

KEPPELPUB02172
21/10/2021

KEPPEL
pp 02172-02186

PUBLIC
HEARING

COPYRIGHT

INDEPENDENT COMMISSION AGAINST CORRUPTION

THE HONOURABLE RUTH McCOLL AO
COMMISSIONER

PUBLIC HEARING

OPERATION KEPPEL

Reference: Operation E17/0144

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

AT SYDNEY

ON THURSDAY 21 OCTOBER, 2021

AT 1.45PM

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.

<CHRIS LUKE HANGER, on former affirmation

[1.50pm]

MR ROBERTSON: There's a technical issue perhaps with the microphones.

THE COMMISSIONER: There's also a technical issue with the screens I think, Mr Robertson.

10 MR ROBERTSON: I can see on my screen but perhaps not you, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Well, I can see but I'm not seeing what I thought we were supposed to be seeing. I can see the back of the room and you, not the witness.

20 MR ROBERTSON: Just pardon me for a moment. I'm told that you, Commissioner, and those in the physical hearing room, will see things in a slightly different way on the screen, at least for the next little bit, but that it's not affecting the live stream.

THE COMMISSIONER: It affects my ability to see the witness, Mr Robertson, if I can't see him on the screen.

30 MR ROBERTSON: Yes. I'll ask whether that can be changed. Sorry, Commissioner, I'm told that there's may be some issue with the witness camera, which is why I think you can see a box that says IW, as in ICAC witness. Can I suggest a brief adjournment with a view to fixing that matter? I apologise, Mr Hanger.

THE COMMISSIONER: Very well. I'm sorry, Mr Hanger. Let me know when it's resolved, please, Mr Robertson.

SHORT ADJOURNMENT

[1.55pm]

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Robertson.

40 MR ROBERTSON: I'm sorry about that delay, Mr Hanger. Prior to the luncheon adjournment we got up to the announcement of Minister Harwin of 24 August, 2018, referring to what was there described as a commitment. As I understood what you said this morning, following the Wagga Wagga by-election period there was an application that was made by the Riverina Conservatorium for funding of that \$20 million or so under the RCDF. Is that right?---That's correct.

And what was the result of that application, was that successful or unsuccessful?---It was unsuccessful.

Can we go, please, to page 266 of volume 31.0. I'll show you an email under your hand that seems to have been sent to Dr Wallace of the conservatorium. Zoom in a little bit further. Do you see there you say, "Thank you for taking the time and effort to submit the details of your project to the Regional Communities Development Fund." Do you see that there?---Yes.

10

And it says, "The assessment panel has reviewed your business case and deemed there was insufficient information to support a proper assessment." See that there?---Yes.

And the substance of your response is to indicate that the project was unsuccessful in its application under the Regional Communities Development Fund. Is that right?---That's correct.

20

Now, in terms of the application that was made, was it - - -

THE COMMISSIONER: Do we have a date for this letter, Mr Robertson?

MR ROBERTSON: My note is of 31 May, 2019.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

MR ROBERTSON: That's consistent with your recollection that it was sent around about that time?---That time sounds correct, yes.

30

Now, this particular application that was made to the Regional Communities Development Fund, was the assessment by the assessment panel assessing it by reference to competitive criteria of the kind that you and I discussed this morning?---Yes.

But is it right that the particular reason that this application was unsuccessful was that there was insufficient information to support a proper assessment?---That's correct.

40

And so at least the way in which the stage 2 matter was dealt with, it was dealt with in a different way to the ACTA proposal that we discussed this morning. It was not put through an existing competitive grant program. Is that right?---That's correct.

And is that similarly in respect of stage 1? I take it stage 1, insofar as money was necessary for stage 1, was that put through a competitive assessment process of the kind that you and I discussed this morning?---No.

Now, you then see in your fourth paragraph you say, “In order to progress funding arrangements, et cetera, the conservatorium will need to provide a series of matters.” Do you see that there?---Yes.

So at least as at about May of 2019 we’ve got a thing that was described in Minister Harwin’s announcement as a commitment but there was a rejection of an application made under the Regional Communities Development Fund. Is that right?---Yes.

10 Just have a look at the third paragraph. It says, “The recital hall remains an important project for the Riverina region and the commitment of \$20 million from the NSW Government to this project remains steadfast.” Do you see that there?---Yes.

In what sense did you mean that there was a commitment, noting that, as I understand your evidence this morning, the position at least at an agency level was that there was a reservation by this point in time, but not an approval or an allocation or anything along those lines?---So, reservation or approval would have been the terms would have been better in that context.
20 Commitment means still an interest in government in continuing work on stage 2 of the conservatorium to fill out the inadequacies of the application that they submitted in the RCDF.

So are you saying a better way of putting your third paragraph would have been to describe it as a reservation but not more?---That’s correct.

And the sense in which you’re using “commitment”, was that in the sense of an election commitment, or in this case a by-election commitment, a political commitment?---That’s correct, yes.
30

As opposed to a commitment in the sense of an actual allocation or approval or something along those lines. Is that right?---That’s correct, yes.

So at least within government, at least within the bureaucracy of government, the status as at May of 2019 was a reservation, here’s money that can’t be spent on anything else, rather than anything more concrete, is that right?---Yes.

40 Did the RCM round – sorry, I withdraw that. Did the RCM stage 2 ultimately move from a reservation to an allocation or approval or anything along those lines?---No.

And so what’s the current status of stage 2 at least so far as you and your agency is concerned, as you understand it?---Yep. So, we’ve completed a strategic business case to investigate stage 2. That business case has shown that the project is not economically or financially viable as it was regionally announced in August 2018, so the sort of 300-odd seat recital hall is, is not viable, and in that context we’ve said that, that stage 2 sort of cannot

progress and we will look at other options in regards to performance spaces in Wagga.

And so what then is the status of the reservation of \$20-or-so million, the subject of the correspondence that I showed you before the luncheon adjournment?---So that's been returned to the broader Regional Growth Fund envelope.

10 So in effect the reservation has now been unreserved, so that money is potentially available for other projects within the RCDF, is that right?
---Yeah. Or other projects in the Regional Growth Fund.

I tender the email on the screen, email from Mr Hanger to Dr Wallace, 31 May, 2019, page 266, volume 31.0.

THE COMMISSIONER: Exhibit 439.

20 **#EXH-439 – EMAIL FROM CHRIS HANGER TO DR ANDREW WALLACE REGARDING REGIONAL COMMUNITIES DEVELOPMENT FUND APPLICATION**

MR ROBERTSON: Mr Hanger, you're aware that Ms Berejiklian gave evidence before this Commission to the effect that she was in a close personal relationship with Mr Maguire from at least about the time of the 2015 election or slightly after or thereabouts?---Yes.

30 When did you first become aware of that matter, namely the existence of a personal relationship between Mr Maguire and Ms Berejiklian?---When that evidence came out last year, about the middle of the year.

It wasn't something that you were aware of before it was the subject of evidence from Ms Berejiklian before this Commission, is that right?---No.

40 Had you know about that information at the time that you had involvement in the ACTA project and the RCM project, as we've discussed this morning, would you have done anything differently to what you in fact did at the time?---Yeah. You, you would put in place ways of identifying and managing conflicts of, potential personal conflicts of interest.

And so what does that mean practically? When you say you would put things in place, you would put what in place?---You, I'd notify my senior managers in regards to that and we'd be, who would have been Gary Barnes, and then discuss with him what's the best way to manage that conflict.

So at least you would see that as a matter of a potential conflict, is that right?---Yes.

And you would regard it as something that would need to be managed in at least some fashion?---Yes.

And is this right, you would speak with your senior managers and perhaps others as to the appropriate way to manage that position of potential conflict?---Yep, yes.

10

Have I got that right?---Yes.

That's the examination, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Robertson. Mr Agius, I understand that you wish to take some instructions in relation to your examination, well, if you indeed intend in due course to make one, of Mr Hanger?

20

MR AGIUS: Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Is that correct?

MR AGIUS: There's one issue, and I've spoken to my friend about it during the short adjournment, and I would ask that Mr Hanger not be released from his summons. The issue concerns three people, Mr Barilaro and then two senior people in his department, and I'll need to obtain some instructions. I also have requested my friend show me any email that relates to that issue. I'll do my best to get those instructions as soon as possible, but it may not be until Monday. Thank you.

30

THE COMMISSIONER: I understand that, Mr Agius. I think Mr Robertson, in that light, that I should not call on anybody else to examine Mr Hanger at this stage because there may be questions which arise from whatever instructions Mr Agius may obtain and any questions he may ask.

MR ROBERTSON: I'm in the Commission's hands. I'm mindful that the program of witnesses of next week is very tight and it's going to be very difficult to add additional matters. I'd at least suggest - - -

40

THE COMMISSIONER: I'm conscious of that, too.

MR ROBERTSON: - - - the Commission consider calling on whether Ms Callan has any questions. If she considers she's in a position of disadvantage by reason of what has just transpired, then, of course, the appropriate course would be to go no further.

THE COMMISSIONER: Well, I think in fairness to Ms Callan, she may not be in a position to know unless she hears the questions.

MR ROBERTSON: If that's so, then certainly she should not be called upon, but I'm just mindful that there is a short gap in the time frame this week but not necessarily next week.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: I understand that, too, Mr Robertson. And it may be that, and you've already said we may spill over into the following week. It may be that, if necessary, we have to adjust the timetable to accommodate that but I'm conscious that what we don't want to preclude is a series of questions and then possible going back and - - -

MR ROBERTSON: Quite so. I respectfully adopt that entirely. And if Ms Callan considers herself at any disadvantage at all, then I would withdraw what I've said so far.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, Ms Callan, do you wish to examine Mr Hanger now in the light of that exchange? Do you want to go as far as you can today and then if Mr Agius comes back and wishes to ask further questions take it from there?

MS CALLAN: Yes. Yeah, I would seek leave to ask - - -

THE COMMISSIONER: Please call me "Commissioner", Ms Callan.

30 MS CALLAN: Sorry, Commissioner. Old habits. Commissioner, I would like to make good use of the time this afternoon.

THE COMMISSIONER: Very well.

MS CALLAN: And I have some sense of the boundaries of Mr Agius' client's interests and we'll take things as far as I can today.

THE COMMISSIONER: Very well.

40 MS CALLAN: Mr Hanger, my name is Ms Callan. I appear for Ms Berejiklian in this inquiry. Can you see and hear me satisfactorily?---Yes. Yes.

Mr Hanger, you gave some evidence in answer to some questions from Counsel Assisting before lunch in relation to the ACTA proposal, the Australian Clay Targets Association proposal, by reference to the decision which was made by the ERC in December 2016. You recall that?---Yes.

And you accepted the proposition that your role was not to rubberstamp a business case but to see whether a satisfactory business case could be achieved. You recall that?---Yes.

10 Can I ask against the background of the ERC having indicated its commitment to that project, subject to a satisfactory business case, did you understand that a part of your task or the task that was, as it were, outsourced to the consultants was to seek, through the application of skill and acumen, to seek to identify and formulate a business case which, to use the terms of the ERC's decision was satisfactory?---Yeah. You'd try and develop a business case that presents a project in its strongest light.

Yes. In that respect, and you were asked about a press release that Mr Maguire issued in the beginning of 2017 in relation to funding for the proposal, you were asked some questions about whether that added a measure of pressure to your task and the task that had been set for you by the ECM.---ERC?

20 Sorry, ERC. The suggestion that was made was that this might add to the priority and attention with which you approached the task of considering the business case. You recall that?---Yes.

Is it your evidence that you gave that particular proposal higher priority, or more attention than you would have in the ordinary course, against the background of that decision that had been made by the ERC?---As compared to - - -

30 If the press release had not been issued, for instance.---It would still be a priority project. ERC had identified that they were looking for a business case to be developed, so it was, it was a high priority for us.

And as I understand your evidence, because of what had been indicated by the ERC's decision, it was a high priority for you, and an aspect of that priority was to seek to see if a satisfactory business case could be formulated.---That's correct, yes.

40 In relation to the approach taken, which was to go back to GHD, who was the entity who had formulated the original business case, was it a decision made by you or someone within your team for that to occur, rather than, for instance, for it to be done in-house?---So GHD had, from what I understand, done the work that formed the basis of the ERC decision. So they would have knowledge of that project. As was covered this morning, the business case was not sufficient and required further work, so it made sense to use a firm that had already done that preparatory work to see if, with further work, the business case that they'd prepared would meet that criteria.

And so in terms of the task that had been set for you or your team in due course, by reference to the ERC's decision that the grant was subject to the finalisation of a satisfactory business case, there were compelling and sensible reasons for that work in respect of the business case, in first instance, to be undertaken by GHD?---Yes. If you've got a consultant who's prepared a business case that's inadequate, you would, in the first instance, go back to them to see if they could improve that.

10 And that would be the most efficient way of going about it from a cost perspective, wouldn't it?---Yes.

And is that an aspect that informed the reason why, along with the technical understanding and expertise and background, that informed why you and your team went back to GHD to do the work?---Yes, so I wasn't directly involved in the procurement, but, yes, that seems logical.

20 And is that a process that you'd observed had occurred previously within your team or otherwise in the department? That is, to procure consultants to undertake work rather than doing it in-house in a way which would likely be less efficient?---Yeah, so as I outlined this morning, we do provide support for applicants to develop business cases, and that's an outsourced process. It's relatively rare for the department to prepare business cases other than for State Government projects.

And the support that's provided, when you say support, that includes funding for the development of those business cases?---That's correct.

30 And that is something which is done regularly enough, as I understand your evidence?---It's, I wouldn't call it "regularly enough". Increasingly, as both capacity and also capability of applicants to prepare business cases that are robust enough for assessment has become more challenging, we do provide financial support for business cases. Our overriding objective in providing government funding though is to see things built rather than necessarily developing a library of business cases, so we need to balance that, but there are instances where what we think are sort of community needs are not able to be captured in the capacity of the applicant to be able to pull together a business case to justify it.

40 Can I ask you, in relation to the evidence that you've given to this Commission about the BCR, or benefit-to-cost, assessment and its role in decision-making or consideration that's given at the agency level to the funding of projects, the position which was emphasised and from your evidence this morning was in relation to Restart funding, there is a sort of sacred requirement that the BCR be 1 or more than 1?---So Infrastructure NSW looks to see, looks and funds projects that provide a benefit for New South Wales, and that is traditionally assessed through a benefit-cost ratio with a project achieving a benefit-cost ratio above 1.

So that's not limited to Restart, it's a more general approach to the assessment of funding of projects. Is that your evidence?---Restart absolutely has that requirement.

Yes.---There will be other projects that Infrastructure NSW would review and provide advice on where the funding source may not require that, but for Restart it needs to show a positive benefit for New South Wales and the way that's assessed by Infrastructure NSW is through benefit-cost analysis.

10 Aside from Restart with, as you put it, that absolute requirement in terms of that BCR score, as I understand it your approach is that it is always good for projects to show a BCR of 1 or more than 1.---That's desirable. If that's able to be achieved by a project, then absolutely that would be preferable.

Preferable including in terms of in the assessment whether it's recommended for funding?---Yes, but it may not be a requirement for a fund.

20 You've observed, I imagine, over the years instances of projects being funded particularly in regional New South Wales where the assessment is a BCR less than 1?---Yes.

Are you aware of a particular criticism that has been made by some segments of government and the business and community sectors about the use of the BCR score 1 or more in relation particularly to projects in regional New South Wales?---Yes.

30 Are those criticisms ones that you adopt or embrace yourself in your work? ---No. I think the nature of the project should inform what type of assessment is most appropriate. For projects where you're seeking an economic outcome, a positive benefit-cost ratio clearly is preferable. There are projects, though, especially those in what I'll call sort of service provision, and the example that we think of most frequently for regional communities is in regards to water projects, where the scale of investment required and the size of the community that benefits, it's very, very difficult for those projects to achieve a positive benefit-cost ratio. Nevertheless, there are other strong arguments of why those projects should progress even if they don't at a whole-of-state level achieve a benefit-cost ratio positive, more than 1.

40

That being the position, you would not consider a BCR of less than 1 as being necessarily an indication that a decision to fund a project was a poor decision or an improper decision, would you?---No. It would depend on the nature of the project, but in and of itself it just tells you the relativities of the costs and the benefits.

You gave some evidence in relation to the ACTA grant and the work that you did on it of the impression you formed via others as to the interest of the

Premier in that particular proposal. You were not made aware of reasons why, as you understood it, she was particularly interested in that proposal?
---No.

Were you told, for instance, that support for the project at the political level was connected to a desire by the government to demonstrate support for regional electorates, particularly after the outcome of the Orange by-election toward the end of 2016?---No.

10 Can I ask you in relation to the evidence you gave about the circumstance in which the BCR score was revised from 0.88 to 1.1 in relation to this ACTA proposal, the change of score, as I understand your evidence, was informed by work done by GHD in refining the business case?---That's correct.

And that was then subject to the rigour and experience of the department's own Investment Appraisal Unit?---Yes.

20 And in giving your evidence before lunch, you didn't mean to convey that either GHD or your colleagues at the Investment Appraisal Unit had artificially included information or inflated that BCR number, did you?
---No.

You're not suggesting that either GHD or your colleagues in that unit conducted their task in a way that lacked integrity?---No, I am not.

And you're not meaning to imply that figure of 1.1 was the result of inappropriate or corrupt political pressure, are you?---No.

30 Can I turn to the Riverina Conservatorium of Music proposal? The point in time, as I understand your evidence, you became involved was when the communication was sent to Dr Wallace in July 2017 that the unsolicited RCM proposal – sorry – the RCM unsolicited proposal had been unsuccessful?---Yes.

Were you familiar at that time or are you familiar now with the criteria or purpose for the unsolicited proposals fund that the NSW Government had?
---Not in detail but it does present an opportunity to bring forward unique projects that can't be solved through other means.

40 In that respect, do you understand it is designed for proposals to deal directly with government in respect of commercial propositions?---Yes.

And your understanding that a type of proposal that would not be likely to progress or success via that path would be a proposal that did not contain a commercial proposition for the government?---Yes.

In respect of the RCM, that, I accepted in evidence from Counsel Assisting, was a relatively small, non-profit organisation to your understanding?
---Yes.

As I understand your evidence, you never saw the full, unsolicited proposal, which had been submitted in 2017?---Not the full proposal. I've seen a series of concepts that the RCM have put together but I don't believe I've, I've read the, the full unsolicited proposal.

- 10 In respect of what you have seen by way of concepts, is it your evidence that nature of that unsolicited proposal was seeking assistance with the move to the 1 Simmons Street site, that is, stage 1 as referred to by Counsel Assisting?---Yeah, I think it was sort of the, the acquisition and move to that site.

That is the gift of the building or the acquisition of the building, it was your understanding that that formed part of the unsolicited proposal?---Yes.

- 20 Is it your understanding that the building or construction of a recital hall at stage 2, that that formed any part of the unsolicited proposal by RCM?---I'm not, I'm not aware, I understand the whole concept was probably considered. The, the, the way in which the referral of the unsolicited proposal to Regional NSW, my understanding was we were to look specifically at the move of the RCM.

In relation to the aspect of the proposition that concerned the move and acquisition of the building, was any part of that a commercial proposition for the government?---Not that I'm aware of.

- 30 In relation to if you assume that the unsolicited proposal included a proposal for the building of the recital hall, does that involve in any way a commercial proposition for the government?---So I, yeah, as part of the recital hall, I understood there was elements that were potentially either commercial or retail that were proposed in there.

And commercial for the government?---No is my understanding.

But potentially an avenue of revenue stream for the RCM?---Yes.

- 40 In that respect, returning to, and I recognise you have limited understanding of the nature of the unsolicited proposals scheme, in the sense that no part of the proposal contained a commercial proposition for the government, that suggests that it was unsuitable and almost certainly going to be unsuccessful via the unsolicited proposals mechanism?---Yes.

And insofar as a request was made that you and your team work with the RCM to, nevertheless, seek to advance the move and potentially stage 2 in terms of the recital hall, that reflected, did it not, recognition that this was a

project worthwhile of further attention?---So I'd say that there's acknowledged recognition that the work of the conservatorium is, is important, the services that they provide to regional communities is obviously important, being able to continue to have those services in, in a location like Wagga is important.

10 You were asked some questions about the chronology in relation to the RCM proposal, including by reference to events immediately before and after the by-election that was conducted in Wagga in September 2018. Do you recall or are you aware that Dr Joe McGirr won that seat as an independent?---Yes.

And after the election are you aware the Premier's position continued to be supportive of the RCM?---Yes, that's my understanding.

And Dr McGirr has lobbied for the RCM since he replaced Mr Maguire?
---Yes.

20 Insofar as you gave evidence at the end of the questioning from Counsel Assisting about what you perceived might be a potential conflict, can I ask is that on the basis that you were dealing with projects that concerned the Wagga electorate?---Yes, insofar as if the Premier was having a relationship with an MP who was advocating on behalf of projects in Wagga and she was both advocating and possibly involved in any of the decisions around that, that conflict should have been declared.

The potential for conflict.---Potential for conflict, yes.

30 Commissioner, that's as far as I can go with the witness.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms Callan. Mr Harrowell, did you wish to seek leave at this stage to ask Mr Hanger any questions?

MR HARROWELL: If I may very briefly, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Harrowell.

MR HARROWELL: Is this microphone okay?

40 THE COMMISSIONER: I'm not the person to ask, Mr Harrowell. Yes, it is, I - - -

MR HARROWELL: I might need to, I thought you might (not transcribable) a little bit just - - -

THE COMMISSIONER: I think you might, if you could come forward so that Mr Hanger can see you. Thank you, Mr Harrowell.

MR HARROWELL: Mr Hanger, my name is Harrowell, I appear for Mr Maguire. Just a couple of short questions. My learned friend was recently asking you about the nature of the conservatorium project, if I can call it that. The services provided by the Riverina Conservatorium of Music were quite unique in that region, weren't they?---Yes.

10 If the conservatorium were to close, there was no other body within hundreds of kilometres, probably as far away as Sydney indeed, who could provide those services?---That's my understanding, yes.

And to some extent it's a bit like, even if it wasn't commercially viable, a bit like the evidence you gave on the need to fund water facilities in fairly remote areas, there may not be financial return but it's something that should and could be done?---That, that's correct.

20 Thank you. And turning back to the clay target shooting, at the end of the day there's been a great deal of debate about the formulation of business cases and the inadequacy of the original business case, and you've been asked a number of questions today about that. Your team reviewed it, worked with GHD, and at the end of the day there was a business case that came up with a return greater than 1?---That's correct.

30 And you were satisfied that the work done, both by your team and the additional work done by GHD, to the best that one can on a business case make that number in excess of 1, a robust number?---Yeah. So the, the Investment Appraisal Unit sits separate from my team in that regard. So our work with GHD in developing the business case is essentially reviewed independently by the Investment Appraisal Unit, and there needs to be a separation between sort of the development and the assessment of the business case.

And that separation of the process as an independent review is critical to ensure that good decisions are made?---Yes.

40 And from your knowledge of the way the matter progressed, the decision made at the end of the day was robust and sound decision?---Yeah. It, it, the, the business case and the assessment of it met the criteria for Restart.

And it was on that basis that with Infrastructure NSW it was sent back for final approval.---Yes, that's - - -

And there is no suggestion that anyone or anybody tried to manipulate that process of independent assessment and independent review.---So the independent assessment by the Investment Appraisal Unit?

Yes.---No.

No. Thank you, Mr Hanger.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you Mr Harrowell. Mr Carr, did you wish to seek leave at this stage?

MR CARR: No, no questions, Commissioner. No.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: Very well. Mr Agius, can I ask you to keep Mr Robertson informed as to your progress and advise him as soon as possible when you're in a position in relation to Mr Hanger.

MR AGIUS: Yes, I will do that.

THE COMMISSIONER: And do you have any questions at this stage, further questions at this - - -

20 MR ROBERTSON: Not at this stage, and so I'll call Mr Ayres tomorrow at 9.30am I think is the suggestion followed by Mr Barnes when I'm finished with Mr Ayres.

THE COMMISSIONER: Very well. Mr Hanger, I hope you understand from the exchange with Mr Agius that I can't release you from your summons at this stage.---Yes.

We'll let you know as soon as possible what the position is and seek to meet your convenience in relation, if at all, to any return to the hearing room. ---Thank you, Commissioner.

30 Very well. We'll now adjourn until 9.30 tomorrow morning.

THE WITNESS STOOD DOWN [2.41pm]

AT 2.41PM THE MATTER WAS ADJOURNED ACCORDINGLY [2.41pm]