

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

**Recommendations**

	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Section reference</b>
1	That the new Act be named the <i>Public Health Act</i> .	1.1
<b>Comment:</b> Support		
2	That non-legislative mechanisms, such as a Memorandum of Understanding, be entered into with agencies administering legislation that interface with public health legislation, as required in the particular circumstance.	1.2
<b>Comment:</b> Support		
3	That the public health Act recognise the importance of promoting public health.	1.2
<b>Comment:</b> Support		
4	That the public health Act recognise the need to address inequalities in the health and wellbeing of disadvantaged communities.	1.2
<b>Comment:</b> Partly support – should be similar for everyone		
5	That the initial print of the public health Act include the explanatory memorandum at the front of the Act (subject to the approval of Parliamentary Counsel).	1.3
<b>Comment:</b> Not necessary		
6	That the term “health and wellbeing” be defined in the public health Act to include health as a positive condition, not merely the absence of disease, and be inclusive of physical, social and mental wellbeing (both individual and collective) and apply to the provisions in the public health act relating to the following: objects (see 1.6) guiding principles (see 1.7) functions of Secretary, Chief Health Officer and municipal councils (see 1.8 to 1.10) public health inquiries (see 2.1)(e) municipal public health plans (see 3.1)(f)	1.4

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	Issue	Section reference
	health information management (see 3.6).	
	<b>Comment:</b> Support	
7	That the term “health” apply to all other provisions and be defined narrowly, to exclude concepts of social and mental wellbeing.	1.4
	<b>Comment:</b> support	
8	That the public health Act provide that it applies throughout Victoria (including areas that do not form part of a municipal district).	1.5
	<b>Comment:</b> Strongly and whole hearted support	
9	That the Governor in Council may declare that a municipal council has specified powers and functions under the public health Act in relation to an area that is outside a municipal district, as if the area was within that municipal council’s municipal district. (The Minister for Health would be required to consult with the Minister administering the <i>Local Government Act 1989</i> (Vic), before making a recommendation to the Governor in Council in relation to this issue.)	1.5
	<b>Comment:</b> Support	
10	That the public health Act bind the Crown.	1.5
	<b>Comment:</b> Strongly and whole heartedly support	
11	That the public health Act include the following statement of objects:  <i>Whereas</i>  The State of Victoria has a significant role in promoting and protecting the health of all Victorians; and  It is accepted that health is a state of individual and collective wellbeing, not merely the absence of	1.6

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Section reference</b>
	<p>disease; and</p> <p>One of the ways it is possible to improve the population's health status and reduce health inequalities is through public health interventions —</p> <p>The objects of the Act are: to protect public health and prevent disease, illness, injury, disability and premature death; to promote conditions in which the people of Victoria can be healthy; and to reduce social and health inequalities and enable all Victorians to achieve the best possible state of health and wellbeing.</p>	
	<b>Comment:</b> Support	
12	That the provision of evidence-based information to the public about the health of the population be incorporated into the functions of the Chief Health Officer under the new Act, rather than as an object provision.	1.6
	<b>Comment:</b> Support	
13	<p>That the public health Act include the following guiding principles:</p> <p>Principle of evidence-based decision making</p> <p>Decisions as to the most effective and efficacious public health interventions and efficient use of resources to protect and promote public health are informed by reliable and relevant evidence (where available in the circumstances).</p> <p>Precautionary principle</p> <p>If there are threats of a serious public health risk, lack of full scientific certainty should not be used as a reason for postponing measures to prevent or control the public health risk (based on section 1C of the <i>Environmental Protection Act 1970</i> (Vic)).</p>	1.7

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Section reference</b>
	<p>Principle of the primacy of prevention</p> <p>Preventing harm or damage is preferable to repairing it later. Promoting resilience and building capacity is preferable to allowing deficits or problems to otherwise undermine health or autonomy.</p> <p>Principle of accountability</p> <p>Public health officials should ensure, as far as is practicable, that decisions made under the Act are transparent, systematic and appropriate. The community should therefore be given:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>access to reliable information in appropriate forms to facilitate a good understanding of public health issues; and</li> <li>opportunities to participate in policy and program development (based on section 1L of the <i>Environmental Protection Act 1970</i> (Vic)).</li> </ul> <p>Principle of proportionality</p> <p>Acts taken and decisions made by officials under the public health Act should be proportionate to the harm to be prevented, minimised or controlled. Where action is necessary to protect public health, the action chosen must be the least intrusive means available to achieve that goal and must not be imposed in an arbitrary way.</p> <p>Principle of collaboration</p> <p>Public health is enhanced by collaborative approaches between national, state and local government, the community sector, industry and individuals.</p>	
	<b>Comment:</b> support	
14	That the public health Act continue to have provisions for the Minister for Health and the Department of Human Services:	1.8

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Section reference</b>
	<p>creation of Secretary (based on section 6 of the Health Act)</p> <p>Secretary subject to direction of Minister in relation to the Secretary's exercise of powers and functions under the public health Act, or any other Act (based on section 8 of Health Act)</p> <p>delegation by the Secretary under the public health Act or any other Act (based on section 8A of the Health Act)</p> <p>delegation by the Minister under the public health Act or any other Act (based on section 8B of the Health Act).</p>	
	<b>Comment:</b> support	
15	<p>That the public health Act include the following statement of function of the Secretary under the Act:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to develop and implement policies and programs to achieve the objects of the Act</li> <li>to assist other agencies which have an impact on public health to enhance opportunities for public health</li> <li>to support, equip and empower communities to address their health needs</li> <li>to establish and maintain a comprehensive information system which includes information on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the health status of Victorians and groups of Victorians including the extent and effects of illness, injury and premature death</li> <li>the determinants of health(iii) health system performance in Victoria.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	1.8
	<b>Comment:</b> support	
16	<p>That, if a statutory position of Chief Health Officer is established, the public health Act require the Chief Health Officer to ensure that a comprehensive report on the health and wellbeing of Victorians is made available to the public on a biennial basis.</p>	1.8
	<b>Comment:</b> annually is preferred	
17	<p>That the public health Act establish the position of</p>	1.9

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Section reference</b>
	<p>the Chief Health Officer, who is a registered medical practitioner appointed by the Minister and can delegate his or her powers to an employee or officer of the Department of Human Services, who is a registered medical practitioner.</p>	
<p><b>Comment:</b> Support but the CHO should be “head of the department”</p>		
18	<p>That the public health Act include the following statement of functions of the Chief Health Officer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to develop and implement strategies to promote and protect public health</li> <li>to advise the Minister about public health issues</li> <li>to carry out any other functions granted to the Chief Health Officer under the public health Act or any other Act</li> <li>to ensure that a comprehensive report on the health and wellbeing of Victorians is made available to the public on a biennial basis.</li> </ul>	1.9
<p><b>Comment:</b> OK</p>		
19	<p>That the public health Act include the following statement of the function of the municipal councils:</p> <p>The function of every council under this Act is to seek to protect and improve public health, and promote community wellbeing by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>creating environments which support the health of the local community and strengthen the capacity of communities and individuals to achieve better health</li> <li>initiating, supporting and managing public health planning processes at the municipal level</li> <li>developing and enforcing up-to-date public health standards and intervening if the health of people within the municipal district is, or may be, affected</li> <li>facilitating and supporting the efforts of other local agencies whose work has an impact on public health to improve public health status of the local community</li> <li>coordinating and providing immunisation services to children living or being educated within the municipal district.</li> </ul>	1.10

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	Issue	Section reference
<b>Comment:</b> OK		
20	That the public health Act not re-enact the requirement for municipal councils to report annually to the Secretary, but the requirement to report as required by the Secretary be retained.	1.10
<b>Comment:</b> Disagree - should be linked to funding and annual reporting		
21	That the public health Act provide that the exercise by a delegate of council's power to refuse an application for registration under the Act is only valid if the council later ratifies that refusal.	1.10
<b>Comment:</b> Support strongly		
22	That the Secretary retain the power to perform the functions of municipal councils in emergency situations where there is a serious risk to public health (based on section 36A of the Health Act).	1.10
<b>Comment:</b> support		
23	That the public health Act not include the legislative requirement that every municipal council appoint a medical officer of health.	1.12
<b>Comment:</b> Do not support – we require local content and accessibility		
24	That non-legislative mechanisms be employed to assist municipal councils obtain public health expertise.	1.12
<b>Comment:</b> good idea		
25	That the public health Act re-enact the requirement for every municipal council to appoint one or more environmental health officers, and allow environmental health officers to be shared between councils.	1.12
<b>Comment:</b> Strongly support		
26	That an environmental health officer who is appointed by a council automatically be an	1.12

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Section reference</b>
	authorised officer for the purposes of the public health Act (see paragraph (b) of the definition of "authorised officer" in section 4(1) of the <i>Food Act 1984</i> (Vic)).	
	<b>Comment:</b> yes	
27	That the public health Act require that a council only appoint as an environmental health officer a person who has qualifications and/or experience nominated by the Secretary, or by a person approved by the Secretary.	1.12
	<b>Comment:</b> strongly support	
28	That the provision of the Health Act that provides that, in addition to any other duties, the Secretary, "health officers", environmental health officers and "engineers" have the same powers and duties as environmental health officers and medical officer of health appointed by municipal councils not be re-enacted.	1.12
	<b>Comment:</b> support	
29	That the public health Act provide that: the Secretary may appoint Departmental officers as authorised officers a municipal council may appoint employees or officers of the council as authorised officers.	1.12
	<b>Comment:</b> Ok if qualified	
30	That the Secretary or municipal council (as appropriate) may only appoint a person to be an authorised officer if the Secretary or municipal council (as appropriate) is satisfied that the person has the qualifications or experience required to perform his or her functions. Those competencies regarding qualifications or experience would not be specified in the public health Act.	1.12
	<b>Comment:</b> See 27 – must be qualified to a prescribed level	
31	That consideration be given to the development, in	1.12

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Section reference</b>
	consultation with stakeholders, of non-legislative guidelines as to competencies and minimum standards of training required to fulfil particular statutory functions.	
	<b>Comment:</b> There should be no “non legislative guidelines. Thus do not support this idea	
32	That the public health Act include a provision allowing the Secretary to appoint analysts for specified purposes under the Act.	1.13
	<b>Comment:</b> support – we need specialists	
33	That where an analyst carries out an analysis, the analyst may prepare and sign a certificate in writing of the analysis.	1.13
	<b>Comment:</b> support	
34	That any such certificate of analysis may be produced as evidence to a court of the thing in relation to which the certificate is issued, and is presumed to be accurate and precise, unless evidence to the contrary is presented.	1.13
	<b>Comment:</b> support	
35	That the public health Act provide for a broad power to conduct inquiries into matters of public health concern (modelled on the modern public health inquiries powers in other jurisdictions’ public health Acts), including the power to appoint independent experts to conduct the inquiry.	2.1
	<b>Comment:</b> yes	
36	That the public health Act continue to provide that such an inquiry can be initiated at the direction of the Governor in Council, the Minister or the Secretary, or on the initiative of the Secretary.	2.1
	<b>Comment:</b> yes	
37	That, if a statutory position of Chief Health Officer	2.1

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Section reference</b>
	is established, the public health Act provide that the Chief Health Officer may conduct and initiate an inquiry.	
	<b>Comment:</b> yes	
38	That there be a requirement that a report on any inquiry be made available to the public (subject to exceptions relating to privacy and confidentiality).	2.1
	<b>Comment:</b> yes	
39	That the public health Act provide that, when conducting an inquiry, the Secretary, Chief Health Officer, person or panel: must act as quickly, and with as little formality and technicality, as is consistent with a fair and proper consideration of the issues. is not bound by the rules of evidence; may inform itself in any way it considers appropriate, including by holding hearings; subject to any directions, may decide the procedures to be followed for the inquiry; and may allow or refuse to allow a person, including a lawyer, to represent someone else at the inquiry.	2.1
	<b>Comment:</b> yes	
40	That the public health Act require that, when conducting an inquiry, the Secretary, Chief Health Officer, person or panel must observe the principles of natural justice.	2.1
	<b>Comment:</b> yes but some major issues require an over-riding principle to apply.	
41	That the provisions regarding the constitution, procedures and functions of all consultative councils be consolidated in one part of the public health Act.	2.2
	<b>Comment:</b> yes	
53	That the public health Act contain a regulation-making power regarding the mandatory notification	2.2

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	Issue	Section reference
	of specified events by health service providers to prescribed consultative councils established by the Minister.	
	<b>Comment:</b> yes	
54	That the public health Act provide that a prescribed consultative council established by the Minister may request a health service provider to provide information to the council and the health service provider is authorised to provide that information to the council. This could be a general request or made in a particular case.	2.2
	<b>Comment:</b> support	
55	That in order to protect and promote public health within their municipal district, municipal councils be required to prepare a municipal public health plan (in consultation with the Department of Human Services) within 12 months after each general election.	3.1
	<b>Comment:</b> partly support = health plan should be incorporated in council plan	
56	The public health Act list matters to be addressed in municipal public health plans as follows: examine data about health status and health determinants in the municipal district identify goals and strategies based on available evidence for creating healthy communities, to enable people living in the municipal district to achieve maximum health and wellbeing describe how the local community is engaged in developing, implementing and evaluating the plan address how municipal councils work in partnership with the Department of Human Services and others undertaking public health initiatives, projects and programs within the municipal district to accomplish goals and priorities identified in the municipal public health plan.	3.1
	<b>Comment:</b> see 55	

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Section reference</b>
57	That the public health Act provide that each municipal council be required to review its municipal public health plan annually and, if appropriate, amend the plan.	3.1
<b>Comment:</b> see 55		
58	That the public health Act provide that each municipal council must submit its municipal public health plan ("MPHP") to the Department of Human Services within 12 months after each general election. Where the plan is amended, it must be submitted annually. The MPHPs would be made available on a central database as a resource for council health planners. Further, MPHPs would inform the development of state public health planning and policies.	3.1
<b>Comment:</b> see 55		
59	That the Department of Human Services continue to support municipal councils in the development, implementation and evaluation of municipal public health plans through non-legislative mechanisms, including developing and implementing tools and capacity building initiatives such as <i>Environments for Health</i> .	3.1
<b>Comment:</b> see 55		
60	That municipal public health plans be required to be consistent with the council plan prepared under section 153A of the <i>Local Government Act 1989</i> (Vic) and municipal strategic statement prepared under section 12A of the <i>Planning and Environment Act 1987</i> (Vic) for the municipal district.	3.1
<b>Comment:</b> see 55		
61	That the Department of Human Services develop a non-legislative public health plan that assesses and sets priorities for the public health system. However, at this stage, the Act should not require the Secretary to develop such a plan.	3.2

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	Issue	Section reference
<b>Comment:</b> support		
62	That the Department of Human Services continue to establish non-legislative bodies to advise on specific public health matters, as required. The public health Act should not establish a public health advisory council.	3.3
<b>Comment:</b> seen as useful		
63	That Victoria continue to rely on a legislative requirement for health impact assessment in the <i>Environment Effects Act 1978</i> (Vic) and the <i>Environment Protection Act 1970</i> (Vic).	3.4
<b>Comment:</b> support		
64	That there is further consideration regarding whether public health issues are adequately addressed in the <i>Planning and Environment Act 1987</i> (Vic).	3.4
<b>Comment:</b> support		
65	<p>That, at this stage, there is no new statutory obligation to require a health impact assessment to be conducted. However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Secretary to the Department of Human Services and Chief Health Officer would have the statutory power to conduct and initiate inquiries</li> <li>the Secretary's statutory functions include assisting other agencies which have an impact on public health, to enhance opportunities for public health (see 1.8)</li> <li>the Department of Human Services and councils could prepare non-statutory health impact assessments.</li> </ul>	3.4
<b>Comment:</b> support		
66	That the Department of Human Services consider non-legislative guidelines for consultation, if appropriate, to support provisions in the new Act.	3.5

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	Issue	Section reference
	<b>Comment:</b> Non legislative guidelines are not supported. Enforcement requirements need strong legal backing.	
67	That the public health Act continue to provide for the collection of the following information: notifiable diseases (Health Act, s 138) perinatal data (Health Act, ss 162F, 162G) HIV incidence (Health Act, s 130).	3.6
	<b>Comment:</b> satisfactory	
68	That the public health Act authorise the establishment of registers by regulation. The Act would set out general provisions as to the purposes and procedures for registers established and their proposed use and confidentiality requirements (modelled on the proposed Public Health Bill (NZ)). Registers that may be established by regulation include: an environmental events register (modelled on the <i>Public Health Act 2005 (Qld)</i> ) a register of public health information held by the Department of Human Services and provided to third parties, for example, for research purposes (modelled on the <i>Public Health Act 2005 (Qld)</i> ).	3.6
	<b>Comment:</b> satisfactory	
69	That the public health Act provide that, if the Secretary determines it is in the public interest, he or she may release information held by the Secretary or an authorised officer to a statutory authority if, in the opinion of the Secretary, the disclosure would assist the body to carry out one or more of its functions.	3.6
	<b>Comment:</b> support	
70	That the public health Act provide that, if the municipal council determines it is in the public interest, it may release information held by the council to a statutory authority if, in the opinion of the council, the disclosure would assist the body to carry out one or more of its functions.	3.6

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	Issue	Section reference
<p><b>Comment:</b> support</p>		
71	<p>That the public health Act support and enhance the practice of risk management, rather than incorporate specific procedural requirements.</p>	4.1
<p><b>Comment:</b> Can be too loose, clear directives are paramount in a litigious society.</p>		
72	<p>That the Department of Human Services consider developing administrative guidelines where appropriate, to ensure that issues of risk are addressed properly and in a consistent manner (such as guidelines for the issue of improvement and prohibition notices: see 4.9).</p>	4.1
<p><b>Comment:</b> Can be too loose, clear directives are paramount in a litigious society.</p>		
73	<p>That it is a condition of licences and registration made under the Act that, except in relation to cooling tower systems, the holder of the licence or registration must comply with the following duty:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>The person must not undertake the licensable/registered activity in a manner that may result in a serious harm to health of another person unless the person takes all reasonable and practicable measures to prevent or minimize the possibility of that harm occurring ("General Duty")</i></p> <p>That, in relation to cooling tower systems, the Act includes a regulation-making power allowing the General Duty to be imposed by regulation. For instance, it could be imposed on the person who manages or controls the system.</p>	4.2
<p><b>Comment:</b> support</p>		
74	<p>Monitoring compliance with the General Duty in these circumstances would be the responsibility of the registering or licensing authority (Secretary or</p>	4.2

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	Issue	Section reference
	municipal council).	
	<b>Comment:</b> If suitably supported by relevant and clear legislative and enforce-able requirements	
75	<p>That a registration or licence holder’s compliance with the duty could be determined as follows:            if there is a method outlined in the Regulations, these must be complied with            if the Chief Health Officer develops guidelines that state how to minimise public health risk, then the person must either:                adopt and follow the method stated in the guideline; or                adopt and follow another way that minimises the public health risk; and            where there is neither a prescribed method nor any Chief Health Officer guideline, then the person may choose the method by which they discharge their obligation.</p> <p>Notice of the Chief Health Officer’s guidelines would need to be published in the Government Gazette and the guidelines would need to be published on the Department of Human Service’s website.</p>	4.2
	<b>Comment:</b> Can be too loose, clear directives are paramount in a litigious society.	
76	That the public health Act not impose a General Duty on all people.	4.2
	<b>Comment:</b> Agree	
77	<p>That the following limits be imposed on the scope of the General Duty:            applies only to material risks and not trivial risks            requires people to refrain from conduct that is injurious to public health, rather than create a positive duty to promote public health            only requires people to act reasonably and appropriately, and by expecting them to do the things that can practicably be expected of them.</p>	4.2

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	Issue	Section reference
	<p>Reasonableness of a person's conduct would be considered having regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the nature of the conduct and the circumstances in which it occurred</li> <li>the likelihood of a person suffering harm as a result of the conduct</li> <li>the nature and seriousness of the harm that may be suffered as a result of the conduct</li> <li>the number of people who may be harmed by the conduct</li> <li>the reason why the person engaged in the conduct and the social utility of the activity</li> <li>the knowledge and information that the person had or ought reasonably to have had or acquired about the risk, nature and scale of harm that may be suffered as a result of the conduct</li> <li>whether and, if so, what precautions the person took to prevent or reduce the harm that may be suffered as a result of the conduct, or to reduce the risk that harm may occur as a result of the conduct</li> <li>the ease or difficulty with which people at risk of suffering harm as a result of the conduct could protect themselves against the risk of harm and the extent to which they voluntarily accepted the risk</li> <li>any other relevant factors.</li> </ul> <p>Could specifically exclude harm to self and hypersensitivities.</p>	
	<p><b>Comment:</b> Can be too loose, clear directives are paramount in a litigious society.</p>	
79	<p>That the Chief Health Officer may issue an improvement or prohibition notice if a person: undertakes an activity that poses a serious risk to public health; and fails to take all reasonable and practicable</p>	4.2

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	Issue	Section reference
	<p>measures to prevent or minimise the possibility of that harm occurring.</p> <p>The limits noted in recommendation 77 would apply in relation to situations where the Chief Health Officer may issue an improvement or prohibition notice.</p>	
<p><b>Comment:</b> support – it is expected some devolution of powers to others will be permitted</p>		
80	<p>That the Chief Health Officer be able to exercise general enforcement powers in investigating whether to issue an improvement or prohibition notice.</p>	4.2
<p><b>Comment:</b> support – it is expected some devolution of powers to others will be permitted</p>		
81	<p>That it would be at the discretion of the Chief Health Officer (“CHO”) whether to impose the improvement or prohibition notice. The provision would not create liability for breach of statutory duty in relation to whether the CHO does or does not issue a notice or in relation to the terms of that notice. Without limiting the above, the CHO may decline to issue a notice if:</p> <p>alternative remedies are available or separate legal proceedings have been or could be brought</p> <p>it is more appropriate for another person or body to address the matter (for instance, the CHO could refer the matter to the Health Services Commissioner or a health practitioner board);</p> <p>or</p> <p>the nature of the issue means that, if the risk is to be addressed, it should be addressed by regulatory reform involving legislative provisions.</p>	4.2
<p><b>Comment:</b> support – it is expected some devolution of powers to others will be permitted</p>		
82	<p>That the public health Act not introduce a “risk to health” offence.</p>	4.3

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	Issue	Section reference
<b>Comment:</b> support		
83	That the new Act continue to deal separately with environment related health risks that arise at the local level (nuisances) and broader public health risks that affect the community or subsections of the community.	4.4
<b>Comment:</b> support		
84	That the nuisance provisions apply to nuisances which are, or are liable to be, dangerous to health or offensive, including nuisances arising from or constituted by: any building or structure any land, water or land covered by water any insect or animal capable of carrying a disease transmissible to humans any refuse any noise or emission any state, condition or activity any other matter or thing.	4.4
<b>Comment:</b> we support the use of nuisance provisions to overcome neighbourhood disputes at a local level that supports our community safety efforts.		
85	That "offensive" be defined as "noxious or injurious to personal comfort" and the reference to "annoying" be removed.	4.4
<b>Comment:</b> Agree - however we support the use of nuisance provisions to overcome neighbourhood disputes at a local level that supports our community safety efforts		
86	That a risk of a "nuisance" be sufficient to trigger powers.	4.4
<b>Comment:</b> Support		
87	That, in determining whether a state, condition or activity is a nuisance which is, or is liable to be, dangerous to health or offensive: regard must not be had to the number of people affected or that may be affected by the state,	4.4

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	Issue	Section reference
	condition or activity; and regard may be had to the degree of offensiveness of the state, condition or activity (as in s 40(2)).	
<b>Comment:</b> Support		
88	That each municipal council continue to have a duty to “remedy as far as is reasonably possible all ‘nuisances’ in its municipal district” (as in s 41).	4.4
<b>Comment:</b> support – see comment at 84		
89	That the following administrative powers continue to be applied to the duty to abate a nuisance: notification of nuisance (ss 43(1) and (2)) failure of council to investigate complaint (s 45) nuisance caused by two or more people (s 46) who may institute proceedings (s 47) delegation (s 47A) investigation outside districts (s 47B) nuisances on unoccupied land (s 47C) regulation-making power (s 47D).	4.4
<b>Comment:</b> support		
90	That it continue to be an offence to cause a “nuisance” (as in s 42).	4.4
<b>Comment:</b> support		
91	That if, upon investigation, a nuisance is found to exist, the council must: take action to abate the nuisance; or if the council is of the opinion that the matter is better settled privately, advise the person notifying the council of the nuisance of any available methods for settling the matter privately (s 43(3)).	4.4
<b>Comment:</b> strongly and wholeheartedly support		
92	That nuisance abatement provisions (s 44) be removed, and municipal councils instead rely on the general enforcement provisions under the new Act;	4.4

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Section reference</b>
	that is, improvement notices and prohibition notices (see 4.9).	
	<b>Comment:</b> Would prefer that both the new and the previous options be available to Council.	
93	That the Department of Human Services continue to issue best practice standards of practice, as appropriate. Compliance with standards of practice would be non-binding, unless they were set out in the regulations. However, compliance with guidelines could be a defence under the public health Act, if the guidelines relate to the General Duty.	4.5
	<b>Comment:</b> Do not support . See comments again about clear and enforceable standards and tools to enact same	
94	That there continue to be an obligation for the owner of land on which there is a cooling tower system to ensure that a risk management plan is prepared in relation to the system (see recommendation 215).	4.6
	<b>Comment:</b> support	
95	That there is consideration regarding whether any other people undertaking a registerable or licensable activity should be required to prepare a risk management plan. The Act would specify whether such people are required to prepare a risk management plan.	4.6
	<b>Comment:</b> support	
96	That the provisions in the public health Act regarding risk management plans in the case of registerable/licensable activities, be based on the approach used in Part 5B of the <i>Building Act 1993</i> (Vic) in relation to cooling tower systems. For instance: there would be provision for approved auditors who are approved by the Secretary approved auditors would need to comply with any conditions imposed on their approval	4.6

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	Issue	Section reference
	<p>the approved auditors would assess whether the risk management plan addresses the required matters, but not its adequacy</p> <p>there would be provisions regarding reporting “failed” audits to the registering authority (the Secretary or municipal council)</p> <p>there would be provisions regarding conflicts for approved auditors, granting audit certificates and impersonation of approved auditors.</p>	
	<b>Comment:</b> support	
97	<p>That an improvement notice could require a person to prepare a risk management plan (see 4.9). (This would not include the requirement that external approved auditors audit the plan.)</p>	4.6
	<b>Comment:</b> support	
98	<p>That the public health Act provide powers for the Secretary (or municipal council, where applicable) to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>grant, renew, vary, suspend or cancel the registration/licence</li> <li>determine whether the registration/licence applicant is a fit and proper person</li> <li>set registration/licensing periods for public health risk activities within specified parameters (for example, a maximum licensing period of three years)</li> <li>set conditions to which the licence is subject (registration would not be subject to conditions)</li> <li>make enquiries regarding the authenticity and suitability of documents presented with licence or registration applications</li> <li>reissue a licence or certificate of registration upon application of a licence holder that the original licence/registration has been lost, stolen or destroyed</li> <li>monitor the activities of licence/registration holders, to ensure that they comply with any requirements of the licence/registration.</li> </ul>	4.7

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	Issue	Section reference
	<b>Comment:</b> Registration should be subject to conditions. Otherwise proposal is supported.	
99	<p>That the public health Act:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>set out criteria for registration/licence applications, renewals, variations, transfers, suspensions or cancellations of registration/licences, so that the registration/licensing process is transparent and decisions to register/licence are consistent</li> <li>set out eligibility requirements for a licence/registration, such as prescribed qualifications or training competencies</li> <li>provide for prescribing fees, including for the issue and reissue of a registration/licence, and for late applications.</li> </ul>	4.7
	<b>Comment:</b> Fully support subject to the prescribed fees being cost recovery or very close there-to.	
100	<p>That the following offence provisions be set out in the public health Act:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>conducting an activity for which a licence is required, without the operator being registered/licensed</li> <li>breaching the conditions of the licence</li> <li>making a false or misleading statement in relation to an application for the grant, renewal or variation of a registration/licence</li> <li>failing to prepare a risk management plan (where there is an obligation to have a risk management plan)</li> <li>an offence of failing to notify authorities in the event of certain types of incidents occurring.</li> </ul>	4.7
	<b>Comment:</b> support subject to them be enforceable via PERIN	
101	<p>That a person whose registration/licence has been cancelled by the Secretary/municipal council has the right to re-apply for registration/licence, but could be required to inform the registration/licensing authority of previous cancellations or suspensions. Failure to do so could be grounds for refusing to issue a registration/licence, or for cancelling any registration/licence subsequently</p>	4.7

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	Issue	Section reference
	issued.	
	<b>Comment:</b> support subject to them be enforceable via PERIN	
102	That (at this stage) there should not be a requirement that solaria be registered with municipal councils (or the Secretary).	4.7
	<b>Comment:</b> Do not Support – this activity is/can be a “public health risk” and should be overseen	
103	That there should not be a requirement that public events be registered with municipal councils (or the Secretary).	4.7
	<b>Comment:</b> Do not Support – this activity is/can be a “public health risk” and should be overseen	
104	That regulation-making powers allow for an obligation being imposed on people conducting activities subject to registration/licensing and on proprietors of non-registered premises (for example, proprietors of swimming pools or brothels) to notify the relevant authority (Secretary or municipal council) in the event of prescribed circumstances.	4.7
	<b>Comment:</b> support	
105	That the Secretary or municipal council (as appropriate) must issue the authorised officers with identity cards that: contain the authorised officers’ name and photo identify the authorised officers as authorised officers under the Act are signed by the authorised officer are signed by the Secretary (for Department of Human Services officers) or a member of council staff authorised to issue the identity cards (for council officers or employees).	4.8
	<b>Comment:</b> support	
106	That an authorised officer is subject to the directions of the Secretary or municipal council (as	4.8

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	Issue	Section reference
	appropriate) in the performance of his or her functions, or the exercise of his or her powers under the Act or the regulations. A direction of the Secretary or municipal council (as appropriate) may be of a general nature or may relate to a specified matter or specified class of matter.	
	<b>Comment:</b> support	
107	That an authorised officer must produce his or her identity card for inspection: before exercising any of the powers noted below (general enforcement powers, incident powers and emergency powers), unless the request is made in writing or it is otherwise not practicable, such as entry onto land that is temporarily unoccupied) if asked to produce his or her card by the occupier of the premises during the exercise of the power.	4.8
	<b>Comment:</b> support	
108	That an authorised officer may not continue to exercise any of his or her powers if he or she fails to produce on request his or her identity card for inspection by the occupier of the premises.	4.8
	<b>Comment:</b> Do not support.	
109	That before entering a premises to exercise a general enforcement, incident or emergency power, the authorised officer must (subject to the exceptions noted in this paragraph) announce that he or she is authorised under the public health Act to enter the premises and give any person at the premises an opportunity to allow entry to the premises. The exceptions to this requirement are if: it is not practicable (the premises are vacant) the authorised officer believes on reasonable grounds that immediate entry to the premises is required to ensure: the safety of any person; or the effective exercise of the powers noted below.	4.8

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	Issue	Section reference
	<b>Comment:</b> support	
110	<p>That the public health Act provide that an authorised officer is able to exercise powers to monitor compliance and investigate possible contraventions of the Act. This should include the power to (at any reasonable time) exercise the following “general enforcement powers”:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>enter a place</li> <li>stop and search any person, animal, vehicle, vessel or other means of conveyance</li> <li>inspect, examine and make enquiries at the place</li> <li>examine or inspect any thing at the place</li> <li>bring any equipment or materials to the place that may be required</li> <li>seize any thing, including a document, at the place, where: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the seizure is required to determine whether there has been a contravention of the Act; or</li> <li>the seized thing may be used as evidence for a possible prosecution; or</li> <li>the seizure is required to minimise a risk to health</li> </ul> </li> <li>seal a place or thing</li> <li>take a sample of any thing at the place</li> <li>take any photographs or measurements or make sketches, impressions or any audio or visual recordings</li> <li>make copies of, or take extracts from, any document kept on the place</li> <li>use or test any equipment at the place</li> <li>request a person at the place to provide information or produce documents</li> <li>request a person at the place to operate equipment to access information from that equipment (such as from a disk or tape)</li> <li>request a person at the place to provide any document that is needed to investigate or monitor compliance</li> <li>use any assistants the authorised officers considers necessary to exercise the powers conferred on an authorised officer</li> <li>exercise any other power conferred on the authorised officer by the public health Act</li> </ul>	4.8

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	Issue	Section reference
	do any other thing that is reasonably necessary for the purpose of the authorised officer performing his or her functions, or exercising his or her powers, under the public health Act.	
<b>Comment:</b> fully support		
111	That there is no need to have a warrant to perform any of the above powers.	4.8
<b>Comment:</b> fully support – this is current practice and has not been compromised ever to my knowledge		
112	<p>That the following provisions apply for seized things:</p> <p>the authorised officer must provide a receipt for any seized thing in the prescribed form</p> <p>seized things may be held for up to 60 days, unless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Magistrates’ Court extends the period of seizure, on the application of an authorized officer; or</li> <li>the thing had to be destroyed by the Secretary or council (for example, due to contamination)</li> </ul> <p>the seized things should be returned (if practicable) if the reason for their seizure no longer exists. If the thing cannot be returned, it becomes the property of the Secretary or council.</p>	4.8
<b>Comment:</b> support – this is current practice and works well		
113	<p>That self-incrimination is not an excuse from complying with a request of the authorised officer. However, any self-incriminatory statement made under a direction is not admissible in any criminal proceedings against that person, unless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the answer is admitted in respect of a proceeding regarding the provision of false information to an authorised officer; or</li> <li>the information is contained in any document or item that a person is required to keep by any Australian law.</li> </ul>	4.8
<b>Comment:</b> support		

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Section reference</b>
114	<p>That the public health Act include offences regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>impersonating an authorised officer</li> <li>failure to answer questions of an authorised officer without a reasonable excuse</li> <li>knowingly providing an authorised officer, council, Secretary or Chief Health Officer with information that is false or misleading</li> <li>interference with, or obstruction of, an authorised officer</li> <li>failure of a person that is required to keep records to (upon request by an authorised officer) provide the records to the authorised officer.</li> </ul>	4.8
<b>Comment:</b> support – this is current practice and works well		
115	<p>That the public health Act provide that an improvement or prohibition notice could be issued by a municipal council or the Secretary, where the council or Secretary believes on reasonable grounds that a person is breaching or may breach an obligation under the public health Act or its regulations.</p>	4.9
<b>Comment:</b> Strongly support		
116	<p>That the public health Act provide an illustrative list or examples of some of the types of improvement or prohibition notices that could be issued under the Act. An improvement or prohibition notice would be able to achieve everything that a “notice to abate” can achieve under section 44 of the Health Act.</p>	4.9
<b>Comment:</b> Strongly support		
117	<p>That failure to comply with an improvement or prohibition notice is an offence under the public health Act.</p>	4.9
<b>Comment:</b> Support if subject to PERIN process		
118	<p>That the public health Act provide for additional powers where: The Chief Health Officer is of the view that there is</p>	4.10

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	Issue	Section reference
	<p>a serious risk to public health (the reference to “a serious risk to public health” incorporates risks that may eventuate). In these circumstances, authorised officers should have the ability to respond quickly to the relevant incident to protect the health and safety of people.</p> <p>The Chief Health Officer is of the view that an epidemic or the risk of an epidemic of a disease poses a serious risk to public health. In these circumstances, authorised officers (who are registered medical practitioners) should have the ability to respond quickly to the relevant incident to protect the health and safety of people, by providing treatment or prophylaxis.</p>	
	<b>Comment:</b> support	
119	<p>That in the event that the Chief Health Officer (“CHO”) determines that there is a serious risk to public health, the CHO can, in order to lessen or prevent the serious risk to public health, authorise an authorised officer to exercise the following “incident powers”:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>close any premises, place, vehicle or vessel, including a school, children’s services centre or shopping centre</li> <li>direct a person or group of people to enter, not to enter, to stay at or to leave any particular place</li> <li>enter any, place and search for and seize any thing (without a warrant) for the purpose of investigating the serious risk to public health</li> <li>require the provision of information to investigate the serious risk to public health or to address that risk</li> <li>inspect any place where a disease may be spread</li> <li>require cleaning or disinfection of any place where the risk may arise</li> <li>require disposal or destruction of any thing in order to address the risk</li> <li>direct the proprietor of a business or the person in charge of a place to take any action necessary to address the risk</li> </ul>	4.10

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Section reference</b>
	<p>direct any person to take any other action that the CHO considers reasonably necessary to prevent or address the risk</p> <p>exercise any of the general enforcement powers noted in any of the earlier recommendations.</p>	
	<p><b>Comment:</b> support</p>	
120	<p>That in the event that the Chief Health Officer makes a finding that an epidemic or the risk of an epidemic poses a serious risk to public health, the Chief Health Officer may, in order to lessen or prevent the serious risk to public health, authorise an authorised officer (who is a registered medical practitioner) to exercise the following “epidemic powers”:</p> <p>treat any person</p> <p>administer prophylaxis (including vaccination) to the person, subject to any of the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the proposed prophylaxis is vaccination and the person has been vaccinated against the disease</li> <li>a registered medical practitioner reasonably believes that an individual may suffer an adverse reaction to the prophylaxis, which may contraindicate prophylaxis</li> <li>the individual has produced medical confirmation of experiencing the natural disease against which the prophylaxis protects, which renders the administration of the prophylaxis ineffectual</li> <li>the individual has produced laboratory confirmation of the presence of existing adequate immunity</li> <li>the individual (or legal representative) objects in a statutory declaration on the basis that the individual has a conscientious objection to the prophylaxis (modelled on section 5-109[h] of the US Turning Point Model State Public Health Act and section 144 of the Health Act)</li> </ul>	4.10
	<p><b>Comment:</b> appears satisfactory</p>	

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Section reference</b>
121	That, if a person refuses to comply with a direction given under these provisions, a member of the police force may use reasonable force to ensure compliance with that direction.	4.10
<b>Comment:</b> appears reasonable		
122	That, in exercising these powers, a search warrant should not be required. (There would be requirements that the authorised officers identify themselves and display their identification.)	4.10
<b>Comment:</b> supported		
123	That the Governor in Council may proclaim an emergency in relation to a specified area, as a result of a serious risk to public health. Such a proclamation: may be made for up to 4 weeks may be extended for 4 week periods up to a maximum of 6 months would be a disallowable instrument (could be disallowed by either House of Parliament).	4.10
<b>Comment:</b> supported.		
124	If there is such a proclamation of an emergency by the Governor in Council, the Chief Health Officer may, in order to lessen or prevent the serious risk to public health, authorise an authorised officer to exercise the following “emergency powers”: detain any person or class of person in a proclaimed area (an authorised officer must facilitate any reasonable request for communication made by a person subject to detention) restrict the movement of any person within the proclaimed area prevent any person from entering the proclaimed area give any other direction that is reasonable and necessary to protect the health and safety of people exercise any of the “incident powers” or “epidemic powers” noted at recommendations 119 and	4.10

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	Issue	Section reference
	120 above exercise any of the “general enforcement powers” noted at recommendation 110 above.	
<b>Comment:</b> supported		
125	That further consideration be given to whether the Chief Health Officer should have reserve powers, to direct public hospitals and public health services to provide services or use of facilities to respond to a public health emergency. Mechanisms for engagement of private health services and health care workers may also be examined.	4.10
<b>Comment:</b> supported		
126	That if a person is prosecuted and found guilty of contravening the public health Act, the following provisions apply: a municipal council or the Secretary could seek reimbursement of costs it has incurred costs as a result of the contravention (such as clean-up costs) if a municipal council or the Secretary is awarded legal costs, it could seek payment for the costs incurred by its officers to investigate the contravention.	4.11
<b>Comment:</b> The suggestion is that council can only seek payment for costs via the courts. This is contrary to provisions of Local Government Act. Thus we do not support this proposal unless it mirrors the provisions of the Local Government Act.		
127	That if a person fails to comply with a direction of a municipal council, authorised officer, the Secretary or an improvement or prohibition notice and the municipal council, authorised officer or Secretary steps in to perform that task, then the municipal council or Secretary would be entitled to seek the cost of performing that task.	4.11
<b>Comment:</b> The suggestion is that council can only seek payment for costs via the courts. This is contrary to provisions of Local Government Act. Thus we do not support this proposal unless it mirrors the provisions of the Local Government Act.		

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Section reference</b>
128	That expenses incurred by a municipal council in the abatement of a nuisance can be recovered from the occupier of the land, even if there has not been a prosecution.	4.11
<b>Comment:</b> Strongly supported		
129	That there should also be further consideration regarding whether other cost recovery provisions would be appropriate, having regard to the provisions in the <i>Environment Protection Act 1970</i> (Vic) and the <i>Health Act 1958</i> (Vic).	4.11
<b>Comment:</b> Supported – see previous comments on this matter		
130	That there be the capacity for contraventions of some provisions of the public health Act to be enforced through the Penalty Enforcement by Registration of Infringement Notice system.	4.12
<b>Comment:</b> Strongly supported. More-over, the more listed specific contraventions the easier to enforce same.		
131	That during the development of the relevant regulations that determine which offences are subject to the Penalty Enforcement by Registration of Infringement Notice system, the Department of Human Services consult closely with local government and other relevant stakeholders.	4.12
<b>Comment:</b> Strongly supported		
132	That the public health Act set penalty levels that reflect the seriousness of the public health consequences of a breach and be sufficient to deter conduct that creates an unacceptable risk to public health.	4.12
<b>Comment:</b> Overly expensive penalties are a dis-incentive to authorised officer usage. Thus a careful balance is necessary, providing a greatly lesser penalty via penalty notices.		
133	That higher penalties be imposed on bodies corporate, than those imposed on individuals. The maximum fine would be 5 times the maximum fine	4.12

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	Issue	Section reference
	for a natural person.	
	<b>Comment:</b> Overly expensive penalties are a dis-incentive to authorised officer usage. Thus a careful balance is necessary, providing a greatly lesser penalty via penalty notices.	
134	That, based on the offence provisions that are currently proposed for the public health Act, the public health Act not introduce a defence of due diligence (modelled on section 17E of the <i>Food Act 1984</i> (Vic)).	4.13
	<b>Comment:</b> Supported	
135	That blood and tissue donation forms (which create statutory defences) are approved by the Secretary. Notice of the form would need to be published in the government gazette and the form would need to be published on the Department of Human Services' website.	4.13
	<b>Comment:</b> supported	
136	<p>That the public health Act provide for the following appeal rights in relation to licences and registrations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a right of internal review for applicants for decisions by the municipal council/Secretary to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>refuse to grant, extend or vary a licence/registration</li> <li>vary, suspend or cancel a licence/registration</li> <li>impose certain conditions on a licence/registration.</li> </ul> </li> <li>full appeal rights to the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal in relation to any decision made upon internal review</li> <li>a right of direct appeal to the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal in relation to any decision to cancel or suspend a registration or licence (the holder of the cancelled/suspended licence or registration could elect to utilise the internal review or apply directly to the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal for review).</li> </ul>	4.14

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	Issue	Section reference
	<p><b>Comment:</b> Whilst this appears sound, VCAT decisions are often very subjective and likely to result in differing results. The court system sets precedent and usually results in better consistency. Hence we prefer appeals to the court.</p>	
137	<p>That there is a review mechanism for improvement and prohibition notices that specifies the steps to be undertaken. The review mechanism needs to be prompt and review should be by the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal.</p>	4.14
	<p><b>Comment:</b> Whilst this appears sound, VCAT decisions are often very subjective and likely to result in differing results. The court system sets precedent and usually results in better consistency. Hence we prefer appeals to the court.</p>	
138	<p>An application for an appeal in relation to licences/registrations and review in relation to improvement/prohibition notices must be made within 28 days after the later of: the day on which the applicant was notified of the decision the day on which the eligible person is notified by the Secretary/municipal council of the eligible person's right to a review.</p>	4.14
	<p><b>Comment:</b> Whilst this appears sound, VCAT decisions are often very subjective and likely to result in differing results. The court system sets precedent and usually results in better consistency. Hence we prefer appeals to the court.</p>	
139	<p>That a person may appeal to the Supreme Court against the exercise of an order (but not a testing or examination order) made under the equivalent section to section 121.</p>	4.14
	<p><b>Comment:</b> See comments to 139.</p>	
140	<p>That the review mechanism regarding incident and epidemic powers be similar to the current approach for reviewing public health orders (internal review to the Secretary and external review to the Supreme Court) (modelled on section 122 of the Health Act).</p>	4.14

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	Issue	Section reference
<b>Comment:</b> supported		
141	That there are no appeal provisions in relation to the exercise of emergency powers (although the proclamation of the emergency by the Governor in Council would be a disallowable instrument and the provision would not oust judicial review).	4.14
<b>Comment:</b> supported		
142	Subject to a decision to the contrary (by the Supreme Court, the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal or the person who is conducting the internal review), an appeal does not affect the decision that is subject to review.	4.14
<b>Comment:</b> supported		
143	That further consideration be given to whether the Chief Health Officer and Secretary should be able to apply to the Supreme Court to compel a person to comply with a direction that was made as part of an incident power, epidemic power, emergency power or public health order.	4.14
<b>Comment:</b> supported		
144	That the requirement that businesses conducting hairdressing be registered with municipal councils not be re-enacted in the public health Act.	5.1
<b>Comment:</b> Not supported. These activities, whilst under registration have maintained good standards. Removing an controls is very likely to result in reduction in standards. Furthermore, good business operators prefer standards to ensure all operators meet similar requirements.		
145	That the requirement that a person conducting a business of beauty therapy be registered with municipal councils be re-enacted.	5.1
<b>Comment:</b> Supported and notes at 144 apply.		
146	That businesses conducting tattooing, skin penetration and colonic irrigation be required to be registered with municipal councils.	5.1

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	Issue	Section reference
<b>Comment:</b> Supported and notes from 144 apply		
147	That the specific regulatory scheme set out in the Regulations would be proportionate to the level of risk associated with the specific activity. For example, the regulations for premises conducting skin penetration could be more prescriptive than the regulations for premises conducting beauty therapy.	5.1
<b>Comment:</b> Supported but as noted previously, guidelines that are not enforceable are of little value and must be "called" up in legislation.		
148	That definitions for "beauty therapy", "tattooing", "skin penetration" and "colonic irrigation" be included in the public health Act. The definition of skin penetration would include various cosmetic and decorative procedures such as scarification, branding and beading.	5.1
<b>Comment:</b> The addition of hairdressing should also be included		
149	That the practices of professionals who are trained in infection control and regulated by professional bodies which regard poor infection control practices as unprofessional conduct (registered medical practitioners, dentists, nurses, podiatrists and acupuncturists) be exempted from the requirement to register with municipal council. The practices of accredited pathology services and hospitals should also be exempted from the requirement to register with municipal council. However, exempt businesses would still be required to comply with the requirements regarding cleanliness of equipment (including sterilisation) and personal hygiene of each person in the business that conducts the skin penetration activity.	5.1
<b>Comment:</b> Supported		
150	That proprietors of swimming pools continue to be subject to regulation under the public health Act, but not be required to be registered with municipal councils.	5.1

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	Issue	Section reference
<p><b>Comment:</b> Not supported. We believe pools are “public health risk” and thus should be controlled. Most councils already inspect/test pool water and thus registration of same, would permit some form of cost recovery.</p>		
151	That the brothel provisions under the Health (Infectious Diseases) Regulations 2001 (Vic) not be transferred to the Prostitution Control Regulations 1995 (Vic), but that administrative arrangements between the Department of Justice and the Department of Human Services ensure that the members of the industry are informed of their requirements under the Health (Infectious Diseases) Regulations 2001 (Vic).	5.1
<p><b>Comment:</b> appears sound</p>		
152	That public health risks associated with sex on premises venues be addressed under the public health Act, by the ability for the Chief Health Officer to issue an improvement or prohibition notice if the proprietor fails to take all reasonable and practicable measures to prevent or minimize the possibility of a serious harm happening to another person (such as the spread of sexually transmissible infections).	5.1
<p><b>Comment:</b> appears sound</p>		
153	That the public health Act have regulation-making powers broad enough to allow regulation of sex on premises venues, should voluntary arrangements not succeed.	5.1
<p><b>Comment:</b> appears sound</p>		
154	The public health Act continue to require registration of premises providing accommodation to a high number of people (such as tourist accommodation and rooming houses).	5.2
<p><b>Comment:</b> High number suggests a variation from the current cut off of more than 5. We prefer that this number be retained as currently exists.</p>		

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	Issue	Section reference
155	That the regulation-making power under the public health Act be broad enough to regulate accommodation provided by people who are not necessarily “in the business” of providing prescribed accommodation. This would be broad enough to regulate accommodation provided to seasonal workers (if appropriate).	5.2
<b>Comment:</b> Totally supported.		
156	That the public health Act continue to prescribe by regulation the classes of accommodation to be registered. It is expected that the classes of accommodation currently required to be registered will continue to be prescribed by regulation, except for some residential accommodation that is adequately regulated under other legislative regimes, for example accommodation regulated under the <i>Children and Young Persons Act 1989</i> or the or the <i>Intellectually Disabled Persons’ Services Act 1986</i> . The classes of accommodation currently exempt from the requirement to be registered will probably continue to be exempt, although it would be appropriate to carefully consider facilities provided to non-permanent residents in caravan parks.	5.2
<b>Comment:</b> Support		
157	That the specific regulatory scheme set out in the Regulations be proportionate to the level of risk associated with that activity.	5.2
<b>Comment:</b> Partly supported, must cover costs		
158	That the following principles apply in relation to the investigation and control of infectious diseases: the general principles that apply to the whole Act (see 1.7) the guiding principles which are currently in section 119 of the Health Act (except to the extent that the principles are incorporated into the general guiding principles).	5.3
<b>Comment:</b> support		

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Section reference</b>
159	<p>That the following people be authorised to exercise contact tracing powers for a notifiable condition under the public health Act: authorised officers of the Department of Human Services, subject to directions of the Secretary authorised officers of council, but only if directed to do so by the Secretary and subject to the directions of the Secretary.</p> <p>These powers authorise the collection, use and disclosure of personal information and health information.</p>	5.3
<b>Comment:</b> supported		
160	<p>That contact tracing powers extend to permit information to be obtained from: the person with the condition and their contacts any other person who has or may have relevant information, including: business records other records held about the person.</p>	5.3
<b>Comment:</b> supported		
161	<p>That the public health Act clearly set out what action may be taken when contact tracing is authorised and the protections provided to individuals that may be required to provide personal information under these provisions (modelled on the <i>Public Health Act 2005 (Qld)</i>).</p>	5.3
<b>Comment:</b> supported		
162	<p>That the Chief Health Officer has the power to require a registered medical practitioner who has the appropriate qualifications or experience to conduct an autopsy on a body, or collect diagnostic specimens from a body, in cases where the Chief Health Officer reasonably believes there is a risk to public health and the coroner does not have jurisdiction over the body.</p>	5.3
<b>Comment:</b> supported		

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Section reference</b>
163	Before conducting an internal examination of the body, the Chief Health Officer would need to seek to advise the senior next of kin of the proposed internal examination. The senior next of kin would be able to object to the examination, in the same manner that the senior next of kin may object to a coroner that proposes to conduct an autopsy under the <i>Coroners Act 1985</i> (Vic).	5.3
<b>Comment:</b> appears satisfactory		
164	That the provisions in the public health Act relating to compulsory testing orders and authorisations: continue to apply to human immunodeficiency virus and forms of hepatitis that may be transmitted by blood or body fluids, such as hepatitis B, C and D continue to apply to infectious diseases that are prescribed for the purposes of the compulsory testing provisions apply to occupational incidents, irrespective of whether the person is a care-giver or custodian apply to incidents involving a volunteer or "Good Samaritan".	5.4
<b>Comment:</b> appears satisfactory		
165	That there is further consideration regarding whether there should be specific restrictions in the public health Act regarding the permitted use of a sample taken under the compulsory testing provisions.	5.4
<b>Comment:</b> appears satisfactory		
166	That public health order powers under the new Act continue to apply to an infectious disease or condition where there is a serious risk to public health.	5.5
<b>Comment:</b> appears satisfactory		
167	That the power in section 121(1) of the Health Act for the Secretary to order that a person be	5.5

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	Issue	Section reference
	<p>examined and tested for a disease be re-enacted, but the power should be granted to the Chief Health Officer. The basis of the order should continue to be a reasonable belief that the person has an infectious disease, or has been exposed to an infectious disease in circumstances where a person is reasonably likely to contract the disease.</p>	
	<p><b>Comment:</b> appears satisfactory</p>	
168	<p>That the Chief Health Officer be given the power to make an order to detain or isolate the person for the purpose of examination or testing (where a person refuses to undergo an examination or testing). The basis of the order should continue to be a reasonable belief that the person has an infectious disease, or has been exposed to an infectious disease in circumstances where a person is reasonably likely to contract the disease.</p>	5.5
	<p><b>Comment:</b> appears satisfactory</p>	
169	<p>That there should be an obligation to conduct the examination or test as soon as practicable, if an order was made on the basis of the Chief Health Officer's ("CHO's") belief that the person has an infectious disease, or has been exposed to an infectious disease in circumstances where a person is reasonably likely to contract the disease. If the CHO no longer holds the belief that is required to make an order, then the CHO must revoke that order.</p>	5.5
	<p><b>Comment:</b> appears satisfactory</p>	
170	<p>That the public health Act not include additional guiding principles from the US Model Act in respect of the power to conduct testing and examination under a public health order. Issues in relation to validity; justification; pre-test information; and post-test information (modelled on US Model Act) would be considered in developing administrative guidelines to support the provisions.</p>	5.5
	<p><b>Comment:</b> appears satisfactory</p>	

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Section reference</b>
171	Subject to a law to the contrary, the sample taken under these provisions could only be used and kept for the purpose of conducting the test or a further permitted test (such as a confirmatory test). Once there is no longer a need to keep the sample for the permitted purpose, the sample would be destroyed.	5.5
<b>Comment:</b> appears satisfactory		
172	That the public health Act include a power for the Chief Health Officer to make an order that may require a person to do any or all of the following for the period stated in the order: undergo testing or examination undergo counselling by a stated person or people refrain from stated conduct refrain from visiting stated places stay at a specified place submit to the supervision of another person undergo treatment be isolated and detained	
<b>Comment:</b> appears satisfactory		
173	That the public health Act provide that orders may be subject to the reasonable conditions the Chief Health Officer considers appropriate.	5.5
<b>Comment:</b> appears satisfactory		
174	That the general structure of the provisions indicate that the powers provided form a general hierarchy from the least to most restrictive, although there would be flexibility to allow powers to be used as needed to protect public health. As a result of this hierarchy, a restrictive order may not be imposed unless the Chief Health Officer believes: The person has an infectious disease or has been exposed to an infectious disease in circumstances where a person is reasonably likely to contract the disease; and If infected with that infectious disease, the person is likely to transmit that disease; and	5.5

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Section reference</b>
	<p>There is a serious risk to public health; and The person has been counselled, or reasonable attempts have been made to counsel the person, before the making of the restrictive order is not practicable.</p> <p>In practice, the way powers are used will be affected by: the disease concerned the availability of treatment for that disease the infectivity and ease of transmission of that disease whether urgent action will significantly affect the public health outcome whether the person will comply voluntarily with a requirement of the Chief Health Officer and, if so, to what extent the capacity of the person to understand the public health risk they present.</p>	
	<p><b>Comment:</b> appears satisfactory</p>	
175	<p>That reasonable use of force may be exercised by an authorised officer or the police to enforce a public health order made under this section. If an authorised officer exercises the power, the person may obtain the assistance of any member of the police force.</p>	5.5
	<p><b>Comment:</b> Totally supportive</p>	
176	<p>That the public health Act require that all public health orders be reviewed by the Chief Health Officer, at intervals not exceeding 28 days.</p>	5.5
	<p><b>Comment:</b> No comment – does not appear to be realistic</p>	
177	<p>That the public health Act provide that an authorised officer who is a registered medical practitioner may seek a warrant to apprehend a person who fails to comply with a public health order and take the person to a place named in the warrant.</p>	5.5
	<p><b>Comment:</b> appears satisfactory</p>	

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Section reference</b>
178	That the public health Act provide that a person on a public health order who is apprehended must be advised of his or her rights and obligations.	5.5
<b>Comment:</b> appears satisfactory		
179	That the public health Act not re-enact the offence of knowingly and recklessly infecting another person with an infectious disease, and instead rely on the <i>Crimes Act 1958</i> (Vic) for prosecutions of this nature.	5.5
<b>Comment:</b> supportive		
180	That the term “notifiable disease” be replaced by the term “notifiable condition” in the public health Act.	5.6
<b>Comment:</b> supportive		
181	That notifiable conditions (notifiable diseases) continue to be prescribed in a schedule to the regulations.	5.6
<b>Comment:</b> agree		
182	That the public health Act enable the Governor in Council to proclaim that a condition is a notifiable condition. The proclamation would be used for new and emerging diseases. This proclamation would last for up to 12 months and be a disallowable instrument.	5.6
<b>Comment:</b> agree		
183	That pathology laboratories and registered medical practitioners continue to be required to notify the Secretary of a notifiable condition, in the prescribed form and within the prescribed time.	5.6
<b>Comment:</b> agree		
184	That the public health Act require that hospitals have processes in place to ensure that notification requirements under the Act are met.	5.6

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	Issue	Section reference
<b>Comment:</b> agree		
185	That the public health Act not re-enact the HIV-specific pre and post-test counselling provisions.	5.7
<b>Comment:</b> agree		
186	That the public health Act include a regulation-making power that requires post-test counseling to be provided for prescribed diseases and by a prescribed class of people (if any). It is expected that the Regulations would require post-test counselling for positive test results for human immunodeficiency virus (and possibly hepatitis C) by registered medical practitioners, and nonmedical practitioners who have completed an approved course.	5.7
<b>Comment:</b> appears satisfactory		
187	That the public health Act not include specific privacy provisions for human immunodeficiency virus (the privacy framework for all health records provided in the <i>Health Records Act 2001</i> (Vic) would apply).	5.7
<b>Comment:</b> agree		
188	That the public health Act not retain the provision specifying that the court may be closed when evidence is presented concerning any matter related to human immunodeficiency virus and instead, courts rely on their general powers to hear evidence in a closed court.	5.7
<b>Comment:</b> agree		
189	That the public health Act include a regulation-making power to permit conditions to be imposed on pathology laboratories. For example, a requirement to take part in quality assurance programs, to refer all HIV reactive tests to a specified laboratory for confirmatory testing or to supply data for epidemiological purposes.	5.7

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	Issue	Section reference
<b>Comment:</b> agree		
190	That provisions in relation to immunisation records in children's services (Regs 14(2) and 16(0)) be retained in the Children's Services Regulations 1998 (Vic), rather than included in the public health Act.	5.8
<b>Comment:</b> Not supported. ACIR is available and should not be duplicated.		
191	That the current requirement for a parent or guardian to provide an immunisation status certificate on enrolment of their child in primary school be retained.	5.8
<b>Comment:</b> Strongly supported		
192	That a parent or guardian be required to provide evidence of immunisation status on enrolment of their child in secondary school.	5.8
<b>Comment:</b> Strongly supported		
193	That no obligation be imposed on people enrolling in tertiary facilities to provide evidence of immunisation status.	5.8
<b>Comment:</b> supported		
194	That the public health Act require school principals to make reasonable efforts to seek an immunisation status certificate for every child enrolled in the school (this would apply to primary and secondary schools).	5.8
<b>Comment:</b> Not supported in its current form, should be more strongly worded to above reasonable efforts.		
195	That the public health Act require principals to take reasonable steps to ensure that immunisation records are kept up-to-date for each child enrolled in the school.	5.8
<b>Comment:</b> Supported		

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Section reference</b>
196	That section 144(2) of the Health Act not be re-enacted in the public health Act. (This provision provides that “a person in charge of a primary school must not refuse a child admission to the school only because an immunisation status certificate has not been produced in respect of the child”. The provision is unnecessary.)	5.8
<b>Comment:</b> Should force schools to require the certificate. This will allow schools to not chase up certificates.		
197	That there be no offence for a parent or guardian failing to produce immunisation records to the school.	5.8
<b>Comment:</b> appears satisfactory		
198	That an immunisation status certificate under the public health Act include one of: a certificate issued in the prescribed form by a person authorised to do so by a municipal council a certificate issued in the prescribed form by a person who is authorised by the Australian Childhood Immunisation Register to be an immunisation provider a prescribed person who certifies that the person has been presented with the required documentary evidence in relation to each prescribed infectious disease a prescribed document (it is proposed that the Child History Statement issued by the Australian Childhood Immunisation Register would be prescribed to be an immunisation status certificate).	5.8
<b>Comment:</b> Uniformity is required for simplicity. Thus a standard form should be prescribed.		
199	That a person authorised to do so by a municipal council must issue an immunisation status certificate to a parent, where: The parent produces for each prescribed infectious disease one of the forms of evidence listed in recommendation 201 below; and	5.8

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	Issue	Section reference
	The child resides in the municipal district or attends, or proposes to attend, a school in the municipal district.	
<b>Comment:</b> supported		
200	A prescribed person or a person authorised by the Australian Childhood Immunisation Register to be an immunisation provider, may issue an immunisation status certificate if the parent produces for each prescribed infectious disease one of the forms of evidence listed in recommendation 201 below. However, it would not be a statutory obligation for these people to issue an immunisation status certificate.	5.8
<b>Comment:</b> supported - ACIR should issue the certificates.		
201	<p>That an immunisation status certificate be issued if the parent or guardian of the child produces for each prescribed infectious disease:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>evidence that the child has been immunised (this may include patient-held records, provider held records or an Australian Childhood Immunisation Register report)</li> <li>laboratory evidence that the child has developed a natural immunity and does not require immunisation</li> <li>evidence that the child has not been immunised against the disease(s) due to the reasonable belief of a registered medical practitioner that the child may suffer an adverse reaction to the vaccination</li> <li>a statutory declaration that the parent or guardian believes that the child has been vaccinated</li> <li>a statutory declaration that the parent or guardian has a conscientious objection to vaccination against a specified disease</li> <li>(f) other prescribed evidence (it is envisaged that the regulations would provide that a parent report of varicella infection (chicken pox) would be prescribed).</li> </ul>	5.8
<b>Comment:</b> appears satisfactory		

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Section reference</b>
202	That an immunisation status certificate must cover the prescribed diseases. The vaccines listed under the National Health and Medical Research Council <i>National Immunisation Program</i> could be prescribed.	5.8
<b>Comment:</b> supported		
203	That a parent or guardian be required to notify the school if their child is infected or comes into contact with a person infected with a vaccine preventable or excludable infectious disease.	5.9
<b>Comment:</b> supported		
204	That exclusion periods from schools and children's services for infectious disease cases and contacts continue to be prescribed.	5.9
<b>Comment:</b> supported		
205	That the Chief Health Officer be given discretion to waive or alter the prescribed periods in individual cases.	5.9
<b>Comment:</b> Not supported. Uniformity is important		
206	That school principals and people in charge of children's services be required to seek advice from the Department of Human Services before excluding children where: the child enrolled in the school or children's service is suffering from a vaccine preventable illness the child enrolled in the school or children's service has not been immunised and has been in contact with a person at the school or service who is infected with the disease.	5.9
<b>Comment:</b> appears satisfactory		
207	That the provisions in the new Act and Regulations be consistent with National Health and Medical Research Council <i>Guidelines on the Recommended Minimum Periods of Exclusion from School, Preschool and Child Care Centres of Infectious</i>	5.9

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	Issue	Section reference
	<i>Disease Cases and Contacts.</i>	
	<b>Comment:</b> supported	
208	That the provisions of the Health Act concerning offensive waterways (ss 68–72) not be included in the public health Act.	6.1
	<b>Comment:</b> supported	
209	That the public health Act include a consequential provision repealing section 275 of the <i>Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works Act 1958</i> (Vic) (which refers to Division 4 of Part 4 of the Health Act).	6.1
	<b>Comment:</b> supported	
210	That a separate regulation-making power regarding rats and mice, as is currently contained in section 87 of the Health Act, not be included in the public health Act.	6.1
	<b>Comment:</b> supported	
211	That the regulation-making powers in the public health Act be broad enough to make regulations to control specific public health risks, including public health risks posed by insects and animals capable of carrying a disease transmissible to humans.	6.1
	<b>Comment:</b> supported	
212	That, subject to the amendments noted below, Parts 5A and 5B of the <i>Building Act 1993</i> (Vic) be transferred to the public health Act.	6.2
	<b>Comment:</b> Strongly supported	
213	That responsibility for registration transfer from the Building Commission to the Secretary to the Department of Human Services.	6.2
	<b>Comment:</b> Strongly supported	

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Section reference</b>
214	That the public health Act provide that the owner of the land on which there is a cooling tower system must ensure that the system is registered.	6.2
<b>Comment:</b> supported		
215	That the public health Act continue to provide that the owner of the land on which there is a cooling tower system is responsible for the obligations noted in sections 75EA, 75EB, 75EC, 75ED and 75FA of the <i>Building Act 1993</i> (Vic).	6.2
<b>Comment:</b> supported		
216	That the public health Act provide that the Secretary is able to vary the risk management requirements for a particular cooling tower system or class of systems, including: specified maintenance and testing requirements specified aspects of risk management plans specified audit requirements where the Secretary is satisfied that such an exemption would not pose a higher health risk.	6.2
<b>Comment:</b> supported		
217	That the public health Act include a power to make regulations that exempt a person from complying with the requirements of the Act. These exemptions could be made subject to conditions.	6.2
<b>Comment:</b> supported		
218	That the public health Act enable the Governor in Council to make regulations that would re-enact the provisions in Part 3 of the Health (Legionella) Regulations 2001 (Vic) (maintenance and testing of warm water systems).	6.2
<b>Comment:</b> supported		
219	That the public health Act not include a provision enabling the owners of mobile cooling tower systems to register that cooling tower system and notify the Secretary where it is located. The owner	6.2

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	Issue	Section reference
	of the land on which the cooling tower system is located would need to register the system.	
<p><b>Comment:</b> supported</p>		
220	That the public health Act not re-enact Part 15 of the Health Act.	6.3
<p><b>Comment:</b> Strongly not supported – The VMA are not interested in food standards and thus retention is necessary. We have had numerous complaints that VMA will not act on.</p>		
221	That there is a consequential amendment made to section 35(2) of the <i>Meat Industry Act 1993</i> (Vic), so that the reference to “consulting the Minister administering the <i>Health Act 1958</i> ” is changed to “consulting the Minister administering the <i>Food Act 1984</i> ”. (Section 35(2) relates to consultation before there is an exemption by the Governor in Council from the prohibition of selling meat for human consumption, which is from a mammal that is not a “consumable animal”.)	6.3
<p><b>Comment:</b> Strongly not supported – The VMA are not interested in food standards and thus retention is necessary. We have had numerous complaints that VMA will not act on.</p>		
222	That the provisions in Part 15 of the Health Act not be incorporated into either the <i>Meat Industry Act 1993</i> (Vic) or the <i>Food Act 1984</i> (Vic).	6.3
<p><b>Comment:</b> Strongly not supported – The VMA are not interested in food standards and thus retention is necessary. We have had numerous complaints that VMA will not act on.</p>		
223	That the <i>Food Act 1984</i> (Vic) be amended so that it is an offence against the <i>Food Act 1984</i> (Vic) for a person to contravene the requirements of section 34(1) of the <i>Meat Industry Act 1993</i> (Vic) at, on or in respect of: food premises that are registered under Part 6 food premises that are required to be registered under Part 6.  The penalty would be the same as it is for a breach	6.3

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	Issue	Section reference
	of section 34(1) of the <i>Meat Industry Act 1993</i> (Vic) (100 penalty units; subsequent offence 500 penalty units or 12 months imprisonment).	
	<b>Comment:</b> See previous comments. We need the power to deal with meat issues	
225	That, following further analysis of the provisions in Part 20 of the <i>Health Act 1958</i> (Vic) and Parts 8 (Vic) and Parts 8 and 9 of the <i>Food Act 1984</i> (Vic), consequential amendments be made to the <i>Food Act 1984</i> (Vic) so that the relevant provisions of Part 20 of the Health Act (as amended) are inserted into the <i>Food Act 1984</i> (Vic) as new and separate provisions.	6.3
	<b>Comment:</b> Strongly not supported – The VMA are not interested in food standards and thus retention is necessary. We have had numerous complaints that VMA will not act on. See previous comments	
226	That consideration be given to whether the <i>Food Act 1984</i> (Vic) should be amended, in line with the proposed provisions in the public health Act, to provide that a municipal council may appoint an authorised officer under the <i>Food Act 1984</i> (Vic), if the council is satisfied that the authorized officer has the training or experience required to perform his or her functions. The competencies regarding training or experience would not be specified in the Act.	6.3
	<b>Comment:</b> Not supported. Specific educational standards are required and should be met. This is a sub standard option.	
227	That consideration be given to whether the <i>Food Act 1984</i> (Vic) should be amended, in line with recommendations 8 and 9 above to provide: That the <i>Food Act 1984</i> (Vic) applies throughout Victoria (including areas that do not form part of a municipal district) That the Governor in Council may declare that a municipal council has specified powers and functions under the <i>Food Act 1984</i> (Vic) in relation to an area that is outside a municipal district, as if the area was within that municipal council's municipal district. (The	6.3

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	Issue	Section reference
	Minister for Health would be required to consult with the Minister administering the <i>Local Government Act 1989</i> (Vic), before making a recommendation to the Governor in Council in relation to this issue.)	
	<b>Comment:</b> Strongly support	
228	That the public health Act retain the current licensing requirements, with the additional aspects noted below.	6.4
	<b>Comment:</b> support	
229	That the public health Act continue to provide for the licensing of trainee pest control operators where applicants are: undergoing prescribed training (for example completion of units of competency as specified in the <i>National Standard for Licensing of Pest Management Technicians (1999)</i> or completion of a prescribed course as listed in the current Health (Pest Control) Regulations 2002 (Vic)) operating under the prescribed supervision of a person who is licensed as a pest control operator to use those pesticides.	6.4
	<b>Comment:</b> supported	
230	That pest control operator licences be issued for a period of up to 3 years and may be subject to conditions relating to: pesticide use, including uses that are for purposes noted in section 108C(1A) of the Health Act (for example, weed control and agricultural). The Secretary to the Department of Human Services would need to consult with the Secretary to the Department of Primary Industries before imposing a condition that specifically related to uses that are for purposes noted in section 108C(1A) of the Health Act. minimum competency standards compliance with the <i>Agricultural and Veterinary Chemicals (Control of Use) Act 1992</i> (Vic) and	6.4

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	Issue	Section reference
	(Vic) and the <i>Occupational Health and Safety Act 2004</i> (Vic).	
<b>Comment:</b> supported		
231	That it be an offence for a pest control operator to contravene a condition of his or her licence.	6.4
<b>Comment:</b> supported		
232	That pest control operator licences be issued for a period of up to 3 years and may be subject to conditions relating to: pesticide use, including uses that are for purposes noted in section 108C(1A) of the Health Act (for example, weed control and agricultural). The Secretary to the Department of Human Services would need to consult with the Secretary to the Department of Primary Industries before imposing a condition that specifically related to uses that are for purposes noted in section 108C(1A) of the Health Act. minimum competency standards compliance with the <i>Agricultural and Veterinary Chemicals (Control of Use) Act 1992</i> (Vic) and (Vic) and the <i>Occupational Health and Safety Act 2004</i> (Vic).	6.4
<b>Comment:</b> supported		
232	That the public health Act contain a provision allowing the Secretary to issue endorsements on licences for pest control operators to use a prescribed chemical product, within the meaning of section 30 of the <i>Agricultural and Veterinary Chemicals (Control of Use) Act 1992</i> (Vic).	6.4
<b>Comment:</b> supported		
233	That, in exercising his or her discretion to issue an endorsement on a licence, the Secretary must be satisfied that the pest control operator is competent	6.4

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Section reference</b>
	<p>to use the prescribed chemical product for which the endorsement is to be issued. The Secretary to the Department of Human Services would need to consult with the Secretary to the Department of Primary Industries before issuing an endorsement on a licence to use a prescribed chemical product within the meaning of section 30 of the <i>Agricultural and Veterinary Chemicals (Control of Use) Act 1992</i> (Vic), if that chemical could (Vic), if that chemical could not be used for a purpose covered by section 108C(1) (such as a herbicide).</p>	
	<b>Comment:</b> supported	
234	<p>That the Secretary be given the power to cancel, suspend, refuse to grant or vary a licence under the new Act on any of the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the licence was issued in error or because of a document or representation that was false or misleading or omitted a material particular</li> <li>the licence was obtained or made in an improper way</li> <li>the holder has not complied with a condition of the licence</li> <li>the holder of the licence has contravened the Act or regulations or other legislation regulating the use of pesticides (such as the <i>Occupational Health and Safety Act 2004</i> (Vic), the <i>Agricultural and Veterinary Chemicals (Control of Use) Act 1992</i> (Vic) or corresponding interstate legislation) (Vic) or corresponding interstate legislation)</li> <li>the Secretary is no longer satisfied that the person is a fit and proper person</li> <li>the Secretary has formed the view on reasonable grounds that to do otherwise (to issue the licence or refrain from cancelling, suspending or varying the licence) may endanger public health.</li> </ul>	6.4
	<b>Comment:</b> supported	
235	<p>That pest control operators be required to keep prescribed records for a prescribed period of, say, up to 7 years.</p>	6.4

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	Issue	Section reference
	<b>Comment:</b> supported	
236	That the public health Act includes a regulation-making power requiring pest control operators to give notice of their proposed use of a pesticide in specified situations.	6.4
	<b>Comment:</b> supported	
237	That the public health Act not include any provisions regulating the non-commercial use of pesticides (except to the extent that these are addressed by the nuisance provisions or the Chief Health Officer's ability to issue an improvement or prohibition notice).	6.4
	<b>Comment:</b> appears satisfactory	
238	That further consideration be given to the development of a memorandum of understanding between the Department of Human Services and the Department of Primary Industries (and other relevant agencies and departments), clarifying the roles and responsibilities of different agencies and departments involved in the management of spray drifts.	6.4
	<b>Comment:</b> appears satisfactory	
239	That the public health Act provides that an employer of a pest control operator is guilty of an offence if the pest control operator contravenes the provisions of the Act relating to pest control. This would be subject to a due diligence defence analogous to section 17E of the <i>Food Act 1984</i> (Vic).	6.4
	<b>Comment:</b> appears satisfactory	
240	That it is an offence for a person to hold him or herself out as being able to use pesticides, where the person would need to be licensed to use these pesticides and the person does not have the required licence.	6.4

**SUBMISSION OF MARK VERBAKEN  
TO THE HEALTH ACT REVIEW DRAFT POLICY PAPER**

	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Section reference</b>
<b>Comment:</b> appears satisfactory		
241	That the public health Act not introduce an offence provision relating to damaging a person's property.	6.4
<b>Comment:</b> appears satisfactory		
242	That Part 13 of the Act (s 228), which empowers the Governor in Council to make regulations relating to precautions against fire, not be re-enacted in the public health Act.	6.5
<b>Comment:</b> appears satisfactory		