



## File Note

<b>Matter name:</b>	Homeworkers Code Committee Incorporated – Application for Authorisation		
<b>ACCC parties</b>	Robert Janissen		
<b>TRACKIT No</b>		<b>File No.</b>	AA1000418
<b>Other parties</b>	CONFIDENTIAL	<b>Note book Ref.</b>	
		<b>Date:</b>	Tuesday, 8 May 2018
		<b>Time:</b>	2:00 pm
<b>Phone to</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Phone from</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Meeting</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Other</b> <input type="checkbox"/>

On 8 May 2018 the ACCC received a confidential submission opposing the Homeworke<sup>r</sup>'s Code Committee's application for authorisation, stating that:

1. The revisions to the amended code of conduct are more than just a name change and have the effect of extending the reach of the code beyond just homeworkers.
2. The amended code extends the audits performed by the Applicant to businesses who do not employ homeworkers and outworkers, not just to businesses who are signatories to the code. Applying audits along the supply chain is unfair and potentially unlawful. The current practice of requesting information from the supply chain is, I believe, risking the privacy of individuals and secondly giving to the auditor, which is the union, a way of both bypassing the current laws to investigate suspected breaches and using external and/or government funding to execute union work.
3. Auditing should be kept separate from administration of the code and should not be undertaken by the Applicant, but by an independent body. By performing audits, the Applicant is effectively subsidising the unions.
4. The code has already caused damage in the industry and it is misleading for the Applicant to say there have not been detriments. Manufacturers who would have ordinarily operated in Australia but do not want to be a party to the code for a range of reasons unrelated to price to make the clothes by a homeworke<sup>r</sup> are invisible to the homeworkers code. The obligation to keep extensive records in time costing each job and having to provide a minimum amount of work to casual workers, far in excess of ANY OTHER CASUAL WORKER in the country have instead led

manufacturers to become importers and they have chosen to establish themselves overseas. Thus they were manufacturers but now are importers. The cost to administer the giving of work to homeworkers is huge and outweighs the cost of the homeworker in many cases. I [the interested party] also can provide case studies galore about this, all in the last 3 years...though I can go further back as well. Customers of mine who made clothes here, using outworkers, and became importers.

5. It is hard to see the full extent of this detriment as businesses who have set up offshore as they usually do not give feedback in Australia as they are no longer manufacturers in Australia and have no interest in the code as it no longer is applicable and are easily overlooked. The hearsay comments from the applicant and the provision of isolated case studies are self-biased and worthless. The real measuring stick is the reduced yarn importation used for fabric production (as there are no yarn producers left for apparel yarns) and the reduced fabric importation of apparel fabrics (not sold at retail) is a better measuring system, and this is easily obtained from customs data. Hard figures trump poorly researched case studies.

This submission was provided by a small Australian textile manufacturer.

<b>Signature:</b> 	<b>Date:</b>	Wednesday, 6 June 2018
	<b>Time:</b>	5:09 pm