

Please find below questions on notice from Senator Andrew Bragg in relation to your organisation's appearance yesterday at the public hearing into the National Reconstruction Fund Corporation Bill:

1) Industry Minister Ed Husic and Resources Minister Madeleine King have had well publicized disagreements that the AMWU have also been drawn into - do you recall these?

The AMWU views on the importance of local manufacturing are well publicised. Likewise, the AMWU views in relation to the previous governments gas policy are on the public record. The AMWU have not participate in any disagreement between Ministers Husic and King. I recall an AFR article drawing in the Australian Industry Group, who referred to gas prices for local manufacturers as 'back breaking'.

2) How have those disagreements, in your view, shaped the direction of this legislation?

This is a question more appropriately addressed by Ministers Husic and King, and/or the Australian Industry Group.

3) Under the 'returns, financial instruments and working with other investors' section of the consultation, the AMWU provided "no response". Why?

There is currently a high volume of senate enquiries underway where AMWU members expect our Union to make submission on their behalf. With limited resources I made the decision to focus our submission on where we are able to provide specialist knowledge, being governance and priorities for funding.

The following questions have been posed to all unions which appeared at the hearing:

1) Did you make any recommendations to the Minister during the legislative drafting phase? If so, what were they?

I sought a meeting with Minister Husic on behalf of the AMWU after the legislation was introduced into the lower house, so nil.

2) The Australian Workers Union note in their submission to Departmental consultation that "the NRF will require a commercial rate of return ... [meaning that] short-term technology upgrades which increase costs without increasing revenue or profit are not eligible". Is it also the view of your organisations that grants could be helpful in this regard?

The AWU has every right to express their view. I refer you to the AMWU's submission. We support the proposal that the NRF be regenerative, with expenditure being via loans, equity and public ownership.

- 3) Consistently you have called for a ‘Secure Jobs Code’ to apply to the NRF. You’ve stipulated enterprise agreement with unions as a precondition of tender, [that] the recipient must not have engaged in conduct that treated workers ‘unfairly’. Companies must commit to direct employment ... contractors and indirect workforce must be employed on the same conditions as the direct workforce. Has the government responded to these demands?**

We have had no response from the government on the matters we raise, aside from the invitation to participate in the Senate enquiry.

- 4) ACTU has noted that the Bill “places almost complete control into the hands of the Minister of the day,” you call it a “significant risk”. What measures would you put in place to avoid this? Would you support legislating the priority areas of the Corporation?**

The AMWU supports the views expressed by the ACTU that the legislation should include the stated NRF ambition. Further the AMWU submission contains a proposal for tripartite appointments to the board, with two position being from Union’s, as a measure to improve the governance and standing of the NRF.