

EDUCATION AND HEALTH STANDING COMMITTEE

INQUIRY INTO THE TOBACCO PRODUCTS CONTROL AMENDMENT BILL 2008

**TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE TAKEN
AT PERTH
MONDAY, 16 FEBRUARY 2009**

SESSION TWO

Members

Dr J.M. Woollard (Chairman)

Mr P. Abetz

Mr I.C. Blayney

Mr J.A. McGinty

Mr P.B. Watson

Hearing commenced at 10.19 am

BROWN, MR MATTHEW JUSTIN
Head of Member Advocacy, RAC (WA),
examined:

CAMERON, MR IAIN
Executive Director, Office of Road Safety,
examined:

The CHAIRMAN: On behalf of the Education and Health Standing Committee, I thank you for your interest and your appearance before us today. The purpose of this hearing is to assist the committee in gathering evidence for its inquiry into the Tobacco Products Control Amendment Bill 2008. You have been provided with a copy of the committee's specific terms of reference.

At this stage I would like to introduce myself and the other committee members present today. I am Dr Janet Woollard and next to me is Mr Ian Blayney and Mr Peter Watson.

The Education and Health Standing Committee is a committee of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia. This hearing is a formal proceeding of the Parliament and therefore commands the same respect given to proceedings in the house itself. 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 a contempt of the 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 document or documents during your evidence, it would assist Hansard if you could provide the full title for the record. Before we proceed to the questions we have for you today, I need to ask you a series of questions. Have you completed the "Details of Witness" form?

The Witnesses: Yes, Madam Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you understand the notes at the bottom of the form about giving evidence to a parliamentary committee?

The Witnesses: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Did you receive and read the information for witnesses briefing sheet provided with the "Details of Witness" form today?

The Witnesses: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you have any questions in relation to being a witness at today's hearing?

The Witnesses: No.

The CHAIRMAN: Would you please state your full name and the capacity in which you appear before the committee today? Then, after each of you have provided a general overview for the committee, we will move into questions. Perhaps we can start with Mr Brown.

Mr Brown: Yes; my name is Matthew Justin Brown. I am the Executive Manager, Member Advocacy, for the Royal Automobile Club of Western Australia.

[10.20 am]

Mr Brown: We have provided a written submission to the committee. I do not intend to read through that, but I will state briefly that we are here to address the terms of reference relating to the

protection of children and adults from the harmful consequences of passive smoking. The RAC has no particular expertise or interest in the other terms of reference and issues dealt with in the bill. For the benefit of the committee and those here today, the view we have on the measure that I just referred to is that we support that part of the bill that relates to trying to stop people from smoking in cars when children are present. We support that in principle, provided a public information campaign advises motorists that such a penalty is coming in. We suggest that there be a phase-in period so that motorists are given a warning for a certain number of weeks or months to phase in the new legislation. The implementation of the new laws should not diminish the police effort in higher priority areas such as speed enforcement, drink-driving and community safety. If an additional burden is to be placed on the police to enforce this measure, the government and the Parliament should consider providing additional resources to the police. In summary, we support this legislation in principle.

Mr P.B. WATSON: Mr Brown, the police commissioner said that he was quite willing for the police to enforce it as long as he got funding from the department health. He does not think it would be a large time-wasting exercise when picking up someone for it. He said that it could take only a few minutes and that it would not be a priority. We have found that in other countries that have implemented this law, a certain percentage of the community will stop smoking in cars because it is against the law. Even if we could pick up those people, it would save a lot of young children's lives.

Mr Brown: If you are putting it to me that this legislation has a symbolic value —

Mr P.B. WATSON: I am saying that the police will still do it and they will run publicity campaigns but in other countries it has been shown that when these laws are introduced, a certain percentage of the community stops smoking in cars because it is unlawful.

Mr Brown: If you are saying that this legislation will send a symbolic message to the community that the Parliament on behalf of the people no longer believes it is acceptable for either drivers or passengers to smoke in a car carrying young children and that the people will pick up on that symbolic measure and stop smoking in cars on their own accord, I would certainly agree with that. Our concern is that an expectation will be placed on the police that this will be a priority for them, which could distract them from what we see as higher priorities such as speed enforcement, drink-driving in particular from a road safety perspective, and general community safety.

Mr P.B. WATSON: That is the same as mobile phones. It is illegal to use a mobile phone while driving. However, it is a very low priority for the police. They are looking at the areas you are looking at but they do have campaigns warning people about using a mobile phone when driving. When driving into Albany, motorists can see the police advertising campaigns warning drivers that the police are looking at .05 one week and motorists using mobile phones another week. If the legislation is there to back it up, the police will not have to pool all their resources into it but people will be made aware that it is against the law to smoke when a child is in the car.

Mr Brown: As we have said in our submission, we think that the Parliament should give serious weight to the views of the police commissioner. The police have a tough job to do with limited resources and they have the expertise. They have to fit these measures into their order of priorities. From the perspective of the road safety organisation, drink-driving and speed enforcement are a higher priority. However, I accept your point regarding the police running a specific campaign and making the public aware of it.

Mr P.B. WATSON: Some of the evidence that we have heard about children who passive smoke in cars is that they breathe in four times as much smoke as an adult based on body weight. We could be killing kids in the cars, too.

Mr Brown: Again, in our submission we freely acknowledge the overwhelming weight of scientific evidence that passive smoking is not good and that it has an effect on others, particularly on young children. We are not arguing the toss on that at all.

Mr P.B. WATSON: No, I am just putting a point of view.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sure that Mr Cameron is aware that in Tasmania there already is a memorandum of understanding between the police and the Department of Health to reimburse those costs. I certainly support similar moves here. I hope that the Ministers for Health and Police will work together to introduce a memorandum for that funding.

Mr Brown: It is important to remember that it is a matter of not only costs, but also resources. Do the police have the manpower and the time to be doing it? We certainly have no problem with the police seeking additional financial resources from another department to implement the measure. That is their prerogative. It is a matter of where this issue sits in relation to their overall priorities. The higher priorities for us, as I said, are drink-driving, speed enforcement and broader community safety. It is not just about dollars and cents.

The CHAIRMAN: The Commissioner of Police said that the enforcement of that legislation would be opportunistic. It certainly would not be taking the police away from any of their key activities. The Commissioner of Police said he believed it would be self-enforcing. That is what has been shown to occur where these bans have been introduced elsewhere.

Mr Cameron: We also provided a written submission. Because of our role, we will confine ourselves to making comments from a road safety point of view. I acknowledge, as Mr Brown said, that we are aware of the significant amount of public health research on the dangers of passive smoking.

[10.30 am]

But our core business, if you like, is to focus on road safety. We have summarised some of the research there, and more of that detail is available. But by way of general comment, for the benefit of the committee, road safety policy and strategy are evolving internationally, including in this state. In the past 18 months we have done a lot of work recommending a strategy to government called Towards Zero. The essential shift in this strategy is from one of a predominant —

The CHAIRMAN: I might ask if you will document that, as you have brought it and it is before the committee.

Mr Cameron: Certainly; I can make that available to the committee. As I said, that is under consideration. It has been recommended to the government. By way of introduction, that strategy and its recommendations focus on two fundamental principles: number one, that people make mistakes in traffic; and, number two, that there are tolerance limits to the amount of physical force that the human body can withstand. Predominantly, our public focus in the past has been speeding, drink-driving, seatbelts. Getting the driver to comply remains a priority. As Mr Brown said, it is a priority for education and it is a priority for enforcement. However, the significant difference, and where it is relevant to this committee's focus, is that there is a greater acknowledgement now and more investigation underway throughout the world in terms of the contributions that error in attention and distraction make—humans simply making mistakes. Otherwise compliant, law-abiding motorists make an error of judgement for whatever reason that results in a crash.

The CHAIRMAN: You actually said in your submission that 25 to 40 per cent of road injuries and deaths may be attributable to driver inattention.

Mr Cameron: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: How many people does that mean, just in WA?

Mr Cameron: I would like to qualify that, if I may, first. As I said, it is emerging evidence internationally. Those estimates range from high and low estimates, both internationally and within Australia. There is an acknowledgement that data collection systems and the information need to get better. However, having looked at the evidence myself, there is a reasonable body of evidence

that is suggesting that we have emerging issues. For distraction as a major emerging issue, the ranges are from 25 to 40 per cent as a contributing factor. It does not mean it is the sole factor.

The CHAIRMAN: Can we have that in numbers?

Mr Cameron: Of the 25 to 40 per cent, the estimate is that about one to two per cent would be attributed to smoking-related issues, whether that be lighting a cigarette, reaching for cigarettes, dropping a lit cigarette in the motor vehicle et cetera. There have been some studies talking about the effect of carbon monoxide on the driver and his attention. Taking that, to get to your question, there is 25 to 40 per cent driver distraction, of which one to two per cent could be smoking related. In WA that would amount to, in a typical year, approximately one death and 12 to 15 serious injuries. That is based on extrapolation. What I would add for the committee's benefit—I do not think it was in our submission—is that there was some work done here at three Perth hospitals between 2002 and 2004. A group of researchers from the Injury Research Centre at UWA and the George Institute for International Health in Sydney conducted an ethics-approved study. They interviewed 1 367 drivers who had been involved in and were presenting at emergency as a result of a traffic crash. In that study, they found that 31 per cent of those drivers identified at least one factor that they regarded as a distracting factor. Of those, about 1.2 per cent identified smoking as a potential contributing factor in the crash. I guess that is a bit more relevant to WA, and that is not based on extrapolation—but one death and up to 12 to 15 injury crashes a year. As I said, the data is very much in the emerging sphere. We do find in a lot of these areas that that can be an underestimate, but I do not have any more confidence around that at this stage.

The CHAIRMAN: We are very pleased that you have put these statistics to the committee, because we have obviously been looking at the harmful health effects of smoking and passive smoking. You are actually introducing a new element in terms of the road toll.

Mr Cameron: As I said, from a road safety point of view, it is an emerging area, of which there are many distracting factors, but smoking is appearing in the top list of about 10 factors identified in research in New Zealand, in the US and in other parts of Australia. It does come up as a factor in one to two per cent of distraction crashes, so the literature seems to be reasonably consistent around saying it is one to two per cent. They do acknowledge that it is likely to be an underestimate, depending on the crash investigation, how thorough that is and whether or not someone is prepared to admit that, in contributing to that crash, their smoking was perhaps a factor.

The CHAIRMAN: Could I just ask whether you could also give us the statistics—do not worry if you cannot—in relation to mobile phones, because that is something that is often compared with in terms of distractions?

Mr Cameron: I will try. No, I will need to submit that. I can provide that information. I just have a factor here listing distractions, and it does not break it down any further.

The CHAIRMAN: It is just something that tends to be asked by people.

Mr Cameron: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: The main issue for the introduction is because of health, but also, from the research that you are showing has been done or is being conducted here and in other states, these measures will help stop some of the deaths on our roads and the serious accidents related to inattention.

Mr Cameron: That is right. I am, just as we speak, looking at the Victorian parliamentary inquiry. There is quite a bit of information here in the chapter on mobile phones. But I am skimming it here. I would not like to give you a figure just by skimming, but I can provide that information to the committee subsequently.

Mr I.C. BLAYNEY: You are saying that 25 to 40 per cent of accidents involve distraction; is that right?

Mr Cameron: That is the range of high and low estimates, and that is not as the sole contributing factor, so there will be other factors involved. There could be speeding as well; there could be alcohol.

Mr I.C. BLAYNEY: Okay.

Mr Cameron: In a distraction-related crash, the researchers found two key things—two factors that are affected in distraction. Number one is that your braking distance obviously increases if you are momentarily distracted. The other thing is your ability to monitor your speed. If you are distracted, they are finding that they are the two variables. Braking distance and speed monitoring of the driver are affected if they are distracted, so that is what contributes to it. But distraction as a factor is one of the contributory factors. There would be others.

Mr I.C. BLAYNEY: So you would expect that a driver would be more likely to be distracted if he had been drinking.

Mr Cameron: That is right. Similarly, a seatbelt non-wearing crash is often associated with alcohol use. When someone who otherwise would normally put a seatbelt on is affected by alcohol, the stimulus to put the belt on may be removed and they may forget. So there is often an overlap. Therefore, the percentages in road safety never add up to 100; they add up to much more than 100, because you often have co-factors involved. That is why we would never point to one thing and say that it caused that crash, because often it is not that simple. There is a combination of factors that came into play, and then sometimes another factor on top of that, to cause the actual crash.

The CHAIRMAN: In fact, I am happy for either of you to answer this question. I know that Mr Brown was here earlier for the presentation by the AHA, which wanted to move us off into traffic fumes. I note the research in other countries. In Finland, they found that air pollution levels during August 2003 in outdoor cafes with many smokers were five to 20 times higher than on the sidewalks of busy streets polluted by bus, truck and auto traffic. I expect that you were not expecting to be hit with that one, and I think that that really needs to go to another parliamentary committee, because we are focusing on health and education. However, I am interested in your follow-up in relation to his comments about the fumes.

[10.40 am]

Mr Brown: You are right. I was not expecting that question. I would note, broadly speaking, that emission standards of vehicles in Australia, and around the world, and fuel quality have improved significantly over a number of years.

There is always a desire from organisations such as the RAC to seek continued improvement in terms of the level of pollution, which motor vehicles do cause, but I am certainly not aware of any specific studies or research which compares vehicle emissions with passive smoking. I suppose at least with a driver smoking there is in fact a choice there that they can choose not to smoke in the car. I think we have learnt to live with the motor vehicle, and we will be living with it for some time now. So, while we continue to improve that, I do not think that is a reason to not do something about another public health issue that we do have the ability to do something about.

The CHAIRMAN: As you say, the choice is there with the driver, but as we know and as Mr Watson referred you to, some of the evidence we have had here talks about the children who are not voluntary smokers—they are involuntary smokers. He referred to some of the evidence that was given before this committee in terms of the fact that children had an increased respiratory rate and they are affected both by the passive smoke if someone is smoking in the car with them plus the third-hand cigarette smoke, which is the cigarette smoke that sits on the upholstery of the car, so that when they then get into the car and are strapped into their seatbelts, in the circulation of the air they are then inhaling the carcinogens as third-hand, even if someone is not even actually driving in the car with them. So there are very far-reaching effects of smoking in cars, and we appreciate the support that you are giving and your concern, I guess, that this issue should not become the

dominant feature in terms of the police's role but should be introduced in an opportunistic manner in terms of enforcing this legislation. I am sorry, Mr Cameron.

Mr Cameron: In respect of your earlier question, with some time I have got the relevant figures you sought before. There are a lot of estimates on the percentages of crashes involving mobile phones. I think, to keep it like for like, the best advice I would provide at this point is to compare the earlier figures I gave you for smoking in the same studies for mobile phones. So there are three studies that the Victorian parliamentary inquiry into driver distraction referred to in 2006. There is a US study, and they found that mobile phones were 1.5 per cent as a contributing factor in distraction crashes. That compares with the 0.9 per cent for smoking that I gave you earlier. In the Virginia study and the commonwealth, in the US and Canada, mobile phones, 3.9 per cent of distraction crashes compared to 2.1 per cent of smoking as a factor in distraction crashes in the same study. In New Zealand, mobile phones are estimated to account for five per cent of distraction crashes; the same figure for smoking is 2.2 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN: In fact, again with the benefit of the presentations that have been made to this committee, the statistics that we have been given for smokers show that whilst it is 15 per cent of the general community, in some groups in the Indigenous community it is up to 50 per cent. So, I guess with those statistics it is also very relevant on where those statistics were gathered in terms of what the percentage is shown in the results. We are obviously hoping that this legislation will be introduced sooner rather than later, but I am just wondering how the RAC and the Office of Road Safety would be able to support educational measures for smoking reductions in cars.

Mr Brown: I will just say briefly that the RAC, of course, would support informing its members of any legislation the Parliament passed relating to motorists. We have more than 700 000 members across the state. Our *Horizons* magazine has a circulation of in excess of 600 000, and we find that our members actually do read it. Through that we are constantly informing our members of different changes to different legislation; so that would provide us with a vehicle to inform our members of that. But, as I said in our submission, we would also like to see the government and the Parliament suggest to the government that there be a broader public information campaign, because if you take the point that this is going to be an important symbolic measure, then the way you reinforce that message or promote it further is to get out and tell people that it is to be brought in. I am not quite sure if it falls under the Office of Road Safety because it is not specifically a road safety issue, but certainly governments have lots of experience in informing the public through public information campaigns, and it should be in advance of the legislation coming into effect.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr Brown, we will get you one of the papers in particular that talked last week about the dangers of passive smoking in cars. We will get you Dr Peter Sly's submission once it has been corrected, and I hope that you will be able to use that in your next magazine to inform your members, because you obviously do have a very high number of people who are with the RAC and, hopefully, you can help get that message out to the community and assist in the control against tobacco. Mr Cameron?

Mr Cameron: We would tackle it, as I said earlier, from a driver distraction point of view, and while at this stage it is pre-emptive, the recommended strategy "Towards Zero" does acknowledge, as I said before, driver distraction as a major emerging issue—distraction, inattention—that then leads to fatigue in a lot of cases. We are concerned, and it comes down to the issue of continuing to focus on the problem behaviours: speeding, alcohol, seatbelts. There will be no backing off there, but we do acknowledge, and the research is pointing us towards, a major new driver distraction campaign, which is in the planning and, subject to approvals, we would be looking to move ahead with that. That will involve us giving the public some reminders about common potential sources of distraction in motor vehicles. So it is pre-emptive to say that would specifically be smoking, but certainly in our supporting materials we would be referring to the variety of sources—whether it is eating, whether it is drinking, whether it is a sign on the side of the road advertising a cheap

discounted sale of something. Anything that is a potential source of internal and external distraction we will be focusing on broadly with the community; but typically what that will mean for us is we have to get this on the public's agenda. While committees such as this and other people are looking at specific issues, we would, I guess from a communications point of view, remind the committee that for the public it is going to take a while for us to get driver distraction onto the public's agenda. They are focused on speeding, drink-driving, seatbelts, which is good; we will keep that up. So the first phase is that we will be starting to educate the community that driver distraction is an issue as well, and that will include the sources. What I am saying is there is potential for us to integrate information and messages about smoking as a potential source of distraction in a motor vehicle.

The CHAIRMAN: And I guess with those statistics you will also be meeting with the police in terms of driver distraction being a major component then, or causing deaths and serious injuries.

Mr Cameron: As Mr Brown said, we would be very much focused with police on those primary severe risk factors. You have got to look at, for example, speeding as well. That then contributes to a number of other factors. As I said before, if you are distracted and speeding, where we know the police can have an effect on speeding, drink-driving and seatbelts, we will keep going. We will have discussions with police around these issues. I cannot speak for the police but generally when we have these discussions they refer us to quality policing stops.

[10.50 am]

We encourage them to be on the roads and reminding the public of their presence, and while they focus on those primary problem behaviours, they also talk to us about doing quality policing stops. So they are visible, they are present, and they are stopping motorists for a variety of things, and, under quality policing, they can pick up a number of other things.

Mr I.C. BLAYNEY: I have got a question more about motor vehicles rather than smoking, so perhaps I will ask that later.

The CHAIRMAN: No, that is fine.

Mr I.C. BLAYNEY: How far away will it be before we can buy a crew cab utility that has the standard safety gear they are putting in all the sedans now? You cannot buy one with stability control or curtain airbags or stuff like that. How far away is that? Most people are buying these things now as substitutes for sedans, but they do not come with all the standard safety equipment.

Mr Cameron: It is a very good question. From a safety point of view, we would like it as soon as possible. That is in the hands of the manufacturers and the market. I will declare that I am a board member of ANCAP, which is the Australian New Car Assessment Program. All the states and territories and the motoring clubs around Australia contribute funding to that consumer-driven crash testing program. We are increasing the amount of vehicles that we test in the commercial realm. You are right; the passenger market is vastly improved to what it was and there is a lag in the commercial vehicle sector. The industry advises us that those vehicles have a longer shelf life, or cycle life, so the rate of change in those vehicles is slower. ANCAP has identified that, and it will be looking to crash test more commercial vehicles and publicise those results to encourage the market to start making those purchases. I cannot answer that, it is an industry-related question, but from our point of view we will be advertising and publishing results of commercial vehicles.

Mr I.C. BLAYNEY: Some of the manufacturers actually sell them in other markets and they have got that stuff in them, but they just do not put them into them in Australia.

Mr Brown: That is right. That is one thing the RAC has gone out publicly on before and will continue to. We argue that if a manufacturer can put a vehicle on the road in Europe or in the US with a certain level of safety, there is no reason why that same manufacturer could not put that same vehicle on Australian roads. We should not have to accept second best. We consistently say that safety is not an optional extra, it has to be integral to the vehicle. If you want to contact the RAC, I could most probably track down a list of those vehicles which are currently on the market here

which have better safety standard equivalents being sold overseas. It is a problem, and as Mr Cameron said, it is something that those people with an interest in road safety are continually advocating for change on, but it is going to take a while. Slowly but surely there are, coming onto the market, vehicles which do offer ANCAP four-star or five-star rated safety. We have to get enough of the fleet buyers et cetera, to start buying those, and that then obviously generates demand. When there is demand there will be supply and greater competition. So it is a slow process, but it is certainly one that both the RAC and the Office of Road Safety have been pushing for some time now and will continue to push.

Mr Cameron: I know we are on another issue, but I will just quickly that given the level of road trauma on regional WA roads, and given the predominance of commercial vehicles in some regions of the state, we view it as a very high priority that we increase the rate at which those vehicles are fitted with those extra safety features. Electronic stability control is one of the those features, and the preliminary estimates from last year are that 80 per cent of our fatal crashes were single vehicles running off on a country road.

Mr I.C. BLAYNEY: Exactly.

Mr Cameron: They are not all down to speeding, drink-driving and seatbelts. I would estimate maybe 30 per cent of those are. That leaves 70 per cent that are driver error, distraction, inattention, making a mistake. That figure is the same for other states, and with such a high figure, the more vehicles we can get on country roads with electronic stability control and similar, the more we will be able to quickly reduce our regional road trauma, because we cannot stop people from making a mistake.

Mr I.C. BLAYNEY: Yes, that is right.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sure you are lobbying the minister about those issues, and I am sure you will get a lot of support. Mr Brown, in your submission you talked about public surveys which show support for banning smoking in cars where there are children present. I am obviously well aware of the many community surveys, I am just wondering which surveys you were referring to?

Mr Brown: I had a briefing note referring to a Cancer Council survey of 2005, which I most probably would be able to track down the original for you.

The CHAIRMAN: No, that is fine. I would probably have those ones from the Cancer Council. I just wondered if there was another one I was not aware of.

Mr Brown: In that survey, 80 per cent of smokers and 87 per cent of non-smokers favoured banning smoking in a car. Broadly speaking, there is community support for it. As I said, we tried to do an online survey, but given the time frames we just could not get a large enough sample to come up with a reliable finding unfortunately. I do not think there is any doubt that the majority of the community would think it is a good measure, and if we can implement it sensibly and maintain that community support, then I think that is the best outcome.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Would you each like to have a few closing words?

Mr Brown: I think we have pretty much covered it. As I said, the RAC supports the measure in principle and if the Parliament passes it, we would certainly be ready to assist in informing our members of the change. In fact even if it does not pass, if you want to get me that information I would certainly be happy to put it up to Horizons and maybe we can start the process before the Parliament even passes the legislation, just to remind them about the dangers. I think, generally speaking, people are aware, but we need to keep reinforcing that.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr Brown. We will forward that information on to you. Mr Cameron?

Mr Cameron: From a road safety point of view we are supportive, on the basis that it can help contribute to raising the community's awareness of one of the potential sources of distraction. In

this case—within the motor vehicle—our comments relate to the driver. We do not have any information about those effects of other people smoking. As we said, it would not necessarily be the highest priority from a road safety point of view, but we do acknowledge the broader public health benefits and there is an opportunity to connect up public policy for benefits in a number of areas. But as a potential contributor to helping raise community awareness of one of the sources of distraction, which is, more generally, a major emerging area of concern for road safety. On that basis we have an interest, and, in principle, support it.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to thank you both for your evidence before the committee today.

A transcript of this 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 to the transcript. If the transcript is not returned within this period, it will be deemed to be correct. New material cannot be added by 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 when you return your corrected transcript.

Hearing concluded at 10.58 am