

## Yvette Norris

---

**From:** Lucy Hooke [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, 5 July 2019 10:02 AM  
**To:** wcpolicy  
**Cc:** A1 David Hooke; Stephen Lacaze  
**Subject:** WorkCover Submission

Dear Sir/Ms,

I write on behalf of my husband David Hooke ( he had a shoulder operation on Monday) & myself who are TSL holders of 8 licences in Brisbane since 1982 with regard to Worker Cover in the Taxi Industry. In 1997 our company Western Suburbs Taxi Depot were part of a submission to the Supreme & High Court of NSW with regard to drivers being self employed (bailie/bailor) workers & the consequences & outcome of this court action are available to you online or in your archives . Up until that time drivers were covered under the Workers Compensation act & the premiums were to say the least extreme & unaffordable to many owners/operators. After the Supreme court of NSW decision the Q'ld Government chose to reject the Taxi Industry from participation in the scheme & we were forced to find our own accident cover for owners/drivers/operators. To date this has been working well & not a tremendous burden on the participants.

We are now struggling to understand why the Government are once again wanting to take us back into the system that was unaffordable when we were in it, except for the financial benefit (money grab) for the Government that have sold the 100yr old Taxi Industry down the river to the International Multi National gig economy conglomerates that now pervade the Personal Transport Industry. From my memory of those times prior to 1997 having been in the Taxi Industry since 1971 the annual premiums were between \$3,000 & \$4,000.00 per taxi per year, with heavy penalties applied if a claim was made on the subsequent premiums for several years.

We currently manage 69 taxis for TSL owners over 70 who can no longer drive or manage their own cabs, all I can see is the Government trying to claw back some lost annual income from the taxi industry multiple times (30 to 40) as we haven't paid the annual DTMR fees of around 195.00 for the past few years.

As history has a habit of repeating itself with a 15 to 30yr window I doubt that we will still be around as we are 68yrs old now when the Government of the day realises their error & attempt to correct it. As a Government you do not seem to be concerned @ destroying the retirement & income stream of thousands who have been in the Taxi Industry & the subsequent consequences involved therein from self funded retirees having to apply for pensions to destruction of participants health & a multitude of knock on effects in multiple areas such as loss of homes & the inability to access a loan from financial institutions to purchase replacement vehicles & equipment.

Please find appended below, my submission to the Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Consultation Office of Industrial Relations.

### **Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Consultation Office of Industrial Relations**

#### **Objectives as stated in RIS and Quintennial Review**

- Reduce community and worker exposure to costs that could be met by WorkCover
- Develop an updated implementation model that provides the WorkCover safety net equitably across the ENTIRE industry, and can be extended more generally to the 'gig economy' and workers in it.

## Philosophical inconsistencies in analysis to date !

- Attempts in both documents (RIS and 5year review) to separate Taxi industry participants actually revealed more similarities than differences. Taxi drivers are by all the filters used, clearly, the original 'gig workers'
- A simple test in the Personalised transport industry would be to establish cover for all holders of a certain credential - the BHTX ,All drivers regardless of affiliation or ownership status !
- Attempts to separate out an owner driver of a taxi (including a leasing driver) but to include such a driver in non-taxi operations is clearly an artificial and seemingly arbitrary distinction.
- ALL drivers in the Qld Personalised Transport Industry, have NO price setting ability, and are therefore 'vulnerable'
- If it is acceptable to impose the WorkCover burden upon one ABE (Authorised Booking Entity) why should it not be imposed on every ABE.

## Potential difficulties in implementation -

- Protests by sectional interests
- Passing on of costs to drivers, by an ABE through increased commission's or affiliation fees (almost inevitable)
- Willful non compliance, especially by foreign based corporations.

## Benefits of universal coverage based on BHTX credential

- Large 'pool size' to spread risk broadly
- Horizontal equity
- **Potential for government to impose a "fare levy" across the entire industry as has been seen in other jurisdictions for other purposes.**

Our names and contact details are :

David C M & Lucija Hooke

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Phone:

Phone:

Email:

Email :

Sent from my iPhone