



PARLIAMENTARY CRIME AND CORRUPTION COMMITTEE

Members present:

Mr JM Krause MP—Chair
Mr DJ Brown MP
Ms JM Bush MP (virtual)
Mr MJ Crandon MP
Ms JC Pugh MP
Dr MA Robinson MP
Mr CG Whiting MP

Staff present:

Ms M Westcott—Committee Secretary
Ms A Groth—Assistant Committee Secretary

MEETING WITH PARLIAMENTARY CRIME AND CORRUPTION COMMISSIONER

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

FRIDAY, 19 AUGUST 2022

Brisbane

FRIDAY, 19 AUGUST 2022

The committee met at 9.01 am.

CHAIR: Good morning, everyone. I am Jon Krause, the member for Scenic Rim and chair of the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee. Joining me on the committee today are: Mr Don Brown, the member for Capalaba; Ms Jonty Bush, the member for Cooper; Mr Michael Crandon, the member for Coomera; Ms Jessica Pugh, the member for Mount Ommaney; Dr Mark Robinson, the member for Oodgeroo; and Mr Chris Whiting, the member for Bancroft, who is today substituting for Mr Jimmy Sullivan, the member for Stafford.

Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet and their elders past, present and emerging. The committee's proceedings today are proceedings of the parliament and are subject to the standing rules and orders of the parliament. As parliamentary proceedings, under the standing orders any person may be excluded from today's meetings at my discretion or by order of the committee. The proceedings are being recorded by Hansard and broadcast live on the parliament's website. Media may be present and will be subject to my direction at all times. The media rules that are endorsed by the committee are available from the committee staff, if required. All those present today should know that it is possible you might be filmed or photographed by media during the proceedings and images may also appear on the parliament's website or social media pages. Before we begin, I ask everyone, including the members of the committee, to please turn mobile phones off or switch them to silent.

The committee is beginning its meeting in public to deal with a number of matters. It will then commence its public meeting with the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Commissioner. The committee will then move into private session with the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Commissioner. Following that, the committee will meet in public with the CCC before moving into a private session with the Crime and Corruption Commission. Do we have any declarations of interest for the public part of the agenda?

Mr WHITING: I will make one generally. I am a member of the ETU and the CFMMEU. I am also a member of the Moreton Bay Cycling Club.

CHAIR: Thank you very much. I assume that does not affect your ability to ask questions about anything today. Members have been provided with a copy of the agenda for today's meeting. I move that the agenda for Friday, 19 August 2022 as circulated be adopted. All in favour? Those against? That is carried.

KUNDE, Mr Mitchell, Principal Legal Officer, Office of the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Commissioner

WOODFORD, Mr Michael, Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Commissioner

CHAIR: I would like to welcome the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Commissioner, Mr Michael Woodford, and the principal legal officer, Mr Mitchell Kunde, to our meeting today. Members have been provided with the parliamentary commissioner's public report to the committee for the period 15 February 2022 to 9 August 2022. There is a proposed resolution that the committee authorise the publication of the parliamentary commissioner's public report to the committee for that period. Michael Crandon, would you like to move that?

Mr CRANDON: Absolutely.

CHAIR: All those in favour? Against? That is carried, thank you. We will move into a discussion of the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Commissioner's activities. I invite Mr Woodford to make an opening address to the committee, after which committee members will have some questions. I also acknowledge the presence of Mr Kunde. Mr Woodford, you have the floor and we welcome your report.

Mr Woodford: I am here today to update the committee on the work that has been undertaken by the office over the last six months, since I was last here on 25 February this year. As has been noted, a report has come over in advance of the meeting which sets out what we have been doing over the last six months. A table of the key outputs commences on page 2 and continues thereafter.

As you are aware, the parliamentary commissioner has various statutory obligations and functions that are found within various state and commonwealth legislation. From a performance point of view, I am pleased to advise the committee that the office has continued to execute its statutory functions in a timely manner. All statutory inspection and reporting obligations have been discharged and are up to date. That includes reporting to the committee and to external statutory office holders, where required under the legislation. In undertaking the statutory functions that I and the office are required to undertake, I have had various meetings throughout the last six months with people from the CCC. We have not ventured to the QPS during this half year; we will be going there in the coming months.

There have been discussions with various people who occupy positions within the CCC that are relevant to what we look at. Those discussions enable us to better understand the manner in which they execute their functions and how those functions are captured in the documents that we go to look at. I mentioned that last time I was here, six months ago. I see it as an important thing for the office to keep engaging with people inside the CCC who are in control of things we come to look at to ensure we completely understand what is going on and to keep looking to see if there are better ways of doing things so they can be more efficient in complying with their legislative obligations and our work can be done better.

Planning for the next half-yearly statutory inspections and reporting tasks is well in hand and that will commence in the coming weeks. Of all of the auditing undertaken of the various records at the CCC, only one real anomaly was detected. It was a compliance affidavit for a TI inspection being given one day late to the Public Interest Monitor. In the scheme of things, our office did not consider it too alarming. Part of the work of the office is to examine, consider and respond to notifications of improper conduct under section 329 of the Crime and Corruption Act. Each of those notifications received over the last six months has been finalised save for one matter, which we will perhaps speak about at a later time, but everything is in order with the 329s.

There were three referrals that were on hand from the committee over the last six months for us to examine, consider and report on. Examination is an enormous task with each referral that comes down. It does take a lot of time, firstly, to obtain the material and then to look through the vast amounts of material. Of course, that all needs to be considered and something needs to be put together in a report to assist the committee in understanding the issues.

One of those matters was finalised, which I foreshadowed at the last meeting. I said that it would be coming across within a couple of weeks, and it did. I am in the same position at this meeting with another matter which is all but finalised. There is one small issue that we are waiting to deal with. It was all but finalised a few weeks ago. We cannot control the speed with which people respond to us—not to any great extent anyway. I do expect that the committee will be furnished with a further report in the coming weeks.

There is a third matter that is on our books in the office. That is more in its infancy. The CCC is gathering material consequent upon our request at the moment. I expect that the committee will receive a report on that matter in a couple of months time rather than weeks.

Another matter that occupied the time of the office over the last six months was the inquiry that took place regarding the Logan councillors. A lot of time was taken in responding to and putting forward submissions. The commission of inquiry was interested in our comments on certain things and, of course, we put the work in to properly respond. Looking through the report, it seems that those submissions that were made were helpful and were taken on board as part of the consideration by the commissioners.

In the end, three submissions were made to the commission of inquiry. There was a major submission and then there was a supplementary one to respond to some further questions that the commissioners had. Then there was a further submission when some new case law came from the courts that we wanted to make them aware of.

Of course, the report of the commission of inquiry and its recommendations are a matter for government. There were a couple of things in there that really caught the attention of our office. One was the move away from a policing law enforcement model to a multidisciplinary approach for the management, investigation and consideration of corruption investigations. It was something that, in our submissions to the commission of inquiry, took up quite a lot of time considering the experience within the office—and a lot of that rests with Mr Kunde, given his extended period of time there, but I have seen it during my time in this position as well. It was something that caught our imagination. In terms of the pure crime functions of the commission, yes, a policing model is a better fit. However, when it comes to corruption investigations, then perhaps a much broader approach is a better one. It was very good, we thought, to see where the commission of inquiry came to on that issue. We saw that as being a very positive step forward for the CCC.

The other major part was the DPP and its position on what the commission of inquiry recommended. Views may differ on the DPP being tasked with reviewing corruption briefs and advising on charging. I put forward views about where that should rest, but other views were put forward by others. The commission of inquiry looked at various systems all over the country and thought about those things quite carefully and came back to the position that existed in Queensland up until some amendments back in 2018 to section 49 where the DPP theoretically and possibly could look at these matters.

The recommendation is that there be a more certain move, if you like, that the DPP is to review these things before there are charges in corruption. That was the other major step forward we saw. Of course, following on from the work that the committee did with the Logan councillors, everyone was anxious to see that there be some oversight on corruption charges because of the significant public disruption that can follow when a government body can be put in peril as a result of charging. That was a point we made in our submissions. When it comes to corruption charges, every individual who is charged with something is impacted enormously. However, certain individuals who might be charged also exercise public functions, and it can have a really destabilising effect on the community through a body of government being disabled. It is welcome that oversight is being recommended. The model they have chosen is the model they have chosen.

That took up some work of the office. Throughout this period the committee was interested in some particular issues as well, and some advices came from our office on those particular issues. That completes my opening statement on the work of the office over the last six months.

CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Woodford.

Ms PUGH: I want to return to the recommendations your team made around the commission of inquiry, which was fascinating reading. I was very interested in your recommendation around the Director of Public Prosecutions' involvement; that was something we all saw arise from the Logan report. Are you able to provide details of the relationship that will now exist in a more formal capacity? As you have previously alluded to, there was that potential for a referral, but now we are talking about setting up a more formalised system. Can you expand on how you might see that operating going forward to ensure there is a systemic approach to that new cooperative working relationship?

Mr Woodford: There are two parts. The first part starts with the legislation. If the recommendation is taken up, there are two ways of going about things. You either have a memorandum of understanding between the different bodies whereby the DPP must review a corruption brief and give an opinion—there are different ways to attack it. There can be those memorandums of understanding and administrative arrangements. The other way of dealing with it is for it to be enshrined in the legislation. That was the avenue that I understood when I was reading the report, that the commissioners were recommending there be that formality to the approach such that a seconded police officer could not charge someone without going through the DPP except in exceptional circumstances. I guess what they had in mind is that you always have to have a reserve capacity to do something. Something might be going on and someone may have a plane ticket. That is the obvious case where you would need to use that reserve power.

Historically, that function did exist for the DPP to advise, but my understanding of how things worked over that period of time—those decades—was that opinion and advice would be sought from the DPP in certain matters. That functioned as it functioned. I cannot remember whether there was anything prior to the Logan councillors that came to the public attention of that magnitude, but it did function. Following the Logan councillors inquiry, perhaps the thought is moving towards that the process needs to be so much more formalised, because what we have seen—and we know—is that the fact of charging can have a really significant impact on individuals and on a community. That is the nature of corruption charges, because they can trigger other legislative provisions which do have that greater public impact.

I guess it is a question of which way the government wants to go. Does it want to leave it as memorandums of understanding or make it something more formal? It seems that the commissioners were suggesting a formal legislative regime or an amendment to section 49 to make it more formal.

CHAIR: I think the government has indicated they are accepting the recommendation.

Mr Kunde: I suspect that there might have to be some protocol between the two agencies for matters that you would think perhaps do not need the oversight, but that is a matter for them to gauge. There may be other very straightforward matters.

Mr Woodford: There are significant corruption matters where you would want a DPP involved. Then there are other matters that may come to the DPP that are relatively minor and do not require that higher level of thought. Then you throw into that mix something coming out of the Coaldrake Brisbane

report with the prospect of a clearing house. That is something that caught my attention and imagination, and that picks up on something Mr Kunde just said about the different levels of matters that are coming through. Maybe that is something the government needs to think about if the clearing house model is adopted. That clearing house may be the gatekeeper of, 'Okay, this corruption matter needs to go here.'

Mr CRANDON: The then chair of the CCC was asked about the DPP involvement et cetera during the hearings. His argument was that if this had gone to the DPP under the current structure it would have taken forever for it to come back out, for it to go through the process. What are your thoughts on that?

Mr Woodford: At that time, in that environment, perhaps that is correct. Moving forward several months after he was asked that question, there was a commission of inquiry raking through these issues and seeing an imperative that the DPP should be looking at these things. Then you ask yourself: would you be in the same position that it comes through the pipes and takes months to rattle around before you get an outcome? I suspect that in the environment we are in now—a properly resourced DPP with people considering particularly corruption matters and the seriousness that they hold for the public—you would expect that you would not have those time difficulties. We need to move forward in time from a DPP with a memorandum of understanding or a loose agreement—I do not mean that in a negative sense; I mean a non-structural arrangement—that if we need advice, we will go to the DPP and they will get around to doing it as best they can, given the resources they have. I think the public interest in this now has indicated—and the work that has been done through the commission of inquiry—that it needs to be done a little bit better and faster.

Ms PUGH: I think you have alluded to the issue of workload for the DPP if we are to suddenly have matters that are not just about corruption but also potentially about crime being referred on. Even if it is on those lower level matters that come straight back to the CCC with their approval, it still creates those challenges. Did you give any thought in your submission or post your submission to how those challenges might be addressed as to whether we go to a legislative model or an MOU as you have spoken about?

Mr Woodford: I did not until you raised it this morning. Maybe it is just because I am a lawyer, but when I looked at the recommendations my mind jumped to, 'How is section 49 going to be amended to enshrine a requirement that the DPP consider a matter?,' and then, 'Only in exceptional circumstances can a police officer charge without that opinion being received.' That is what my mind jumped to. It is a matter of policy. The CCC chair may be able to comment on that, and certainly the DPP would want input there.

Ms PUGH: He certainly expressed an opinion, as I recall, in the hearings last year. I was interested to get your thoughts as well while we have the opportunity.

Mr Woodford: I think the bigger issue for the DPP will be the resourcing, to be frank, because it is a busy office that is doing large amounts of criminal work. However, if it is resourced to deal with the corruption matters, I cannot see why it is something that would not be embraced. Charges following a corruption investigation is an interesting aspect of criminal law, and there is certainly a wealth of experience at the DPP. I imagine they would quite look forward to and enjoy that work in a professional sense because of the variety and the complexity of it.

CHAIR: In your opening statement you referred to waiting on material for one of your particular reports and said that it should be right in a week or so. Are you waiting on materials from the CCC or another government body or an individual?

Mr Woodford: No, it is an individual witness. The processes are that we need to give people time to respond when we are waiting on something. Then if there is compliance and we receive what we want in terms of a response, good. If there is not then there are other levers that can be pulled and then that is a judgement call as to whether or not it is necessary.

CHAIR: Mr Woodford, I have not read your submissions to the COI. I apologise.

Mr Woodford: They were fantastic! I think Mr Crandon may have seen appendix H. I think you and I have debated in our meetings the movement of the law with respect to who gets what material from the CCC. That was something I spent a bit of time on in our submission because, for me, it is a big issue.

CHAIR: Sections 60 and 62?

Mr Woodford: There are some other issues. In the end, the commission of inquiry looked at those issues and it is contained in an appendix. I thought it was important, given that within the committee we have been discussing those issues and I have reflected on it a lot. It is to do with when
Brisbane

people are pulled in for compelled hearings and just who should have access to that material in terms of decision-makers to charge and then, down the track, whether co-accused people should have access to this material.

The law on this is in a state of movement. It started about a decade or so ago, and the journey still has a way to go. We look around the country and we see those sorts of issues bubbling away. My thought was, 'Is this a government issue? Is this something we should get ahead of, or is it something that the case law will catch up on?' There are some issues that just take time for different circumstances to come through in order for the big thinkers to find the good ways forward.

My thinking on it is that over the next 10 years I am already thinking we will see some of those issues bubble up in cases and so it is catching people's imagination. The way life works is that it is a matter of time before, within particular cases, those issues really come to the forefront. That then may trigger either leaps forward in the common law, which we have had over the last decade on those issues, or some sort of legislative response. It is not happening around the country in jurisdictions like Sydney and Victoria yet, but the issues are bubbling away. I note that particularly for you, Mr Crandon, because I know it is something that we have discussed before, and it is in that particular part of the report you might have found interesting.

Mr CRANDON: To clarify, it is something that has been brought to us in public hearings from the Police Union, as one example, but also from lawyers and silks and so forth. They brought those concerns to us. It is absolutely a live issue.

CHAIR: You said that you made some submissions on case law in your submissions to the commission of inquiry. Can you give us a flavour of what that was about? In particular, did you make a submission subsequent upon the Court of Appeal decision in the Carne matter?

Mr Woodford: They are two very different things. The case law that I was submitting on was in relation to the issue I have just been raising with Mr Crandon. I wanted to draw to the attention of the commission of inquiry the state of the law around the country, because some of those cases are a little difficult to find.

In relation to Carne, that came out post—and that in itself is a very interesting issue but completely unrelated to what we were looking at with the commission of inquiry. The thing about Carne—and when we are sitting here today, it is not a matter of criticising judgements that are coming from the Court of Appeal at all. When I am looking at that judgement, I am looking at the response from the CCC.

This is something, no doubt, that the committee will want to speak with the CCC about in terms of: 'What are you doing now, because the Court of Appeal has indicated the extent of your powers for reporting through that judgement.' The CCC is now in a position of: 'If there are no charges, what should we be reporting on? If it is not a function of ours, a legislative function to do certain things, then why are we doing it?' My mind turns to think about the CCC. If the CCC goes off and does something that is not within its powers, what is going to happen? It is getting hauled over the coals.

The CCC reports to this committee in order to assist the committee on things. When you have a Fitzgerald report—the recent report—talking about corruption prevention, not corruption prosecution, being a critical thing and then the CCC is in a position of: 'We want to report there are no charges. What are we doing? Do we report to you because it is a part of our function?', I wonder how the CCC within the organisation are responding to that. Similarly with Coaldrake, when I was looking through the Coaldrake report it is talking about investigation and education. Reports that come to this committee from the CCC are not purely responsive reports to, 'We have charged. Here is a report,' or 'Here is a report into the charging.' Part of the purpose of their reporting is education—I will use that loosely—but informing the committee about things. I do not know whether—and really it is not my issue, but I am here to assist you. When I read Carne I thought, 'I wonder what the response to this is going to be by the CCC'—not the legal response in terms of courts.

CHAIR: Is it your view that the narrowing of the power of the CCC in accordance with the Carne decision is somewhat inconsistent with the general thrust of recommendations of the Fitzgerald commission of inquiry?

Mr Woodford: And Coaldrake. You have encapsulated what I was trying to say. That is the issue I have. We do not have that issue, but I wonder what the CCC makes of it all, because the CCC may sit there and say, 'We've just come out of the Logan commission of inquiry. That was a particularly difficult experience for us and we need to make sure that we are doing things better and fast.' That is logical. That is an institutional response to that. Then they are dealing with Carne and

the precise point that you are making: what does the CCC do? 'We want to make sure we are doing everything correctly. We are a statutory organisation. We need to act within our powers and execute our functions within the act, not go off doing things'—

CHAIR: In accordance with court decisions as well.

Mr Woodford:—and in accordance with court decisions. When I read Carne, and respecting the judgements in Carne—it is not a criticism of Carne; it is a concern about the response by the CCC. That is something that I think the government is going to need to have a think about in terms of whether there is any clarification that needs to happen following Carne.

CHAIR: I am conscious of the time, but I want to ask two other things. In the Logan report there was some reflection made on the role of police officers in the CCC. One of the findings—and I am paraphrasing—was that the actions of a particular officer were a consequence or a reflection of the culture of the Crime and Corruption Commission. I guess there are different ways you can interpret that finding. One way of looking at it is that the way in which the police had conducted themselves was a result of culture within the CCC—a culture which comes about not only from the police but also from the civilians who work at the CCC—whereas the commission of inquiry seems to have taken a different view about those cultural issues and the way the police have been operating. Do you have any opinion or observations to offer about that? You have obviously made some lengthy submissions to the COI and you were here for the Logan inquiry as well. Is there anything you could offer the committee by way of observation about those matters?

Mr Woodford: I do not think so. I really do not. You have different positions being put forward. We saw that in the Logan councillors inquiry, and in some of that it was made pretty obvious that there was a cultural problem. The extension of that is: how widespread is it? Is that particularly related to this matter? Is it related to that sphere that they were looking at then in terms of local government? Was that something that became a focus of attention and so did people get a little bit carried away? Does that mean in matters outside of that there is the same culture? I just do not think I am in a position to respond.

Mr WHITING: If we are talking in a lot of ways about an expansion of culture into education and prevention—and I think previously moves into the area of government policy and how you construct the body itself were mentioned. Related to that—and this comes back to what you said originally—was moving away from looking at investigating corruption by a non-policing model. Is that what we are talking about in terms of different things that are being investigated or moving into a prevention and educative function?

Mr Woodford: It is a bit of all of that. The problem—and I think the problem that is identified in the commission of inquiry—is that for pure crime, police officers are what you need. In terms of the bundle of skills that you need to investigate a crime, you want a police officer. When you are dealing with corruption, it is not so simple. A police officer will have a number of elements and will try to understand, 'Can this amount to this? Can this amount to this element? It seems this has happened—tick. We have a prima facie case. Now we will move to charge.' Corruption matters can be so much more complicated. When you have ethicists and people with those levels of skills, they bring a different flavour to the investigation. This is something captured by the commission of inquiry. Having that bundle of skills with corruption matters is a better holistic way of looking at the conduct that is being complained about or examined and looking at it in that way before you move to a policing method.

There may be many other avenues that a complaint can go down in terms of review and guidance—there is a long continuum of things as opposed to the binary, 'Are we charging or not?' You have that whole mix that comes into it as well, and I think that is the greater attraction. For the skill level to deal with corruption per se, you need people beyond police officers, who are expert in dealing with pure crime.

Mr WHITING: I have other questions, but I will defer to my colleagues.

Mr BROWN: Earlier you touched on resourcing with regard to corruption. When I read the commission of inquiry it goes towards the civilianisation of the corruption function. I am trying to understand whether there is enough expertise out there to resource up the DPP—maybe a clearing house. You have the OIA also investigating low-level or medium-level corruption and then transitioning over a period of time. Do we as a state have the pool of expertise that we can call upon, whether it be at the bar or in the department of prosecution? Where are we going to get it from?

Mr Woodford: The short answer is that I do not know. The second part of the answer is that you are not going to the bar to get people. This is part of the problem. You need policing as a part of it for corruption because of the investigative capacity. Police officers know how to investigate things;

that is just part of it. You need lawyers to understand the charging in the background, but you need so many different people in between. You do not go to the bar and expert lawyers. When you are moving through and you are looking towards charging, then those people become important. To answer your question, I would not know. It is a valid question. You do not set up this fantastic model of all these different people to go and do these things without some work being done on ascertaining that people are out there.

When we talked before the commission of inquiry was set up I made the point: 'I hope that you have'—I do not know what they are called—'people who design organisations.' This comes back to what you were asking. You need people with that skill set to direct and advise on what is the right mix of people. At the moment you are at the step of a commission of inquiry saying, 'We've looked at all of these things. This is the road we think you should go down.' The next step then really is engaging with those people. That is where you go to the professors of university who have the super high level understanding of these issues. You engage with those people to say, 'Right, let's design this.' How do you design this to achieve what we want? Then it is those people who have the understanding of the resources that are available. You would hope it would not go from, 'Here's a really great idea and here's another idea for what we think it looks like and then we'll just kick that off and start filling it and see how it goes.' This is why I raised this a long time ago about having the right people to assist with design. You need that step along the way now before something is put in place to have these massive changes. I think that is what the report is really saying, too.

CHAIR: I will make this my last question. The report references Bob Atkinson, retired QPS commissioner, observing, 'It is unlikely that the QPS officers seconded to the CCC would have the confidence to resist a prosecution where the chair of the CCC has authorised such a prosecution.'

Mr Woodford: We saw that already in the inquiry run by the committee. I agree. I think that is a sound comment. We saw that.

CHAIR: Do you think the recommendations around section 49 and so forth are adequate to deal with that observation?

Mr Woodford: This really comes back to the charging fallacy, doesn't it? It was one of the central points. It is a theme that came through the inquiry. You enshrined there that a police officer can never go and charge without having the DPP look at it. Can you ever conceive that a police officer is going to go, 'Well, that's interesting. Thanks for your view, DPP. I'm going to charge anyway,' or 'I'm not going to charge'? It would be unrealistic to think that would happen. Those thoughts came into my mind as well when I was reading it, because the charging fallacy was something that was really a hot item of discussion through the committee's work. No, I do not think—

CHAIR: It would be worked out in the detail of the memorandums and so forth.

Mr CRANDON: I have just one comment. You alluded to it earlier as to whether or not there was a particular focus by the chair and the CCC because of the entity they were going after. It is pretty clear that since Belcarra there was a concerted effort to go through and clean up, for want of a better word, the councils of Queensland. We found through that inquiry we did that, in fact, there was not a massive amount of corrupt conduct across the board, particularly with elected officials. I think the chair of the CCC came back to us and said, 'Yes, at the end of the day there were two elected officials that were found guilty of corruption.' That is where it was; there was this determination to nail something to the wall, and that is where that culture started.

Mr Woodford: Looking through all the work in the inquiry that was done, what seemed to come through that was: a perception of local government needing to be cleaned up was something that was in the chair's mind as the guiding eye of the CCC. That came through, that the chair really thought there was something that needed to be done and therefore a lot of resources and a lot of effort went into looking at that issue. Whether that caused a cascade of other things to happen, who knows?

CHAIR: Mr Woodford, we will wrap up the public section of our meeting. Thank you for all of that. Thank you to those who are watching at home or in the public gallery here. The committee will continue its meeting with the parliamentary commissioner in private session.

The committee adjourned at 9.46 am.