

# **STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**

**INQUIRY INTO WORKSAFE**



**TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE  
TAKEN AT PERTH  
TUESDAY, 5 MARCH 2019**

**SESSION ONE**

**Members**

**Hon Adele Farina (Chair)  
Hon Jacqui Boydell (Deputy Chair)  
Hon Ken Baston  
Hon Kyle McGinn  
Hon Darren West**

---

**Hearing commenced at 10.09 am****Mrs DEBRA CUNICO****Private citizen, sworn and examined:****Ms ASHLEA CUNICO****Private citizen, sworn and examined:**

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Thank you very much for coming this morning. My name is Kyle McGinn. Today I am the acting Chair of the committee. On behalf of the committee, I would like to welcome you to the meeting. Before we begin, I would like to ask you both to take either the oath or the affirmation.

[Witnesses took the oath.]

**The ACTING CHAIR:** You will have signed a document entitled “Information for Witnesses”. Have you read and understood that document?

**The WITNESSES:** Yes.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** These proceedings are being recorded by Hansard. A transcript of your evidence will be provided to you. To assist the committee and Hansard, please quote the full title of any document you refer to during the course of this hearing for the record, and please be aware of the microphones and try to talk into them. Ensure that you do not cover the microphones with papers and be careful knocking them because they can be quite sensitive. I also remind you that your transcript will become a matter for the public record. If for some reason you wish to make a confidential statement during today’s proceedings, please request and let us know that you would like to move into a private hearing. We can then take that in a closed session. If the committee grants your request, any public and media in attendance will be excluded from the hearing. Please note that until such time as the transcript of your public evidence is finalised, it should not be made public. I advise you that publication or disclosure of the uncorrected transcript of evidence may constitute a contempt of Parliament and may mean that the material published or disclosed is not subject to parliamentary privilege.

Personally, I would like to really thank you both for coming in today to front this committee. We are really looking forward to the evidence that you have on offer. I would like to give you the opportunity now, if you would like, to make an opening statement.

**Mrs D. Cunico:** Ashlea will do this on my behalf.

**Ms A. Cunico:** Firstly, thank you very much for having us. It has been 10 and a half months, 45 weeks and 319 days since my dad went to work and never came home. He was tragically killed in a workplace incident that should never, ever have occurred. It is extremely difficult to put into words how much our lives have changed. We are now lifelong members of a club you never want to join. Each and every one of us has been destroyed by the loss of a loved one who should have had the right to come home from work. We have suffered an unimaginable loss. No-one should ever endure the pain and suffering we have been subjected to because of the lack of safety and sense of a workplace.

My father’s death is still currently under investigation by WorkSafe, so whilst we share our journey thus far, I am unable to comment on everything as we have not yet reached a point in our investigation where we have any answers.

---

It is glaringly obvious that WorkSafe, as the industry regulator, is terribly under resourced. They require a substantial increase in funding to be able to adequately monitor and audit our workplaces, as well as investigate serious incidents and fatalities. In the first six months following my father's death, very little to nothing was done in the way of investigating his death. In fact, his work mobile phone, which could have potentially contained critical information, was sitting at the coroner's office, uncollected. All the while, I had the police coronial investigators' team reminding me to let WorkSafe know that it was still there. We are now 10 months in and are only now having key witnesses being interviewed in the last couple of weeks. The time in which it takes to interview witnesses or collect statements is unacceptable. Any duty holders or employers that are potentially facing prosecution after a workplace fatality should not be afforded the luxury of time, especially when supplying evidential documents. Months after my father's death, the regulator was still awaiting required documents to proceed any further with the investigation. All the documents relating to said fatality should be produced in a timely matter or to a strict deadline. It is not acceptable for duty holders to withhold any information or evidence when a fatality has occurred and the industry regulator should have the governing powers to demand all documentation immediately. However, very conveniently in my father's case, certain documents were missing and were required to be requested over and over again.

Whilst it is understandable that an investigation can take time—I have been led to believe it is a long process—investigations are taking 12 months—plus. This interrupts the natural grieving process for families and can be mentally challenging, as we have already suffered an unimaginable loss, but to be left with very little to no answers 10 months in and further is absolutely heartbreaking.

There needs to be greater transparency when it comes to dealing with families and investigations. Whilst I recognise that early on in an investigation the evidence may point towards a certain fault or failure and very quickly that can change with further investigation, it is important note to that families live in the dark. We live in fear every single day that nobody will be held accountable for our loved one's death. Surely, there is a way to reach a happy medium when it comes to informing families of the investigation progress whilst also maintaining a level of confidentiality. From our personal experience, we have been privy to some of what took place that fateful day from speaking with my father's work colleagues; therefore, that information I have been able convey with our caseworker.

I believe that a stronger presence of the regulator on our worksites and workplaces would in time naturally foster a more positive mentality towards safety. The police govern the roads to ultimately deter people from doing the wrong thing, which could in turn lead to road traffic accidents and deaths, yet WorkSafe as the industry regulator are not governing our worksites to deter negligent and reckless behaviours. Therefore, these companies and businesses are self-regulating and, in general, unsafe work practices are occurring daily. Shortcuts are being taken, poor-quality materials are being supplied and safety procedures are not being adhered to. The lax safety culture in Australia is shocking, and it is critical that the regulator has the means and power to enforce change or more people are going to die.

Without a doubt, safety should be at the forefront of every business or company. I believe the depth and scope of an investigation needs to be re-evaluated. The safety culture and poor reputation, or good reputation for that matter, of a company prior to a fatality occurring needs to be taken into consideration. For example, if a company has a persistent issue with near misses and serious incidents occurring constantly, then this history should form part of the investigation, as it clearly is indicative of a cultural or systematic failure towards safety.

---

The current laws and legislations are not disincentive enough for employers to wilfully ensure the safety of all their employees. The current penalties and provisions held by the regulator do not fit the crime, especially in circumstances where a fatality has occurred. There need to be a harmonisation of safety legislation so that each state and territory is operating under similar provisions. The RSPCA holds tougher provisions for both monetary and jail terms, yet employers are getting away with killing people, not animals, with a mere slap on the wrist.

It is extremely difficult to trust in an industry, albeit the regulator, that has clearly already failed my father beyond comprehension. If the current safety laws and legislations were working as intended, then my dad would still be here today. The industry, the regulator and all safety entities are systematically failing. This is evident in the very fact that 18 people never went home to their loved ones this year alone, and we are only in March. If the employers do not actively and willingly adopt safe work practices and procedures, then it is up to the regulator and the government to enforce laws, legislations and a framework that ensures beyond a reasonable doubt that they must abide by these acts or they will be penalised to the full extent, and our jurisdiction must allow for this to occur. Thank you.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Thank you very much, Ashlea. Are you comfortable with tabling those documents you have just read off of, that opening speech? Are you comfortable?

**Ms A. Cunico:** Yes, that is fine.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Thank you very much; that was very powerful.

We have a few questions that we are going to run through. Feel free to abbreviate on them. We may cross-section on some things that have already been said, but please touch on anything that you feel comfortable talking to, and then each member may have some individual questions.

Can you please tell the committee, in your own time, about the circumstances of Robert's death?

[10.20 am]

**Ms A. Cunico:** Basically, my father was a supervisor. What happened is the procedure that they were doing was changed so the work line was altered at the last minute. They were decommissioning pipes and the blind flange plate that they were supplied with was the incorrect size. They were waiting for a new part but because it was going to rain, my father's superiors and the engineers decided that they had to make what they had fit at all costs, basically, so they changed the work line by 10 to 12 metres and, basically, they made a cut and put the blind flange plate on. My father went to inspect for leaks and then the pipe shot off and killed him.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** What was Mr Cunico's profession and how much experience did he have in the job that he was performing on that day?

**Ms A. Cunico:** Years and years of experience.

**Mrs D. Cunico:** Forty-plus years as a piping superintendent. He had not actually worked on the tools for probably close to 30-odd years. He had been in supervisory positions. He was very experienced and very well looked up to. In fact, most engineers would often come to him and ask for his recommendations.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** So he was not —

**Mrs D. Cunico:** He was not inexperienced.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** By no means was it a different job for him; it was the same stuff?

**Ms A. Cunico:** No.

**Mrs D. Cunico:** No.

---

**The ACTING CHAIR:** You told the Senate committee that it was four hours before you were told what happened by the police. What were your earliest dealings with WorkSafe after that, after the initial —

**Mrs D. Cunico:** They actually dealt with my son because I was quite distraught. He actually received, I think, a phone call or an email prior to making an appointment with WorkSafe to come and speak to us.

**Ms A. Cunico:** It was 13 days.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** You contacted them first or did they contact the family?

**Mrs D. Cunico:** I am under the impression they contacted him.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** From that initial contact up until today, how has the communication been between WorkSafe and yourselves? Has it been constant?

**Ms A. Cunico:** Yes, it has been constant but mostly from my initiation. I kind of took the reins and have taken it upon myself to constantly be informed by WorkSafe. Our case manager, although he is amazing—I do not have anything critical to say about him—a lot of the time our contact is initiated by myself; I will phone him.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Specifically, do you know how many times you have contacted WorkSafe? It is okay if you do not. You can take it on notice if you want to or we can just let it pass.

**Ms A. Cunico:** I would say over 10 times. In fact, I think I annoy him, to be honest.

**Hon DARREN WEST:** How many times would you have been contacted by WorkSafe during this time? You said you have made a lot of initial contacts. Have they been in touch with you?

**Ms A. Cunico:** I would say he has contacted us at least six or seven times.

**Hon DARREN WEST:** Okay, thank you.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Who were you able to speak to each time; was it one specific case manager, as you said, or was it going through the whole —

**Ms A. Cunico:** We only speak to one case manager.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** So you were given that number on the initial contact?

**Ms A. Cunico:** Yes.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** So, 13 days after the incident, you —

**Ms A. Cunico:** My brother was contacted by our case manager 13 days after the incident, and then we met with him, it would have been 17 or 18 days after the incident, in person.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** So you had direct contact with that case manager from the get-go?

**Ms A. Cunico:** Yes. But can I just add that he has 72 cases that he is dealing with.

**Mrs D. Cunico:** Extremely under-resourced.

**Ms A. Cunico:** Yes, extremely under-resourced. Although he is very personable, we are just one of those 72 cases.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Are there any examples you would like to expand a little further on how you can understand that he is under pressure? Are there things that you notice?

**Ms A. Cunico:** The length of time it takes him to respond to information we have given him. If he is coming back to me with information, the time in which it takes him to, I guess you could say, speak with the investigators, or his allocation of time for, obviously, each case. I do know from him that

there are priority cases. Some of those 72 cases are serious incidents, so the people are still alive, but some of those 72 cases are actually fatalities and so they are prioritised. For the first six months of my father's investigation, they had another serious fatality; therefore, dad's investigation did not even really get looked at. They were just concentrating on obviously closing up that other fatality.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Are you aware whether that case manager was specific to the industry incident or whether it was all incidents that he was handling?

**Ms A. Cunico:** I could not tell you, no.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** No worries—that is okay. Did you ever get through to an inspector who was dealing with the incident or has it just been the case manager?

**Ms A. Cunico:** Only the case manager. I have asked to meet with the inspector, as it actually states in this booklet that is given to families —

**The ACTING CHAIR:** What is the name of that document?

**Ms A. Cunico:** "When your partner or relative dies in a work-related accident".

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Are you comfortable tabling that document for the committee? We can take a copy of that.

**Ms A. Cunico:** Yes. My mum has an issue with this. Obviously, when a fatality occurs, the loved one is given this. This was emailed to my brother. Up until a month ago —

**Mrs D. Cunico:** Until 30 December, we did not know it even existed.

**Ms A. Cunico:** Yes, up until a month ago, we had no idea that it had been received by anyone in our family. When we met for the first time with our caseworker, he did make mention of this but we had no idea. Obviously, we are grieving. We had no idea what he was making reference to. My brother just said, "Yes, yes, I've got that." So nothing went further from that conversation whatsoever. It was not until we had met with some politicians that they have come back and said, "Well, hold on, you've received this booklet." Then we have dug some —

**Mrs D. Cunico:** It was sent the day before my husband's funeral, so, of course, it was missed.

**Ms A. Cunico:** When the police turned up at my mum's door, she was handed a small A4 piece of paper folded up into A7 size, I believe it is, "When a Person Dies Suddenly", from the coroner. This should also be handed. If my mum did not want to look at it, that was fine, she could have put it to the side and read it in her own time. This goes through everything from the day that your loved one dies. So not having this or not being aware—we will take full responsibility for the fact that we had it and were not aware, but I just think that more onus needs to be given.

**Mrs D. Cunico:** There needs to be a hard copy given to the families. I did bring that up with our case manager but they said because they do not see us for the first couple of weeks to allow us grieving time, they email it out. Most people do have access to an email, but the fact is you are grieving; you do not always go through every part of that email. If it is a hard copy, you can get a loved one to read it and say, "Is there anything relevant that I need to be knowing in these first few days?" But, like I said, I did not know about this until 30 December.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** You believe that, potentially, the email version, but also upon the first face-to-face meeting with the case manager, that should be produced to the family?

**Mrs D. Cunico:** Yes.

**Ms A. Cunico:** Absolutely.

**Hon DARREN WEST:** You found that a useful publication once you did go back and read it?

**Mrs D. Cunico:** I have only just recently got it, so I have read some of it.

**Ms A. Cunico:** It would have been extremely useful.

**Hon DARREN WEST:** Useful then?

**Mrs D. Cunico:** Yes.

**Hon DARREN WEST:** I am just trying to gauge the sort of value of it to someone in your position.

**Mrs D. Cunico:** Basically, we were finding our own way through the system. This would have guided us.

**Hon DARREN WEST:** Okay, thank you.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Obviously, the witnesses have agreed for copies to be taken, so we would love to have a look at that document. I notice that you have some other documents there, but they might be for further down the —

**Ms A. Cunico:** They are just our —

**Mrs D. Cunico:** Somebody else, if we sought —

**Ms A. Cunico:** They are just terms of reference.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** If there is anything you want to table, feel free to let us know and we will be comfortable to move forward.

You probably just answered it then, but what information has WorkSafe given you around the whole process and around the incident?

[10.30 am]

**Ms A. Cunico:** Very little—very little. Most of the information that we discussed with WorkSafe has come from information that we have been privy to ourselves, that I then discussed with our caseworker, and then, obviously, he is not breaching confidentiality in discussing it with us because I have said it myself. So we would obviously love to know what is going on. Like I said, 10 months down the track, and we still do not have any answers.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** When asking for information, has anyone at WorkSafe ever advised you that you could use freedom of information to secure information on the investigation?

**Ms A. Cunico:** I did mention it to our caseworker at our initial meeting, but I was under the impression that you are not entitled to do that until the end of the investigation.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** May I ask how you got that impression? Was that from the caseworker?

**Ms A. Cunico:** Yes. He said to us that we are able to access the coronial report at any time throughout the investigation, but on his advice he said to ask for the graphic imagery to be removed.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** At any point did you FOI anything? Just out of curiosity.

**Ms A. Cunico:** No, not as of yet, but we intend to.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Absolutely. So now you understand that you have the right to FOI information rather than ask?

**Ms A. Cunico:** I did not realise that we were entitled to do so whilst the investigation is still open. I thought it had to be closed.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** You testified at the Senate inquiry about the lack of support services for families in your position. Could you tell the committee what, if any, support you have been given from any government agencies?

---

**Ms A. Cunico:** None—none whatsoever.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** I suppose the obvious question is non-government agencies.

**Ms A. Cunico:** The union has actually, the CFMEU in particular, although my father was not a member of the union whatsoever, they have been quite supportive of us. They have not obviously forced anything upon us in any way, shape or form, but they have offered us support in terms of legal support if we need to have any thorough understanding of anything, or have just generally been there to see if we are doing okay, really.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Excellent. Any other organisations?

**Ms A. Cunico:** Bass, my husband's work.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Okay. Has anything happened in regard to Mr Cunico's death since the evidence was given to the Senate committee on 30 August last year?

**Ms A. Cunico:** No. We are still none the wiser; nothing has happened.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Overall, how would you describe your dealings with WorkSafe?

**Ms A. Cunico:** Like I said, I am not critical of WorkSafe. As a grieving family, I would like to think that the process could be handled quicker. I do not like the fact that we are still waiting for answers. But I really do not have anything negative to say because —

**Mrs D. Cunico:** Our case is still ongoing.

**Ms A. Cunico:** It is still ongoing.

**Mrs D. Cunico:** So it is still very hard to comment on that type of thing.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** That is absolutely understandable.

**Ms A. Cunico:** If you came to us in, say, three or four months' time and perhaps they have not found a breach, then I would probably have something critical to say, but at this point I do not really.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Obviously, your understanding of the terms of reference of this committee is that legislation is what we have the ability to look into. In terms of greater accountability, would you favour the introduction of some sort of industrial manslaughter laws in Western Australia?

**Ms A. Cunico:** Yes, absolutely.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Would you like to add any further comment on why you think that that may be a law that would improve safety?

**Ms A. Cunico:** I think if—as a deterrent only. I mean, I am not going to sit here before you and say that I want people to go to jail, because families have already been destroyed by the loss of a life. I do not want more families to be destroyed. But I think it is important for people to recognise that they need to be held accountable if they have made decisions that have actively endangered someone's life, or if they have done something or their actions have led to something that is unsafe, then they must recognise that it was their responsibility to ensure that their employees were safe. It is not okay for people to keep making mistakes or make a mistake in the first place and not have consequences to their actions. So, I think that if it was a tougher penalty in place, then perhaps directors or superiors or employees would actually think twice about putting safety first and foremost, really.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Just picking up on your comments before with regard to the harmonisation of the act, I believe it has just been passed in October last year that now Western Australia's fines are equal to those in the harmonisation act in Australia.

**Ms A. Cunico:** Yes.

---



**The ACTING CHAIR:** So even with the increase in fines, you would still have that stance on industrial manslaughter?

**Ms A. Cunico:** Absolutely, because obviously for us those fines are not made retrospective, and I am aware that obviously industrial manslaughter would not be retrospective for our case either. But some fines, I know —

**Mrs D. Cunico:** They appeal them—they appeal fines.

**Ms A. Cunico:** We have actually had this discussion with our case manager. For instance, the fines as they stand for my father's case, possibly \$80 000, \$100 000 maybe. How much will it cost for them to appeal the case? The same, if not more. So what will they do? They will plead guilty, cop that fine, and walk away. When you have got fines of \$600 000, \$700 000 or more, or whatever they may—I do not know the exact figure at the moment—of course they are going to be appealing them. Will they get away with it? Perhaps. That seems to be the case in most of the investigations. But there needs to be something else as well. They need to realise that time can potentially be taken away from them if they do the wrong thing, because we have lost time with my father.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Thank you very much. Do you have any suggestions for this committee as to how things might be improved into the future?

**Ms A. Cunico:** Do you mean for WorkSafe or as in changing people's attitudes?

**The ACTING CHAIR:** I am very interested to hear from both the government side of things and also from employers, potentially.

**Mrs D. Cunico:** I just think there needs to be more awareness. People just do not seem to be aware of the scope of these incidents that are occurring. If we could educate people more—I know they are technically supposed to be educated about these things, but there needs to be more awareness. It is a bit like the road traffic speeding, drink driving. People did that and never thought twice about it 20, 30, 40 years ago. If we can start educating people with safety in workplaces and what the consequences are and things like that, maybe people's attitudes might start changing. People just seem to accept that you go to work, and if you die, they do not seem to bat an eyelid. There are just way too many deaths in Australia every year.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Would you be able to expand on potentially how much you have seen of advertisement from WorkSafe around safety—anything publicly, TV ads?

**Mrs D. Cunico:** None whatsoever.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Are you aware of any safety alerts or publications after the incident that were put out to make other industries aware?

**Ms A. Cunico:** For my dad's case?

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Yes.

**Ms A. Cunico:** Yes. I was told by our case manager that they had put out a safety alert.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Do you know where that safety alert went?

**Ms A. Cunico:** On WorkSafe's website.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Was that all—just onto the website?

**Ms A. Cunico:** Yes.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** It was not sent out to specific workplaces, to your knowledge?

**Ms A. Cunico:** No, not that I am aware of.

---

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Do you think that is enough?

**Ms A. Cunico:** No, not at all.

[10.40 am]

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Do you have any suggestions on what you think they should do?

**Ms A. Cunico:** Touching on the industrial manslaughter as well, I do not believe industrial manslaughter is the only answer here. Like my mum mentioned, people used to speed, drink and drive et cetera, 30 or 40 years ago. This issue is a cultural mentality and that can only be fixed over time. So there would be a number of components to be able to fix the Australian safety culture, industrial manslaughter being one of them, more education being another, stronger presence of the regulator, so that they know, like the public knows, when the police are on the roads, or they have speed cameras set up, or you can ring the police and tell them that your house has been broken into, or whatever it maybe. The regulator needs to be of similar nature to the police or people will just keep doing what they are doing and creating unsafe work practices and the culture will never change. I think people really need to see the regulator. They cannot come out after someone has been killed and have a little chat and then walk away and they never hear anything more about it again. They need to be there before, they need to be actively stopping these incidents from occurring, they need to be informing the employers, and they need to be informing the employees to ensure that they are all doing the right thing in the first place so that people are not going to work and never coming home.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Are you aware of whether or not WorkSafe had been to this site?

**Ms A. Cunico:** Yes, once?

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Once?

**Ms A. Cunico:** Prior to the —

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Prior?

**Ms A. Cunico:** Not aware at all.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** But after the incident, they went once to the site?

**Ms A. Cunico:** Yes; as far as I am aware, the case manager went once.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Are you aware when if they have followed up after a serious incident like this that has taken place whether they have done further investigations at that site?

**Ms A. Cunico:** No, I do not think so, and I know that the site has had near misses since.

**Mrs D. Cunico:** As well as before.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** As well as before?

**Ms A. Cunico:** Yes.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Do you know if those near misses were reported to WorkSafe on hazard observation or via the hotline?

**Ms A. Cunico:** I could not tell you whether they were or not, but I highly doubt it.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** When you say “highly doubt it”, is that because there is a culture out there of non-reporting?

**Ms A. Cunico:** Absolutely.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** What do you think the reason is for that culture? Is it the employer or the regulator?

---

**Ms A. Cunico:** I do not think it is the regulator, no; it is the employer.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Would you say that is due to fear of retribution for reporting safety?

**Ms A. Cunico:** Yes, and I think it is because they do not really care.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** I think you have covered this, but I will ask it just to make sure—you mentioned in the Senate inquiry “prevention as opposed to cure” in the testimony. Can you expand on that?

**Ms A. Cunico:** I think the onus really needs to be on prevention, like I have just discussed with all of you. There needs to be preventive measures put in place. Although there already is, they are clearly failing. They need to be taken further, so I think with a stronger presence from the regulator. We need to be teaching our employees and our employers that the regulator is there. The message is loud and clear with the police. The message also need to be loud and clear in the workplace that if you do the wrong thing, if you put profit before safety, then you will be caught.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** I have a couple of other questions. In regard to work colleagues on the workplace—I am not sure whether or not they have been in contact with the family—are you aware of how they were treated throughout the whole process and whether or not they received any support from WorkSafe or the employer at the time?

**Ms A. Cunico:** I do not know if they received any support from WorkSafe, but there were a number of my father’s work colleagues on workers compensation; therefore, they were obviously receiving support from the employer. From WorkSafe, I could not answer that question, I am afraid; no.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** That is okay. In regard to the case manager, is his job title “case manager” or is he an inspector or do you know what specifically his role is within WorkSafe?

**Ms A. Cunico:** He is not an inspector.

**Mrs D. Cunico:** He oversees —

**Ms A. Cunico:** He is a case manager. He also dealing with mines as well. Obviously construction is different from the mines, but they have formed the one sector here in Western Australia so he is dealing with both.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Are you aware whether he is maybe the team leader of an industry group?

**Ms A. Cunico:** Yes, he possibly is the team leader.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** What we might do. Are there any other questions from the committee?

**Hon DARREN WEST:** For the public, no.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** If it is okay, could we go into a private session, we have a couple of questions that we would like to ask in private, if that is okay.

**Ms A. Cunico:** Yes.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Can the people in the gallery step out for a second. Apologies for that.

**[The committee took evidence in private session]**

[10.58 am]

**The ACTING CHAIR:** We will just bring the public in and we will just finish it off. For the record on *Hansard*, we are now re-entering public hearing.

On behalf of the committee, I would like to thank you for your attendance here today. The committee will forward you the transcript of evidence, along with additional requests for information. Personally, I would like to thank you both for coming before this committee. The evidence you have given that I have heard today has been powerful, and I believe you are definitely

doing the right thing in honouring your father and husband and letting us know of the situation. Coming from workplaces where people have been lost, I understand how hard this would have been for you both. I cannot thank you enough, on behalf of the committee, for coming here today to share that evidence with us.

**Hon DARREN WEST:** I would like to just reiterate what the Chair has said and thank you again. It would have been very difficult for you, and I am sure Rob would be very proud of you both right now for stepping forward and helping us.

**Hon KEN BASTON:** And likewise, thank you.

**The WITNESSES:** Thank you.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Thank you very much for your evidence today.

**Hearing concluded at 10.59 am**

---