

**JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE
COMMISSIONER FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE**

**REVIEW OF THE EXERCISE OF THE
FUNCTIONS OF THE COMMISSIONER**

**TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE
TAKEN AT PERTH
WEDNESDAY, 19 NOVEMBER 2014**

Members

**Ms L.L. Baker (Chair)
Hon Robyn McSweeney (Deputy Chair)
Ms E. Evangel
Hon Sally Talbot**

Hearing commenced at 10.05 am

Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN
Attorney General, examined:

Mr MARTIN CONNOLLY
Policy Adviser to the Attorney General, Department of the Premier and Cabinet, examined:

The CHAIR: On behalf of the Joint Standing Committee on the Commissioner for Children and Young People, thank you, Attorney General, and your policy adviser, Martin, for your appearance before us today. The purpose of the hearing is to assist the committee in its review of the functions exercised by the commissioner with particular reference to the recommendations contained in the recent review of the commissioner, which you tabled in Parliament on 20 August this year. At this stage, I formally introduce myself, the member for Maylands, Lisa Baker; the missing Hon Robyn McSweeney, member for South West Region—who we imagine will be here at any minute, I hope—and the member for Perth, Eleni Evangel, whom I know you know. Also assisting us is Liz Kerr, Clerk Assistant (Committees) of the Legislative Assembly; Renee Gould, the principal research officer for the committee; and our Hansard team. This is a formal proceeding of Parliament and therefore commands the same respect given to a proceeding in the house. Even though the committee is not asking witnesses to provide evidence on oath or affirmation, it is important that you understand that any deliberate misleading of the committee may be regarded as contempt of Parliament. This is a public hearing and Hansard will be making a transcript of the proceedings for the public record. If you refer to any documents during your evidence, it would assist Hansard if you could provide a full title for the record. I now have to ask you a series of final questions. Have you completed the “Details of Witness” form?

Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN: I have, yes.

The CHAIR: Do you understand the notes at the bottom of the form about giving evidence?

Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN: Yes.

The CHAIR: Did you receive and read the information for witnesses briefing sheet provided?

Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN: Yes.

The CHAIR: Do you have any questions in relation to being a witness today?

Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN: No.

The CHAIR: Perhaps to start with, the best thing to do is to ask you how important you think the role of the commissioner is in WA, and I will let you take it from there.

Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN: As far as the government is concerned, the commissioner performs an important role in the state working with relevant stakeholders to promote the interests of children and young people, and identifying areas in which policy or some other action is required. In particular, the Commissioner for Children and Young People is well placed to advocate to government where it is considered that particular action is required to help improve the lives of children and young people in Western Australia. The review has confirmed the importance of the position and although it has recommended some minor changes to the legislation, it has essentially endorsed the current format of the legislation and the functions that the commissioner is currently called upon to perform. There have been some issues regarding slightly enhancing those functions that you are aware of, and we will no doubt hear more about that in the course of the public

comment period for the review, which was put out I think on 20 August for a three-month public exposure. We look forward to seeing what comes of that. I understand that to date there have been submissions from about three different interest groups, and more may come.

[10.10 am]

The CHAIR: Good. Thank you very much, Attorney. I suppose while we are on the subject of the commissioner—we were hoping that Fiona would join us as it would have been helpful to follow up on the appointment process because I just feel like you may not know what I am going to ask, which is how they are going with appointing a new commissioner.

Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN: As it happens, I think that the acting commissioner was a bit concerned about coming in with me because she had not been particularly summonsed as a party at this stage, and if you wanted to hear from her you would, although I did have the benefit of a briefing with her before attending today. The recruitment process is underway. I recently met with the Public Sector Commissioner and discussed the initiation of that process and it has been initiated. Currently as I understand it, the job description and other paperwork is with the Office of the Commissioner for Children and Young People and the job description is being settled. Part of the issue there is to ensure that there is sufficient identification of the skill sets that would enable the commissioner to take on the monitoring, awareness-raising and referral role envisaged for child sex abuse complaints or child abuse complaints. I expect the paperwork very shortly with a view to potentially advertising a position in early December. A question arises as a matter of strategy whether we advertise—I would like to get the position filled earlier rather than later, but it is a question of timing: does one issue an advertisement over the Christmas–new year period or wait until the new year, or does one issue it earlier and have an extended period for expressions of interest and applications? I will discuss that with the Public Sector Commissioner and see which is, in his experience, the most effective way of going about it.

The CHAIR: That is very promising, thank you. I wonder if you do not mind me reading a little bit of a preamble to my next question. In the UK at the moment—I do not expect you are across this—they are about to appoint a new Children's Commissioner for England. The current commissioner, Maggie, has been there for two terms now, so there is a new appointment. In the process for appointing a new commissioner, they have a select committee that has a formal role in the appointment process. In respect of this appointment—the Children's Commissioner in the UK—the Education Committee in England conducts a pre-appointment hearing with the government's preferred candidate, and in this instance it is a lady called Anne Longfield OBE. They already did that on 11 November and they published a report for their government about the committee's views on the government's recommended candidate. It is kind of just an additional commentary or an additional part of the recruitment process. This may be more a question for the Public Service Commissioner to consider, and this committee does not have a specific role, but I wondered if the WA government might be persuaded to consider a similar role in future, mind you we will not be appointing that many new commissioners on a frequent basis we hope, but it is an interesting model that the UK has chosen.

Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN: I was not aware of that and as to its desirability and the pros and cons I would not be able to comment. If I could just say that there is, for example, with the Commissioner for the Corruption and Crime Commission a role for the joint standing committee there, but that is entrenched in legislation. So I would have thought that at the very least if there was to be some formal role in the appointment of a public officer by a parliamentary committee that it would have to require some legislative amendment in order to accommodate that.

The CHAIR: But they are not appointing it.

Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN: There may be other issues, but even then in the appointment process—I confess I am not over the detail of it—it would be my understanding that a selection committee would be appointed under the authority of the Public Sector Commissioner who would

make recommendations and the like, or an external agency, albeit a parliamentary committee, to have a role in that would need to be formalised by some legislative amendment, but otherwise I am speculating.

The CHAIR: I more or less understood that that would be the case. I just thought that it is an interesting model that the UK has been using.

Hon ROBYN McSWEENEY: Would you not change the legislation here first, given that you need to put recommendations in it from the Blaxell report? Would you not have to change the act of the commissioner first, in Parliament, before appointing a new one, or would you appoint somebody to keep on going until the act has been done?

Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN: The commissioner is currently performing several functions that are foreshadowed by the Blaxell inquiry and report. I could go into some more detail, but the commissioner is involved in awareness-raising among children and young people, monitoring the way that complaints can be dealt with and are dealt with, and can perform a referral function to a large extent without any amendment to the legislation for that purpose. Sorry, my train of thought has gone off the rails for a second. The current functions under section 19 of the act would seem to be broad enough, particularly, I think, paragraph (h) to embrace the sorts of functions or to a large degree the sorts of functions envisaged by the Blaxell report. If there is sufficient identification of that particular role in the job description, we would hopefully be getting people applying who have the skill set necessary to do that. There is no necessity to amend the legislation so far as that goes. If what emerges from—currently, the review, of course, does not envisage amending the legislation to changing the selection process. On an earlier occasion, I was before the committee, and otherwise, I had made mention that it appeared as though the appointment process was a very long and cumbersome one. I am informed that it ought not to take that long this time around, because that was the plenary or the inaugural commissioner and the structures had not been set up for the appropriate liaison between interest groups and those responsible for the appointment. Since then, there has been an awful lot of work done to establish contacts with various interest groups for consultation purposes generally, and the Public Sector Commissioner would expect to use those facilities in order to consult within the requirements of the act in respect of any future appointment. In fact, those contacts and those avenues have been used for the purposes of the review, and they have proved to be quite effective. We do know who the interest groups are, how to contact them and how to best deal with them, because the commission's office has been doing that for the last several years, so the process ought to be a bit more streamlined this time.

Getting back to it, no amendment is being considered for that aspect. To look at adding a role for an external agency, albeit a parliamentary committee, in the selection process is something that I would have to get advice on and consider. That would require, I would have thought, some specific accommodation in the act.

Hon ROBYN McSWEENEY: It would be unusual.

Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN: It would be unusual. There may be some desirable features about it, there may not. I do not know how it functions in the United Kingdom or whether it is effective. The provisions for the appointment of the commissioner for the Corruption and Crime Commission are specifically crafted to try to ensure that there are enough checks and balances, and the like to ensure that a political lackey, for example, was not appointed to that significant and very powerful role. I do not think that the same sensitivity is necessary in respect of the commissioner. The role, I think, is everyone brings their own personality and vision to the position. I see it essentially as being someone who is an advocate to government, not necessarily an advocate against government, but an advocate to government on behalf of the interest groups to assist the government in formulating policy and in refining the way that children and young people dealt with. So far, well, we will see how it goes in the next selection process, but I have no reason to suppose you will not select a suitable candidate.

The CHAIR: I think you raised a good point, Attorney General, the UK experience has been based on the massive upheavals that they have gone through before the commissioner was put in place, and so their attitude towards the appointment is far more politically focused along much more the lines of the Corruption and Crime Commission. I think you have hit the nail on the head, in WA we have perhaps not had that level of public outcry to make this an appointment that needs scrutiny. Anyway, that is fine.

[10.20 am]

Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN: I might also volunteer that it may be that the commissioner there has specific powers beyond those in our legislation that may require additional bipartisan involvement in the selection process in order to give comfort that those powers are not going to be misused. That is not the case as I see it with our particular commissioner, whose function is more of an assistance role.

The CHAIR: Thank you.

Hon ROBYN McSWEENEY: Very, sorry, Attorney General.

The CHAIR: Perhaps if we can continue on with the Blaxell line of inquiry, because you kind of got us there by mentioning it a couple of times. The committee is interested in your views about the role. We had a discussion before you came about the scope of the work that the commissioner might take on and the fact that it is all quite grey at the moment about how much she or he could take on, and how that would evolve. I was wondering, from your sense of it, do you have a position on what you think the commissioner should do? You mentioned some of the functions that have already covered in the act, is there any area that you think needs strengthening specifically?

Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN: No, I would not have thought so. I think the review identified the issues that did need to be dealt with. As far as the Blaxell issue is concerned, I am advised by the acting commissioner there is already, because of that royal commission into child sex abuse generally, as well as the Blaxell inquiry, an increased awareness by agencies of the potential for child abuse and the need to better protect children and young people, particularly those who are in institutions. Although the government has indicated that it will await the outcome of the findings and what can be learnt from the commonwealth royal commission into institutionalised abuse, there is a lot that can be done by our commissioner now, and is being done, in that field. I am informed that since the review was conducted, the office has commenced work on the development and promotion of resources to promote child safe organisations. It has appointed a reference group to assist the commissioner in that project, comprising both government and non-government agencies. The commissioner has consulted with children and young people to seek their ideas about what makes an organisation safe and friendly, and what strategies they would recommend for a child or young person who is feeling unsafe when engaging with an organisation. There is further education and outreach work that is to be commenced. It has been outlined in the review. Otherwise, there are powers that the commissioner has currently under the legislation to require reporting from agencies on specific matters, and the commissioner can engage and use those powers.

One area that the review was most concerned about was the idea of duplicating any investigative role. That is one of the things that had exercised my mind and that of government and those conducting the review. Superficially—it is a bit hard to know what Commissioner Blaxell had in mind in detail—but if he had in mind an investigative-type role or a gloss over the current investigative roles that are performed by police and others, it does raise significant problems. Child sexual abuse and the investigation and prosecution of it is a very specialised area nowadays. The facilities that have been provided to facilitate investigations and effective prosecutions are quite refined, including early interviews that can be recorded and may be used in evidence later on and things of that nature. It requires some significant training on the part of those to whom those issues are reported and are conducting those investigations to make sure that they do it properly and do not taint the evidence and do not render it inadmissible in some fashion, as well as to ensure that it is

comprehensive and sufficiently detailed to sustain a prosecution. There would be a very grave risk, unless you set up the commissioner as a specialist investigating unit, to even touch on going into those areas. That requires some special management in order to ensure, for example, that if someone does come to the commissioner saying that they had been abused in some fashion that whatever is said does not compromise a prosecution down the track or the investigation. The commissioner needs to be very careful about how the commissioner receives those sorts of complaints. The emphasis, I think, is better set, and I think the commissioner is working on that, in a way of being a referral agency, apart from enhancing awareness and providing information that would comfort complainants or those who were acting on behalf of complainants, such as parents or friends, and directing them to the correct agencies, ensuring that those complaints are being dealt with sensitively and appropriately, and that there is an appropriate response by the various government agencies, and indeed private agencies, that may be in receipt of complaints to know how to deal with them and what to do with them. I believe work is being done on that and it is being accommodated within the current structure of the act. The commissioner has very broad powers and can require information on matters from other government agencies. There are, of course, limits in respect of confidentiality and the like, but I am sure that in many cases those can be worked out with commonsense and goodwill between the agencies that are concerned. There is always going to be some clash of interests between various responsible authorities as to who should take precedence and whose legislation and processes should govern a particular case, but I am sure that, as in most cases, those things can be worked out sensibly.

The CHAIR: I was going to say in your best guess, but that is probably not parliamentary at all. In relation to the term “full implementation”—in your media release you said “we’ll wait for implementation for a couple of years”—had you hoped that any specific things would come out of the royal commission that might inform the commissioner’s role in that expanded sense? You have already said a lot is already covered, but have you any views about what is not covered at the moment, without pre-empting the review?

[10.30 am]

Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN: No. There may very well be something we can learn from the commonwealth royal commission. I do not mean this to be taken as a final view, because I am waiting to see what the royal commission might come up with that might point the way to improvements and enhancements to what is currently being undertaken. I have indicated that I have considerable reservations about duplicating the role of other agencies that have the primary responsibility for dealing with criminal complaints or the welfare of children, such as the Department for Child Protection and the Western Australia Police, and indeed even the Corruption and Crime Commission in appropriate cases. If the royal commission identifies areas that can comfortably fit with the commissioner’s role, then we would take action to improve that and to implement that. But I simply do not know. At the moment, going further than we have done at present may create more issues than they solve. I would like to see the effectiveness of the current strategies that are being implemented by the commissioner in order to see that those are effective or, if they are not effective, enhancing the commissioner’s capacity to fulfil those. Another factor, of course, is that we are at the moment dealing with an acting commissioner. I think she has done a fantastic job, but a new commissioner may take a slightly different view of what is and is not necessary, and I will of course take advice from that commissioner if another one is appointed. Indeed, if the current one happens to be interested in the job and is reappointed, she may have a slightly different approach to it rather than being in a caretaker mode. There are a number of things I need to balance. But at the moment I think that the bulk of the concerns of the Blaxell report can be accommodated within the current structure and with the approaches that are being taken. I have had no indication that there are things that the commissioner cannot do that they feel they should be doing. I really do not know what the royal commission might come up with. Of course, the royal commission is also looking back into some very, very old cases that may be of

very limited value in the current environment. It is like many royal commissions: they look historically and make recommendations based on what things have happened in the past and their understanding of what the situation is at the time that they complete their evidence. But by that stage governments tend to move on and modify things in the meantime as the problems are identified. Often, royal commission reports tend to be very out of date.

The CHAIR: Historical. From what you are saying, Attorney General—without putting words in your mouth—I am sensing that there are a number of changes to the legislation that you could progress fairly soon? Is that your intention? They are quite technical and minor.

Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN: Well, the ones that emerge from the review, yes; those can be, and we will determine the priority for doing those early next year. As Hon Robyn McSweeney would know, there is priority set for legislation from time to time, and so we will see how our legislative program completes this year and as to where the priorities are going to be put next year. I have to say that although there are some very useful things that need to be done with the legislation, I think that by and large it has not been a case of saying there is a fundamental flaw with it that needs urgent attention. I am not suggesting that I am going to put it at the bottom of the pile, but it is not the highest priority to do the tweaking that is recommended at the moment, in my mind. But, again, if someone tells me or the commissioner says, “Look, I really think this needs to be done more urgently”, then I will of course take that on board and deal with it.

Hon ROBYN McSWEENEY: The commissioner has wideranging powers now, so I understand what you are saying. There is nothing that she cannot do now that she could do with new legislation. Her charter is to look at children and how children are faring in this state, and if she sees something that needs doing, then she does it.

Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN: Particularly paragraph (h), which is —

to promote public awareness and understanding of matters relating to the wellbeing of children and young people;

That embraces the outreach roles that are currently being put into effect. There is the ability to conduct special inquiries, if that proves to be necessary. There is power in paragraph (o) —

to do anything which the Commissioner considers is necessary or convenient to further the principle in section 3 or any of the guiding principles in section 4;

And in paragraph (p) —

to perform any other function conferred on the Commissioner by or under this Act or any other written law.

There are some very wide-ranging powers, and that is one of the reasons why there have been no significant changes recommended by the review. But, of course, we have the public consultation period which is drawing to a close—20 November, I think—so we will see what comes of that as well.

The CHAIR: Are you happy with the review recommendations as they stand? Is there nothing you would add or take away or change?

Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN: No.

The CHAIR: That is interesting.

Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN: I was keen to have an independent review of the legislation in order to see whether the office was being effective, whether it could be improved and whether there were deficiencies in the legislation, and the review seems by and large to have concluded that it is functioning satisfactorily and fulfilling the objectives. And, of course, as I say, every commissioner will bring to it his or her particular vision and approach to the issues, and give, among the various functions, more or less emphasis to one or the other, depending on what they perceive to be the

immediate problems that need addressing. It is like in any other role of authority, but I am confident that the legislation is functioning satisfactorily.

The CHAIR: I will just pick up on an issue around achieving a good balance between the roles around complaints investigation that you have touched on, about how that might work. Into the future it seems that what Blaxell has done is put a light on the need to do that effectively and lift its importance in the commissioner's role in some respects, Attorney. So, with that in mind, there may be work that he or she needs to do that they are not currently resourced to do in the future. Is that something which you would be looking for comments on from the review that is out at the moment?

Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN: I would have thought the best person to say whether resources are needed for a particular function that are not currently available would be the commissioner. I do not mean to downplay the role of interest groups, but I have never known interest groups to say that there has been enough money or resources devoted to anything of their concern.

Hon ROBYN McSWEENEY: That is perceptive of you!

Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN: I suppose the other side is that, of course, more resources can be thrown into everything. But the commissioner has a budget and specified statutory functions. The current acting commissioner has achieved economies in that office by realigning some of the work that is being done in order to use the resources more effectively. There have been certain savings achieved in respect of lease accommodation, and those savings have been diverted into the educational and outreach roles, as I understand it. The acting commissioner will be able to give you more detail on how they have gone about that and what is necessary, but I am not aware of any deficiency in resources to be able to fulfil the role that is currently being undertaken, or the further work that is being undertaken to fulfil the Blaxell requirements.

Hon ROBYN McSWEENEY: Our committee, as you would know, is having an inquiry looking at everything to do with children's commissioners, and that can only be of benefit to the Attorney General's office. You are aware of it anyway, but any assistance that we can give through this inquiry, I believe, you would find helpful.

[10.40 am]

Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN: I appreciate that. There is always something to learn, and this committee has of course the facility to look around at other jurisdictions, determine best practice and inquire as to how roles may be more effectively promoted elsewhere and learn from the experience and indeed the mistakes in other jurisdictions and enhance the role here. And many of those things may not require any legislative amendment, but simply changing practices and internal things that the commissioner, albeit an independent statutory officer, can benefit from.

The CHAIR: Do you have any other questions that you want to pick up on?

Ms E. EVANGEL: Just a point that I wanted to make. My observations with the role of the commissioner over the last 18 months is that there is a lot of good works being undertaken in terms of reports relating to different issues regarding children in this state. But I would like to see implementation of those reports. I am seeing a lot of awareness-raising and I am seeing a lot of identifying of things that need to be done, but I think that what we might need to look at, because there is some good research coming out through the commissioner's office, and perhaps the resourcing that we might look at is actually the implementation of the good work, because I just do not see the point of having the good work if we are not going to be using it. That is just an observation of mine in my nearly 18 months of being here.

Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN: I take the point. I should mention, of course, that there are other agencies, if you like, where the commissioner can consult with or advise. Many things can happen behind the scenes where the commissioner identifies a problem and talks to the Commissioner of Police, for example, and suggest an improvement and things of that nature. They do not achieve headlines or necessarily even come to the attention of anyone, but practice and functional things can

be done behind the scenes. Indeed, the Commissioner for Victims of Crime has been doing an awful lot of work in that regard, and within the first, I think, 100 days of her taking up her position, she sent me a list of about 20 different things that she thought could be done, and has been diligently working away negotiating with the courts, the DPP, the Department of the Attorney General, the Prisoners Review Board, the Commissioner of Police and others on ways that things can be improved for victims of crime. In the same way, the commissioner can do an awful lot of good without necessarily changing the world or requiring an enormous amount of resources to throw into a particular issue. There may be little systemic issues that could be fixed by simply just commonsense discussion as to how things can be done better. But I will go back to the office and see whether there are any more recent reports and whether they are being dealt with seriously and their contents are being taken into consideration and find out what has been happening in that regard—or at least Martin will!

Hon ROBYN McSWEENEY: That was a good handball if ever I saw one!

The CHAIR: I think we have nearly finished, Attorney. I was just going to further underline what Eleni has said. The committee's last report on the work of the commissioner, or I think our first report not our last report, suggested that it might be beneficial to look at the outcomes, and try to give us more indication of how the translation has occurred between the research findings and changing what is really happening. I think that from my perspective, as a member of this committee, it has been very obvious that having a children's commissioner in Ireland, in Scotland, in England and in Europe has done very little effectively to change what was happening on the ground in families. So, what is happening in those developed countries is an awareness that they actually need to be more cognisant of how effective their work is in changing what is happening so that we do get better reporting of child abuse, but so that child abuse is lowered rather than just reported. So there is quite a lot of work being done, and I think that is pretty much what is driving what is happening overseas these days, from my research anyway. So, I think we agree with you: it would be good to get some outcomes to show what the work is actually doing.

Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN: Yes, look, if I might offer, again, a slice of personal philosophy, it is a bit difficult, I think, to properly compare various jurisdictions. Every country, every jurisdiction, will have its own background and history. Ireland may have had a particular one because of its culture, its history. It may have had to catch up a lot more than, say, Western Australia where we have had, albeit with failings, at least some attention to these issues for some time. Just by way of an example, it is not meant to be necessarily indicative, our changes to the Evidence Act over the last 20 years to facilitate the taking of evidence in cases of child abuse to allow children to give evidence by closed-circuit television—things of that nature—those have been ahead of any other Australian jurisdiction. Other jurisdictions are catching up to us. So when you look at a different environment and say, "Hey, look, they have had to do A, B, C and D in order to achieve it", we may have already achieved those things 20 years ago. I can remember back in 1985, my first exposure to the crown law department to a case involving child rape up in Kununurra and just what was not available there compared to what is available now and has been since 1996 when the victims of crime legislation was put in and things have advanced by leaps and bounds since. So, sure, we can always learn more and there may be ways of refining our practices, but translating the experience of another jurisdiction and saying that we should do this as well may not necessarily be the best way to go. In many respects I think we can do better than that and I think that we have. I am not saying that there are no problems, but I do not know whether there is much that the Irish Commissioner for Children and Young People can teach us. We might be able to teach them a bit in the ways that we accommodate the interests of different demographics in our society.

The CHAIR: We had a swag of questions that we thought you would probably not want to go into now—they are more technical and mechanical in nature. I am wondering whether you would be agreeable to us just putting them on notice and sending them through to you.

Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN: Absolutely.

The CHAIR: Thank you very much, that would be fantastic, Attorney. Is there anything, Attorney, that you wish to add on this occasion?

Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN: No, but thank you for the opportunity to talk to you. I hope you have drawn something from it that will be useful for your work. Thank you for the relatively informal nature of it. It has been a pleasant experience!

The CHAIR: We do not get that comment from many witnesses! I need to read the closing statement, Attorney. Thank you for your evidence before the committee today. The principal research officer will be writing to you with some questions on notice—some that you have agreed to provide and the committee wishes to clarify as a result of this hearing; that is what we will be sending to you. Your attention to this matter is appreciated. A transcript of the hearing will be forwarded to you for correction of minor errors. Any such corrections must be made and the transcript returned within 10 days from the date of the letter attached the transcript. If the transcript is not returned within this period, it will be deemed to be correct. New material cannot be added via these corrections and the sense of your evidence cannot be altered. Should you wish to provide additional information or elaborate on particular points, please include a supplementary submission for the committee's consideration. Thank you so much for coming Attorney General. We really appreciate your time.

Hearing concluded at 10.49 am
