

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
UNIFORM LEGISLATION AND STATUTES REVIEW**

**CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION (COVERT POWERS) BILL 2011**

**TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE  
TAKEN AT PERTH  
WEDNESDAY, 30 NOVEMBER 2011**

**SESSION ONE**

**Members**

**Hon Adele Farina (Chairman)  
Hon Nigel Hallett (Deputy Chairman)  
Hon Linda Savage  
Hon Liz Behjat**

---

**Hearing commenced at 9.49 am**

**MACKNAY, MR ROGER ANTHONY**

**Commissioner, Corruption and Crime Commission,  
186 St Georges Terrace,  
Perth 6000, sworn and examined:**

**SILVERSTONE, MR MICHAEL JOSEPH WILLIAM**

**Executive Director, Corruption and Crime Commission,  
186 St Georges Terrace,  
Perth 6000, sworn and examined:**

**O'CONNOR, MR PAUL RICHARD**

**Director, Legal Services, Corruption and Crime Commission,  
186 St Georges Terrace,  
Perth 6000, sworn and examined:**

**The CHAIRMAN:** Welcome. My name is Adele Farina. I am the Chair of the committee and I would just like to introduce the other members of the committee—Hon Linda Savage, to the far end; our two advisory officers Alex and Anne; the Deputy Chair of the committee, Hon Nigel Hallett; and the other member of the committee, Hon Liz Behjat.

**Mr Macknay:** Thank you. I am Roger Macknay and with me are Paul O'Connor and Michael Silverstone.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Welcome. Are the people at the back of the room with you?

**Mr Macknay:** No.

**The CHAIRMAN:** On behalf of the committee, I welcome you to the hearing. Before we begin, I must go through a range of formalities and I must ask you to take either the oath or the affirmation.

[Witnesses took the oath.]

**The CHAIRMAN:** You will have signed a document entitled "Information for Witnesses". Have you read and understood that document?

**The Witnesses:** Yes.

**The CHAIRMAN:** These proceedings are being recorded by Hansard. A transcript of your evidence will be provided to you. To assist the committee and Hansard, please quote the full title of any document you refer to during the course of this hearing for the record. And please be aware of the microphones and try to talk into them and ensure that you do not cover them with papers or make noise near them. I remind you that your transcript will become a matter for the public record. If for some reason you wish to make a confidential statement during today's proceedings, you should request that the evidence be taken in closed session. The committee will then consider your request and if the committee grants the request, any public and media in attendance will be excluded from the hearing. I just emphasise that because we do have members of the public in the room at present. If there is any part of your evidence that you would like to take in private, please say so, so that the committee can consider that request. Also, please note that until such time as the transcript of your public evidence is finalised, it should not be made public. I advise you that publication or disclosure of the uncorrected transcript may constitute a contempt of Parliament and

may mean that the material published or disclosed is not subject to parliamentary privilege. Having gone through all that formality, I would like to invite you to make an opening statement if you so wish.

**Mr Macknay:** Yes—only to say that we obviously are here to assist the committee in any way that we can in relation to this legislation. This legislation will not affect the commission in terms of its own activities and that being the case we would not seek to say anything more than that in opening.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The committee has forwarded you a list of questions that we propose to put to you and then members of the committee are invited to add whatever other questions they might like to add or that might arise as a result of the answers provided during the hearing. Just running through the questions that we have already provided you: have you, your predecessor or the commission been consulted on the bill?

**Mr Macknay:** Not to my knowledge.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Would either of the gentlemen on either side like to make any comment on that? I appreciate that you have been in the position for only a short period of time.

**Mr Silverstone:** Not to my knowledge—no.

**Mr O'Connor:** And not to my knowledge.

**The CHAIRMAN:** What will be the relationship between the bill once it becomes an act and the Corruption and Crime Commission Act 2003 into the future, given that there appears to be an overlap between the provisions of the CCC act and the bill? And how will this bill impact on the operations of the CCC?

**Mr Macknay:** As the committee is, I am sure, aware, there are some parallel provisions between the CCC act—if I may refer to it as that—and the bill, particularly in relation to a power to grant the right to use an assumed identity and the power to mount a controlled operation. As the committee is no doubt aware, the right of the police to obtain either of those powers is dependent on persuading the commission that such ought be granted. The effect of the bill, if it becomes law, would be that that obligation would disappear and would be replaced by a power in the Commissioner of Police to grant either of those things on the application of a police officer. The ability of the police to obtain either of those things is dependent on satisfying the commission of the matters set out in section 46 of the CCC act. That obligation includes an obligation to satisfy the commission that there are reasonable grounds for believing that the use of exceptional powers would be in the public interest. As I understand the bill, there is no provision to that effect in the bill. It might therefore be said that the task confronting the police officer wishing to obtain either of those things is less onerous than the task would be under the CCC act. It could be the case therefore that in the event that the bill becomes law, if either of those things was sought, an application might be more likely made under the bill than it would be under the CCC act. That is of course a matter simply for comment on my part because I do not and I cannot speak for the Commissioner of Police.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Do you see any circumstance in which the police might continue to apply to the CCC for the exceptional powers as opposed to provisions under the bill?

**Mr Macknay:** That brings me to the second part of my answer, Madam Chair; that is, that the CCC act in fact contains a suite of powers—not simply the right to empower the police to assume identities or to embark on controlled operations. In the first place it provides the right to have an examination conducted. In my view that is really the most significant power in the CCC act because it takes away the right to silence, which people in our community ordinarily enjoy, and replaces it with an obligation subject to the protections in the CCC act to answer questions that are put in an examination. One would expect, I think, that the police would continue to find that a useful power. Of the various exceptional powers, that would seem to be the one that has been most utilised. There are also other powers which can be granted under the exceptional powers provision dealing with the right to search without obtaining a warrant and it might be expected that at some point those things

would also be sought. In answer, I think, yes, the CCC act will continue to have a role in relation to police exceptional powers. My own view is that that power to have a private examination is perhaps a power that has not been used to the extent that one might have expected it to be used and therefore it might well be that it will be used more frequently in the future by the police.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Can I ask if you have a view about why it has not been used as frequently as you would think it would be and why you think that it might be used more frequently in the future.

**Mr Macknay:** I have read passages of the joint standing committee's report in which my predecessors have spoken about those things. I think that I am not really in a position to add to that other than just to make the general observation that the CCC is a very young instrumentality in our community. It is very different to anything that has gone before in this state. Of course, it is an organisation of the type that has existed in other places and under commonwealth legislation for some time. So it is perhaps not unexpected that it took some time for people to become aware of the things that it had to offer and also for there to be sufficient confidence perhaps in it that it would actually provide assistance. I note from the comments of my immediate predecessor in the report—did I mention that being the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission report number 10 of last year—that it would appear that the police have shown a greater confidence in the commission and a greater preparedness to adopt these things. The reason, Madam Chair, why I say that I think it is likely that there will be greater use of it in the future is that experience in other places would seem to reveal that bodies which really function simply as places where people can be required to give evidence have been shown to be useful and indeed operate principally for that function. So it has, I think, probably been underutilised.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Currently, the Parliamentary Inspector oversees the CCC and the CCC in turn oversees the police commissioner and the police service. The bill proposes that the oversight mechanism of the police commissioner as the chief officer will be the Ombudsman. This is only one level of oversight as compared with the two that currently exist. What is your view of this change in the level of oversight?

[10.00 am]

**Mr Macknay:** I say in the first place in so far as that is a matter of policy, with respect, I think that is a matter for the government of the day rather than for the commission to comment on it as policy. Can I just add the observation that I think in our view we would say that there is really presently one level of oversight and that is provided by us, because the parliamentary inspector's oversight of us is a limited one, as set out in the CCC Act, and is one that involves the audit of operations rather than any direct oversight of the police commissioner.

**The CHAIRMAN:** What about the role of the Joint Standing Committee on the CCC—the parliamentary committee—and its oversight role of the CCC, which is not included in this bill in terms of an oversight?

**Mr Macknay:** I think that my comment would be really the same: it is perhaps a matter of semantics. I would not regard the role of that joint standing committee as being one of oversight of the police commissioner given the limited role that it plays.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Currently the CCC has an oversight role in relation to the police and how police handle complaints against police officers. Now, if this bill is enacted, would the CCC continue to have that oversight role in terms of police complaints or in relation to police operation, including controlled operation, or would that power be removed in relation to controlled operations, and how would you determine whether it was a controlled operation or not?

**Mr Macknay:** If I may say so, with respect, that is an extremely good question and I have to say that it is not one that I have turned my mind to. It is not perhaps necessary for me to do so, of course, until this bill does become law, in the event that it does. I think it is probably a matter on

---

which I would need to take advice. Obviously, it would depend on the terms of both the CCC Act and the Criminal Investigation (Covert Powers) Act, as it would be. But private —

**The CHAIRMAN:** I am sure you know the CCC Act very well: would you say, looking at those two pieces of legislation, that currently with the wording of the bill, that would be ambiguous?

**Mr Macknay:** With respect, I have not studied the bill in that respect, but can I just say that I would anticipate that given the obligation of the CCC to monitor, and where appropriate, investigate the operations of the Western Australian police that I would adopt a starting position that would include the use of any special powers granted by any act. In the event that the act under which I operate proved to be not capable of giving that ability, then I would expect and I would wish to bring that to the attention of the Parliament with a view to having it changed. It seems to me, just as a matter of common sense, that there would be something wrong with the situation where the CCC would oversee 96 or 98 per cent, or whatever other percentage you might like to use, of the operations of the Western Australian police, but would not be able to look at some small part of the police operation because it was utilising the powers under another act of Parliament rather than its own.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Report 10 of the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission refers to the underutilisation and complexity of the CCC Act process. If the bill is passed, is it your view that the CCC Act will continue to be underutilised; and if yes, why?

**Mr Macknay:** I suppose whether it is being underutilised depends on the number of opportunities that the Western Australian police had to seek to use the powers of the commission but chose not to. Obviously, that is a matter for the police rather than for me; I am not conversant with the operational needs of Western Australian police. The obligation to satisfy the commission is not particularly complex in my view. Insofar as legal challenges go it does, as I think I have already mentioned, contain a public interest requirement in relation to controlled operations and assumed identity powers. As I think I have also already stated, the bill does not have such a requirement. In relation to those two particular powers, it might therefore be expected that police would look to the bill in the event that it becomes law rather than to the CCC Act, but again the CCC Act extraordinary powers provisions contain a suite of powers that can be granted, and for reasons I have already expressed, I would anticipate some greater use of, in particular, the examination power. I should add, of course, that the CCC Act is also the subject of review by the government presently. There is a draft bill that I understand might well come to the Parliament some time early in the new year and might well significantly change the landscape in relation to, certainly, the organised crime side of things. So, that makes it very difficult to predict the future in terms of how the police might function in relation to extraordinary powers.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Do you agree that the process under the bill is less complex or cumbersome than the process under the CCC Act; and, what do you see as the advantages and disadvantages of this less complex process?

**Mr Macknay:** Again, it seems to me that the principal difference in terms of the task that confronts someone who wants to obtain the right to assume an identity or to conduct a controlled operation is the public interest requirement of the CCC Act in section 46. Section 46(1)(c) of that act states —

there are reasonable grounds for believing that the use of exceptional powers would be in the public interest having regard to —

- (i) whether or not the suspected offence could be effectively investigated without using the powers;
  - (ii) the extent to which the evidence or other information that it is suspected might be obtained would assist in the investigation, and the likelihood of obtaining it; and
-

- (iii) the circumstances in which the evidence or information that it is suspected might be obtained is suspected to have come into the possession of any person from whom it might be obtained.

As I understand the bill, that requirement is absent from it. Now, it really depends, I suppose, on one's individual views as to the merits or otherwise of that particular provision, and with respect, I am not sure that it is really appropriate for me to express a view on that. Can I just add, Madam Chair, that the bill, as I understand it, represents model legislation that has been considered and adopted by the commonwealth and other states. So it would seem that a view is held in other places that there is sufficient safeguard, if you like, in relation to the obligations that must be met.

**The CHAIRMAN:** What is your response to a view that has been expressed to the committee that the police commissioner, as the chief officer, will prefer to use the bill because of its diminished oversight mechanism?

**Mr Macknay:** Again, with respect, it is difficult for me to speak to what the police commissioner might think or might do. I am not sure the oversight provisions are substantially diminished. Certainly, there is an obligation in relation to assumed identities. As I understand it, the obligation in the bill is simply to provide a yearly review. Under the CCC Act there is an obligation on the part of a police officer to report to the Commissioner of Police every six months and after termination, with a corresponding obligation on the Commissioner of Police to then provide that material to the CCC. That would appear to be missing. The CCC also has the right to seek information any time it chooses. In relation to controlled operations, there would seem to be an obligation on a police officer to report after two months and then there is an annual obligation of reporting. That would seem in fact to be more onerous than under the CCC Act where the obligation is to report, I think, every six months. So, in some respects, the obligations are diminished, but not in all respects. It is true that there is no oversight body in that sense, and that at the moment the CCC can seek information at any time that it so desires.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Since the establishment of the CCC, how many times have the police applied for the use of the exceptional powers provisions? What was the nature and purpose of the operation? How many times have the exceptional powers being granted?

**Mr Macknay:** Madam Chair, I am not sure I have got the information as to the number of applications that have been made, but I am told that there have been 10 grants of exceptional powers and just by way of information, because this is really an additional matter, under our act two fortification notices, there has been one grant of power in relation to a controlled operation, which I am told was not in the event actually exercised and the examinations resulting from exceptional powers grants have resulted in it being 35 hearing dates in the commission.

I apologise, I am told that there have in fact been 14 grants of exceptional powers, but 10 grants of exceptional powers that resulted in hearings.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Would you be able to take the first part of that question on notice in terms of the number of applications that have actually been made?

**Mr Macknay:** I certainly shall.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Anne will contact your office after the hearings today and just confirm that issue is being taken on notice and provide you with a date by which we will need the information.

**Mr Macknay:** All right, if Ms Turner would like to contact Mr O'Connor, my director of legal services on my right, we will endeavour to provide that information just as quickly as we can. I assume we do have it.

**Mr O'Connor:** Yes.

[10.15 am]

---

**The CHAIRMAN:** What issues have arisen with oversight of the exceptional powers findings since the coming into force of the CCC act?

**Mr Macknay:** I am not aware that there has been any suggestion that police officers have overused their exceptional powers or that there has been any question of abuse of those powers. Mr Silverstone?

**Mr Silverstone:** There has been, on occasion, concern about the interpretation of those powers. But I must say that in preparing for today's meeting we have particularly focussed on controlled operations and assumed identities in terms of that, and because of the paucity of applications for exceptional powers in regard to those two matters, no particular issues have arisen.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I have a few additional questions. The bill provides the Ombudsman with an oversight power that is limited to inspection rather than empowering the independent body to conduct investigations into particular controlled operations. Is it your view that the Ombudsman should have the power to conduct investigations into particular controlled operations, as the CCC currently does?

**Mr Macknay:** Again, if I may say so, with respect, that would seem to be a question for the government and the Parliament rather than for somebody who simply occupies a statutory post. Can I just reiterate that it seems to me that given that the obligation of the CCC is to oversee Western Australia Police and that part of that obligation carries with it a power to carry out investigations where appropriate—that is part of the misconduct function, of course—that it might be thought that oversight carries with it, ideally, an ability to investigate where appropriate in order to carry out an oversight function.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Yes, but that would limit the power of investigation to where a complaint has been lodged.

**Mr Macknay:** Yes.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Powers as they are currently under the CCC are not limited. Your investigation power under the act is not limited to where a complaint against a police officer has been lodged.

**Mr Macknay:** No. The CCC can form the view that there is a need, of its own motion, to commence an investigation. That requires, of course, a belief to be formed that there is some misconduct. It is not an auditing role, if you like; it is a right or an obligation that is quickened by the formation of a belief that there has been misconduct.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Is it your view that the CCC would continue to have that function, even in relation to controlled operations, once the act is in force?

**Mr Macknay:** Again, I think I answered that earlier in that ultimately that would be a matter of the interpretation of both the CCC act and the Criminal Investigation (Covert Powers) Act—in the event that it became such. But my preliminary view, untutored by an examination of the particular provisions and by the receipt of legal advice, would be that the CCC would continue to have that ability.

**The CHAIRMAN:** How would you know that a police officer was involved if they had an assumed identity for the purposes of the controlled operation?

**Mr Macknay:** Again, with respect, that is a good question, but that would depend I suppose on the evidence in relation to the particular matter. I assume —

**The CHAIRMAN:** Is it not the case that given the police officer would have an assumed identity, the likelihood of a complaint reaching the CCC in relation to the police officer, because the person would not believe that person to be a police officer, would be greatly reduced, if not zero?

**Mr Macknay:** Yes. If there was misconduct on the part of a police officer in the course of a controlled operation and it was not known by the person affected that it was in fact a controlled

operation but was thought simply to be somebody breaking the law, then without more it would be difficult, I accept, in ordinary circumstances, for the CCC to become aware that a police officer had so acted; yes. I suppose that flows from the very nature of assumed identities.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The committee has received a submission expressing the view that the oversight monitoring powers in the bill would be better exercised by the CCC. Would you agree with this view; and if yes, why? And I appreciate you are going to say this is a policy issue, but I am asking the question of you in terms of being someone whose responsibility it is to enforce the provisions of the CCC act and comparing that to the oversight provisions that exist in the bill.

**Mr Macknay:** I think I must really confine myself to the conventional answer that you indicated I would be likely to use, Madam Chair. I think to provide a different answer would require me to have a working knowledge of the operations of the Ombudsman's office, and I simply have no personal knowledge at all of the Ombudsman's office, so I have no reason to think that the Ombudsman would not be well equipped to carry out an oversight task.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The bill provides that relevant offences would include all offences carrying a penalty of imprisonment for three years or more. Would you classify all offences carrying a penalty of imprisonment of three years or more to be serious offences?

**Mr Macknay:** I really do not feel able to answer that. I think that is a matter of opinion, while as individuals we would all hold an opinion—or most of us would no doubt. I might have an opinion, but in my capacity as the commissioner I do not have an opinion.

**The CHAIRMAN:** A principal concern with controlled operations, because of their very nature, is a possibility of corruption. A controlled operation involves the committing of actions that would otherwise be criminal by law enforcement officials or persons authorised by law enforcement officials. The community is naturally concerned that the power to commit such an act with legal immunity is not misused. The CCC's main purpose, as stated in section 7A(b) of the CCC act, is "to improve continuously the integrity of, and to reduce the incidence of misconduct in, the public sector". The committee has received a submission expressing the view that the CCC by its nature is more likely than the Ombudsman to take close attention to, take note of and respond appropriately to possible misuses of the controlled operation powers of law enforcement agencies. Do you agree with this view?

**Mr Macknay:** The commission has, of course, a power itself to conduct controlled operations, and I am not aware that there is any real allegation of any misuse by the commission of those powers. The Commissioner of Police would not seem to find that power a particularly attractive one, given the paucity of applications to the commission up to this point for the right to conduct such operations. But, again, ultimately I think it really becomes a question of the ability of the Ombudsman to properly carry out oversight functions. Again, I have no reason to think that the Ombudsman is not well placed to do that.

**The CHAIRMAN:** But it is not the role of the Ombudsman to investigate misconduct of public officers; that is the role of the CCC, only you will not know that the person is a public officer.

**Mr Macknay:** Yes. I understood the question you were asking was about the oversight of controlled operations generally rather than where there was misconduct and that be simply a general oversight in terms of monitoring the use of controlled operations and so on. Again, in relation to misconduct in the course of a controlled operation, I suspect that it would be likely to come to the attention of the commission if there was some individual misconduct and the CCC, as I say, I think would be likely to operate on the basis that it currently would have the power to investigate that misconduct.

The executive director, Mr Silverstone, points out that as part of our oversight of Western Australia Police we are able to look, of course, at particular aspects of police operations to see whether there is some difficulty in a particular part of the current method of operation of the police; and it would



be open to do that, of course, in relation to controlled operations provided we have not been excluded by the terms of the bill in the event that it becomes law—and I am not aware of any provision to that effect—and we would in fact have that ability.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I am curious to understand how that would be implemented because it is actually a prohibition under the act to disclose an assumed identity, carrying a term of imprisonment, and I do not see any exclusion for the purposes of CCC oversight to that penalty and that offence. I struggle to know how you would actually do that.

**Mr Macknay:** I am not sure there is a prohibition on information that the commissioner made or granted authorities of that kind. So, assuming that to be the case, it would certainly be open to us to have regard to the extent to which authorities were issued. Again, as to whether a complaint of misconduct against a person using an assumed identity came to us, that obviously, as with any other complaint, would turn on the particular facts of the matter. It is pointed out by Mr Silverstone that certainly under section 94 of the CCC act we have the right by written notice served on a public authority or public officer to require the production of information. Section 94(4) of that act says —

The powers conferred by this section may be exercised despite

...

- (c) any duty of secrecy or other restriction on disclosure applying to a public authority or public officer.

That might be an answer to the point you raise.

**The CHAIRMAN:** If it is not overruled by the bill. The Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission's report No 15, "Corruption Risks of Controlled Operations and Informants", dated June 2011 found —

If the WA Police are given the power to self-authorise the use of exceptional powers beyond that which presently exists, this will lead to an unacceptable and unnecessary erosion of civil liberties in Western Australia, and would increase the risk of harm to the public

Do you agree with this finding?

**Mr Macknay:** I respect all of the utterances of the joint standing committee, Madam Chair. I am unaware as to the information on which that opinion was based. It was not, as far as I am aware, based on any information provided by the CCC. It would appear—I am not sure the particular powers are the subject of the comment and whether the relatively limited powers the subject of the Criminal Investigation (Covert Powers) Bill or whether the joint standing committee was considering a scenario in which the wider suite of powers was to be conferred on the commissioner. I think I have already answered, in relation to these particular powers the subject of the bill, that it is part of a model piece of legislation, so I assume there is experience with it in other places. Other than that, I do not think I ought really comment.

[10.30 am]

**The CHAIRMAN:** I will ask this next question and see whether I can get an answer from you: are there sufficient safeguards in the bill to guard against an unacceptable erosion of civil liberties in WA and increased harm to the public?

**Mr Macknay:** Can I say that after 16 years it is an unusual position for me to be told that I ought answer the question as a witness! I am much more accustomed to making those utterances myself. The rule of law is paramount, in my view. If people embrace the need to follow the rule of law, then there ought be sufficient safeguards. If people are prepared to act corruptly, then there can never be enough safeguards.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Finding 7 of that same report by the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission states —

---

The CCC has undertaken to conduct a corruption prevention review of the operational activities, policies and processes of the WA Police in relation to the *Prostitution Act 2000*.

Has the CCC undertaken this review, and are there any findings from this review that may be instructive in relation to the committee's inquiry into the bill?

**Mr Macknay:** I think Mr Silverstone is better placed than I to respond to that.

**Mr Silverstone:** We are currently in the process of planning that review.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Are you likely to have it completed within four to five days, which is the time this committee has to report back to the Parliament?

**Mr Silverstone:** No, Madam Chair.

**The CHAIRMAN:** My next question relates to finding 8, which is contained in the same report. It states —

The CCC has undertaken to conduct a corruption prevention review of the operational activities, policies and processes of the WA Police in relation to the *Misuse of Drugs Act 1981*.

Again I ask whether the CCC has undertaken the review and whether there are any findings from this review which may be instructive to the committee in its inquiry of the bill?

**Mr Macknay:** Again, I would ask Mr Silverstone to respond to that.

**Mr Silverstone:** My response is the same—we are currently planning to do that. It will not be completed within 48 days, Madam Chair.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Are there any closing statements you would like to make?

**Mr Macknay:** No. Thank you for inviting us to speak to the committee. These are important powers. Clearly the way in which grants should be made in the exercise of these powers are all part of a work in progress because of the youth of the CCC. We are anxious to cooperate in any way that we can. Personally I appreciate, because it is a work in progress, no doubt as the years go by, with experience in the way these things work, we will obtain greater wisdom as to the ideal model.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Thank you very much. Just to recap: Anne will be in contact with your office in relation to the question that has been taken on notice. A transcript of the uncorrected *Hansard* will be provided to you for you to review and advise us of any changes that you would like to make to that uncorrected transcript. It is subject to parliamentary privilege. Thank you very much.

**Hearing concluded at 10.34 am**

---