

**Division 38: Corruption and Crime Commission, \$32 003 000 —**

Mr I. Blayney, Chairman.

Mrs L.M. Harvey, Minister for Police representing the Attorney General.

Mr J.R. McKechnie, QC, Commissioner.

Ms P. M. Mabbs, Acting Chief Executive.

Mr M.W.R. Hanrahan, Chief Finance Officer.

Mr M. Connolly, Principal Policy Adviser, Office of the Attorney General.

[Witnesses introduced.]

[2.20 pm]

**The CHAIRMAN:** The member for Butler.

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** I refer to note (a) on page 452 of the *Budget Statements*. It appears from the table at the foot of the page that the transfer of oversight of misconduct and crime prevention and education functions to the Public Sector Commission will result in a saving to the Corruption and Crime Commission of \$1.7 million. That appears to be the amount for a full year, because the amounts for the out years of 2016–17, 2017–18 and 2019–20 rise to \$1.78 million. Is that the total saving to be had by the commission by transferring the minor misconduct matters to the Public Sector Commission?

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** Yes, that is correct.

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** Bearing in mind what the Premier had to say when announcing these amendments, this is a saving of only five per cent in the commission's overall budget.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** I would need to check the percentage, but the savings listed in the budget result from transferring those functions over.

**Ms M.M. QUIRK:** The second dot point on page 453 reads —

- The Commission is undergoing a 'root and branch review' which aims to better align the Commission's functions, processes, systems, operations and organisational design to its legislative purposes and operating environment. This process has culminated in the adoption of and transition to a more strategic, intelligence led business model that facilitates the identification of higher value operational opportunities. Consequently operations undertaken by the Commission are of a strategic nature, target areas of high corruption and misconduct risk within the public sector and will deliver outcomes of maximum public value.

I do not know what that means. Perhaps someone can explain it to me.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** I will ask Mr McKechnie to respond.

**Mr J.R. McKechnie:** They are not my words, but in short this means a greater focus on matters where there is suspected corruption or serious misconduct that is of significant risk to the state. Rather than chasing every rabbit down every burrow, we are going to try to focus on those matters that we see as particularly significant.

**Ms M.M. QUIRK:** Further to that, the last sentence of the dot point reads —

This approach will ensure that the Commission is better placed to reveal, disrupt and reduce systemic corruption and serious misconduct.

Do I take it from that sentence that it is more about the whole environment rather than looking at individual cases of misconduct?

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** I will ask Mr McKechnie to respond.

**Mr J.R. McKechnie:** Yes and no. Yes, it is about the whole environment, probably illustrated by individual cases of misconduct. If a number of cases indicate a systemic problem, that is what we will be interested in, rather than just an act of misconduct in an otherwise reasonable system.

**Ms M.M. QUIRK:** The commissioner is saying that there will be a greater focus where there is a greater risk to the state. This may be operational, but what are the perceived greatest risks to the state in the corruption environment?

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** I will pass this on to Mr McKechnie.

**Mr J.R. McKechnie:** The misconduct intelligence assessment that was tabled earlier this year lists a number of high-risk areas, which is not to say that they are necessarily corrupt, but they are areas at high risk. They are all in the MIA, but just a couple of these areas would be issues around procurement of government services from

private enterprises, and whether there are proper controls, risks of fraud or other matters; obviously, areas around police, which is one of our remits; and abuse of office and possible corruption. They are all in the MIA, but that sort of thing is where we will be focusing.

**Ms M.M. QUIRK:** In relation to the police, does the commissioner contemplate that more of the cases referred to him are likely to be taken up by the CCC than is currently the case?

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** Mr McKechnie.

**Mr J.R. McKechnie:** I could not say whether that is correct or incorrect but we will certainly give attention, as we must, to police operations and so forth, but more in trying to find out whether there is a systemic problem or issue that is wider than just an isolated incident.

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** Under a previous Attorney General, Hon Christian Porter, and under a previous commissioner, following a report by the Parliamentary Inspector of the Corruption and Crime Commission—Mr Chris Steytler, as I recall—inquiring into the commission's function in relation to allegations of police misconduct, the then Attorney General said that there would be a refocusing of the commission onto the core business of police misconduct. I do not see that in these budget papers, although the commissioner has referred to it in passing by way of an answer to the member for Girraween. In this root and branch review, does the commission still see the investigation of allegations of police misconduct as a core function? We were told by the immediate past commissioner—there have been several—that the commission had been restructured to include a police investigations division. I forget the name of the gentleman who was nominated to be in charge of that, but that was seen to be a core business of the commission. Indeed the genesis of the whole CCC was in the Royal Commission into Whether There Has Been Corrupt or Criminal Conduct by any Western Australian Police Officer. Does the commission still see the investigation of police misconduct as a core endeavour?

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** Absolutely. The chief role of the Corruption and Crime Commission is oversight of police activities, but I will get Mr McKechnie to respond further on some of the nuances of the member's question.

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** If I can just interpolate here, because it may help the commissioner's answer, I am not looking for systemic corruption but, rather, where there is an allegation of assault in custody or whatever, does the commission see investigating such allegations as its core business?

**Mr J.R. McKechnie:** I agree with the minister. Western Australia is not big enough to have, as New South Wales does, a Police Misconduct Commission and an Independent Commission Against Corruption, so necessarily we have to do the lot. As the member correctly pointed out, the genesis was the police royal commission, so yes, it is a core part of our work. What we actually take on there—what we take on everywhere—I can tell members now is a matter about which, no doubt, there will be differences of opinion from time to time. Some people will think we should have taken on some matters and should not have taken on others. Those are just going to be our best judgements at the time. Police misconduct, which is sort of a different order than other forms of corrupt conduct in that it is often more of an abuse of power rather than venal corruption, absolutely will remain one of our main focuses, yes.

[2.30 pm]

**Mr M.J. COWPER:** I refer to outcomes and key effectiveness indicators on page 454. A number of allegations have been received by the Corruption and Crime Commission—in fact, 7 260 in the previous financial year. I am interested to know what percentage of those is attributed to the police department compared with other government departments. Can we have a rough estimate, percentage-wise, of how many of the 7 260 allegations relate to police?

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** I refer the member to Ms Mabbs to answer that in further detail.

**Ms P. M. Mabbs:** We do not have that breakdown, I am sorry, but we will take that on notice, if possible.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** I have some information here that might assist. In 2013–14, the allegations of misconduct and police reviewable actions accounted for 6 077 of those complaints. Of those, 1 398 were monitoring the investigation of allegations of misconduct referred to public sector authorities for their action; 1 103 reviewed the outcome of the investigation of misconduct allegations by public sector authorities in accordance with section 41 of the Corruption and Crime Commission Act; 244 were conducted preliminary investigations pursuant to section 32(2) of the CCC Act; and 72 were investigations under sections 33(1)(a) and (b) of the CCC Act. For 2014–15, which is up to 15 May 2015, the allegations of misconduct and police reviewable actions accounted for 4 695. Of those, 1 285 were monitoring the investigation of allegations of misconduct referred to public sector authorities for their action; 1 530 reviewed the outcome of the investigation of misconduct allegations under section 41 of the CCC Act; 288 were investigations pursuant to section 32(2) of the CCC Act; and 57 were investigations pursuant to sections 33(1)(a) and (b) of the CCC Act.

**Mr M.J. COWPER:** I thank the minister; that is very helpful. Of the 6 077 that relate to the police, how many of those complaints are matters that have been reported to the CCC as is required, for instance, by using the local complaint resolution, or LCRs? How many of those complaints would be LCRs?

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** I would have to provide that information by way of supplementary information.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Minister, could you just make clear what you are providing as supplementary information?

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** We will provide by way of supplementary information the proportion of the 6 077 allegations of misconduct and police reviewable actions that were a result of local complaint resolution processes.

[*Supplementary Information No A73.*]

**Mr M.J. COWPER:** Whilst I appreciate that we do not have those figures in front of us, I suspect, as has been the case in previous years, a high proportion of those 6 077 allegations will be local complaint resolutions. For the benefit of my colleagues here, LCRs are complaints that are made about police for not wearing their hats, or perhaps not wearing a seatbelt or something like that, which has been recorded or reported. They are done in-house. Once the local complaint resolution is completed, they are then sent to the CCC. If we take the LCRs out of the 6 077 matters, how many matters did the CCC itself investigate?

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** Once again, I would have to provide the actual number by way of supplementary information, but I will ask Mr McKechnie to clarify in detail where the CCC is headed with respect to local complaint resolutions and their processes.

**Mr J.R. McKechnie:** A lot of the matters that the member gave examples of are the sorts of things that we would not further investigate, other than being notified by them. It should be remembered that police, unlike some other departments, have a strong internal affairs mechanism, which should be the first port of call in the major investigation of police misconduct. We oversee that on occasions, and will on occasions step in. We are highly unlikely to do that for matters that should be resolved at the local level.

**Mr M.J. COWPER:** I acknowledge that, and thank you very much for the explanation. However, of the 7 260 matters that have been recorded in the budget papers, of which we have established 6 077 relate to the police, I think we will find that the vast majority are LCRs. I am interested to know whether the CCC itself has conducted investigations. There is no reference in here to how many matters have been investigated by the CCC.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** Once again, I would have to provide that information by way of supplementary information. I do not have that information at hand today.

**Mr M.J. COWPER:** I find that extraordinary, minister, because surely the organisation would know how many matters it has investigated in a 12-month period?

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** I have been passed a note: there were 57 investigations in 2014–15 so far.

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** By the CCC?

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** By the CCC, yes.

**Mr M.J. COWPER:** What was the budget? It is \$32 million.

**Ms M.M. QUIRK:** I refer to the workforce renewal policy under spending changes on page 452. Are any staff considered front-line and therefore exempt from this policy?

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** I will ask Ms Mabbs to respond.

**Ms P. M. Mabbs:** With respect to the workforce renewal policy, I guess we are a little bit different from most public sector agencies in that we do not offer permanency, so all of our people are on fixed-term contracts. We have identified the savings moving into the next financial year. This goes back to the corrective measures around the workforce renewal policy—through natural attrition. We are looking at targeting those staff whose contracts will lapse in the coming months to reduce our staffing numbers and meet the new budget parameters.

**Ms M.M. QUIRK:** Can the minister tell me how many personnel are at the CCC? Can we have a breakdown between public servants and investigations personnel?

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** My understanding is that this is subject to fluctuation, but I will ask Ms Mabbs to respond.

**Ms P. M. Mabbs:** Thank you. We have 156 full-time equivalents at the moment. Through the budget cuts going into next financial year, we will probably reduce that number by around 25. At the moment, within our operations directorate, we have about 75 FTE. About half of the commission's FTE reside within the operations directorate.

**Ms M.M. QUIRK:** What are the roles of the other 65 staff?

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** I will ask Ms Mabbs to provide a breakdown of the remaining administrative staff.

[2.40 pm]

**Ms P. M. Mabbs:** There are a number of staff within our assessment, monitor and review area. These are the staff who receive all the allegations and assess them. Some of those staff are also engaged in the monitoring and review of matters that we refer to agencies. We do not actually investigate all matters. We also have a corporate services directorate, a legal services directorate and a small corruption prevention area.

**Ms M.M. QUIRK:** How many personnel are in the legal services area?

**Ms P. M. Mabbs:** There are about a dozen full-time equivalents.

**Ms M.M. QUIRK:** What levels are they at? What do they range from?

**Ms P. M. Mabbs:** The director of legal services is a class 3, and it goes down to a paralegal position, which sits at around level 3 or 4.

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** The minister heard the commissioner's helpful answer before on the triaging of complaints concerning police and matters that could be dealt with by local area commanders and whatnot. I now want to come back to —

**The CHAIRMAN:** Has the member got a line item or something to refer to?

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** Certainly. I will pick it up again; I had it open.

**Ms M.M. QUIRK:** It is the second bullet point on page 453.

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** Yes, that is the one. My question relates to the triaging process when a matter could be best referred to a local area commander to investigate, or internal affairs, as the commissioner proffered before. I am talking about when the allegation is a chargeable offence. In other words, I am not talking about rudeness; I am now talking about an assault allegation. In my mind I have the Spratt case, for example. In that case, an allegation of assault was investigated by police and written off. The Corruption and Crime Commission conducted a full inquiry, but that is probably beside the point. When there is an allegation of a chargeable offence against police, will that be looked at at all times by the CCC? When there is an allegation of an offence, can that simply be investigated by police? What is the policy there with the CCC?

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** I will ask Mr McKechnie to respond.

**Mr J.R. McKechnie:** First of all, under the act every complaint, for want of a better word, or every notification has to be assessed. The CCC has a statutory requirement to assess everything—obviously, as the member says, not to do something with everything, but to assess it. So, it will be assessed. If it is an allegation of a criminal offence, obviously the commission will pay greater attention to that than if it is not. We may well leave it with police, but we are more likely to monitor such a thing to ensure that the outcome is what we think is an acceptable outcome. In broad terms, criminal matters are matters for police—that is what the police do—but when it is a police officer against whom the allegation is made, it requires the oversight of someone else to ensure that it is done properly. Whether that leads to the CCC prosecuting the matters—which has often been the case in the past—in the future is a question we will have to determine in the light of several recent High Court decisions.

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** I take on board what the commissioner said about recent High Court decisions. I am talking not about the prosecutorial function but, rather, the investigative function and an expectation by the community, post the royal commission, that when a crime is alleged against an officer, there will be an independent investigation outside of the agency. Is that able to be achieved by the commission, minister? Is the public's expectation being fulfilled?

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** Once again, it is more of an operational question so I will ask Mr McKechnie to respond.

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** Certainly.

**Mr J.R. McKechnie:** As a newcomer, I would have to say that the CCC has not had a good reputation in that or other areas for some time. I am hoping that that will change in the next few years. Obviously, that is one of our central areas. I think we need to regain the public's trust, if that is not there. We certainly need to make sure, to the extent that we can, that our oversight function, in relation to police particularly, is properly met. It is a question of resources. That is not a question about how much or how little money; it is a question of how we allocate our resources. I say again that there will be occasions when people will reasonably differ from us about how we allocate resources, but I entirely agree with the central issue.

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** I will ask about resources by way of a further question because I am nearly at the end of this and we want to move on to another division. I refer the minister to note 2 on page 454. There is a comment there about exceptional powers under the act. Higher up the page, it is noted—as it is always noted every year since I have been here—that the fortification powers and the application for the commission’s assistance to police by way of exceptional powers are budgeted at zero, zero and zero. We know from the report that the minister referred to that there had been a suggested amendment to the legislation by the joint standing committee to change the CCC legislation to read that exceptional powers may be invoked when serious organised crime “may” be occurring rather than “is” or “has”. I note that the Corruption and Crime Commission Amendment (Misconduct) Act makes amendments to do with minor misconduct matters. When the government was transferring those to the Public Sector Commissioner, that amendment was actually made; that is, the powers of the Public Sector Commissioner and the CCC can be invoked when minor misconduct “may” be occurring. It is an earlier threshold point, if you like, than applies to organised crime. If the commission were to get the powers that were mooted by the Premier—mooted by the Premier but squashed by the Legislative Council—to have an original jurisdiction to investigate organised crime parallel to police, that could not be effected by a cost saving of a mere \$1.7 million, could it? The commission would not be capable of taking on a parallel jurisdiction to police to investigate organised crime for a mere \$1.7 million; would the minister not agree?

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** In response, member, I do not think it is appropriate to link the transfer of those functions for misconduct issues to the Public Sector Commissioner to what potentially might be a different function for the Corruption and Crime Commission in organised crime. I do not think it is appropriate to compare those two issues by saying that it would take funding from the minor misconduct matters and use that for a different function, but I will get Mr McKechnie to respond on where the CCC fits with respect to organised crime functions.

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** Perhaps I will ask a follow-up question to that before the commissioner responds because it might save time. Is it not true that the Premier, standing in front of the very seat the Minister for Police is now sitting in in this Assembly, made that very linkage? Is this not true, minister: the Premier said, “The government will transfer minor misconduct away from the CCC and that freed-up capacity will then give the CCC the capacity to have a parallel original jurisdiction to investigate organised crime”? Is that not what the Premier said? It was not me making the linkage; it was the Premier, was it not?

[2.50 pm]

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** The member is talking about matters that occurred some time ago. Since then there has been, as I understand it, a further report and recommendation into the functions of the CCC. There is also the root-and-branch review of the functions of the Corruption and Crime Commission that Mr McKechnie referred to earlier. I think we have moved on from those comments. Mr McKechnie has some different ideas for the future of the Corruption and Crime Commission and I will ask him to elaborate further on what direction the Corruption and Crime Commission is headed and the strategy it will be embarking on over the next few years.

**Mr J.R. McKechnie:** I will deal first with organised crime, before going on to where we are going. There is zero in the budget because under the present legislative arrangements, the CCC does not require very much. It is really an approving or disapproving body; the work is done by police in putting it up. That work has dropped off in part because of the passage of the Criminal Investigation (Covert Powers) Act, which now gives police the ability to approve what was once necessary to be approved beyond. Of course, there are other protections, and the CCC has a function of overseeing that specific thing.

As to crime generally, the question is—which is not a question for us; we just do what Parliament tells us—whether it is necessary for Western Australia to have a crime commission that is responsible for organised crime and so forth. Again, we have a police service and that is its job, and we have an Australian Crime Commission, which the police access and on occasions we work cooperatively with. I obviously do not want to go into details. We already work with those bodies cooperatively within areas in which we have a particular legislative interest. That will continue and, speaking obliquely, one of the high risks is that obviously areas of misconduct may well be areas that coincide with organised crime, and that is our interest and that is what we will be paying attention to.

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** When the commissioner said that issues of misconduct may coincide with organised crime, was the commissioner referring to, as has happened in the past, such as during control operations, a police officer being alleged to have been guilty of misconduct? Did I understand the commissioner right in that regard?

**Mr J.R. McKechnie:** Yes.

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** We support that, but the danger is that during controlled operations, someone could cross the line, and that is why we have also opposed the meshing of the two.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** Organised crime crossover into other public sector agencies, of course, is also an area of corruption that the Corruption and Crime Commission is interested in.

**Mr J.R. McKechnie:** Can I expand on that? Organised crime is about not only bikie gangs and drugs—that is part of it—but also its tentacles spread widely throughout public service and what public services provide, so it is inevitable that we will be dealing obliquely, or less so at times, with organised crime.

**Ms M.M. QUIRK:** I have one final question, minister, about something that the commissioner has canvassed. On page 453 of the *Budget Statements* a reference is made to organised crime under the heading “Service Summary”. What is it that the CCC can offer that police or current bodies such as the Australian Crime Commission cannot offer other than a police investigation role? In other words, why do we need the CCC other than in relation to police corruption? What is it about the CCC that makes it a suitable candidate to investigate organised crime in this state?

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** I think we covered that when talked about organised crime perhaps being involved in corruption within the public sector, but I will ask Mr McKechnie to clarify those comments.

**Mr J.R. McKechnie:** The answer in one sense is nothing. I say nothing because the Australian Crime Commission has the same capabilities as we do, particularly the ability to conduct private examinations, which is essential. However, in another sense, something focused on the state and on state activities might be regarded as important. That is not a matter for me.

**Ms M.M. QUIRK:** There have been some issues about public as opposed to private hearings of the CCC. I wanted to know what the current policy is, minister, for public and private hearings? Bodies such as the Australian Crime Commission have hearings in private so that early on in an investigation it does not necessarily tarnish people’s reputations when ultimately they may not be convicted of anything. What is the current policy on public or private hearings?

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** Once again that is an operational matter and I will ask Mr McKechnie to respond.

**Mr J.R. McKechnie:** The answer is that there is no policy. The act has the default provision of private examination, but public examinations are permitted if the commissioner, on assessing various factors that are in the act and other factors, decides it is in the public interest to do so. I do not want to be technical, but that is why I have no policy, because I regard it as a matter to be decided on a case-by-case basis. I have no bias either way, but the bias is for private examination. There will be occasions when the public interest is served by public examination.

**Mr M.J. COWPER:** I want to rehash the previous question. I received an answer that 57 matters were investigated in 2014. Are there any figures on how many successful prosecutions resulted from those 57 investigations?

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** I will ask Ms Mabbs to respond, but that should be in the annual report of the Corruption and Crime Commission. It is usual that all of those matters are published, but I will ask Ms Mabbs to elaborate.

**Mr J.R. McKechnie:** Could I make a comment while that is happening? This will possibly be controversial, but I do not regard successful prosecutions as a measure of anything, because it is a decision made by a court on the available evidence. Prosecutions are not taken simply to win, but to put matters before the court. I do not regard them as a particular measure of anything, so in the future it is unlikely we will be directly reporting to them. I recognise that is controversial, but I thought I would get that out there.

**Mr M.J. COWPER:** If there is a case of that in any other jurisdiction, if a brief is going to be submitted to a court, it would be done on the basis that, first of all, it would be in the interests of the public and, secondly, that there is a reasonable expectation of a conviction. I am interested to know what the result is.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** I ask Mr McKechnie to further respond.

**Mr J.R. McKechnie:** That is correct. Those are indeed the guidelines that I first published as Director of Public Prosecutions.

**Mr M.J. COWPER:** It was very sage advice, too.

**Mr J.R. McKechnie:** They are repeated and elaborated in the current ones, and I entirely agree with it. That is the reason we would put forward matters, but it does not mean that everyone is a winner; nor does it mean that either a win or a loss necessarily indicates anything about the quality of the investigation.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** I will ask Ms Mabbs to respond to the question about the number of successful prosecutions.

[3.00 pm]

**Ms P. M. Mabbs:** Fifteen people were charged, including seven public officers, with 82 charges in all. Sixty-nine charges were finalised in relation to 12 people, with 12 people convicted in relation to 68 charges. This is representative of a conviction rate of 100 per cent by person and 98.55 per cent by charges.

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** My last question goes right to organised crime and resources. I turn to the anti-association laws and what are sometimes called the bikie laws. Part of those laws are, as a first stage, an application to a

**Extract from *Hansard***

[ASSEMBLY ESTIMATES COMMITTEE A — Thursday, 11 June 2015]

p457b-463a

Mr John Quigley; Mrs Liza Harvey; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Murray Cowper

---

Supreme Court judge—there has not been one yet—sitting *persona designata*; that is, coming off the bench and sitting in his personal capacity rather than in his judicial capacity. Given the pressure that the current Supreme Court is under, both judge-wise and hearing-wise—its list—I ask, firstly, does the CCC have the capacity if the government chose to appoint it as the determiner as to whether an organisation could be classed a criminal organisation? Secondly, having been the state’s most senior prosecutor and a very senior Supreme Court judge, does the current commissioner believe he has the capacity to make those determinations if that was transferred from the Supreme Court, albeit *persona designata*, to the CCC and put it to use in that way? Does the CCC have that capacity?

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** The Corruption and Crime Commission Act does not empower the commission to operate in that function, and there may be some constitutional issues as well with what the member for Butler is proposing. I will ask Mr McKechnie to elaborate further.

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** There are constitutional issues the other way too, with the Kable principle upon which they are founded.

**Mr J.R. McKechnie:** There are constitutional questions each way and I have followed the High Court very closely on where it is going. Better minds than mine can sort that out. There are constitutional issues in giving it to the Corruption and Crime Commission. In answer to the member’s second question about capacity, we would find the capacity if that was thought necessary.

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** I have no further questions.

**The appropriation was recommended.**