

AEROPUB02623
10/12/2019

AERO
pp 02623-02680

PUBLIC
HEARING

COPYRIGHT

INDEPENDENT COMMISSION AGAINST CORRUPTION

THE HONOURABLE PETER M. HALL QC
CHIEF COMMISSIONER

PUBLIC HEARING

OPERATION AERO

Reference: Operation E18/0093

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

AT SYDNEY

ON TUESDAY 10 DECEMBER, 2019

AT 10.00AM

Any person who publishes any part of this transcript in any way and to any person contrary to a Commission direction against publication commits an offence against section 112(2) of the Independent Commission Against Corruption Act 1988.

This transcript has been prepared in accordance with conventions used in the Supreme Court.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Robertson.

MR ROBERTSON: Chief Commissioner, today I propose to call two witnesses. First, Bon Leong Teh, and then secondly, Alex Wood. I anticipate today will be a fairly full day. I hope to finish Mr Wood today, but it's quite possible that he'll continue into tomorrow. Other than that, I don't have any housekeeping matters.

THE COMMISSIONER: Very good.

10

MR ROBERTSON: So I might proceed immediately to calling Bon Leong Teh.

THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Yes, thank you Mr Teh, just take a seat there for a moment if you would, thank you, Mr – just sit down, thank you.

MR TEH: Okay, thank you.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

20

MR DEAN: Commissioner, my name is Dean. I seek leave to appear for Mr Teh.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I grant leave, Mr Dean, for you to appear.

MR DEAN: I have provided some advice to Mr Teh in relation to section 38 of the ICAC Act, and I'm instructed to seek a declaration on his behalf under that section.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: Very well. Thank you, Mr Dean. Mr Teh, do you wish to give evidence on oath or on an affirmation?

MR TEH: On a Bible, please.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you. Would you mind just standing there and my associate will administer the oath?

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Teh. Mr Teh, would you state your full name? Just put, what's your full name?---My name is Bon Leong Teh. Bon Leong Teh.

10 Thank you. Mr Teh, you have been summonsed to give evidence today in this public inquiry, and I understand that the procedures in particular in relation to section 38 of the Act have been explained to you, that is to say, a witness is entitled to object to giving evidence and then I can make a declaration so the evidence can't be used in other proceedings in the future. And I understand that you understand what I'm talking about.---Yeah. Yes, thank you.

All right. And it's your wish to have a declaration made?---Yes.

20 All right, thank you. You understand that of course you are under obligation to answer all the questions truthfully. You understand that? ---Yes, I understand that, yeah.

Thank you. Pursuant to section 38 of the Independent Commission Against Corruption Act, I declare that all answers given by Mr Teh as a witness in this public inquiry and all documents or things that may be produced by him in the course of his evidence are to be regarded as having been given or produced on objection. That being the case, there is no need for Mr Teh to make objection in respect of any particular answer given or document or thing produced.

30

PURSUANT TO SECTION 38 OF THE INDEPENDENT COMMISSION AGAINST CORRUPTION ACT, I DECLARE THAT ALL ANSWERS GIVEN BY MR TEH AS A WITNESS IN THIS PUBLIC INQUIRY AND ALL DOCUMENTS OR THINGS THAT MAY BE PRODUCED BY HIM IN THE COURSE OF HIS EVIDENCE ARE TO BE REGARDED AS HAVING BEEN GIVEN OR PRODUCED ON OBJECTION. THAT BEING THE CASE, THERE IS NO NEED FOR MR TEH TO MAKE OBJECTION IN RESPECT OF ANY PARTICULAR ANSWER GIVEN OR

40 **DOCUMENT OR THING PRODUCED.**

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Teh, Counsel Assisting will have some questions for you. Thank you.

MR ROBERTSON: Mr Teh, you're an accountant at the firm Teh & Ng Pty Ltd, is that right?---Yes.

You're one of two directors of that firm, is that right?---That is correct.

And the other director is Philip Ng, correct?---That is, that is correct.

And that practice is at 323 Castlereagh Street in Sydney, is that right?

---That is correct, too.

And I take it that you're the Teh in Teh & Ng, is that right?---Yes. Correct.

- 10 Your firm has been the external accountants for Wu International Investments Pty Ltd for many years, is that right?---Quite a number of years, yeah.

That's at least been the case since before 2015, is that right?---That is correct, yeah.

And indeed, for a few years before 2015, is that right?---Actually, I check, is 2010, yeah.

- 20 2010 was when you first acted as the external accountants for Wu International Investments, is that right?---Correct.

In that capacity, have you ever had any dealings with Mr Alex Wood?
---Yes.

What do you understand Mr Wood's role to be within Wu International Investments Pty Ltd?---I think Wu, Alex Wood is the owner of Wu International, or one of the owners of Wu International.

- 30 And have you had particular dealings with Mr Wood in your capacity as the external accountants for Wu International Investments?---Yes, yeah.

Was it common, and is it common for Mr Wood to attend on you in relation to matters of accounting?---Well, there would be like two or three occasion in a year that we would have a meeting on tax issue or accounting issue, yeah.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Teh, if you could just keep your voice up a little bit.---Okay. Yeah. Okay, sorry about that, yeah.

40

And just – that's all right, that's okay, and just talk into the microphone. That's fine. Okay.---Yep. Thank you.

MR ROBERTSON: So is it right then that when you have meetings in relation to Wu International Investments, Mr Wood would usually attend?
---Yeah, most of the time, yes.

Is Mr Wood your main contact within Wu International Investments, or is some other person a main contact?---Actually, is the accountant, called Benjamin Pan.

Now, is it right that Wu International Investments has more than one accountant, internal accountant, I mean?---Yes.

And is it right that Benjamin Pan is the senior of the accountants?---I would think so, yes.

10

Are there any other accountants whose names you're aware within Wu International Investments?---Well, he seems to be now in charge of certain, you know, information on accounting, is called Jenny, Kenny Zhan, yeah.

And that's Z-h-a-n. Is that right?---Z-h-a-n.

And is it right that you're dealings with Mr Zhan have happened more recently, rather than in the past?---Correct, yeah.

20

But is it right that in all the times that you've been acting as external accountant for Wu International Investments, Benjamin Pan has been the main contact. Is that right?---Correct. Most of the email from Benjamin Pan.

But Kenny Zhan, at least in more recent years, has had some contact as well. Is that right?---Yes, yeah.

30

And is it right that Benjamin Pan would attend at least most meetings that were necessary in relation to accounting matters for Wu International Investments?---Definitely, yeah.

And but Mr Wood would also attend most meetings as well. Is that right? ---Yes, I would say so.

Do you know who Dr Leo Liao is or was?---He's the general manager.

And do you know that he's passed away, Is that right?---Yes, I do.

40

Now, when he was alive what role did Dr Liao have in Wu International as you understood it?---Well, I think he's more a general manager, right, but in most of the, you know, consultation usually also there.

So is it right then that at least while Dr Liao was alive, the consultations that you had as external accountant for Wu International would usually have at least four people present, one being you, one being Alex Wood, one being Dr Liao and one being Mr Pan?---Dr Liao, Mr Pan, yeah, and occasionally Alex Wood, yes.

When you say occasionally, was it more often than not that Mr Wood would attend or would he only attend sometimes and not other times?---Well, I can't remember exactly but I would say most of the important issue he would be there, yes.

So at least if it was a meeting concerning an important issue, Mr Wood would usually be present. Is that right?---I would say so, yes.

10 So is it right then that at either every meeting or almost every meeting that you would have in relation to Wu International, Benjamin Pan would be present. Is that right?---Yes, anything to do with accounting issue, yes.

Or do you recall having any meetings associated with Wu International at which Mr Pan was not present?---Maybe one or two occasion but I can't remember exactly.

20 You said a minute ago that Mr Pan would be present in relation to accounting issues, but in what circumstances would you have a meeting that had nothing to do with accounting issues?---I'm just the external accountant, yeah.

Well, that's really what I'm asking. Your role in relation to Wu International was to act as the external accountant for that organisation. Is that right?---Correct, yes.

You didn't have some broader role in relation to Wu International?---No.

30 And so is it right to say then that either at all or at least almost all meetings that you would have associated with Wu International, Benjamin Pan would be present?---Yes.

And is it also the case that at all or almost all meetings while Dr Liao was alive, Dr Liao would be present?---Yes, I would say.

And in relation to Mr Wood, is it right to say that he would usually but not always be present in meetings?---Yes.

40 What about Kenny Zhan, when Dr Liao was alive was Kenny Zhan usually an attendee at meetings that you would have?---I think Kenny Zhan only came in quite late.

And when you say quite late, do you mean after Dr Liao passed away? ---After Dr Liao would be more often, yes.

And so after Dr Liao passed away, would Mr Zhan be a regular attendee at meetings that you would have in relation to Wu International?---Yeah, as far as I can remember, yes.

And so do we take it from that, that essentially what happened is that once Dr Liao passed away, at least from your perspective, Mr Zhan took over some of what Dr Liao did when he was alive?---Don't know exactly what his duty is but he'd be there in the meeting.

10 But at least from your perspective as the accountant, you wouldn't expect to see Mr Zhan there when Dr Liao was alive, but you would usually expect Mr Zhan to be there once Dr Liao had passed away. Is that right?---Can't be, can't exactly say that, but I remember most of the time that Kenny Zhan would be, you know, in a meeting with us, yes.

But the most of the time was only after Dr Liao had passed away. Is that right?---That would be more often, yes, definite.

Are you saying though that you recall seeing Mr Zhan in meetings whilst Dr Liao was alive?---Maybe one or twice, yeah.

20 So you may have seen it once or twice but it was relatively rare. Is that right?---Yep.

But it became more common once Dr Liao had passed away. Is that right? ---Yes, correct, yes.

What about Steve Tong, do you know who Steve Tong is?---Well, I don't, I know he's an employee but never, I don't know him personally.

30 Is it right to say that Steve Tong didn't have anything to do with the accounting side of Wu International at least as you understood it?---Yes, I think, yeah.

Those were matters dealt with by people like Mr Pan, Mr Wood and Dr Liao. Is that right?---Correct.

And more recently Mr Zhan as well. Is that right?---Kenny Zhan. Correct. Yes.

40 In relation to those other people, did you also act as a personal accountant for any of those others that we've just discussed?---Yes. I'm the personal accountant for Dr Liao and also the personal accountant for Alex Wood and also the mother and the sisters.

The mother and sisters of Mr Alex Wood. Is that right?---That's correct.

What about Mr Alex Wood's father, Bobby Wu?---Never.

So the sister and the mother. Is that right?---That's correct, yes.

What about any other companies, was it just Wu International Investments Pty Ltd - - -?---Yes.

- - - or were there other companies, associated companies that you were the external accountant for?---There's no, there's no other company. There is a partnership which is a partnership between Mrs, I mean Alex Wood's mother and a doctor. They bought some property together, yeah.

10 So who was that second person you identified?---Dr Ven Tan, Chin Ven Tan, yeah.

Could you just spell that for us?---Dr C-h-i-n V-e-n T-a-n. Yeah. It's just a partnership by, you know, collecting rental, yeah.

20 And putting aside that partnership and Wu International Investments Pty Ltd are there any other related entities of either Wu International Investments or any of the other people we've spoken about like Mr Wood, Dr Liao and Mr Pan that you have acted as the accountants for?---No. No other companies, yeah.

What about the, do you recognise the name of a company called Australia New Century International Pty Ltd?---That's many, many years ago. I, I remember that was doing the business of duty free but that's like, 20 years ago maybe, yeah.

Were you the accountant of that organisation?---I was, yeah, the accountant. It was a long time ago, yeah.

30 Do you recall who the director or directors were of that organisation?---I, I remember I think Bobby was one of them, yeah.

Do you recall any of the other directors?---No.

What about the shareholders. Was Bobby Wu also the shareholder or at least a shareholder of that organisation?---I think so, yeah, but I'm not sure 100 per cent, yeah.

40 Do you recall whether that company also owned any property?---No. During the time it was purely, you know, a duty free shop.

So at least in your time associated with Australia New Century International Pty Ltd it was a duty free shop and nothing more. Is that right?---Correct, yes.

Didn't have any land holdings or anything like that as you understood it? ---No, no, no (not transcribable)

And do you recall what happened to that company?---Somebody took over the company I guess, yeah.

And then you ceased to be the - - -?---Accountant.

- - - external accountant after that had happened. Is that right?---Exactly. Correct.

10 So other than that company and Wu International Investments Pty Ltd have you had any other role as accountant - - -?---No.

- - - for any other entity associated with the Woods or anyone else that we've talked about?---No, not the external accountant for any other companies, no.

We spoke a moment ago about Mr Tong and I understood you to say Mr Tong didn't have anything to do with the accounting side of Wu International. Is that right?---Yes.

20 But do you recall whether you have ever provided any assistance to Mr Tong either associated with accounting matters or other matters?---No.

Have you ever written a letter for example to be signed by Mr Tong?
---Yeah, yeah, to the Electoral Commission on his behalf.

30 So if we can go to Exhibit 313, please. I'm just going to put a document up on the screen in front of you, Mr Teh. Do you see there an email of 19 September, 2016, 7.13am, towards the top of the page? So you need to answer out aloud so it can be written down.---Sorry. Yes.

And you will see there that Dr Liao is asking for what he describes as advice on donation of \$5,000 to Labor Party. Do you see that there?---Yes, I saw that.

And you agree that you received that email on or about 19 September, 2016?---Well, I could say yes because that say so here.

40 Well, you received it and you responded to it later that day to say, "Wednesday okay. See you." Is that right?---Yeah, correct.

THE COMMISSIONER: Could I just ask you, in addition to being Dr Liao's personal accountant, did you also see him on a social personal basis?
---No.

No.---No.

So he wasn't a - - -?---No.

You didn't have a friendship outside the professional relationship?---No, no, never, but he's a very nice person, yeah.

What sort of a person was he by your observations?---He's a very humble person, yeah, very humble, yeah, and always very cheerful.

Conscientious?---Conscientious person, yes, definitely, yeah.

MR ROBERTSON: Diligent?---Sorry?

10

Diligent?---Diligent, I think he's a very smart person, he's a professor, yeah.

And honest, as you could understand it?---I don't mix with him personally on a social basis, so as far as I know he's always very careful about his tax, you know, yeah.

What about Mr Wood, do you have a relationship with Mr Wood that goes beyond business and into personal?---Mr Wood is just my client. We don't socialise at all, yeah.

20

But you at least agree that you know him relatively well?---I would have to say so. I mean as a client for nearly, you know, yeah.

In fact you agreed to be a referee for him to become a Justice of the Peace. Was that right?---Yeah, I was told. I can't really remember that, yeah.

You can't remember agreeing to do that?---Yes, you know.

30

Do you remember who asked you to do that?---Well, would be Alex Wood I guess, yeah.

Are you sure it was Mr Wood, is it possible that it was Dr Liao?---I can't remember, I'm sorry.

You just can't remember one way or the other. Is that right?---Yeah, I'm very sorry, I can't remember.

40

Just back to the email that's on the screen. Was this the first time that you knew anything about an alleged donation by Mr Tong?---Yeah, when I met them and I was given, you know, that letter, that, from the Electoral Commission to them, yes.

But just to be clear, before 19 September, 2016, when it appears that you received this email, did you have any discussions with Mr Tong or Dr Liao or Mr Wood or anyone else to say there's this issue about a donation apparently made by Mr Tong?---No, until this.

So this was the first time that you knew anything about that matter?---Yeah, correct, yes.

And do you agree that ultimately a meeting was set up, probably on 21 September, 2016, being the Wednesday after this email of the Monday?
---Yes.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: So looking at the email from Dr Liao, he commences it by saying, “We would like to have your advice on donation of 5,000 to the Labor Party,” et cetera, “Made by Steve Tong.” Did you take it when he said, “We would like to have your advice,” he was talking about we in the sense of one or more of us, or perhaps more than one? Who did you understand he was making this request for when he said, “We would like to have your advice?”---I guess if I read the email correctly, they’ve got a lot of, the email was cc’d to quite a number of people in there, so I guess it would be those people.

So people associated with Wu International?---Yeah, I would say so, yes.

20 It doesn’t suggest at this stage that they in fact were acting, or wanting you to act for Steve Tong.---No.

No.---No.

Is that right?---Yes, no, I - - -

30 It was more the company or the personnel behind the company who was wanting to you to provide advice to them?---Well, I actually didn’t give any advice, all I did was draw a letter on their behalf.

All right.---Because I have no idea how to advise on the Electoral Commission matter.

I’m just looking at the terms of the letter. “We’d like to have your advice.” That’s what they said.---Yeah, well, probably Dr Liao’s English I guess, yeah.

All right.

40 MR ROBERTSON: You don’t have any special expertise in responding to inquiries from the Electoral Commission. Is that right?---No, I don’t. I’m just a, no, I’m just an old-fashioned accountant, that’s all.

And so you’d agree wouldn’t you that this was a fairly unusual request in your practice. Is that right?---Not unusual, because client to ask all sort of things sometime, you know, for your marriage problem, you know. As a Asian accountant it’s quite common that clients will talk and ask you about their personal matter as well.

So is it at least right though that your core business is doing accounting advice and taxation advice. Is that right?---Correct, correct, yes.

And the key organisations that you would liaise with would be organisations like the Australian Taxation Office. Is that right?---That is correct, yes.

10 But are you saying that although that's your core business, often clients will say, look, I've got this other problem, what should I do. Is that right?
---Yeah, they just on like a friendly basis. It's not like, you know, asking you for actual advice. We are not in a capacity to advise people where we are not an expert on, yeah.

And so you might assist them with some basic task like getting documents together and writing basic letters and things of that kind, is that right?---Correct, yes, correct, yes.

20 But if it's something more serious, you might send them off to a solicitor or to someone else who may have expertise in that particular area.---Yes, I, I, yeah, and I'd be very careful from now on, you know, that I've, yeah.

So what do you mean by that?---Oh, it's just not assisting people for no, you know, they try to help, or you know, you know.

Well, are you saying that you, having received this email, you were trying to help, even though you didn't consider yourself in a position to provide advice as to how Electoral Commission - - -?---No, help in the sense writing a letter (not transcribable)

30 I'll just ask you to wait until my questions are finished, because it then gets very difficult to understand the transcript.---Okay, sorry, yeah, sorry, yes.

Are you saying that you received this email and you sought to do your best to provide some assistance to Dr Liao and to Mr Tong, but you weren't in a position to provide advice as to how the Electoral Commission's enquiries should be responded to, is that right?---Correct, yes, 100 per cent, yeah.

40 And you weren't Mr Tong's personal accountant in this time, is that right?
---No, no.

And you've never performed the role of personal accountant for Mr Tong, is that right?---No.

And so at least as you understood it, this was an email coming from Wu International, where Wu International is asking for your assistance to help out one of their employees, is that right?---Yes.

Now, the meeting that was contemplated by this email, that meeting ultimately occurred, is that right?---Yes.

Now, doing the best you can, who attended that meeting?---Oh, I, as I said before, I can't remember exactly who were there, but I'm very sure that Dr Liao would have taken Steve Tong to my office, because I, I don't know Steve Tong personally.

10 Well, let's deal with that in stages. Are you clear in your mind that Dr Liao was present at the meeting?---Definitely, yes.

Are you clear in your mind that Mr Tong was at the meeting?---I would say so, yes.

Sorry, can you say that again?---I'd say yes, yeah.

20 Well, are you quite sure about that, or is it possible that just Dr Liao attended and Mr Tong did not attend?---Well, Mr Tong would have, would have attended, you know, at least once, otherwise I wouldn't have written a letter on his behalf, you know?

Are you quite clear about that in your mind?---Yeah, I am.

30 Or is it possible that Dr Liao, having sent you the email and wanting some advice about a matter, simply came without Mr Tong and you then wrote the letter for Mr Tong, but that Dr Liao did the running around?---I'm sorry, I can't remember the, the, the event exactly. But you know, at some point of time, Steve Tong would have come and signed that letter. So I would have met him then, you know, at least, yeah.

THE COMMISSIONER: Just pointing out, you're not being asked what would have happened. It's a question of what did happen. We're talking about something that occurred some years ago.---Yes, I know.

So your recollection may not be - - -?---100 per cent, yeah.

100 per cent.---Yes.

40 And we understand that. But what we are interested to know is, whether you recall at least on some occasion having met with Mr Tong. Are you in a position to say that you do recall meeting, perhaps not knowing which date it was, but at some stage meeting with Steve Tong, or don't you have any such recollection?---I have met Mr Tong, yes, definitely, yes.

All right. And do you recall where you met him?---In my office.

And does your recollection enable you to say whether it was just the two of you there, or whether there was somebody else present as well?---I think the

first time, Mr – okay, this is not 100 per cent, but I think, you know, Mr Liao would have taken him to my office, otherwise I wouldn't know who he is. Mmm.

MR ROBERTSON: So you have a clear recollection in your mind of having at least one meeting face-to-face at which Mr Tong was present, is that right?---Yes.

10 And it may have been the meeting that looks like it occurred on 21 September, 2016, consistent with the emails that we've seen, or it may be some other meeting, is that what you're saying?---Correct, yes.

But are you quite clear about that in your mind, or is it possible that you didn't actually meet with Mr Tong, you instead met with Dr Liao, say, or someone else, and made the arrangements for Mr Tong?---I definitely have met Mr Tong, yes.

And you've definitely met him in your office?---Yes.

20 Is that in your own office or is it in a conference room within your office suites?---I can't remember now, yeah.

But at least somewhere within your office - - -?---Office.

- - - area. Is that right?---Yeah.

30 And are you clear in your mind that during the course of that meeting you discussed with Mr Tong this question of donations?---Well, the content of the letter, yes, you know, that the Commission wants information from you.

THE COMMISSIONER: Did you understand that Mr Tong was an employee of Wu International?---Yes.

And do you recall what his job was at Wu International?---No, I, I don't know what his official duty is, yes.

40 MR ROBERTSON: And at the meeting with Mr Tong what is your recollection as to who else, if anyone, was present as well as Mr Tong? ---Well, I think the first meeting Mr Liao would have been there, yeah, because he is the one who introduced me, okay, you know, this Mr Tong.

Do you have a recollection of that or are you saying it's consistent with the usual practice and approach that Dr Liao would be present at meetings of that kind?---Well, this, this, this is a special occasion. I think it's got nothing to do with tax I guess. You know, Mr Liao would have to be, be there to introduce Steve Tong to me.

And indeed Mr Liao was the one who requested the meeting by sending the email that we saw a moment ago. Is that right?---Exactly correct, yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Who did all the talking at the meeting?---Well, basically I was asked to just write a letter in English to reply to the Electoral Commission, yeah.

10 I'm sorry, I couldn't hear that. Would you say that again.---Say I was basically asked just to write a letter to the Electoral Commission answering the, replying the Electoral Commission by giving the information that the Electoral Commission wanted.

And who asked you to do that?---Dr Liao, Leo Liao (not transcribable) Dr Liao, yeah.

Write a letter on behalf of whom?---But they are the one that sign. I just wrote it in English for them that's all.

20 When you say for them, was this to be a joint letter or two separate letters or what?---Just one letter.

One letter?---Yeah. I have given that to ICAC already on the letter, and I did charge them for, you know, the half an hour that I did, yeah.

And you recall drafting the letter?---Yes, definitely.

MR ROBERTSON: Do you recall whether there was anyone else present at that meeting?---I don't, I don't remember.

30 Is it possible that Mr Wood was in attendance at the meeting as well?---I don't remember, sorry.

You described the meeting a moment ago I think as unusual. Is that right? ---I mean I usually say it's not tax that's all it is.

40 I think you described it as a special occasion. Is that right? I don't mean like a birthday party. I mean something unusual, something special in the sense of out of the ordinary. Is that right?---Not out of the ordinary I guess. It's just a different issue that's all, yeah.

But it was a matter of some importance and concern. Do you agree?---Well, yes, now, now that, that I'm, you know, here I definitely say yes.

And is it also right that Mr Wood would usually come to meetings that raise matters of concern?---Correct.

And so whilst you told us a moment ago Mr Wood wouldn't necessarily attend every meeting that you needed to have with Mr Pan for example, he would at least attend the important ones. Is that right?---I guess so, yes.

And so do you agree then that it's quite possible that Mr Wood was also in attendance at the meeting with Mr Tong and probably with Mr Liao?---I don't remember that.

You're not sure one way or the other?---Not sure.

10

So it's possible that he was there. It's possible that he was not there. Is that right?---I'm not sure.

You're not sure one way or the other. Is that right?---Yeah.

THE COMMISSIONER: Did you keep a diary in which you wrote in appointments and the names?---No.

You did not at the time?---No, no.

20

And - - -?---I try to retrieve information on my email and I couldn't.

You couldn't?---Yeah.

MR ROBERTSON: Now, doing the best you can, at the meeting that seems to have happened on the Wednesday that we saw being set up by the emails that were on the screen, how did that play out? Who said what and what did they ask you to do?---Well, basically they just say, you know, can you reply that letter for us and I read the content of the letter to them of course, right, and say look, you know, Electoral Commission is asking, you know, you to give information, right, to prove that you actually are able to pay the \$5,000 donation.

30

Let's look at that tangibly. Can we go, please, to MFI 26 at page 19. While that's coming up I formally tender MFI 26 which is constituted by annexures ST1 to ST7 to the statement of Peter Baragry, B-a-r-a-g-r-y, dated 20 September, 2018.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. MFI 26 will become Exhibit 333.

40

#EXH-333 – NSW ELECTORAL COMMISSION BUNDLE FOR STEVE TONG - BEING ANNEXURES ST 1 TO ST 7 TO THE STATEMENT OF PETER BARAGRY DATED 20 SEPTEMBER 2018

MR ROBERTSON: MFI 26 at page 19, please, which is now Exhibit 333. Just bear with us for a moment, Mr Teh.---Yes.

Now, Mr Teh, you referred a moment ago to a letter from the Electoral Commission. Is this the letter that you're referring to?---I don't think this was it. The one that I saw is asking for - - -

Sorry, you need to get a little bit closer to the microphone, otherwise I can't hear you.---Sorry. I don't think it was the one that I saw. The one I, from what I can remember it's like something asking for, you know, specific informations.

10

Well, can I try and help you this way. Can we go to page 23 of the same bundle.---Okay.

So this is a document that's attached to the letter that I've just shown you. Do you see how it says, "A notice issued to an individual." Do you see that document on the screen now?---Ah hmm.

20

And if we can then just turn the page. Do you see there, there's a series of categories of documents that are being asked for by Mr Smithers?---Yes, well, that's exactly - - -

Mr Teh, do you at least recognise the document that you can now see on the screen, which is page 24 of Exhibit 333?---Just referring to my letter what I have written. Yeah, in my (not transcribable) letter, the letter than I wrote in reply was on that, you know, information that the Electoral Commission asked for.

30

Well, let's do that this way. Can we go please to MFI 25 at page 1. Now, what I'm about to show you, Mr Teh, is what appears to be a draft letter of 22 September, 2016. Do you see that on the screen now?---Yeah.

And is the document that's on the screen the one that you were looking at in hard copy a moment ago in the witness box?---That's correct, yes.

And you've got that in your hand at the moment. Is that right?---Yes, yeah.

And so this is a letter that you wrote by way of a response to the notice to produce that I showed you a moment ago. Is that right?---Yes.

40

And so can we go back, please, to MFI 26, page 19, where we were before. MFI 26, which is now Exhibit 333. And we'll go to page 19 of that bundle, please. Having refreshed your memory with the draft letter, do you now agree that the letter that you were seeking to respond to is the one that we can now see on the screen, being the letter from Mr Smithers of 14 September, 2016?---Yeah, from the last page that you just show me just now, yeah, because I answered exactly, you know, the request from Electoral Commission, so if that, that is part of this letter then I would say so, yes.

But to be clear, you recall receiving or looking at and reading a letter that looks like the one that's presently on the screen. Is that right?---I can't remember, I can't exactly remember the first page, you know, but I remember the last page about, you know, yeah.

So let's do it this way. Go to page 24, please, Exhibit 333. So you at least recall seeing this page, I take it?---Yes.

10 And this page being the one that identifies the particular documents that are required. Correct?---Correct, yes.

And if we just go back one page, this is the first page of the notice, and you'll see there that Mr Smithers is indicating in the second paragraph that he had reason, that he considered he had reason to suspect that cash political donations made at a function called the Chinese Community Dinner Chinese Friends of Labor were made for and on behalf of other persons. Do you see that there?---Yes.

20 And so you read that either during the course of your meeting or at some later time. Is that right?---Yes.

And so you knew that Mr Smithers was concerned that some illegality may have taken place in connection with the Chinese Friends of Labor dinner of 12 March, 2015. Is that right?---Yes, yeah.

And then in terms of the meeting where you discussed or was asked for advice on this issue, are you saying you recall being given a copy of this letter and notice during the course of the meeting? Is that what you're saying?---Yes, I would say so, yes.

Well, not so much you would say so, I'm trying to get your best recollection. I appreciate it's some time ago.---Yeah, well, yes, would be.

But your best recollection is that someone gave you a copy of the letter during the meeting. Is that right?---Yes, otherwise I wouldn't be able to respond with exactly the same information, yeah.

40 But you weren't given a copy of the letter in advance of the meeting so far as you can recall?---No, no.

And so your best recollection is that there was a meeting and during the course of the meeting someone gave you that notice and letter. Is that right?---Yes.

And what then happened, did you have any discussion, did you give any advice or recommendation or suggestion?---No advice. I just explained the content of, you know, the letter to say that, you know, the Electoral

Commission wants you provide those information, so probably to prove that you are capable to donate the \$5,000.

So you at least knew that Mr Smithers was concerned that Mr Tong may have said that he donated \$5,000 but wanted proof that it was actually his money. Is that right?---Sorry, say it again?

10 You at least knew at the time that you had the meeting that we've been discussing that Mr Smithers from the Electoral Commission was concerned about whether Mr Tong was the true donor of the sum of \$5,000. Is that right?---Yes, that's how I understand that letter, yeah.

And you understood that what Mr Smithers was trying to seek was documents to prove whether or not Mr Tong was in fact the donor of \$5,000. Is that right?---Actually the way I was thinking is more, you know, whether he has the capacity to, to, you know, make that donation, rather than this.

20 Did you ask Mr Tong whether he in fact had donated \$5,000 to the Australian Labor Party or Country Labor?---No, I didn't ask any questions.

Did you deliberately decide not to ask that question because the circumstances looked a little suspicious?---Well, it was not my duty to ask all those questions, I was asked basically just to write in English a letter to respond to the Electoral Commission.

30 Well, you must have at least been interested in that matter, do you agree? ---Well, I don't know how to say I'm interested, I mean I, it's not, as I say, you know, I, it was not my duty to, yeah, no.

But do you at least agree that based on the information that you were provided either during the meeting or afterwards, it caused a suspicion in your mind as to whether Mr Tong was in fact the donor in relation to \$5,000?---Honestly, I was just, you know, my mind was thinking why would Mr, you know, Tong, you know, donate \$5,000 to the Australian - - -

40 At least in your mind it seemed implausible or unlikely that Mr Tong had donated \$5,000 to the Country Labor Party or the Australian Labor Party. Correct?---No, I, I did not, you know, think positively like that, no.

Well, part of the exercise that you performed was to draft a letter to go back to the Electoral Commission. Is that right?---Yes.

And part of that exercise involved someone collating relevant documents. Is that right?---Yes.

Now, in terms of collating the documents that Mr Smithers had asked for, is that an exercise that you did or is that an exercise that someone else did?
---No, they did and then would just compile it for them, yeah.

When you said they did, who are you referring to now?---Well, Steve Tong I guess, yeah.

Well, do you have a recollection as to how that played out? Did they attend the meeting with documents to give you, or did they come at some later
10 stage, or how did that work?---Yeah, I think he would have, you know, come to the office, you know, and give all this information, well, what, maybe in the first meeting before he came to sign the letter, right, I would have, I would have advised him this is the thing that you need, and then he would have collated all this information, and then when he came to sign the letter, my PA would have just, you know, put them all together.

But do you at least agree that at the time that you prepared the draft letter that we saw a moment ago, you had in front of you the documents that were going to go to the Electoral Commission?---No. You mean, oh, yes, the,
20 the, you mean that letter? Yes, yeah.

Well, let's look at that specifically. If we go back, please, to MFI 25, and to page 1. I take it that you agree at the time that you prepared the letter that's on the screen, you had each of the documents referred to in items 1, 2, 3, 4 that are on the page.---Yes. I would say, yeah, when, when the letter is prepared, yeah.

In fact, you must have had that in front of you, otherwise you wouldn't be in a position to give the descriptions that we can see in 1, 2, 3, 4, is that right?
30 ---Yes, yes, mmm.

And to be clear, it was you that got onto the computer and typed out the text that we can see on the screen, is that right?---Mmm, I did type this out.

You did type it?---No, this, this is my secretary who typed the letter.

So do we take it then that you picked up a dictaphone or something and you dictated to the secretary what to write?---Oh, no, sorry, by writing this letter, I would have used my old-fashioned way of writing it on a piece of paper,
40 so - - -

So, you have a recollection that at some time, probably around 22 September, 2016, which is the date of this letter, you wrote out in handwriting - - -?---Yeah, in the, on the draft, yeah.

- - - a draft letter for your secretary to type out, is that right?---100 per cent, yes, that's how I do.

And do you agree that at the time that you were doing that, you had a series of documents from Mr Tong in front of you?---Correct, yes.

And the particular documents you had are the documents that you've summarised in items 1, 2, 3, and 4, is that right?---Yes.

10 And if we can go back then, please, to Exhibit 333, which was MFI 26, and if we can go to page 31 of that bundle. Just while that's coming up, we had the original meeting. Your best recollection is that you get a copy of the letter and notice to produce during the course of that meeting. Correct?
---Ah hmm.

You don't get the documents at that point. You tell whoever's at the meeting, you need to go away and get the documents that Mr Smithers asking for, correct?---That, that is correct, yes.

At some later stage, those are delivered to your office, correct?---Yes.

20 Do you recall who delivered them, whether it was Mr Tong, Dr Liao, or someone else?---I can't remember who.

But you at least recall sitting down with the benefit of the documents and handwriting out the draft letter that should go to the Electoral Commission, is that right?---Yes. Yes.

And do you agree that one of the documents that you were given is the document that we can see on the screen?---Correct.

30 And do you agree that that shows gross payments for the financial yearend of 30 June, 2015, of \$14,116?---Yes.

And I take it that you had a look at that payment summary when you were collating the documents ready to go back to the Electoral Commission.
---Yes. Yes.

40 Now, in the face of that, you must have been suspicious as to the suggestion that Mr Tong had donated \$5,000, being a man who in the financial yearend of 30 June, 2015, only earned \$14,000 from this particular employer. Would you agree?---Yeah, is, from a normal, you know, a logical person, I guess, you know, that figure doesn't weigh up, you know, for him to donate \$5,000 (not transcribable)

So it was at least suspicious in your mind as to whether Mr Tong had in fact donated \$5,000, is that right?---Well, you know, I mean, not suspicious, but I, because it was not my duty to judge him, yeah, but definitely common sense tells you he wouldn't have the capacity to - - -

It must have jumped out at you immediately as a matter of common sense that the likelihood that Mr Tong was the true donor in relation to \$5,000 seemed quite unlikely. Would you agree?---Yes.

Now, was that concern one that you shared with the Electoral Commission or anyone else?---Yes.

So did you – no, did you report to the Electoral Commission that you were
- - -?---Oh, no.

10

- - - concerned as to whether Mr Tong was in fact the donator of \$5,000?
---No, because I wasn't involved in anything to do with the Electoral Commission.

Did you ask Mr Tong whether he was the true donor in relation to \$5,000?
---I did not because my duty was just to write a letter so I didn't ask about any other questions.

20

Is it fair to say not only didn't you ask but you didn't want to know because it looked suspicious to you as a matter of common sense?---Yeah, I don't want to know, yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: I'm sorry, what's your answer?---Sorry?

So what was your answer?---I say I didn't - - -

Did it look suspicious?---I don't want to know, you know. Yeah, it looked suspicious but I didn't want to know about it because it's not my duty.

30

So sorry, it was put to you - - -?---Sorry, is that what you asked?

It did look suspicious to you at the time, that is to say, whether Mr Tong had made or had not in fact made the donation. It did look suspicious to you?
---Well, as I say, you know, from the information on the PAYG summary it doesn't look like he has the capacity to donate \$5,000.

So that - - -?---But then I didn't go further into - - -

40

No, I know - - -?--- - - - asking more question only because - - -

I know you didn't go any further but that was one factual matter that raised some suspicion in your mind about the matter?---It does. It does, yes. Honestly it does.

MR ROBERTSON: And you were very careful in the questions that you were asking and the role that you're performing in the sense that you didn't want to know anything more, you just wanted to make sure that the Electoral Commission's inquiries were responded to and you didn't want to

ask too many more questions because you may find out an answer that may cause further grounds for suspicion. Is that right?---Well, as far as I'm concerned I just did a letter and I just bill according to the letter, you know.

You were asked to assist with a response to the particular letter. Correct?
---That's correct.

10 But I'm suggesting to you that you were quite careful to not ask too many questions about it because you didn't want to know anything more. Would you agree?---Exactly, correct. Yes.

Because it looked to you to be suspicious but your role was simply to assist in drafting a response and you didn't want to know any more of the details. Is that right?---That is correct.

20 Now, you then prepared the draft letter that you did in handwriting and your secretary typed out. At that point in time you had the documents to be attached including the payment summary that we can see on the screen. Is that right?---Yes, correct.

And what happened then, how did that draft letter then turn into a final letter?---A proper letter, yeah.

How did that happen? What arrangements were made? Did you get your secretary to call Dr Liao or Mr Tong to say come and pick up the letter or come and sign it, something like that?---Normally my secretary will call, you know, whoever, you know, that need to come and sign, right, and obviously must be Steve Tong that came in and sign it, yeah.

30 So at least as a matter of usual practice your secretary would make contact with the person who has to sign a document and ask them to what, come in and sign it. Is that how it works?---Correct, yes.

So are you saying your best recollection is that after you did that exercise, the letter is finished, it was left for Mr Tong to sign at the reception of your offices. Is that right?---Correct, yes.

40 And do you recall whether it was your office who then sent it to the Electoral Commission or did Mr Tong take it away?---Yeah, that's where I actually had a discussion with my PA who just came back from a chemotherapy session of treatment, yeah, and she say yeah, put in an envelope that has our letterhead on it, our company's name on it, yeah, and use our franking machine. I think she was just trying to be helpful and just, you know, send it, you know, on their behalf after all the, collating all the information, yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Sorry. So do I understand you said it went through the mail system from your office. Is that - - -?---Yes, from my office with a franking - - -

To the Electoral Commission?--- - - - franking machine stamp on it, yeah.

With the franking machine being used?---Yeah.

10 And it went direct then from your office to the Electoral Commission office. Is that what happened?---I think so, yes, yeah.

That's what you believe happened?---I think so, yes.

MR ROBERTSON: If you just go to page 35 of the same document Exhibit 333. Is that a copy of the envelope that you were referring to a moment ago, Mr Teh?---Yeah, and that's my secretary's writing, yeah.

20 So you recognise this handwriting as your secretary's handwriting. Correct?---Correct, yes.

And you recognise what we can see in red or pink in the top right-hand corner as a frank produced by your franking machine. Correct?---Yes, sir.

And you've spoken to your secretary and based on that you understand that your secretary wrote the letter, put the frank on it and then sent it off to the Electoral Commission. Is that right?---That's right. I think he would have got the, Steve Tong to sign also, yeah.

30 Well, if we go back to page 26 of the same document, we can see a signed version of that from Mr Tong. Is that right?---Yes.

And so this is a, or at least appears to be a signed version of the document that was left by either you or your secretary at reception to sign. Is that right?---Yeah, that's correct.

If we can go then back to MFI 25 to the last page, MFI 25 now. Now, you ultimately set a bill to Wu International Investments Pty Ltd for preparing the letter. Is that right?---Yes.

40 And I've just put up on the screen a document called Billing Instruction. Is that a document that you prepared?---That is, that is, that's how I do billing instruction, yes.

And so this is a note effectively to your secretary to say please bill the following people for the following tasks. Is that right?---Correct, yes.

And the one that we can see towards the middle of the page is the bill for the letter to the Electoral Commission. Is that right?---Correct.

And if you just look at the column entitled CAT, you'll see there there's a date, 29 September. Do you see that there, 29/9?---Oh, that's payment.

And so that's the date of payment. Is that right?---Correct.

And so you keep a record with this billing instruction not just of sending the bill, but when payment has been received. Is that right?---Yeah, that's how our old-fashioned way of - - -

10

And then I take it that in the next column where it says LT, that's your initials?---That is correct, yes.

And the amount is obviously the amount that you're billing to the client? ---Yes.

And then we have the invoice number and the date that it was sent. Is that right?---Correct.

20

And so if we go then back to page 2 of the same - - -

THE COMMISSIONER: Just before you go off that page – on the left-hand side of the document it has the word, "Instruction."---Sorry?

You see in handwriting - - -?---Wu International.

- - - on the left it says something instructions?---Not instructions.

30

That's Wu - - -?---No, Wu International, not instruction.

Sorry, what are the letters?---Wu, W-u's, the writing is W-u's.

Stands for Wu, does it?---Wu, Wu International.

Wu International.---That's correct.

So you're recording the instructions from the client Wu International. ---Well, that's, I deal with them because Leo Liao was the one that came, Mr Liao was the one that came on this matter.

40

Thank you.

MR ROBERTSON: And so as you understood it, you were being asked by Wu International to prepare this draft letter to go back to the Electoral Commission. Is that right?---Well, because Mr Liao was the person that took Steve Tong to me, so I billed the bill to Wu International.

But at least as you understood it, your client was Wu International, not for example Mr Tong. Is that right?---Yeah, that's how I, you know, felt when I wrote that billing here.

Well, that's as you understood it and that's how you billed it. Is that right?
---That is correct, yeah.

10 And if we go to page 2 of the same bundle, is this a copy of the bill that was sent by your office in relation to preparing the response to the Electoral Commission?---Yes. If you look at the tax invoice it's exactly the same as my billing instruction invoice number.

So you're drawing attention to the fact that this is tax invoice number 1-5-3-5-3. Is that right?---Correct, yes.

And that number matches the invoice number that we saw on page 7 of this same bundle. Is that right?---On the billing instruction, yes.

20 Why then does the narrative for this bill says, "Attending meeting held with Leo Liao in relation to general tax consultation?"---Yeah. I don't really understand, because my instruction to my secretary was a letter to the Electoral Commission, if you look at my billing instruction.

So are you saying that it was an error to describe it as being in regards to general tax consultation - - -?---Yeah, I would say so because - - -

Just let me finish the question, I'm sorry.---Sorry, yeah.

30 Are you saying that it was an error to describe this as in regard to general tax consultation and instead should have been a reference to letter to Electoral Commission. Is that right?---Yes, I would say yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: It records there a meeting held with Leo Liao. There's no reference there to Mr Tong. Can you explain that?---(No Audible Reply)

40 Are you able to explain that?---No, actually, the, my instructions were just letter to Electoral Commission. I didn't actually see this, and my secretary is the one that just probably, you know, make a mistake and just write something like that, because he probably understand that Leo Liao was, you know, meeting on that, you know, meeting, yeah.

Well, are you - - -?---It's, Leo Liao is the general manager, Mr Commissioner, yeah.

Yes, I understand. So when it says attending meeting held with Leo Liao, are you saying it should have also referred to a meeting including Mr Tong?---Yes, definitely, yes, I would say so.

And the fact that Mr Tong's name is not mentioned there, are you saying that's due to some form of oversight?---Yeah, it's, it's, yeah, well, definitely, because my instruction specifically is Electoral Commission matter, yeah.

10 MR ROBERTSON: Just to understand the mechanics of how this works in your business, do you just issue the billing instruction to your secretary and then she then just deals with it, or does she give you the invoice back to have a look at and to check?---No, she will type it up, and then she will send it out.

And so are you saying that looking at these documents, it looks like she just made an error in terms of the narrative, she should have said, "Letter to Electoral Commission," but instead she put a different narrative saying, "Meeting with Leo Liao in regards to general tax consultation"?---Yeah, I would say so, yes, that's right.

20 Now is that the only assistance that you gave in relation to any enquiries of Mr Tong from the Electoral Commission?---No, there was another letter that, when he say he was sick and he want to supply his medical certificate, yeah, I wrote (not transcribable)

And so if we go to page 6 of this bundle – in fact, just before we do, Mr Teh, if you just have a look on the screen, see where it says, "Client code"? ---Yes.

It's says "TWU INTER", do you see that there?---Yeah, that's right.

30 And do I take it that's the client code within your billing system for Wu International?---Yes.

And what does the T stand for, do you know?---Trust.

T for Trust. And so you will see the payee of this invoice is Wu International Investments Pty Ltd, as trustee for The Friendly Trust, do you see that there?---Correct, yes, correct.

40 And is it right that, as you understand it at least, Wu International Investments Pty Ltd is the trustee of The Friendly Trust?---Yes.

And is it also right that that's the only thing, as you understand it, that Wu International does, it only acts as trustee of that trust, it doesn't act in any other capacity, is that right?---Correct, yeah.

Is that right?---Yes, yes.

And so does that mean that on a yearly basis, tax returns and the like will be issued just in relation to The Friendly Trust, and no separate one for Wu International Investments Pty Ltd?---No, yeah, all the bill will be under this.

Well, not just the bill, but the correspondence that you have with the Australian Taxation Office, for example, you will prepare a tax return for The Friendly Trust - - -?---Yes. Yes.

10 - - - and not a separate tax return for Wu International Investments?---No, it's only a trustee, yeah.

Because the only thing that Wu International Investments does, as you understand it, is acts as the trustee of that trust, is that right?---Correct, yes.

If we go, please, to page 6 of this bundle, you referred to a further letter on behalf of Mr Tong. Is this the letter that you were referring to?---Yeah.

20 So again, is this a letter that you handwrote out, and that your secretary typed out?---Yeah. Yes.

Do you recall whether you had a separate meeting with Mr Tong, Dr Liao, or anyone else associated with this matter?---No, I think, from my memory, Steve Tong took an email, you know, and said, "Can you reply on my behalf? You know, I got the medical certificate." Yeah.

Well, let's try and look at that tangibly. Can we go to MFI 24, please? And while that's happening, I tender the bundle of documents referred to as MFI 25, being seven pages of documents produced by Mr Teh.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, MFI 25 will be admitted and become Exhibit 334.

#EXH-334 – BUNDLE OF DOCUMENTS PRODUCED BY LEON TEH

40 MR ROBERTSON: MFI 24, page 71, please, page 7-1. Mr Teh, I'm showing you now an email from Mr Alex Wu to you of 17 May, 2017. Do you see that on the screen?---Ah hmm.

And do you see that that appears to be forwarding an email that originated from Mr Baragry of the Electoral Commission to Mr Tong of 1 May, 2017? ---Yes.

And so is it consistent with your recollection that this is how you were requested to produce the letter that we saw a moment ago in connection with medical records?---Yes, this will be the email, yeah.

And so are you saying that it wasn't like Mr Wood or Dr Liao called you up and said we need some further assistance?---No.

Rather it was being forwarded to you by this email. Is that right?---Yeah. In this particular instant this was the email that I saw and I reply according to this email which is dated 1 May, yeah. The letter states that.

10 So just to be clear, you took the email from Mr Wu of 17 May, 2017 to be a request to assist in responding to Mr Baragry's email to Mr Tong. Is that right?---Correct, yes.

So again is it right to say you took it to be that Wu International was asking you to assist one of their employees. Is that right?---Well, I would think so, yes (not transcribable)

You need to get a little bit closer to the microphone.---Sorry. Yeah, yeah. I would think so because the instruction came from Mr Wu, yeah.

20 But that's how you understood it at the time, Mr Wood, the owner of Wu International as you understood it, is saying here is an email, a bit of correspondence. We need your assistance in responding to it. Is that right? ---Yeah.

And having received that email what steps did you then take to assist in a response to Mr Baragry's email?---Yeah, I just wrote the letter on the - - -

30 THE COMMISSIONER: Sorry, I can't hear you.---Sorry. I wrote a letter on, on their behalf on 19 May and that will be an exhibit there I guess, right?

MR ROBERTSON: But how did you obtain the medical records?---Oh, Steve Tong handed it to me, you know, yeah.

40 So Mr Tong handed, did he email them to you or did he hand them to you personally or - - -?---No, no, not the email. The email was actually sent to me, right, but the medical, you know, certificate, you know, to say that he is sick he came to my office to sign this letter and then attach the medical, you know, certificate.

But you must have had the medical certificate before you drafted the letter. Do you agree?---No, I would, I would think that, you know, he would have given me the certificate - - -

Well, let's go - - -?--- - - - at the time he sign the - - -

Well, let's just go back to MFI 25, now Exhibit 334. MFI 25, Exhibit 334, at page 6. Now, this is the draft letter that you and I discussed a moment

ago but see how it says, "I'm enclosing two medical reports from the Repatriation General Hospital." Do you see that there?---Yeah, that one exactly, yeah.

You can see that on the screen?---Yeah. Yeah, I can see it.

10 And so do you agree that at the time that you wrote out that letter, at least in draft, you must have had the two medical reports in front of you so that you knew that there was two rather than one or three. Do you agree?--- I would think so, yes, yeah.

So I'm just trying to understand then how did you get the medical records in relation to Mr Tong. Did Mr Tong deliver them to you? Were they emailed to you? How did that happen?---Was delivered to me because, but I can't remember exactly but I think it was delivered to me because it has to be attached to this letter.

20 So you have a recollection of someone delivering you a hard copy of those records rather than just emailing them to you?---Yeah.

Is that right?---Correct, yeah.

Do you happen to recall who that was, who did the delivery?---I would say Mr Steve Tong.

Do you have a recollection of that or are you just guessing based on what you now know?---Just, just recollecting. I'm not 100 per cent, yeah.

30 Do you agree that it's quite possible that it was someone else who delivered it? For example, Dr Liao or perhaps even Mr Wood?---I can't remember, sorry.

You're not sure one way or the other. Is that right?---Not sure, yeah.

But then you ultimately prepared this draft that's on the screen. Is that right?---Yes, correct. Yeah.

40 And did you send this one off to the Electoral Commission like you did with the other one or - - -?---I, I don't remember. I'm sorry.

You're not sure one way or the other?---Yeah.

But you did issue an invoice in relation to this matter. Is that right?---Yes, I did, yes.

And so if we can go please in the same bundle to page 5, this is still Exhibit 334, is this the fee note that you issued in relation to preparing that letter? ---Correct.

Can you just explain why this is addressed to Mr Steve Tong rather than being issued to the Friendly Trust or to Wu International Investments Pty Ltd?---I think he came and see me personally on this, so that's why I did that.

But I thought you said that Mr Tong came in personally with respect to the other letter.---Sorry, sorry, I didn't hear what you just said, sorry.

10 What I'm trying to understand is, why was this invoice issued in Mr Tong's name whereas the previous one we looked at was issued in Wu International's name?---Yeah, because this one I think Steve Tong came and see me, you know, personally.

THE COMMISSIONER: I can't hear you I'm sorry?---Mr Tong came and see me personally on this, yeah.

MR ROBERTSON: But did he come, but did Mr Tong come and see you personally in relation to the first letter?---No. Just I think bringing the stuff
20 to me, so yeah.

Well, I just want to be clear about your evidence on this. Let's talk about the first letter first, the notice to produce where Mr Smithers was asking for documents like payment summaries and the like.---Yes.

Did Mr Tong attend on you personally in relation to that matter?---No, Mr Leo Liao.

30 Just Mr Liao and not Mr Tong?---And, and Mr Tong, and Mr - - -

So I just want to be clear about this.---Yes.

For the first letter that we talked about before, and we'll just get this back on the screen to be clear about it, if we go to page 3 of the same document, that's Exhibit 334, so you remember this morning, Mr Teh, we discussed this letter that's now on the screen, the March 2017 letter?---Ah hmm.

40 And that was a response to the notice to produce. Are you saying that you probably didn't see Mr Tong personally in relation to this letter? Is that what you're saying?---No, definitely I see Mr Tong there, yes, the first letter.

So you saw Mr Tong personally in respect of both letters, both this March letter and the May letter. Is that right?---Yeah.

So you saw Mr Tong on at least two occasions. Is that right?---Correct, yes.

And if we then go back then to page 5, so keep going to page 5, what I'm trying to understand, Mr Teh, is why is this invoice going to Mr Steve Tong whereas the first invoice you and I discussed went to Wu International?
---To be very honest I don't even know why, but I put exactly, I didn't need to hide anything, I put exactly what I did, to the NSW Electoral Commission.

10 At the very least the client code is the Wu International client code.
Correct?---Yes, because that's the only way you can relate Steve Tong because he's not my personal client.

And is it right to say that it was emailed, if you have a look at the email address, it was emailed to Benjamin Pan at Wu International?---Yes.

So although this was addressed to Mr Steve Tong, at least as far as your accounting system was concerned, it was work for Wu International. Is that right?---I would think so, yes.

20 You didn't set up Steve Tong as a new client, for example?---No, no.

And so whilst it was addressed to Mr Tong, it was still an invoice issued to - - ?---To W-u.

- - - to Wu International. Is that right?---Yeah, the code is - - -

THE COMMISSIONER: Do I understand you - - ?---The barcode say that, yeah.

30 You sent this invoice of 23 May, 2017, and though addressed to Steve Tong, to Wu International for payment and is that because you had an understanding that the work to be done in drafting this letter to the Electoral Commission about Mr Tong's health was in effect being done under instructions of Wu International?---Yes, because the email came from Mr Wood, yes, yeah.

Sorry?---The email came from Mr Wood on the instruction.

Yes, that's right.---Yeah.

40 So this memo of fees does relate to the instructions that came from Alex Wu in the letter we looked at earlier. Is that right?---Yeah, correctly done I should have actually - - -

Say it again?---On hindsight correctly done it should be billed to Wu International.

Right.---Yeah.

MR ROBERTSON: But at the time you were doing work for your client, Wu International. Is that right?---Yes.

That's how you understood what you were doing?---Yeah.

You weren't doing work for Steve Tong personally, because you're not Steve Tong's personal accountant, correct?---Yes, I'm not his accountant, no.

10 Was this fee note ultimately paid?---Sorry?

Was this fee note ultimately paid?---Yes.

By who?---Well, I think he paid cash.

And who paid cash?---I'm not sure who paid cash, but the writing say has been paid.

20 So you've checked your records, and they confirm that this invoice has been paid and been paid in cash, is that right?---Yeah. That's correct, yes.

Do you have any recollection as to who actually delivered the cash?---I have no idea, I'm sorry, yeah.

And are you saying you don't have records of who actually delivered the cash?---Yeah. No, no.

30 But you're not suggesting that Mr Tong paid for it out of his own pocket, it was someone within Wu International, is that right?---I, I am not suggesting that, but I'm, because I am not sure, sorry.

But you're not saying that you have a recollection of Mr Tong, for example, coming in and giving you an envelope with \$155 in it?---No, I, I have no recollection of that, no.

40 THE COMMISSIONER: The first invoice we saw for drafting the letter to the Electoral Commission, in relation to the notice to produce, after it was billed to Wu International, did Wu International pay it in the ordinary way? ---Yes, yes, by EFT.

And was the ordinary way that they remitted the funds electronically? ---Correct, they did, yeah.

Do you know why, in relation to the second invoice, it wasn't paid electronically but it was paid in cash?---I have no idea.

You don't know?---No, I don't know.

It's unusual, was unusual.---Yeah, but sometime client do, because it's a small amount, they just pay by cash, yeah.

No, but it was, I take it, unusual for Wu International to pay your bills in cash.---Yes, unusual.

In fact, can you ever remember an occasion in the past where Wu International had paid one of your bills in cash?---No. No.

10 Well, then, what's the explanation as to why this bill that's on the screen, dated 23 May, '17, was paid in cash and not electronically in accordance with the usual process?---Oh, because, I guess, maybe was, say, you know, addressed, the invoice addressed to Steve Tong.

Sorry, just speak into the microphone, sorry, say that again?---Sorry, maybe, maybe because the invoice was addressed to Steve Tong, yeah.

Okay, but what – you're just guessing now, are you?---I guess, oh, maybe, yeah, yeah.

20

Do you know the reason? What's the reason why this particular, in the email of fees 23 May, 2017, was not paid in accordance with the usual process with the Wu International, but was paid in cash?---I honestly don't know why it was - - -

You don't know why. All right.---Yeah, I honestly don't know why, yeah.

Well, you know it is, it was unusual for that to happen.---Yeah, if it is Wu International, it would be by an EFT, yeah.

30

MR ROBERTSON: Other than the two letters to be signed by Mr Tong, have you provided any other assistance to anyone associated with Wu International in relation to enquiries from the Electoral Commission?---Mr Liao.

And is it right that you assisted Mr Liao with a response to a notice to produce issued to him?---Yes.

40 And if we can just, in MFI 25, go to page 3. That's Exhibit 334, page 3. Is this the draft letter that you prepared to be signed by Mr Liao?---Yes. Yes.

So again, explain to us how that exercise came about, who requested you to provide assistance in relation to what appears to be a response to a notice to produce issued to Dr Liao?---I, I have no recollection of any emails or any, you know, things that come out from anybody, but I remember obviously Mr Liao was the one that approach me to assist.

So you at least have a recollection of Dr Liao making contact with you to say he's received a notice to produce, is that right?---Yes, yeah, but - - -

And so he received a document that was similar to the one that was received by Mr Tong, is that right?---Correct, yeah.

10 And so can we just have a look at that? If we go please to the, I'll call it the Liao NSW Electoral Commission annexures, which are annexures QL1 to QL7 of the statement of Peter Baragry dated 20 September, 2018. And while that's coming up, I might tender that immediately. So I tender the Liao NSW Electoral Commission bundles, being annexures QL1 to QL7 of the statement of Peter Baragry dated 20 September, 2018.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. The Electoral Commission bundle QL1 to 7, 20 September, '18 be admitted and become Exhibit 335.

20 **#EXH-335 – NSW ELECTORAL COMMISSION BUNDLE FOR
QUANBAO LIAO – BEING ANNEXURES QL 1 – QL 7 TO THE
STATEMENT OF PETER BARAGRY DATED 20 SEPTEMBER 2018**

MR ROBERTSON: And we'll go please to page 19 in what's now Exhibit 335. Liao bundle. Page 20 actually. So again, Mr Teh, your recall receiving a copy of a notice that looks like the one on the screen. Is that right?---Yes.

30 And this time it's one to Dr Liao rather than to Mr Tong. Correct?
---Correct.

And if we just turn the page, again Dr Liao is being asked for some documents but different ones to the ones that Mr Tong was asked to produce. Correct?---Yeah, there are only two things here.

And so you assisted Dr Liao in responding to the notice that we can see on the screen. Is that right?---Yes, with my letter, yeah.

40 And do you recall whether you had a meeting with Dr Liao concerning that matter?---Yes.

So you have a recollection of him coming in to discuss how this matter should be responded to. Is that right?---Well, just not how it should be responded to, but respond accordingly.

Can you just explain what you mean by that?---So whatever was written, or you know, asked to just draft a letter to respond, that's all this.

But did you have a more general discussion with Dr Liao regarding this issue of donations?---No.

Again you're being asked to do something unusual to assist in a response to the Electoral Commission rather than to someone like the Australian Taxation Office. Correct?---Yes.

10 And this was not the first time that you were asked to assist, it's now one of three things you were asked to do in relation to the Electoral Commission. Correct?---Yeah, correct (not transcribable)

And now you not only had one person to deal with, Mr Tong, you've now got someone else to deal with, Dr Liao. Correct?---Correct, yes.

So that at very least must have added to your suspicions as to what was going on here. Correct?---Definitely, yes.

20 Well, did you have any discussions at all with Dr Liao regarding that matter?---No, I didn't want to get involved in whatever.

Again are you saying that this further led you to be suspicious as to what was going on, and again you were trying to not know things that you didn't want to know?---Exactly, correct.

But are you quite clear in your mind that you had no discussion with Mr Tong, Dr Liao, Mr Wood or anyone else associated with Wu International, or indeed anyone at all, about this question of whether Dr Liao and Mr Tong had in fact donated \$5,000?---No.

30 Sorry, you need to answer out loud.---Sorry, no.

You at least thought that it all looked a bit suspicious, correct?---Yes, because is the second letter, yeah, second person, yeah.

But you wanted to be careful to not know too much about something that at least in your mind looked suspicious?---Well, yes, it's not, not, none of my matter, you know, or I was instructed just to answer the Electoral Commission letter, that's all, in English, yeah.

40 Well, it was a little bit more than that, wasn't it, because you were kept up to date, at least in part, as to what was going on with the Electoral Commission's inquiries. Would you agree?---Yeah. Mr Liao did say that, I can't remember here, like it was just an interview or something like that.

Well, let's have a look at that. If we go to MFI 24, please, to page 45. Do you see there an email from you to Dr Liao saying, "Noted?"---Yes.

And then if we just go down the page to see what you are noting, and go to the next page, please.---Yeah.

Do you see there Mr Baragry is writing to Mr Liao and asking, making an informal request to obtain a recorded statement. Do you see that there?

---Mmm.

10 And if we then go back one page, you then see that Dr Liao sends it to you at about 9.14pm on 20 March, 2017. Do you see that there?---Yes, yeah.

And you write back on the next day saying, "Noted." Do you see that?

---I saw the letter just noted, yeah.

And so you're at least aware by March of 2017 that Dr Liao had been asked to give a recorded statement. Is that right?---Yeah. Recalling the email, yes.

Did you provide Dr Liao with any assistance in relation to that matter?

20 ---No. Definitely no, because - - -

After being forwarded, this email and responding saying noted, did you have any other involvement in the Electoral Commission's investigation?

---No, not that I remember.

Have you ever discussed the Electoral Commission's investigation with anyone?---No.

30 How about this Commission's investigation, have you discussed this Commission's investigation with anyone?---Sorry?

Have you discussed ICAC's investigation with anyone?---No.

Mr Wood for example or Mr Zhan or anyone else hasn't called you up and said look, this is what's been going on?---No, not since November 8 when I first - - -

So when you're saying November - - -?---8. When I had my private hearing.

40 So is it right to say that from 21 March, 2017 when you send this email that we can see on the screen you've had, other than getting some evidence to this Commission you've had no involvement at all in anything to do with this question of donations. Is that right?---No, no. Definitely no.

So March 2017 that's the end of it other than your participation before this Commission. Is that right?---Yes, sir.

Can we just go back to MFI 26, now Exhibit 333 and can we go, please, to page 30. I just want to ask you one further thing about the payment summary that we looked at a moment ago. Page 30 of Exhibit 333. I showed you this payment summary a little while ago, Mr Teh. Can you just assist us with one thing. Do you see there it says gross payments of about \$28,000. Do you see that?---Yeah. Ah hmm.

And then do you see a little bit further down reportable employer superannuation contributions of \$20,000?---Ah hmm.

10

That's quite a high number of reportable employer superannuation contributions if the gross payments are only \$28,000. Would you agree? ---Mmm.

Do you agree with that?---Could be a salary sacrifice (not transcribable)

Well, usually, at least the standard will be a superannuation payments of say 9.5 per cent of gross payments.---(not transcribable) superannuation guarantee.

20

That's the superannuation guarantee amount.---Contribution, yes.

Can you assist us with any explanation as to why the reportable employer superannuation contributions here are as high as \$20,000 rather than being a lower figure of the kind that one would often find?---Okay. Well, PAYG payment all these are the internal accountant step to pay all these which is, you know, Benjamin Pan, yeah. So I have no idea really.

30

So you have no recollection of anything happening in the year ended 2015 that would explain why the reportable employer superannuation contributions are so high?---No. These decisions are made within their internal accounting.

It's not something that you had any involvement?---No, no.

And it's not something - - -?---We might have typed the PAYG summary for them, yeah.

40

But that's not something that you either had any involvement with or usually would have involvement with?---No, no.

Would you at least agree that that figure looks high matched against the gross payments figure that we can see on the screen?---If it is a salary, salary sacrifice for people who are above 65 years old it's quite a good thing to do because, you know, instead of paying tax on your gross salary you just pay 15 per cent tax on your contribution so - - -

So it might be explained by Mr Tong's age for example. Is that right?
---Yeah, could be, yeah. I'm just talking - - -

So are you saying - - -?---I'm talking in general.

So you're saying it looks higher than what one would ordinarily expect to see but it may be explained by the fact that Mr Tong is getting into later years as at 2015 and that might explain those two figures. Is that right?
---Possibly, yeah.

10

But you don't have any specific recollection or knowledge of how that arose in relation to the 2015 - - -?---No, no, because we're never involved in how they deal with the accountings, yeah.

That's the examination, Chief Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Sorry?

20

MR ROBERTSON: That's the examination.

THE COMMISSIONER: Just before we adjourn for morning tea, just in relation to the request to draft the letter for Mr Tong, it's the first letter that you drafted and your office sent it on to the Electoral Commission.---Yep.

Firstly, the subject matter of the letter, namely a political donation, meant that this was most unusual work being done for which Wu International were going to pick up the bill. It had nothing to do with Wu International's business. It was all about a political donation made by a person named Steve Tong, is that right?---Correct.

30

That in itself is a most unusual feature of this, isn't it, that it didn't fall within the ordinary business, financial accounting matters concerning Wu International. That had nothing to do with Wu International. It had everything to do with a political donation made by one of its employees, is that right?---Yes.

Highly unusual.---Yes.

40

You'd never done work of that kind for Wu International before, had you, political donations?---No. No, no.

So it must have occurred to you strange that you had been asked by Wu International to be concerned with drafting a letter from one of its employees concerning a political donation.---Well, I, I knew myself, you know, to be helpful to my client. So when people ask for, you know, like, people who can't speak English or write English properly, to me it was like a very simple thing, oh, I'm just writing a letter, you know, to reply, to, to

reply exactly what, you know, the request is. Yeah, I, I didn't think of all the, what the consequences that came out of it, you know, so, really - - -

But you said you had a suspicion about what was going on here.---Yeah, well, I, I, I have a suspicion, you know, they probably would not be able to, you know - - -

10 The other circumstance, though, that would have raised doubts in your mind was why is Wu International concerned about what one of its employees did in his personal capacity, is that right?---Mmm. Yes, correct.

Why would Wu International - - -?---Yes, normal, but - - -

- - - be taking all this trouble - - -?---Correct.

- - - of getting you to write the letter? Is that right?---Yes, normal person, yeah, common sense, yes.

20 It had nothing to do with Wu's business.---Yeah.

So all of these features made it a very unusual request, didn't it?---Yes.

And it sowed seeds of doubt in your mind as to what was really going on about the donation and why Wu International would be so concerned about it.---Correct.

Is that right?---Yes. Well, it does, you know - - -

30 Very strange, would you say?---Yeah. Strange, yeah, but, you know, as I say, my instruction was just simply to write, so I didn't want to get involved in any further discussion on it.

But nonetheless it was strange.---Yes.

And it occurred to you at the time there was something strange about it.---Correct.

40 And then when Dr Liao turns up four or five months later, same sort of issue about drafting a letter for him. Again, Wu International very concerned, it seemed, about the Electoral Commission asking questions of Dr Liao this time, is that right?---Yes.

Again about - - -?---Yes.

- - - the political donation.---Yeah.

Nothing to do with Wu International's business.---Yes.

Struck you as being very strange, I take it?---Yes, it does, yeah.

Why is Wu International getting itself involved in trying to deal with the Electoral Commission?---Correct, yeah.

But you knew Alex Wu very well, didn't you, by the time you drafted these letters? You often met with him?---No, I don't socialise with Alex Wu.

10 No, but in business, in the business context of Wu International.---Yeah, well, yeah, on accounting issues and on tax issues, yes.

He was well known to you, Alex Wu, or Wood, is that right?---Yes.

And he would speak to you regularly about Wu International business, accounting matters.---Discussion, yes. Usually it's Benjamin Pan, who does the accounting, is the one that would be doing most of the talking, yeah.

20 And did he, in any discussions with you, discuss why he was interested in matters concerning political donations?---No.

After Dr Liao tragically took his own life, that must have caused you considerable concern when you heard about that?---Yes, I was very upset actually, yeah.

And you held him in high regard.---Yes, I do.

And did you have discussion with Alex Wood about the circumstances in which Dr Liao took his life?---Not with Alex Wood, no.

30 But after you came to hear of the fact that he had died, did you have a discussion with Alex Wood about Dr Liao?---No.

40 Not at all?---I've never spoken to Alex Wood on Dr Liao at all because I understand, you know, from the paper only in the last few months, right, Dr Liao took his life, that I realised, you know (not transcribable). But, honestly, how do I say it, yeah, when he took his life, I heard it from Dr Pan. I didn't mention that before. I, he's the one that relay the message to me that Dr Liao died, you know, and he was quite, quite upset actually, yeah. But I have never talk about Dr Liao's death to, Dr Liao to Alex Wood at all.

When did you last see Dr Liao alive?---Oh, I can't remember now. Would be quite a while.

Was it long before he died?---Be quite a while, yeah.

How long since you had seen him as at the date of his death?---Can't remember. According to, I had something (not transcribable). The last meeting - - -

You have a document there that might help you?---I, I just have a look (not transcribable). There was a tax matter, right, and I just want to see whether it was there or not.

10 That's all right.---Not too sure. Sorry, just give me a couple, couple of minutes.

That's all right. Take your time.---Since this October '18 there, because there was a tax matter of Wu International. Yeah, there's, there's no meeting with Dr Liao there, so - - -

Sorry, what date was that?---It says October '18. 17 October, '18.

20 And you saw Dr Liao on that occasion?---There's no Dr Liao. There's no, there's no meeting with Dr Liao, so I - - -

You spoke to him on that occasion, did you?---No, there's not, not, not since October (not transcribable). He would have passed away by then, right? He passed away, when he passed away? In '17, is it?

MR ROBERTSON: I can assist. The 24th of June, 2018.---Yeah, so this is going back October '18, so I wouldn't have - - -

30 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, no.--- - - - yeah, been in touch with Dr Liao, you know, for quite a while I would say.

Did Dr Liao at any time disclose to you that he was worried about something?---No. No.

And have you come to learn why it is believed he took his life?---I've come to learn from all the reading I have, yeah.

Have you ever discussed that matter with Alex Wood?---Definitely not.

40 All right. Anything else?

MR ROBERTSON: Not for my part.

THE COMMISSIONER: Any application for cross-examination of Mr Teh? If not, then, Mr Teh, thank you for your attendance. You're excused. ---Thank you, Mr Commissioner. Thank you.

Thank you.

THE WITNESS EXCUSED

[11.38am]

MR ROBERTSON: Can I just deal with two formal tenders?

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. You may step down. Thank you. You can step down. Take your papers. Yes.

10 MR ROBERTSON: I tender pages 45 and 46 in MFI 24, being an email exchange between Leon Teh and Leo Liao on 20 March and 21 March, 2017, regarding inquiry by NSW Electoral Commission.

THE COMMISSIONER: Very well. Those documents will be marked as one exhibit, 336.

20 **#EXH-336 – EMAIL FROM ALEX WU (WOOD) TO LEON TEH ON 17 MAY 2017 AT 11:27AM REGARDING NSW ELECTORAL COMMISSION INQUIRY**

MR ROBERTSON: Next, I tender pages 71 through to 87 of MFI 24, being an email from Alex Wu to Leon Teh of 17 May, 2017, 11.27am, regarding NSW Electoral Commission inquiry.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, the document so described will become Exhibit 337.

30 **#EXH-337 – EMAIL EXCHANGE BETWEEN LEON TEH AND LEO LIAO ON 21 AND 20 MARCH 2017 REGARDING NSW ELECTORAL COMMISSION INQUIRY**

MR ROBERTSON: May it please the Commission.

MR TEH: Scott, what was that? I didn't understand.

40 THE COMMISSIONER: Is it something - - -

MR ROBERTSON: I'm sorry, Mr Teh?

MR TEH: What was that? You just say, I didn't, I didn't hear that.

MR ROBERTSON: You don't need to worry about what just happened.

MR TEH: Sorry (not transcribable)

MR ROBERTSON: You've now been excused for today, Mr Teh.

MR TEH: Thank you very much.

MR ROBERTSON: Thank you for your assistance.

MR TEH: Thank you. Thank you, Mr Commissioner.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, thank you. I'll take the morning tea
adjournment.

SHORT ADJOURNMENT

[11.40am]

MR ROBERTSON: I call Alex Wood.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, very well. Who appears, Ms Li, yes, you
appear for Mr Wood?

MS LI: Correct, yes, please. If I - - -

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, well, I confirm I grant your leave again to
appear on his behalf.

MS LI: Yes, thank you, and seek the section 38 as well.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: Could you just speak into the microphone that's
there?

MS LI: Apologies, and seek the section 38 as well, please.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, very well. Just for the record, would you
state your full name, just put on the record your name?

MR WOOD: My name is Alex Wood.

40 THE COMMISSIONER: All right, Mr Wood. You've had the provisions
of section 38 explained to you on a, previously as I understand it, and you
understand that a declaration made then prevents the evidence from being
used against you in other proceedings?

MR WOOD: Yeah.

THE COMMISSIONER: And it's your wish, is it, for a declaration to be
made for your evidence today?

MR WOOD: Yes, please. *Okay.*

THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Pursuant to section 38 of the Independent Commission Against Corruption Act, I declare that all answers given by witness Mr Wood and all documents and things that may be produced by him in the course of his evidence are to be regarded as having been given on objection. Accordingly, there is no need for Mr Wood to make objection to any particular answer or document or thing produced.

10

PURSUANT TO SECTION 38 OF THE INDEPENDENT COMMISSION AGAINST CORRUPTION ACT, I DECLARE THAT ALL ANSWERS GIVEN BY WITNESS MR WOOD AND ALL DOCUMENTS AND THINGS THAT MAY BE PRODUCED BY HIM IN THE COURSE OF HIS EVIDENCE ARE TO BE REGARDED AS HAVING BEEN GIVEN ON OBJECTION. ACCORDINGLY, THERE IS NO NEED FOR MR WOOD TO MAKE OBJECTION TO ANY PARTICULAR ANSWER OR DOCUMENT OR THING PRODUCED.

20

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Wood, you understand, do you not, that however you must answer all questions truthfully?

MR WOOD: Yes, I do, yeah.

THE COMMISSIONER: Do you wish to give evidence on oath or affirmation?

30 MR WOOD: *Bible.*

THE COMMISSIONER: Would you mind just standing then? Thank you. My associate will administer that.

<ALEX WOOD, sworn

[12.09pm]

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, take a seat, thank you.

<JENNIE RUTTER, affirmed

[12.09pm]

10 THE COMMISSIONER: Could you put on the record your name, please?

THE INTERPRETER: My name is Jennie Rutter, Jennie, J-e-n-n-i-e, Rutter, R-u-t-t-e-r, and I work for Multicultural NSW, and my vendor number is 3-2-5-5-5.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

THE INTERPRETER: Thank you.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. I wish to just put to Mr Wood one matter again, so that there's no doubt about it, and I'll use you to interpret. Mr Wood, having taken an oath to give evidence, you understand that you are under an obligation to give truthful evidence. Do you understand your obligation?---Mmm. Yes. Yes, I understand.

Counsel Assisting is going to ask you some questions now.

30 MR ROBERTSON: Mr Wood, do you agree that in September of 2016, Mr Steve Tong told you that he was required to produce documents to the NSW Electoral Commission?---*Yeah, would you repeat the question?*

Mr Wood, do you agree that in September of 2016, Mr Steve Tong told you that he was required to produce documents to the NSW Electoral Commission?---*No.*

You don't agree, is that right?---(Speaks Mandarin)

40 I'll just put the question again. Do you agree that in September of 2016, Mr Tong told you that he was required by the NSW Electoral Commission to produce documents, do you agree?---*I only learned later on about this matter.*

Chief Commissioner, I apply for the direction that was made on 8 November, 2019, in relation to the compulsory examination of Alex Wood be lifted insofar as it would prohibit the disclosure of the fact that Mr Wood gave evidence on that date, and insofar as it would otherwise prohibit the publication of any question asked or answer given in this public inquiry.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, in respect of the direction that I made on 8 November, 2019, in respect of the evidence of Mr Wood, I vary the direction in order to permit disclosure of the fact that Mr Wood gave evidence in a compulsory examination on that date and vary the direction insofar as it would otherwise prevent the disclosure in this public inquiry of questions and answers from Mr Wood on that day.

10 **VARIATION OF SUPPRESSION ORDER: IN RESPECT OF THE DIRECTION THAT I MADE ON 8 NOVEMBER, 2019, IN RESPECT OF THE EVIDENCE OF MR WOOD, I VARY THE DIRECTION IN ORDER TO PERMIT DISCLOSURE OF THE FACT THAT MR WOOD GAVE EVIDENCE IN A COMPULSORY EXAMINATION ON THAT DATE AND VARY THE DIRECTION INSOFAR AS IT WOULD OTHERWISE PREVENT THE DISCLOSURE IN THIS PUBLIC INQUIRY OF QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS FROM MR WOOD ON THAT DAY.**

20 MR ROBERTSON: May it please the Commission. Mr Wood, you participated in a private hearing before this Commission on 8 November, 2019, correct?---*Yes, I did.*

And do you agree that on that occasion, I asked you whether in September of 2016, Mr Tong told you that he was required to produce documents by the Electoral Commission, and you said yes? Do you remember giving that evidence?---*Yes, I did said so, but I couldn't recall and - - -*

30 Was the evidence that you gave on 8 November, 2019, true or false?
---*I gave all the truthful evidence.*

So do you accept then that in September of 2016 Mr Tong told you that he was required to produce documents by the Electoral Commission?---*I don't want to explain further. If I said so, that's it.*

40 Let's be clear. You accept, don't you, that in September of 2016 Mr Tong told you that he was required to produce documents by the Electoral Commission. Do you accept that or not?---*Should be so, but at that time he didn't say, he told me in year 2017, I can recall.*

THE COMMISSIONER: Look, Mr Wu, you know at some stage Mr Tong had received documents from the Electoral Commission. You know that he did receive documents from the Electoral Commission, because that's what he told you. Is that right?---*Should be so. He has told me but because it was a long time ago I couldn't recall clearly.*

No, but you have sufficient recollection that Mr Tong had received some documents, sorry, that he had been required to produce documents to the Electoral Commission. You remember that much?---*Yes.*

All right. Now Mr Wood – sorry, is there more to it?---*So yes, there is such a thing.*

10 Okay. Mr Wood, I just want to speak to you about giving answers to questions. It's taken now about five minutes or more to get one answer from you. If it takes five minutes to answer every question, we're going to be here for a very long time. It is your duty to listen to every question that's put and to answer it directly. Do you understand what I'm saying?---*Yes, understood.*

And will you do your best to answers questions directly and promptly?
---*Yes.*

All right. Let's see how we go.

20 MR ROBERTSON: Let's try it this way. Exhibit 313, please. Mr Wood, do you see on the screen an email from Dr Liao to Mr Teh and others, including you, of 19 September, 2016?---*Yes.*

Do you agree that you received this email?---*Yes, I agree.*

30 Do you agree that before you received this email, Mr Tong had told you that he was required by the Electoral Commission to produce documents?---*I don't know what happened, there are further correspondence. I only heard from Tong that the Election Commission asked for documents.*

I'm going to ask the question again and I want a direct response, please. Do you agree that before you received the email that is on the screen, Mr Tong told you that he was required to produce documents by the Electoral Commission?---*I don't know.*

40 Do you agree that you told this Commission on 8 November, 2019, that Mr Tong had told you in September of 2016 that the Electoral Commission had required you to produce documents?---*Yes, I did, but at that time I meant that he told me about this in 2017.*

Well, let's be clear about this. Can we have the compulsory examination transcript on the screen, please. So are you saying that you didn't know about the Electoral Commission's inquiries until 2017 now. Is that your evidence, is it?---*In 2019 I do know he was required to give, produce documents but I don't know exactly.*

When did you first find out that Mr Tong was asked to produce documents to the Electoral Commission?---*When I find out should be the time when

he came to, second time to see me. That was in 2017. At that time it should be that time I learned about this issue.*

Can we have the compulsory examination transcript page 2240, being PDF page 9, on the screen, please. Mr Wood, I want to direct your attention to line 15 of the page on the screen. Line 15 is about halfway between the number 10 and the number 20 that you can see on the screen. Mr Wood, are you able to read the question that starts at about line 15 to yourself in English?---*Yes, I did.*

10

Now, Mr Wood, you have just read the question starting at line 15 to yourself in English. Is that right?---*Yes, I did.*

Your English skills are good enough for you to be able to read that question and the answer to that question. Correct?---Yes. *Yes, I did.*

And your English skills are good enough for you to be able to understand the question that is written out on the screen and the answer to that question. Correct?---*Yes, I do.*

20

Having read that do you agree that you told this Commission on 8 November, 2019 that Mr Tong told you in September of 2016 that he was required to produce documents to the Electoral Commission?---*Yes, correct.

Was that evidence correct or incorrect?---*Yes, it was true.*

Can you now have a look at the next question, line 19, and can you read that to yourself and read the answer to yourself as well. Starting at line 19 and finishing at line 21.---Okay. Okay.

30

So you've read that to yourself now, Mr Wood?---Yes.

And do you agree that you told this Commission on 8 November, 2019, that you made arrangements for Mr Tong to have assistance from your accountant, Mr Teh?---Yeah, so, yeah, yeah. This is for the 2017.

You just agreed a moment ago that the evidence about September 2016 was correct. So do you wish to change your answer?---Okay, maybe I directly speak English to you, maybe yeah, may be much easier, yeah. Okay. So, okay, so because that time my memory not, I really (not transcribable) so just say, just say the (not transcribable) August (not transcribable) September (not transcribable) October, November, okay. So, so like, in, in the 2016 September, okay, so this, this thing is, he ask, he, Ms Tong, Mr Tong, he ask Dr Liao to help him and then Dr Liao, yeah, I just there and then he ask Dr Liao (not transcribable) and then Dr Liao asked the accountant people like Leon to help him and then, and then he, and then, and then he, and then, and then I don't know why and then he said why the

40

letter sent to the Electoral Commissioner (not transcribable) in the 2017 he go, Steve Tong go to see me, ask my help, and then - - -

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Wood.---Yeah.

You are not allowed to make statement in this hearing, just as you did then. You are here to answer questions directly and clearly and no other, you have no other function than to answer the questions. Do you understand?---Yeah.

10 Now, your attention is being drawn to your sworn evidence on a previous occasion and unless there's other evidence that I need to consider, I will take your evidence as recorded in the transcript for what it is.---Okay, okay.

So I'll get you to listen to the questions, answer them in English to the extent that you can, if you need the assistance of the interpreter then you can indicate that you need the assistance.---Yeah.

THE INTERPRETER: I can stand by or not?

20 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you.---Thank you.

MR ROBERTSON: I'm asking you about 2016 at the moment, not 2017. Do you understand?---Ah hmm.

And I suggest to you that in September of 2016 Mr Tong told you that he was required to produce documents to the Electoral Commission. Do you agree?---Ah, can you, pardon?

30 In September of 2016 Mr Tong told you that he was required to produce documents to the Electoral Commission. Do you agree?---Okay, I agree, okay.

He did that in September 2016. Correct?---September '16, yeah.

You knew about this request in 2016, not 2017. Do you agree?---'16 not '17. '16 ah, okay, yes.

40 Exhibit 313, please. Mr Wood, at the time that you received this email that's on the screen, you knew that Mr Tong had been asked to produce documents to the Electoral Commission. Correct?---Yes.

And you knew that because Mr Tong told you. Correct?---Yes.

And you asked Dr Liao to make arrangements to obtain the assistance of your accountant, Mr Teh. Correct?---No.

You asked Dr Liao for his assistance in relation to the matter raised by Mr Tong. Correct?---Can you translate. *Would you please repeat again.*

I'll rephrase. After Mr Tong told you that he was required by the Electoral Commission to produce documents you discussed that issue with Dr Liao. Correct?---*Yes, we discussed together.*

THE COMMISSIONER: Can you continue your answers in English. If you need the help of the assistant, or assistance of the interpreter you can let us know.---Yeah.

10 So we're going to go forward now. We will proceed on that basis.---Yeah. Yes, we discuss, Steve Tong discuss with Dr Liao and me together.

MR ROBERTSON: And after that discussion Dr Liao sent the email that we can see on the screen. Correct?---Yes.

And when you received this email you knew that Dr Liao had set up an email with your accountant, Mr Teh. Is that right?---Yes.

20 And a meeting with the accountant, Mr Teh, in fact happened on about 21 September, 2016. Do you agree?---Yes.

And you attended that meeting. Correct?---No.

To your knowledge did Dr Liao attend that meeting?---Yeah, I, I think and my knowledge is Steve Tong and Dr Liao should come to the meeting, yeah, so this - - -

30 What is, sorry.---I think, yeah, I just, my thinking I think Dr Liao like and Mr Steve Tong should attend the meeting but I am not.

How do you know that it was those two who attended the meeting?
---Because Dr Liao organise the meeting for Mr Tong so should be Mr Tong and Dr Liao together to see Mr, the accountant Leong.

But did Dr Liao tell you after the meeting what had happened at the meeting?---No.

40 But your firm at least paid for the advice given by Mr Teh. Do you agree?
---So you mean pay the money for this service?

I'll do it this way. Can we go to MFI 27, please. Do you agree that Mr Teh sent an invoice to Wu International in relation to this matter of assisting Mr Tong?---I don't know.

I'm just going to show you a document MFI 27 and if you just go to the next page. Do you see on the screen a fee note being sent to Wu International Investments Pty Ltd? Do you see that on the screen?---Yeah.

And do you agree that this was an invoice that was sent to your company in relation to advice given to assist Mr Tong?---I, I don't know (not transcribable) you can see just the invoice there like just say just the general tax consultant, then, yeah, then the, my accountant people, yeah, so just pay it because under \$200, yeah, so just pay it.

10 Well, do you agree that this invoice was connected with the advice given to Mr Tong? Do you agree with that?---Oh, no, so I cannot say I agree or not agree. Just (not transcribable) invoice just say you should pay, then, then you should pay.

Do you at least agree that this invoice was paid by Wu International Investments Pty Ltd?---Just say this paid by Wu International, yes, yes.

Yes. You agree with that?---Yeah.

20 And if we just go to MFI 28, have you provided to this Commission a copy of a bank statement that shows payment of invoice number 15353? Do you recall providing that to your solicitor, who then provided it to the Commission?---Yeah. Yep. So it's just the invoice number, right? Yep.

We'll just put it up on the screen so you can see the document I'm referring to.---Yep. Yes.

If you have a look on the screen, does that appear to be a redacted version of a piece of paper that you provided to the Commission via your lawyer?
---Yes. Yes. I give that, because I give (not transcribable) yes.

30 So you obtained this document and gave it to the Commission, is that right? You obtained the document we can see on the screen - - -?---Ah hmm.

- - - and you gave it to your lawyer, and your lawyer gave it to me, is that right?---Yes.

And do you agree that this shows payment of invoice 15353 by Wu International?---Yeah, Wu International, Wu International paid this.

40 Chief Commissioner, I tender the document that appears on the screen, namely a page from a statement of Wu International Investments Pty Ltd and showing payment of invoice number 15353.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, that document will be admitted as so described. It will become Exhibit 338.

#EXH-338 – PAGE OF WU INTERNATIONAL INVESTMENTS PTY LTD STATEMENT FROM HSBC SHOWING PAYMENT OF TEH & NG INVOICE NUMBER 15353

MR ROBERTSON: And so is it right to say, Mr Wood, that you agreed to treat the advice being given to Mr Tong as a company matter that the company would pay for?---No.

Well, why was your company paying for a bill if it wasn't a company matter?---Okay, my company just paid, just paid the, that relate to my company, so like an invoice, you see the invoice, there is the tax, general tax consultant fee, so we just paid. If the invoice say (not transcribable) invoice (not transcribable) related to the Electoral Commission, then (not transcribable) then we cannot pay it.

But Dr Liao had your permission to arrange a meeting with him and Mr Tong with your accountant, Mr Teh, is that right?---Yes.

So you were happy for Mr Teh to assist Mr Tong and to assist Dr Liao, correct?---Yes, yes.

20 And you were happy for that to happen because this question of donations had at least something to do with your company, would you agree?---No, no.

In fact, you knew that the reason that both Dr Liao and Mr Tong had signed documents saying that they were donors was to try and please Mr Ernest Wong, do you agree?---*No, it was --* Sorry, yeah, sorry, not, I say no because it's not relate to me and relate to my company. This is a personal, personal, private action, yeah (not transcribable) yeah (not transcribable)

30 You personally made a donation in connection with the Chinese Friends of Labor dinner of 2016, correct?---Yes.

And you did that to support Ernest Wong, correct?---Yes.

As at September of 2016, when this meeting was being set up with Mr Teh, you knew Ernest Wong very well, do you agree?---Not, not say very well, just say social.

40 Well, it was more than social. You knew each other well enough that he knew something about your character, and you knew something about his character, do you agree?---No, I, I don't, I, I, I can say I don't understand his characters, yeah, also I think he, yeah. I, but he, yeah, so he know my character or he understand, or not understand, I, I don't know.

THE COMMISSIONER: But in 2016 and 2017, you were friends with Mr Wong, and he a friend with you. Is that right?---Yeah, just association (not transcribable)

MR ROBERTSON: Well, you asked Mr Wong to recommend you for appointment as a justice of the peace in May of 2016, correct?---No, was he, he appoint me to be the JP, not, not me to ask him. Yeah.

Well, you wanted to be appointed as a justice of the peace in 2016, do you agree?---Mmm, okay, yeah, yes, okay.

10 Let's go to MFI 24. So you accept, don't you, that at least as at May of 2016, you and Mr Ernest Wong knew each other well enough for Mr Wong to recommend you as a justice of the peace, and for you to accept that recommendation, do you agree?---Okay. Yeah, he just asked me, yeah, to be the JP, then, then I just, yeah, I also I wanting to be the JP, yeah.

Well, let's be clear about this timing. Do you agree that in April of 2016, you personally made a donation in relation to the 2016 Chinese Friends of Labor dinner?---No.

20 Do you agree that you made a donation in connection with the Chinese Friends of Labor dinner of 2016?---Yeah, just, yeah, yeah, yes, mmm.

You're agreeing that you made a donation personally in relation to the 2016 Chinese Friends of Labor dinner, correct?---Yes, yeah, yes, Dr Liao asked me to donate, yeah.

Yes, but you agreed to do that. Is that right?---Yes.

And you did that to support Ernest Wong. Correct?---Support to the Labor.

30 So the reason you made a donation in 2016 was to support the Labor Party. Is that right?---Yeah.

And so would you regard yourself as a supporter of the Labor Party?---Yeah, just say yeah, yeah.

THE COMMISSIONER: Were you interested in politics in 2016?---Yeah, yeah, okay, you can say yes, okay (not transcribable)

What level of interest did you have in politics in 2016?---Just, just a 50/50.

40 What about 2015?---Oh, from now 50/50, forever 50/50.

Are you seriously telling me that you had a real interest in politics in 2015?
---Interest in - - -

Are you seriously telling me you had an interest in politics in 2015?---No.

No?---No.

Well, did you develop some interest in politics after 2015?---Yes. But also I can say no, yeah.

I'm sorry, what's your answer?---I'm not interested in the politic, yeah.

All right. So overall if you take the period from 2015 to now, if asked do you follow politics and are you interested in politics, your answer would be what?---Yeah, okay.

10 Would it be yes or no?---Okay. Just a, yeah, just a little bit interesting, okay, just a little bit, yeah.

MR ROBERTSON: So the donation in 2016, are you saying that wasn't made to support Ernest Wong, rather it was made to support the Labor Party?---Of course, of course. Like, like, Ernest Wong is, his, his job is belong to Labor, then of course he asked the donation just for the Labor, of course for Labor.

20 Chief Commissioner, I apply for the direction under section 112 of the Independent Commission Against Corruption Act that was made in relation to the compulsory examination of Mr Wood on 11 November, 2019, being the extension of the one that commenced on 8 November, 2019, be lifted insofar as it would otherwise prohibit publication of the fact that Mr Wood gave evidence on that date and insofar as would otherwise prevent publication of any question asked or answer given in this public inquiry.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: In respect of the direction I made under section 12 of the Independent Commission Against Corruption Act on 11 November, 2019, I vary the direction insofar as it would otherwise prevent disclosure of the fact that the witness gave evidence on that day and prevent disclosure of questions and answers put to him and given by him on that date.

40 **VARIATION OF SUPPRESSION ORDER: IN RESPECT OF THE DIRECTION I MADE UNDER SECTION 12 OF THE INDEPENDENT COMMISSION AGAINST CORRUPTION ACT ON 11 NOVEMBER, 2019, I VARY THE DIRECTION INsofar AS IT WOULD OTHERWISE PREVENT DISCLOSURE OF THE FACT THAT THE WITNESS GAVE EVIDENCE ON THAT DAY AND PREVENT DISCLOSURE OF QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS PUT TO HIM AND GIVEN BY HIM ON THAT DATE.**

MR ROBERTSON: May it please the Commission. Mr Wood, do you agrees that when I asked you about this matter on 11 November, 2019, as to the reason why you were donating in 2016, was that Mr Wong was a senior government official and therefore it was a good idea to support him? Do

you remember giving that evidence in the private hearing?---Okay. So, yeah.

Let's do this in stages, Mr Wood. Do you agree that that was the effect of the evidence that you gave in the private hearing before this Commission? You donated because Dr Liao suggested you should and the reason for it was that Mr Wong was a senior government official and therefore it was a good idea to support him. Do you agree that that was the effect of the evidence that you've previously given to this Commission?---*A good
10 suggestion. Not a good idea.*

So are you agreeing that the effect of your evidence to the Commission in the private hearing was that it was a good idea to support Mr Wong because he was a senior government official? Do you agree with that or not?
---Okay. So I just don't remember I have said this but, but just say, just, he just said Dr Liao is good advice, yeah (not transcribable)

Do you agree that as at 2016 your relationship with Ernest Wong was such that he would do things to help you and you would do things to help him?
20 ---No.

You had a transactional relationship in which you would seek to assist Mr Ernest Wong and he would seek to assist you. Do you agree?---No.

Before 2016 Mr Wong also assisted your family in development projects in New South Wales. Do you agree?---I don't know – I don't agree, yeah.

You don't agree. Is that what you said?---So, yeah, can you (not transcribable) the question?
30

Do you agree that prior to 2016 Mr Wong assisted your family's companies in relation to development projects?---I don't know, helping my company, I
- - -

THE INTERPRETER: Do you need an interpreter to translate?

THE WITNESS: Family (not transcribable)

MR ROBERTSON: Let me ask it this way.
40

THE COMMISSIONER: Just a moment. You've taken a very long time to even commence to answer that question.---Yeah, yeah, sorry, sorry.

Listen to my question. Did Ernest Wong assist your company in relation to property development matters?---Yeah, I, yeah, I, I just say, say no, yeah, no.

You might say no but what is the truthful answer? Is there a project or projects that you now recall that he did lend some assistance in relation?
---Yes.

And which projects were they?---Yeah, I just say - - -

Please, the witness, let's get this clear, he's understanding my questions and he's answering them in English. Unless he needs your assistance, we'll - - -

10 THE INTERPRETER: Okay.

THE COMMISSIONER: Would you answer my question now? Which project or projects do you now recall that he lent some assistance with?
---Yes, just the, the, I, I, I forget which year, I forget which year, 2017 or whatever, which year, yeah, Dr Liao just organised the Ernest Wong to see the farm, yeah, just see the farm.

20 Which property was that? Which property are you talking about when you talk about the farm? Which property?---Just the farm, you know, the - - -

Where? Where's the farm?---Yeah, the farm is The Oaks in the (not transcribable) okay, just near the Campbelltown, okay.

Near?---Near Campbelltown.

Kembla?

MR ROBERTSON: Campbelltown.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: Campbelltown?---Yeah.

Thank you.---Yeah.

MR ROBERTSON: Mr Wood, are you referring to the suburb or area called The Oaks? Two words, The, T-h-e, Oaks, O-a-k-s.---Yeah, yeah (not transcribable)

40 And that area is an area that is west of Campbelltown, is that right?---Yeah, yeah, I just, yeah, whatever, I'm not very clear. Just say yes, yeah.

THE COMMISSIONER: And why did Mr Wong visit the farm?---Yeah, so just Dr Liao he organised the, yeah, a meeting with him to see, to see the farm like, ask, like ask the (not transcribable) like ask the State Government for can build, like, a solar farm, to build a, you know the solar farm? Yeah. To, to make the farm to become, just they ask the, have the State Government have policy can build a solar farm there, yeah.

MR ROBERTSON: So you were seeking Mr Wong's assistance in getting approval to build something on that farm, is that right?---No, we just, no.

Well, you arranged for a driver to pick Mr Wong up to take him to the far, do you agree?---Not me. Is Dr Liao, is Dr Liao organised, yeah, the driver to his home, yeah, to, to his home to pick up him, yeah, to the farm.

10 But you told this Commission in the private hearing that it was you who made the arrangements, do you agree?---No, no, no. It's not me. So is, is Dr Liao organise. I just, like just accompany – *I was only accompanying him. It was organised by Dr Liao.*

Would you at least agree with this? Mr Wong attended a farm that is controlled by your company, Wu International Investments Pty Ltd?---It's not control, yeah, by my. Yeah, I think, it just (not transcribable) not controlled by my company.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: What interest, if any, did your company have in the farm? What interest did your company have in the property?---We see just can, just like, yeah, just ask for, like, have, like State Government have any policy can support to build a solar farm. That's it.

Answer my question. What interest did your company have in that property?---Interest? Okay, we just want to build something there. Not like (not transcribable) it's empty. That's it.

Did your company own the property?---No. No. No.

30 Did your company have any interest or share in the property?---No.

Who owned the property?---My parents.

MR ROBERTSON: And is that through a company called Australia New Century International Pty Ltd?---Yeah.

And that's a company that your father is a director of, is that right?---Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Is that a convenient time?

40 MR ROBERTSON: Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, all right. We'll take the luncheon adjournment. I'll resume at 2.10. Mr Wood, we'll resume your evidence at 2.10 this afternoon.---Yeah, thank you.

I'll adjourn.

LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT

[1.07pm]