, which is to look at the risks of undertaking the sort of work the employee is going through and, as appropriate, look at the potential risks and consequences of that and work with the employee to mitigate them. They have sanctioned the home for that purpose, not for looking after kids and making meals but for doing some valuable work that they agree to. That is the right. They want the work done there, they do not want that person to travel 3 hours along the car parks we call freeways. They want them to work at home, safe and sound, and do independent work, and there is an obligation that flows from that. That is all.

Mr DRUM — But again, the example you raised seems a very extreme example — —

Mr WILSON — The Telstra case?

Mr DRUM — Yes.

Mr WILSON — I do not think so. I do not think it is extreme it all.

Mr DRUM — The fluffy slippers coming down the stairs?

Mr WILSON — Yes. Without training, people will act at home in the way they act at home. In that case the lady obviously enjoyed wearing fluffy slippers and she was pleased with her polished floorboard staircase — that is what she chose to live in, and that is perfectly fine. Every Australian homeowner makes a choice. However, at the point at which an employer says, ‘This is now part of the workplace’, those combinations of characteristics when someone is at work take on quite a different perspective.

Mr DRUM — So if I went for a swim at lunchtime and slipped over on the wet tiles, is that my employer's responsibility?

Mr WILSON — According to law, your journey to work is excluded for OHS liability, but when you are at the workplace, it is. I have practised basketball at lunchtime; a colleague of mine slipped over, and he put in a workplace claim because he was in the grounds of the workplace. There are other cases I have heard where people have stumbled on a curb and broken their leg when they have gone to buy some lunch outside of the workplace. They are at work, 9.00 to 5.00.

Mr DRUM — I understand, but it is also a little bit like when the boss takes the team down to the pub on a Friday night and shouts drinks and all of a sudden he takes over responsibility for their behaviour after they have had too many drinks. I have this innate sense that we have gone way too far with this.

Mr WILSON — I personally think the business regulatory load is too great in this country. I am not advocating for more legislative statutes to solve the problems of working from home, but I am keen for employers to understand their general obligation that if they want the benefits of the right of deeming home to be part of their workplace, they need to look at what that means and the consequences of that for their employees. If they are derelict in that duty, they may well bear a consequence.

Mr HOWARD — Just to follow up then, we did not see the court ruling to see why the court ruled as it did, but you have looked at it, so do you think the outcome may have been different if the employer could have shown that they had discussed those risks and attempted to mitigate them?

Mr WILSON — Absolutely. I have had to defend in court serious lost time injuries, and in a couple of instances, regrettably, some fatalities that occurred in the workplace under my employer's purview. The courts put significant store in changing not so much the outcome but the nature of the remedy and the reasonable efforts the employer has made to recognise, understand and manage the risks, as opposed to flagrantly ignoring them. That has always been how the courts work.

The CHAIR — All right.

Mr WILSON — I do not think this is going to change. There is a desire for people to work from home as cities get bigger, and as more remote working is encouraged by governments — people living in the country and country life — we are going to see more remote work, because so many issues in the workplace can be carried over these devices or their equivalent devices. People want that. They want the flexibility of the software power that comes on these things, and they want the flexibility that means that whether they put this down in this room or in the kitchen, they can still work on it. People are voting with their feet that they want the flexibility of remote working, and all we are trying to say is that employers and society need to understand the conditions that act around that. A woman was walking along with a pram in a shopping centre where there was a wet floor — this is another case we have had recently — the work phone went off and she slipped and injured her head.

The CHAIR — Given that teleworking has come in over the last — —

Mr WILSON — Five to 10 years.

The CHAIR — Five to 10 years. It probably came in after the Occupational Health and Safety Act was written. Does the Occupational Health and Safety Act need a review given that our workplaces have become more flexible?

Mr WILSON — Possibly. I am not as concerned about that, because what these cases are coming up with is around the fundamental fiduciary duty of an employer to provide a safe, fit and proper workplace for their employees. That standard is already there.

The CHAIR — So it has to be safe, fit — —

Mr WILSON — And proper.

The CHAIR — For companies or businesses that are going to allow their employees to telework, is there a checklist they have to go through?

Mr WILSON — There is. If you look on the WorkCare or WorkCover websites, there are practice guides on dealing with work remotely. There is stuff available from consultants and others about the standards and the checklists you go through. The problem is that it is clearly having difficulty getting through to smaller businesses, which have enough difficulty coping with all the regulatory stuff they have to comply with anyway. Largely businesses read the Telstra case, and there are alerts from lawyers and others of what the current principles and legislation mean for us and what we need to do. There is a reasonableness in the principle — the quid pro quo of right and obligation. If you want someone to work from home, you should have a bit of a look and see what it looks like.

Mr KATOS — I suppose it is about where that line is drawn that is the issue, because you can think of all manner of examples. For example, you might have an employee who smokes. They have a break to go and smoke outside their house; there is a crack in the path outside the house and they trip. Where does the employer's obligation start and stop? Is there a need to tighten these regulations or to be a bit more prescriptive in what is going on? What is the solution? Otherwise where does the employer start and stop in their inspection of an employee's home?

Mr WILSON — That is where the shade of grey is. It is like leaving an office, going across the road to get a sandwich, tripping on the kerb and breaking your ankle. You are out of work, but it is still a WorkCare claim under the current legislation. If an employer has deemed a place a place for work to be done, I think outside the house, within the property boundary, could reasonably be included in that. Why? Because people go outside for better reception to take a call. They cannot get proper reception inside. Or if they are tired, it is stuffy in the house and they want to feel a bit better, they will walk outside. If they go into the street, again, it is arguable that that is included if it is an adjacent area to where they are working and they are on work time. I do not know that it needs legislation, but it does need strong practice notes and advice to companies to be aware that these are the risks you are taking on the things you should look at. The principles are already covered well in the legislation.

Mr DRUM — However, I would suggest that of all the people who are working from home, for this argument, probably 90 per cent would be initiated by the worker and maybe 10 per cent would be initiated by the employer. So it would be me coming to you — —

Mr WILSON — Why do you say that?

Mr DRUM — I would suggest that most of these approaches seem to be getting made by the employee. I ask you for permission if I want to go and work from home. Then I have to convince you that if I am going to be able to do the work, I can be accountable and that everything at home is fine.

Mr WILSON — Yes.

Mr DRUM — As a committee our role is to try to convince managements across Victoria that this is a good thing they should be doing. However, the OHS act will act as a very considerable weight against management allowing this to happen.

Mr WILSON — If you go to the national employment standards, you are right, an employee can request more flexible work arrangements. They can do that. So long as that request is reasonable it can be granted. There is an obligation on the employers. They can reject it, but they have to demonstrate why it is unreasonable.

The onus of proof on who initiates it or who benefits from it is a bit grey there. If an employer has agreed to an aspect of workplace flexibility the courts would say that is arguably to the benefit of both parties. Otherwise why would they agree?

Mr KATOS — Back to my crack in the path, Peter. If, for example, an employer did that assessment and then went outside and said, 'Sorry, I'm knocking you back. You have a very large crack in the path out the front of your house, so I'm not going to let you work from home', would the employee then turn around and say, 'I'm going to take this further because that is ridiculous'? It works both ways there.

Mr WILSON — You could get that, but usually what happens on safety audits and workplace inspections is that you spot a crack in the path or others like it and you remedy it.

Mr KATOS — So it is a case of 'If you remedy that, we'll let you do it'?

Mr WILSON — Yes, because for the cost of \$200 fixing the path I am going to get about \$10 000 or \$15 000 of valuable work done by this person from home over the next year. That is what safety audits do: they do the cost-benefit analysis of mitigating the risks and eliminating likely problems. Now, that is obviously the thin end of the wedge. You have the person remedying their home — —

The CHAIR — That is what I was going to say. If you go back to the Telstra case, you are going to tell someone, ‘You can’t have your polished boards on the staircase, you have to have carpet’.

Mr WILSON — Or perhaps rubber-soled shoes.

Mr KATOS — Or do you have to put non-slip treads on your stairs?

Mr WILSON — Correct.

Mr KATOS — That is what I mean. Where does that — —

Mr WILSON — I do not know, but that is ultimately a matter for consensus between employer and employee. I have done a lot of workplace safety inspections and audits in offices, and there is usually a consensus on the type of chair you sit on, the period of rest break that you have, the lighting in the office. The employees raise the point, the employers look at it, see the consequences, get some ergonomic specialist in and fix it.

Mr KATOS — So in the Telstra case involving the stairs, if the employer had identified it and said, ‘We’ll let you work from home, but you have to wear non-slip shoes’, if the employee then chose to wear her fluffy slippers and run down the stairs, does that mean the employer is not responsible — if the agreement they made was, ‘We’ll let you work from home, but X, Y and Z has to be done’?

Mr WILSON — To a point, yes, because they have identified a risk. They have stated what they thought was reasonable behaviour. She has chosen not to follow it and has come to grief. That is employee responsibility in a workplace incident.

Mr BEGLEY — I want to just touch on a point that Damian raised before about the 90 per cent worker initiation.

Mr DRUM — It is just a number I plucked out of the air.

Mr BEGLEY — Yes, it is just a number — that 10 per cent are employer initiated — and that is fair enough. I think that would be a general view, but it is possibly changing. That paper that we mentioned by Martin Stewart-Weeks refers to the Macquarie Bank and the Commonwealth Bank, which have built new buildings with not enough space to contain the staff that they employ. The assumption behind that would seem to be that those people, who are staff members, were going to work somewhere else, and one would think that would be at home or something.

Mr DRUM — Or job share or something like that.

Mr BEGLEY — Yes, whatever it might be. So it could be a changing landscape, but I think you are right: in general that would be a view at the moment.

Mr DRUM — Yes. The evidence we have heard is that the attitude is changing and that people are becoming open and amenable to the concept of having employees work at home. But I just see this as being an enormous encumbrance upon this trend taking off.

Mr HOWARD — I just wanted to clarify that against one of the comments you made. I took it that you meant that you are satisfied that a lot of the larger employers that are now moving down this path to having staff work remotely are adopting good WorkSafe strategies.

Mr BEGLEY — Yes.

Mr HOWARD — And there is a lot of good practice out there already, but maybe amongst the smaller ones or a few of the larger ones that are moving down this path this is an issue that they have to clearly address and work more on.

Mr WILSON — That is correct, sir, yes.

Mr DRUM — Can I just look at it another way. This concept of an employee signing the employer clear of indemnity, have you had examples of this happening at all where the employee is very keen to go and do two days at home — because of the health of the kids, they can get the kids to and from school and they can get the work done — but the employer is very concerned and does not want to fix, say, the cracks in the footpath or anything else? Is there an ability for an employee to waive the responsibilities of the workplace?

Mr WILSON — I do not think so. I think maybe case precedents will test that out. I do not think you can contract off a fiduciary duty for a safe and proper workplace if you deem that is what it is. It is like saying a slippery floor next to a printing press can stay greasy because the employees want to work down there and they have taken the liability for it. I do not think that will be sustainable in a court, not if the employer has deemed it to be part of the workplace.

Mr DRUM — Not if the employer has deemed the whole house to be part of the workplace?

Mr WILSON — If they move through the whole house to work, yes.

Mr DRUM — But again on a practical level, let us say you are a writer for my newspaper. I do not want you in the office, I want you at home, but I am going to cover you for the office. I am going to make sure that your office is clean, that you have a good chair and a nice light, but I cannot cover you for the rest of the quarter-acre house, where you might step on a rake that has been left with the tines pointed upwards.

Mr WILSON — The missing piece for me there, sir, is whether they are also then going on and saying, as Yahoo and Google did, ‘You don’t work from home’. In other words, ‘I don’t think it’s a safe place to work from home, therefore you come into work to work’.

Mr DRUM — But Yahoo and Google are effectively saying their reason is that they need the collective creative minds to be bouncing off each other.

Mr WILSON — Yes.

Mr DRUM — That is fine. But what I am suggesting is that we have a real problem if employers out there are saying, ‘We would do this, but I’m not going to be responsible for you falling over in your house. I’m not going to take that responsibility, so you have to come into work’. This great opportunity will be missed because of what I see as a stupid aspect of an overregulatory burden on an employer.

Mr WILSON — You have half of the workforce doing it at least a day a week, and most of those would be the result of a reasonable request for workplace flexibility. To me that is not a pernicious regulatory burden; it is a situation that arises where a right that the employer has exercised with an employee to do the work there and provide a valuable service carries with it an obligation at the very least to go and have a look and to check that it is fit for purpose.

I just think that will be the sustainable principle in law around the workplace and workplace incidents, and employers need to open their eyes about that and respond to it. You cannot have one without the other.

The CHAIR — When you say ‘fit for purpose’, can you define that as just the office space being the work space, or does it have to be the whole house?

Mr WILSON — How long is a piece of string? That is the problem. The employer might have said, ‘All right, I’m deeming your work office, one of the six rooms in your house, to be part of the workplace’. The employee might have left their mobile phone on the other side of the slippery floor between that work office and where the phone is.

The CHAIR — The kitchen or something, yes.

Mr WILSON — The employee heads to it at a great rate of knots, slips over and causes an accident. I can see how workplace judges look at that and say, ‘Employer, you should have contemplated the risk related to being in a home and the person having things spread around related to work in a place that is safe for them’ and deeming that the employer did have a responsibility.

The CHAIR — I run a farm business, and I tell my people to put their helmet on when they are riding a motorbike.

Mr WILSON — I am sure you do.

The CHAIR — Why can’t the employer then tell the people, ‘You don’t run to get your phone’?

Mr WILSON — They can. It is just like the point we discussed before. If they have looked at the risk, workshopped it, talked to the employees and said, ‘Don’t run to get your phone. Walk quietly, and if you miss the call, that’s okay’ — if they have done that and it is very clearly laid out — —

The CHAIR — Documented.

Mr WILSON — Not regulation, but as between the employment relationship between the employer and employee — I think that mitigates the risk to the employer. They cannot be there like Gandalf, casting spells at magical moments; it is what reasonable remedies and actions they have taken to help and support the work in their extended workplace. If they have done something the employee ignores, that certainly changes the nature of the responsibility.

The CHAIR — All right. Do you have any further questions?

Mr DRUM — No. I thank the gentlemen. It is fantastic to hear.

Mr WILSON — Thank you. I have enjoyed it too. I appreciate the work you are doing.

The CHAIR — All right. Peter and Paul, do you have any final comments you would like to make?

Mr WILSON — Only the last little bit. Like the parliamentary report, sometimes it is best to read the last page first. For employees, the article makes the following recommendations if you are going to work remotely. Maintain contact; use phone and email. When you are going to the office, be visible. Make sure people understand that you are there in the office today and that you were not yesterday. Be available at home. Do not say you are working from home and then cut yourself off. Get others to talk about how you work really positively from home, and just make sure that you check in. They are reasonable standards for people to make the equation work better. That is why we — —

Mr DRUM — That was in the *BRW* article last year?

Mr WILSON — Yes. We have given you the hyperlinks there too.

Mr DRUM — Great. We can get that.

Mr WILSON — Absolutely.

Mr DRUM — Thank you.

Mr WILSON — Pleasure.

The CHAIR — Very good. Peter and Paul, once again, thank you very much for the effort you have taken to write the submission and come along today to speak to it. It has been very useful from our committee’s point of view. In about 14 days Lilian will send you a copy of what Hansard has recorded. You will be able to make corrections to obvious errors, but other than that it will be as it is.

Mr WILSON — Good. okay.

The CHAIR — Once again, thank you very much.

Mr WILSON — My pleasure. Thank you, Chair.

Mr BEGLEY — Thank you.

Witnesses withdrew.