

PARAGONPUB00473  
17/05/2021

PARAGON  
pp 00473-00519

PUBLIC  
HEARING

COPYRIGHT

INDEPENDENT COMMISSION AGAINST CORRUPTION

THE HONOURABLE PETER M. HALL QC  
CHIEF COMMISSIONER

PUBLIC HEARING

OPERATION PARAGON

Reference: Operation E18/0736

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

AT SYDNEY

ON MONDAY 17 MAY, 2021

AT 2.00PM

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: Mr Downing.

MR DOWNING: Thank you, Commissioner. Mr Steyn, before lunch I was asking you about the Maintenance Panel tender. Now, if you go back, please, just to volume 15,1, page 319, just to remind you of relevant dates. So it shows that the publication of the eTendering notice in respect of this  
10 Maintenance Panel was on 25 September, and you'll see it shows that a closing date for the tender was 6 October, 2017, at 2.30pm.---Yes, Counsel.

So just bear those in mind. If we could go back, please, to volume 13.7, page 16, and I'm not taking you back to the WhatsApp exchange between you and Mr Rahme. Do you see the first message on that page, 25 September, 2017, so the same day the eTender for the Maintenance Panel goes live, at 8.23 you message Mr Rahme to tell him to check the eTender list for the RMS Heavy Vehicle Maintenance Tender. Do you see that?  
---Sorry, which was it?

20

The very first message, so 8.23, top of the page.---Yes.

So on the day the eTender goes live, you message him through WhatsApp to tell him to check it with a view to Lancomm then putting in a tender.---Yes.

And on the 26<sup>th</sup>, the following day, at 11.46am, you remind – I withdraw that – you let him know that there are short closing time frames. Do you see that?---Yes. Yes, Counsel.

30 And then over the following days you see that Mr Rahme indicates he's got the office populating the tender documents and that he would discuss it with you over the weekend?---Yes.

And you indicate on the 29<sup>th</sup> at 9.16am that you need to see what the submission looks like if he was going to submit one.---Yes.

Now, first of all, you accept, wouldn't you, that it's inappropriate for you to be looking at and advising a contractor on the content of its tender documents?---Yes, yes.

40

Why did you seem – I withdraw that. Why were you keen to look at the document that Mr Rahme was going to submit?---To see what he submitted.

You were keen to get him approved, correct?---Yes.

And you'll see the next message down, on 29 September, at 9.22, you give him a little bit of guidance as to completing the documents in terms of the detail to put in what documents to attach?---Yes.

And you, on 4 October, do you see at 8.07pm, you in effect chase him about his submission?---Yes.

You see you ask, “How’s your submission?”---Yes.

Because by then you were only two days out from the closing date.---Yes.

Which you remind him in the next message.---Yes.

10

THE COMMISSIONER: Why were you so keen for him to get on the panel?---Was a resource I could use.

Sorry?---Was a resource I could use.

Use in what sense?---For boring works.

And what other sense?---Whatever activity we needed.

20

I’m sorry?---For whatever activity we needed.

And what about a personal benefit to you?---Yes.

That is to say that you thought or knew he would be compliant and be not adverse to inserting loadings or margins into the contract prices.--- Yes, there might have been suggestions from Mr Rahme around the proposals.

How did you know that he would be likely to be compliant with any request to corruptly load contract prices?---I didn’t know he’d be compliant.

30

Sorry, I can’t hear you.---I didn’t know he would be compliant.

I’m sorry, I think we’re at cross purposes. I think one reason you were chasing him up and keen for him to succeed in the tender, you regarded he’d be a resource. Is that right?---Yes.

He could do the work.---Yes, Commissioner.

40

But he would also be a resource for you personally too. Wouldn’t he?  
---Yes, Commissioner.

And that was part of your motivation for chasing him up.---I don’t believe so.

You don’t believe so?---No.

But didn’t you have in mind that you would, as you did do in subsequent years, entice him, persuade him to add a margin into the contract prices for

your benefit?---I believe the word ‘entice’ would be strong, in that sense, there was proposals – sorry.

Yes, it may be strong. But that’s the word I’m using.---Okay. Yes.

Would you agree that you had in mind that you’d be able to entice him?  
---Not really.

Pardon?---No, Commissioner.

10

No.---You’re using the word ‘entice’ and I don’t agree with that word.

All right.---I’m happy to - - -

Well, what word would you use?---I’m happy to say there was proposals put forward. I was happy to entertain the proposal.

Happy to what?---Entertain the proposal.

20

Entertain?---Yes, and some of it followed through.

And that you thought he’d be happy to entertain loading the contract prices as you would ask?---I don’t believe I, as I would ask, Commissioner. It was a discussion we had.

Well, you would – you were confident that he would load the contract prices by discussion with you.---Yes, Commissioner.

30

So that you would potentially benefit from that arrangement.---We, we both would, Commissioner.

You both would.---Yes, Commissioner.

I see. Thank you.

MR DOWNING: If we could go back then to the WhatsApp exchange, so I took you to the message on 4 October at 10.51 where you remind him that it closed at Friday at 4.00pm, sorry, at 1400 hours.---Yes, Counsel.

40

And on the same – I withdraw that. Actually, on the 6<sup>th</sup>, so the closing date at 3.06 seems you next get a response, and Mr Rahme actually says, “Obviously we missed the boat.”---Yes.

So he was late and had missed the deadline.---I believe so.

But it’s correct, isn’t it, that you then assisted him in getting his tender in?  
---No.

No?---(No Audible Reply)

All right. Have a look at the next message on 6 October at 3.08pm, after he says, "Obviously we've missed the boat," you respond, "Yes, mate. That was a five-year boat with no hurdles i our way." I take it 'i' was a typo and should be 'in'.---Could have been.

10 First of all, was the Maintenance Panel contract one where once a contractor was on the panel it was on for five years?---Three plus one plus one option.

Right, so in effect if the options were executed, five years.---Yes.

So here, where you were referring to it being a 'five-year boat', what you were referring to was that he now missed out on getting his tender in for a five-year contract with the RMS.---Yes. As he said, he's missed it.

And you say, "A five-year boat with no hurdles in our way." Now, you used 'our', what were you referring to?---Him and I.

20 In the sense that in your way to - - -?---Grow.

- - - continue for him to get work?---Yes.

And for you to benefit from it.---Both.

All right. So Mr Rahme then responds at 3.11, "Oops." And you respond, same day, 3.12, "Oops doesn't begin to demonstrate it. This would given access to all NSW Government panels and works."---Yes.

30 Were you suggesting there that by getting on this panel, that he might then be able to get onto other panels?---Use it as a reference to get onto other panels.

So that, in a way, through your assistance, he would then be able to access other government work?---Yeah, across.

40 Did you have a view that if he might get up, if Lancomm might then secure other government panel works, that in some way Mr Rahme and Lancomm might be indebted to you?---No, it was just, it was just if you got this as a reference, you may be able to apply for other panels in the future.

Do you see then at 3.24, same day, you say, "Mate, unless you can get a tender there before 6.00pm tonight because they only schedule to open the box Monday morn at 7.00 and it's in a locked security office with no access unless security is there."---Ah hmm.

And read through the messages as you go down the page. It's correct, isn't it, that what you do is indicate that even though he'd missed the deadline

that he could get it in and needed to drop it off effectively as soon as possible.---Yes.

You say at 3.52 on 6 October, “Just get one in.”---Yes.

And Mr Rahme responds at 4.36, “Working on it.” See that?---Yes.

10 And then on the 9<sup>th</sup>, so now the following Monday, at 1.39, you say, “You need to populate Form A urgently and follow the criteria. You owe me big time now. You will get a letter today or tomorrow asking for your Form A criteria.”---Yes.

And do you recall that he had got his tender in but it was lacking in some of the paperwork?---I believe so.

So that he still had to submit material in order to satisfy the criteria for, to be on, well, what are known as Form A criteria.---Yes.

20 And if we go over the page, please. On the 11<sup>th</sup>, so now a couple of days later again, he says he can have it done by lunch tomorrow. You see that? ---Yes.

30 And then on the 12<sup>th</sup>, at 7.38am, you respond this way, “To be honest, mate, you were supposed to give me that over the weekend. I’m not sure if the review panel will accept it now, but I will try and see. For the review of Form A, Lancomm scored a zero, which was the most important part of demonstrating experience, responsiveness and flexibility. The average was 80 out of 100. So how do I justify pushing for Lancomm to be in the panel? So do the Form A, and if I am in any way able to pull this off, it will be a freaking miracle.”---Yes.

So it’s the case, isn’t it, that on the actual scoring under the criteria that applied for the panel, that Lancomm scored a zero for this particular criteria.---Yes.

And what you were doing was trying to assist him in getting the paperwork in as soon as possible so that you could justify pushing for Lancomm to be put on the first category A of the panel.---Yes.

40 And you refer there to you having to, in effect, justify for pushing for Lancomm to be on the panel because you wanted Mr Rahme to be under no misapprehension that you were the one responsible for Lancomm getting on, didn’t you?---Yes, I did.

And you’ll see on the 12<sup>th</sup>, same day, at 7.44am, Mr Rahme says, “Not to worry, Craig. Just let it go. To be honest, we are very busy with our current clients.” Do you see that?---Yes.

And at 9.06, same day, you respond, “Okay.” And then 9.13, you say, in the next message, “If that’s how you view it, mate, because it was on a platter for you, so don’t think it would have been a waste.”---Yes.

What do you mean it would have been, sorry, “because it was on a platter for you”?---For him to grow.

Sorry, for him to grow his business?---For him to grow, grow, yes, in what he wanted, what he was pursuing.

10

You don’t think he meant that, in effect, the work would be on a platter because you’d be ensuring he got it?---No.

Then on the 12<sup>th</sup>, at 9.18, Mr Rahme says, “Do you blame me for doubting? Track record over the five years speaks for itself. What you’re failing to see is that this was mainly for you. Didn’t worry me whatsoever whether we were on a panel or not. Anyways, take care.” So do you recall getting that message?---No, but I’m reading it.

20

Well, looking at it, it’s correct, isn’t it, that Mr Rahme was suggesting that, in effect, you were pushing for him to be on the panel for your own reasons, for your benefit.---No. Mr Rahme always pushed for work.

Have a look at the next message, please, 12 October, 2017, at 9.23am, you say, “Okay. Well, glad to hear things are going so well. I am okay where I am, but always on the lookout for opportunities where I may be able to assist Lancomm, which in turn may or may not have some benefits. So it is what” – sorry. “So it is what it is and if you have no interest because of your current platter, then no hard feelings. All good.” See that?---Yes.

30

Now, in that message, what were you referring to in saying that, in effect, that you always look out for opportunities where you can assist Lancomm, which in turn may or may not have some benefits?---Exactly that.

Benefits to who?---Both of us.

Now, have a look down, please, on 23 October, 2017, 3.37pm. Do you see there you send to Mr Rahme a JPEG?---Yes.

40

And if we could go, please, to page 18 – I withdraw that. Sorry. Can we go back, please? Can we go back to page 17? It’s actually Mr Rahme sending the JPEG to you. I don’t want to mislead you. So 23 October, 2017, 3.37, you’ll see it says “Joe” not “Craig.”---Yes.

And if we go to the next page, please. Do you recall that what Mr Rahme sent you was a screenshot of the email from Mr Dubois with a letter of acceptance?---May very well have been.

And he asked, if you go back to page 17, at 3.38, “Are we in?” Do you see that?---3.38.

3.38pm, 23 October, 2017.---Yes.

So this was the day that the results of the eTender were made known to people who had made the two categories on the panel?---Yes.

10 And you say, at 3.52, “What the hell does it say? Do what it says. Bloody hell.”---Yes.

And what was required, what you were referring to was completing the paperwork to confirm acceptance of being on the - - -?---May have, very well have.

Well, go back, please, to the screenshot at page 18. You’ll see it says, “Please complete two of the attached instrument of agreement and return to the RMS within 14 days of the date of the letter.”---Yes.

20 And do you see then, Mr Rahme at 3.55 on the same days says, “Okay, just didn’t want to waste time working on it. Was sent out by mistake.” Do you see that?---Yes.

And then at same day, 3.55, you message, “Told you. If this works, you will have to hand over your first born.”---Yes.

So you were making it plain to him that he was indebted to you as a result of - - -?---It was a joke.

30 - - - you getting him on the job – sorry – getting him on the panel.---It was a joke, Counsel.

Now, look ahead, please, to 15 November, 2017. Do you see you send, on that occasion, it appears, a JPEG photograph?---Yes, Counsel.

5.45.---Yes, Counsel.

40 And if we go ahead, please, to page 19, you will see the image. It was a photo of a broken iPhone.---Yes.

Was that your way of indicating to him that you wanted a phone?---No. It was, “Have you got anything old?” I think the message was said, “Have you got anything that’s used?”

And if we go back, please, to page 17. On the 15<sup>th</sup>, the minute after, Mr Rahme responds, “I’ll have a look at let you know. Otherwise, if you can hold out for a couple of weeks I’ll have a spare iPhone 6.”---Yes. It was anything old that he had laying around.



Can you recall whether you'd spoken to Mr Rahme at the time and indicated that it was the phone of one of your kids?---Might have been.

And you respond same day, 5.46, "No stress. Just if there is one, mate."  
---Yes. If he had an old one laying around the office which was used, happy to - - -

10 Now, just thinking about the process by which Mr Rahme came to submit his tender for the Maintenance Panel, you chased and nagged and in effect nudged him to put his tender in. Correct?---That's a bit strong.

What would you say?---I just asked how it was going.

Well, you followed him up, and even when he missed the deadline you assisted him to ultimately get the tender submitted, correct?---No, I don't believe assisted him. Yeah, I - - -

20 How many others that you can recall of the tenderers for category A missed the actual deadline and then got their paperwork in later?---I don't know.

Can you recall anyone else that came to you and asked if you could perhaps permit them to put in part of the paperwork afterwards?---No.

Isn't it the case that, as far as Mr Rahme, the primary reason for you pushing for Lancomm to be on the panel was so that you could direct work the way of Lancomm in a easier manner?---Ah hmm.

30 Do you agree?---Yes.

And that it would make it easier ultimately, once that work had been done, for you to get money back through Mr Rahme in the form of kickbacks.  
---Oh, was a mutual benefit.

Right, a mutual benefit. I'm not suggesting all of it went to him, sorry, went to you.---Yes.

40 But that was the primary reason you wanted Lancomm, as opposed to any other company doing similar works, on the Maintenance Panel, correct?  
---Not really. It was a specialised activity that he delivered.

Did you go to market to try and find any others that did that sort of work?  
---The market was limited because many of the resources were tied up on what was the rollout of the NBN.

But did you go to market to try and find others?---No. Well, I'm going to the, the eTender to market, that's going to market.

Thinking just about the work that he did – which was predominantly underbore type works, correct?---Ah hmm, yes.

Did you go and seek that anyone else, for instance, any other company that did underbore work, did you invite any other company to submit a tender?

---No, it was public tender.

10 But even though it was a public tender, you did go out of your way to make Mr Rahme aware of it and to make sure that he got his tender in.---Yeah, we had discussions about it, yes.

But no other company that you can recall was contacted by you with a view to seeing whether it might submit a tender?---No.

Can you recall whether you had similar communications with any of the other companies that you were dealing with prior to October 2017? That is, either AA Steel or S A Masters, as far as them putting in tenders?---I don't recall but (not transcribable) may have.

20 Were you similarly encouraging them to put in their tenders?---I may have.

Now, wasn't getting your preferred tenderers onto the Maintenance Panel a way of perhaps limiting the scrutiny that might apply to you using those people as resources for the purposes of RMS contracts?---No, anybody that was applied was reviewed.

30 But thinking back, for instance, to your message, if we go back to page 16, 6 October, 2017 at 3.08pm, you say, "Yes, mate. That was a five-year boat with no hurdles i our way."---Yep.

I think you've accepted it was 'in our way'. Weren't you suggesting with that that in effect by getting on the panel, it would have made it very easy and without a lot of red tape involved for them to then be awarded RMS work in the future?---Either way they could be awarded, if it's not on the panel or not on the panel.

40 All right. Just a couple of other brief matters, Mr Steyn. Just thinking back to Mr Masters, I've asked you about work he might have done at your house, and I've also asked you about Apple products that you obtained from him. Can you recall that at some point he installed some cameras for you at your home?---He assisted me.

Can I ask that you have a look, please, at volume 12.3, page 46. Now, this is an extraction in respect of communications between you and Mr Masters. You had his mobile number.---Ah hmm.

And you would text him from time to time, correct?---Yes.

Do you see, first message on this page, 30 January, 2018. It's a message from you to Mr Masters. "Got a job to install some Mobotix cameras and set up, please, mate. Had a little incident and wife is a little nervous."  
---Yes.

Now, first of all, what are Mobotix cameras?---Was a, a security camera.

And were they cameras that the RMS used?---Yes.

10 Where did you obtain the Mobotix cameras that you were having Mr Masters install at your home?---They were ones taken off sites.

From RMS sites?---Yes.

Did you pay for them?---No, I used them and I returned them to the yard.

So is this the case, that you sourced them, that is you took them from one of - - -?---No, they were used. Old cameras.

20 All right, old cameras.---Yes, taken - - -

Had they been made redundant?---Yes.

Was the RMS throwing them out?---They normally destroy them.

Did you ask permission from anyone to take the cameras?---No. No.

30 So you took the cameras and, is this the case, you supplied them to Mr Masters?---No, I didn't supply them to him. I mounted them up at home and he came and did the technical.

Do you recall, first of all, how many cameras you got?---Four, five I think.

And did you provide them to Mr Masters and say, "These are what I need you to install at my house"?---I mounted them and he came and did, because he had the technical knowledge of how to program.

40 Do you recall that there was an issue with obtaining some housings for them to be installed?---I think one, I needed one housing.

Now, if you see messages five and six, they're messages from you to Mr Masters on 30 January, where you'll see there's some JPEGs, you've sent photos.---Yes.

And if we go, please, to pages 48 and 49. Do you see that – have a look, that's page 48. Was that the box that the Mobotix cameras were in?---Might have been.

Yes. And if you go, please, to the next page, page 49, was this an actual photograph - - -?---Controller.

- - - of the controller?---Yes.

Now, it's still in the box.---Yes.

Do you maintain that these were things that were being thrown out by the RMS?---No, there was a, there was an upgrade of technology.

10

So were they new unused products?---Correct.

All right. And so you sent these photos to Mr Masters, do you recall?  
---Yes.

And if you go back, please, to page 46, you'll see message number 8 on the 30<sup>th</sup> of January. He asks whether you want them in by the weekend.---Yes.

20

Message number 9, you respond, "No, when you have some time, mate."  
---Yes.

And then if you go ahead, please, to page 47, message number 18. Do you see Mr Masters messages you, indicates he's waiting for camera housings?  
---Yes.

So did you ask him to source the camera housings so that it could be installed?---Yes.

30

And he provided them, I take it?---Yes.

Without you paying?---Yes.

And if we go ahead, please, to message number 20. You'll see Mr Masters indicates he picked up the Mobotix gear from the post office.---Yes.

And that was the housing, correct?---Yes.

40

And if you go, please, you'll see there's a JPEG. Go to page 50. You'll recall that was a photo he sent you of what he received from Mobotix, being the housing for this particular camera?---Yes.

And then if we go ahead, please, back to page 47. If you could go to message number 21, please. Do you see that's a 24 March, 2018 message from you to Mr Masters, where you say you've figured out, you have to tell the system hardware configuration, admin menu, and there's a JPEG attached?---Yes.

Do you recall that by then it had been installed by Mr Masters and you were having some issues with it working?---Yes.

And then you'll see there are two JPEGs attached to messages 21 and 22 on 24 March. And if you go ahead, please, to page 51, you sent him an image of the software now working. So the cameras were in and they were working.---Yes.

10 And similarly, if you go to page number 52, that was also a picture of it working?---Yes.

So, by 24 March, Mr Masters had been to the house with the housings he'd sourced and he installed the cameras for you and you had now been able to set them up and get them to work?---Yes.

Now, do you recall whether Mr Masters may have sought some form of payment for this work?---I don't think so.

20 Do you recall if he may have been compensated in some way through issuing a bill to the RMS?---I don't believe so.

All right. If we could go, please, same volume, to page 137, 12.2, page 137. Oh, I apologise, it is a different volume. So 12.2, page 137. Do you see this is an invoice from Mr Masters, 12 February, 2018. So, in that period from when you first communicated with him about putting in the Mobotix cameras, but before, it seems, they were installed on 24 March, 12 February, 2018, and there is a tax invoice from Mr Masters for, "Camera testing and trials re. Mobotix, three days and two hours in office." And it's a sum of \$955.35.---Yes.

30 As best you are able to assist us, does that invoice relate to him actually billing you for the work installing the Mobotix cameras at your home?---I don't believe so.

Do you recall then putting in Mobotix cameras in February 2018 somewhere else?---Testing or trails. I believe he was working on some Mobotix cameras for the yard.

40 But isn't your evidence that by February 2018 these were, in effect, old redundant pieces of equipment?---Yeah. He was testing them to see if they still worked, if it was still viable to use them in the yard.

Do you deny that you ever – well, I withdraw that. Do you recall ever suggesting to him that he might issue an invoice and make it look like he was doing work on the Mobotix cameras for the RMS when in fact it related to work at your house?---No.

So, you believe this was a genuine invoice for work he was doing in testing and trailing Mobotix in February 2018?---Yes. For the yard.

Thank you. Earlier this morning I asked you questions about a car that you had sold to Mr Manuel.---Yes.

And you indicated that you recall he had paid, and you thought perhaps 25 or \$30,000?---Yes.

10 Can we go, please, to volume 10.5, page 2? You'll see that this is the bank statement from the CBA for PMD Consulting.---Yes.

And you'll see this page is for May to June 2018. But if we go, please, to the next page, you'll see this covers the period 9 June to 28 June, and I'm going to suggest, 2018?---Okay.

Do you see on 24 June there is a transfer into, so there's a credit of \$20,000 and it's denoted as, "PMD vehicle purch"?---Yes.

20 And then on 24 June, there's a debit out of the PMD account for \$20,000 and it's described as, "Toyota purchase 1."---Yes.

Was it a Toyota ute that you were selling to Mr Manuel?---Correct.

And this would indicate that it was actually a payment not from him in a personal account but through PMD, that you'd received the \$20,000 for the sale of the ute.---I don't know where it came from, which account.

30 Did you speak to either your wife or Mr Manuel about it being paid through PMD?---No.

Do you know who ultimately made the transfer?---I believe Mr Manuel would have been approving the transfer to go.

Did your wife typically assist him with internet banking?---Yes.

40 So you deny that you ever had a conversation with him where you said, "Look, buy it from me and pay through PMD"?---No, I, I believe he was going to register it under his company.

So this is the company that you've told us, PMD, that originally started out with Mr Duchesne - - -?---Correct.

- - - and did the quality works.---I don't know if Mr Duchesne did any quality works, as I said.

But, sorry, PMD did.---Yes.

And I took you to those invoices earlier.---Correct.

All right. Sorry, just one other matter in respect of the Heavy Vehicle Maintenance Panel.---Sure.

If we could go, please, to volume 15.5, page 16. And do you see this is a document from WSP but to Mr Hayes in respect of the Tender Evaluation Committee?---Yes.

10 And who was on the Tender Evaluation Committee?---I believe it was myself, Mr Dubois, the representative from WSP.

That's Mr Chehoud?---Yes. I think Jai.

Have a look, please, on page 19, if we could go to page 19, please. And do you see these are the signatures of the people that were on the committee, providing a recommendation as to who should be approved?---Yes.

20 And you were one of those signatories.---Yes.

And if we could go, please, to page 18, do you see one of the things that you were noting as signing off on that was that you had no conflict of interest either actual or potential, when it came to carrying out your duties in the tender assessment?---Yes, Counsel.

And you knew you had an actual conflict, didn't you?---Yes, Counsel.

30 In that you were actually promoting the appointment of a number of companies that you'd been getting work for years - - -?---Yes, Counsel.

- - - and had been paying kickbacks to you.---Yes.

Now was one of the requirements of companies that were to be appointed to the panel that they had to have 12 months experience in doing RMS work? ---I don't recall, Counsel. Maybe (not transcribable)

40 Do you recall whether, whose – I withdraw that. If we could go back please to volume 15.1, page 320. Do you see under Tender Details – sorry, if we go back to 319, just to orientate you again. It's the notice of the listing of the tender on the eTendering website.---Yes, Counsel.

I've taken you there before. And then if we go to 320, under Tender Details, what it provides three paragraphs down is "The eligibility requirements to tender for category A work requires you to demonstrate that you have carried out similar works for heavy vehicle enforcement programs for Roads and Maritime in the last 12 months."---Yes, Counsel.

Do you know who came up with that as being an eligibility requirements?  
---No, Counsel.

Is that something that you might have proposed?---No, Counsel.

10 Would you agree that by requiring that that be an eligibility requirement – I withdraw that. That that eligibility requirement had the effect that it was really only the companies that had been doing the work for you in the past that were ever going to be capable of actually putting in a tender.---Mmm, no.

Well, how would a company that was skilled in doing work in their field but had not done work in the last 12 months for the RMS going to be able to put in a tender?---They are the companies that can put in for that that are currently working.

Right, but did any of those companies actually put in tenders?---Don't know. Don't think so.

20 So in effect, wasn't it the case that it was only the body of companies dealing with your area of works that you'd dealt with in the last 12 months that were going to be capable of putting in a tender?---No, there's, as I said, there's other companies at work on other panels that had the option to submit.

But none of them did?---No.

30 All right. Did you know at the time of signing whether Mr Dubois also had a conflict, in the sense that he also had a relationship with his tenderers, where he'd been providing work to them and they'd been providing some benefits to him?---Yeah (not transcribable) I don't know about benefits to him but, yeah, I believe he might have had some personal relationship.

Finally, just thinking about Mr Soliman - - -?---Yes.

- - - in the period where he was your manager. Was he aware at any time, based on anything you had said to him of your relationship first of all with Mr Rahme and Lancomm?---Don't think so.

40 Mr Alexander or Ms Alexander and AA Steel?---No.

Mr Masters and S A Masters Electrical?---No.

Or Mr Duchesne and M&M Inspections?---No.

Had Mr Soliman ever said anything to you to indicate that he had some concern about the nature of your relationship with any of those contractors?  
---No.



All right. And as far as the various contractors are concerned, when did you last speak to Mr Alexander?---I believe it would have been May two thousand and, what are we, '20.

And in what context?---It was just, "How you going?" and I think the last comment was he doesn't want to be seen anywhere with me.

10 And you've given some evidence earlier that you did have a discussion with him after the search warrants were executed in June 2019 about the nature of the moneys that had been paid by either the Alexanders or AA Steel, correct?---Yes. Yes.

The discussion where you suggested that it would be, it was treated as a loan.---Could be regarded, yes.

And was there any further communications from then through to - - -?  
---Today?

20 - - - 2020? You've just described a discussion in about March 2020 where you say Mr Alexander - - -?---May, May, May, I think it was April/May 2020.

All right. And any other dealings since then or communications?---No. No.

What about Mr Rahme? When were you last in communication with him?  
---I believe it would be a couple of months ago.

30 And what was the nature of that communication?---It was - - -

First of all, who contacted who?---Mr Rahme contacted me.

And what was said?---He just mentioned that he had been subpoenaed by ICAC.

Did he say something about having been here?---No.

40 At that point, did he say that he had been required to attend?---No, he just said he had to submit some document.

And what else was said in the course of that discussion? What did you say to him?---I don't think I said much about it because I said I can't talk about it.

So he calls you and says that he's been required to put in some documents.  
---Yes.

Did he ask you anything else beyond that that you can recall?---No.

And you say to him, “We can’t talk,” words to that effect?---(not transcribable) can talk about how you’re going (not transcribable) but can’t talk about that.

And was there nothing else said - - -?---No.

- - - in relation to RMS work?---No.

10 What about Mr Masters? When did you last communicate with him?  
---Maybe over a year, where I just texted him and asked him for some advice on a connection.

To do with an electrical connection at home?---Correct, correct.

And have you had any communications with him in respect of RMS work in recent times?---No, no.

20 And finally, Mr Duchesne, when was the last communication you had with him?---I think that might be November, 2019.

And what was the nature of that communication?---He attended a, a weekend away at my parent’s house.

Is that on the Gold Coast?---Yes.

But any discussions about RMS work?---No.

30 Or evidence to this Commission?---No.

Commissioner, thank you. They’re the questions I have for Mr Steyn. The proposal is that we now defer any questions from other parties until the evidence from each of the contractors is in. So, that will mean deferring for some time because there will be some – I’m referring not just to the contractors that relate specific to Mr Steyn but also to the contractors that did work Mr Dubois, but also some work for Mr Steyn.

40 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, very well. We’ll deal with that programming matter in due course. Just before we finish today, Mr Steyn, earlier in your evidence you acknowledge that throughout your employment with RTA and then RMS, you were not to misuse your position.--- Yes.

And you were bound to act ethically.---Yes, Counsel.

And I think you have made it clear in your evidence, you breached that obligation or duty many, many times over the years.---Yes, Commissioner.

Over quite a few years. Is that right?---Yes, Commissioner.

And I think you have also accepted that through your corrupt dealings you would have received hundreds of thousands of dollars over those years.  
---Yes, Commissioner.

And you were able to do that, as I understand it, through having established your system of operation, which seemed to enable you to be able to deal with contractors and have them load the contract prices with kickbacks, as we've called them, which would benefit you. Is that right?---Yes,  
10 Commissioner.

And essentially the system continued, as has been described in evidence, and the way in which quotes are given, invoices are rendered, extra corrupt payment is added into it, and in due course, the contracts made and then performed, and that was the system that repeated itself over and over again.  
---Yes, Commissioner.

Do I understand that no one in management ever seemed to have picked up on the scheme that you were operating?---Yes, Commissioner.  
20

Sorry?---Yes, Commissioner.

And the more often you did this without anyone picking up on the scheme, the more you were encouraged to just keep going, I presume. Is that the position?---Yes, Commissioner.

Hmm?---Yes, Commissioner.

It was easy money, really, because there didn't seem to be anybody policing the contracting system. Is that right?---Yes, Commissioner.  
30

Mr Soliman doesn't sound like he was any problem to you, is that right, in terms of continuing this system?---No.

Never spoke to you about it?---No, Commissioner.

I take it, however, that you did continue not only because you could, because no one was stopping you or picking up on the scheme, but because you benefitted greatly from it. Is that right?---Yes, Commissioner.  
40

Nobody forced you to do it?---No, Commissioner.

And the only reason that you stopped doing it was when the Commission executed search warrants on your premises. Is that right?---Ah hmm. Yes, Commissioner.

Earlier in your evidence, you said that it was your exposure to Mr Dubois that was a primary factor in you acting corruptly. Do you remember saying that?---Yes, Commissioner.

You said words to the effect that you got caught up in a corrupt scheme. Is that right?---Yes. To a larger scale, yes.

But I think as you've now frankly conceded, you weren't caught up in anything that you didn't want to do.---Yes, Commissioner.

10

So that, from first to last, your involvement in the corrupt dealing, that is, corruptly misusing your position, was something you choose to do, you chose to do.---Yes, Commissioner.

Okay. Are you presently employed?---I don't think so.

I'm sorry?---I was. Not anymore.

I can't hear you.---I was, Commissioner.

20

When did you last work?---A week or two weeks ago.

What work were you doing then, up till then?---Just in the restoration business.

I'm sorry?---Restoration business.

Were you in an employed capacity, or working for yourself, or - - -?---No, employed capacity.

30

Employed. Well, what did that work involve?---Cleaning mould, rectifying, structural drying.

And has any work that you've undertaken since June 2019 had any similarity to the work that you were doing with RMS?---No.

Did it ever involve you in contract work, that is to say negotiating contracts? ---No.

40

All right. Now, Mr Clark, you heard what Counsel Assisting has said about the intended program. It's partly, as I understand it, intended to stand your witness down so that other evidence can be taken which may or may not affect his interest, and that would provide your client with the opportunity of hearing the evidence and responding to it if he wishes.

MR CLARK: Thank you, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Do you have anything to say about that course of action?

MR CLARK: Nothing, as I'm content with that course of action.

THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Is there anything else you – do you want to ask your client any questions now, or do you want to - - -

MR CLARK: Not at this stage. Thank you, Commissioner.

10

THE COMMISSIONER: No, very well.

MR CLARK: The only thing I would ask, Commissioner, is that he's going to stand down - - -

THE COMMISSIONER: Sorry, again, could you use the microphone?

20

MR CLARK: Oh, I'm sorry. The only thing I was going to ask, Commissioner, on the basis of the fact that Mr Steyn is going to stand down now and there are further witnesses to be called, could he be excused from attending, provided he's legally represented here during the next series of witnesses that are being called?

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Clark. I don't see a problem with that.

MR CLARK: Thank you.

MR DOWNING: I have no difficulty with it, Commissioner.

30

THE COMMISSIONER: No, it's a matter for him.

MR DOWNING: Whether he, Mr Steyn, wishes to stay and hear the witnesses, because they will be, for instance, the next witness is Mr Masters, entirely a matter for him, but there's no difficulty with him legally represented and appearing in that manner, from my perspective.

40

THE COMMISSIONER: All right, thank you. Mr Steyn, you'll be able to go today. You can stay or go as you please. It's entirely a matter for you, if you want to stay, if you think it's in your interest to stay and hear the other witnesses, or you can go, whatever. You have your legal representative here, in any event. So you will be required to return at some date in the future, and you'll be notified. So the summons that brings you here to give evidence today still continues to operate. In other words, to require you to attend again in the future at some point in time.---Yes, Commissioner.

Thank you. You may go.

**THE WITNESS STOOD DOWN**

**[2.53pm]**

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Downing.

MS SPRUCE: Commissioner, the next witness is Mr Masters.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Now, Mr Storie, is Mr Storie here?

10 MR STORIE: Yes, I am, Commissioner. Thank you.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Storie, as I understand it, you seek leave to appear for Mr Masters, is that right?

MR STORIE: That's correct.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I grant leave, Mr Storie. Thank you, Mr Masters. Ms Spruce. Now, if you wouldn't mind just standing.

20 MR MASTERS: Sorry.

THE COMMISSIONER: Do you take an oath or an affirmation?

MR MASTERS: Affirmation, please.

THE COMMISSIONER: Affirmation. I'll have my associate administer that affirmation.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, now, Mr Storie.

MR STORIE: Yes, Your Honour. I just wanted to - - -

THE COMMISSIONER: Just use the microphone if you would, please.

10 MR STORIE: I apologise, Commissioner. I just wanted to place on the record my objection and if Your Honour could possibly make a blanket order for the questions which follow.

THE COMMISSIONER: You seek a declaration under section 38 of the Act?

MR STORIE: That's correct, yes.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Storie. Mr Storie, have you explained to Mr Masters what the provisions of the Act are in that regard?

MR STORIE: Generally, Commissioner, yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Well, Mr Masters, would you state your full name?---Steven Allan Masters.

30 Mr Masters, in the exchange I've just had with Mr Storie, who appears for you, a witness is entitled to object to answering questions or producing documents or other things, but the witness must firstly, nonetheless answer the questions and, secondly, must do so truthfully. The evidence, once objected to, cannot be used against you in other proceedings. For that purpose, a declaration is often sought that all answers are covered by the objection. You understand?---So is that the case?

40 The only exception in which the evidence could be used against you would be if you commit an offence under the Independent Commission Against Corruption Act. An offence would be, for example, a witness who intentionally gives answers that are untrue, which is called perjury. Then the evidence can be used in a prosecution for an offence of that kind or any other offence under the Independent Commission Against Corruption Act, but otherwise it does operate to protect you in the way I've indicated. Do you understand?---Yes.

All right. I make a declaration pursuant to section 38 of the Independent Commission Against Corruption Act. I declare that all answers given by the witness, Mr Masters, any documents or things that he may be required to produce during the course of his evidence in this public inquiry are to be taken as having been given under objection. Accordingly, there is no need

for Mr Masters to take individual objections to any particular answer given or document or thing produced.

**DIRECTION AS TO OBJECTIONS BY WITNESS: I MAKE A DECLARATION PURSUANT TO SECTION 38 OF THE INDEPENDENT COMMISSION AGAINST CORRUPTION ACT. I DECLARE THAT ALL ANSWERS GIVEN BY THE WITNESS, MR MASTERS, ANY DOCUMENTS OR THINGS THAT HE MAY BE REQUIRED TO PRODUCE DURING THE COURSE OF HIS EVIDENCE IN THIS PUBLIC INQUIRY ARE TO BE TAKEN AS HAVING BEEN GIVEN UNDER OBJECTION. ACCORDINGLY, THERE IS NO NEED FOR MR MASTERS TO TAKE INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS TO ANY PARTICULAR ANSWER GIVEN OR DOCUMENT OR THING PRODUCED.**

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms Spruce.

20 MS SPRUCE: Mr Masters, could you state your full name, please.---Steven Allan Masters.

And could you please state your date of birth?---[REDACTED], '74.

Mr Masters, it's correct, isn't it, that you left school in year 11 and then completed an apprenticeship as an electrician?---Yes.

30 And it's correct that after becoming a qualified electrician, you initially began working for somebody else?---Yes.

And it's correct that thereafter you started your own business?---A couple of jobs, but yes.

Yes. And it's correct that, initially, you ran your own business as a sole trader?---Yep.

And it's correct, isn't it, that in 2008 you registered a company, S A Masters Electrical Services?---Yes.

40 And it's correct that from 2008 on you've conducted your electrician business through that company?---Yes.

And, Mr Masters, it's correct that you don't have any employees and never have had any employees in that company?---Just, oh, subcontractors and I've had a couple of apprentices, but they've been like mature age apprentices and stuff.



THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Masters, there is a microphone there. If you wouldn't mind just speaking towards that microphone. Please, if you'd keep your voice up so that - - -?---Sorry. Sorry.

- - - the person in the back of the room can hear you.---Okay.

MS SPRUCE: And, Mr Masters, it's correct that between 2004 and 2019, you've done contract work, first for the RTA and subsequently the RMS?  
---Yes.

10

And, Mr Masters, it's correct that in that period I've just indicated, 2004 to 2019, you've during that time been married?---Yes.

And you have three children?---Yes.

And you've been the sole breadwinner for that period?---Yes.

And it's correct that your sole source of income has been the income you have generated through your business, S A Masters Electrical?---Yes, yes.

20

Mr Masters, I'm going to ask you now to just turn your mind to the period when you first started doing work for the RTA in 2004. Now, it's correct, isn't it, that you initially did work for an in-house electrical branch within the RTA?---Yes.

And it's correct that that was known as the Electrical Projects Group?  
---Yes.

30

And it's the case, isn't it, that you knew an acquaintance who was employed by the RTA in that branch?---Yes.

And that it was through that acquaintance that you first began obtaining work for the RTA?---Yes.

And, Mr Masters, it's the case that you hold a level 2 certification as an electrician?---Yes.

40

And could you just explain what a level 2 certification, what sort of work that enables you to perform?---Street lighting connections to the street, connections to premises.

Thank you. And so what sort of work was it that you were obtaining from 2004 on from the in-house electrical group within the RTA?---Connections, like level 2 work, and other work, but yeah.

I beg your pardon?---And other work.

So, level 2 certification work, let's start with that.---Yep, yep.

Is it the case that there was no level 2 certified electricians within the in-house electrical branch?---Yes.

So that when the RTA required level 2 certification, that was work that you would be asked to perform?---Yep.

And you said you were also performing other work.---Yes.

10 Could you explain what the other work was that you did for the in-house electrical branch?---Repairs and maintenance.

Repairs and maintenance. And was there a reason why the in-house electrical branch couldn't do that work themselves?---Too busy.

Too busy. I see. So is it correct - - -?---Overflow.

20 Overflow work. I see. So the work that you were obtaining, even though the RTA had at that time its own internal electrical branch, there was overflow work that they weren't sufficiently resourced to do or work that the in-house branch wasn't qualified to do?---Yes.

And Mr Masters, the Electrical Project Group within the RTA shut down in early 2015. Is that correct?---Yes.

And in the period between 2004 and 2014 to '15 when that in-house group shut down, I take it that all of the work you did for the RTA was for that group?---What do you mean?

30 Did you do work for any other division or branch within the RTA or was your work between 2004 and 2014 all for the in-house electrical branch? ---Might have been the occasional odd job for someone else in the department but mostly, yes.

Predominantly with the in-house electrical branch?---Yes, yeah.

40 And, Mr Masters, once that in-house electrical branch was shut down in 2015, did you continue to do work for what was then the RMS after that point?---Not for, not for 12 months or whatever it was. There was, there was a 12-month break in it, I think.

I see. But after that group shut down, you did ultimately begin to do work again for the RMS?---Yes, yes.

And do you recall how it was that you came to recommence doing work for the RMS after that electrical branch had shut down?---The heavy-vehicle section, Craig and Alex, contacted me because we did the, the installation

work on the generators for the projects group, like, for, Yennora through, through the first division.

So when you're referring to the Yennora group, you're referring to the in-house Electrical Projects Group?---Yes, yes.

Which was located at Yennora, is that correct?---Yeah, sorry.

10 And so is it correct that there was work that you had been doing for the Electrical Projects Group involving generators and that that work continued after the Electrical Projects Group was shut down?---Yes.

And that somebody in Mr Dubois or Mr Steyn's division contacted you to continue doing that work?---Yes.

And do you recall who it was that first contacted you in relation to continuing doing that work?---Not a hundred per cent. It was one of those two.

20 It was either Mr Dubois or Mr Steyn?---Yes.

And at that point had you previously had any dealings with either Mr Dubois or Mr Steyn?---No.

And did you have any personal relationship or knowledge of either of those men?---No.

30 And it's correct, isn't it, that you first started doing work for Mr Dubois and Mr Steyn in their division in around 2014?---Yes.

And, as I understand it, you can correct me if I'm wrong, but although the internal electrical branch shut down entirely in 2015, there was a period in 2014 when it was being phased out?---Yes.

And it's the case, isn't it, that between 2014 and 2019 you did a large amount of contract work for the RMS, which you obtained through Mr Dubois and Mr Steyn?---Yes.

40 And Mr Masters, thinking about that period between 2014 and 2019, is it the case that you worked more for Mr Steyn or Mr Dubois, or did you work equally for both of them, or how was it that you obtained work through Mr Dubois and Mr Steyn?---Probably equally, I'd say.

And Mr Masters, it's the case, isn't it, that in the course of performing work over that period that you developed a friendly relationship with Mr Steyn?---Yeah, working friendly relationship.

A working friendly relationship. Did you socialise outside of work?---No.

Did you have each other's mobile numbers?---Yes.

Did you message each other outside of work?---About stuff not relating to work? Not very often.

Yes, about personal matters or social chitchat.---Not regularly.

10 And when you saw each other at work, was Mr Steyn onsite frequently?  
---Yes.

And you had a good rapport with Mr Steyn?---Yes.

You'd like to share a joke.---Yeah.

You got on well.---Yep.

20 And what about Mr Dubois? Did you develop a friendly relationship with  
Mr Dubois over that period?---Sort of.

Sort of. So less so than with Mr Steyn, is that correct?---Yes.

Did you have Mr Dubois's mobile number?---Yes.

And did you have conversations by text or telephone with Mr Dubois  
outside of work?---Not really.

30 And Mr Masters, just focusing again on that period from 2014 on, when you  
started doing work for Mr Steyn and Mr Dubois, do you have any  
recollection of what the turnover was of S A Masters Electrical Services in  
2014 or the period following?---No.

Could I just show you a document, if I could just show Mr Masters, please,  
the document in volume 12.2 at page 10. Mr Masters, this is an email from  
Dan Gray, who is an RMS employee, on 5 August, 2014, and it's in relation  
to S A Masters Electrical small business request, and you'll see in the body  
of the email, there's a request that S A Masters Electrical be put on the  
small business list, and that their trading terms be 14 days.---Yes.

40 And then if Mr Masters could please be shown the next page, page 11. Mr  
Masters, you see this is a letter from Orion Tax & Accounting Services?  
---Yes.

Do you recognise that as being your accountant?---Yes.

And it's dated 30 May, 2014, and it advises that S A Masters Electrical  
turnover does not exceed \$1 million per year.---Yes.

So does that assist you to recall that in the period of 2014 – or, I withdraw that, that in the year 2014 your business had a turnover of less than a million?---Yes, definitely.

And would it be correct that for the entirety of the period 2014 to 2019 that your business had a turnover of less than a million?---Yes.

10 And would it be correct that for that period, 2014 to 2019, your business had a turnover of less than \$500,000?---There may have been one or two years where it went over that, but other than that, yes, that's correct.

Would you have gone over that by much?---No, probably not, no.

So the turnover would have been under 600,000, at the outside for that period?---I'd say so. Yeah, I'd say so.

All right, so that's the turnover, approximately. And then I take it that during that period, 2014 to 2019, your business was profitable.---Yes.

20 Are you able to give any indication of the sort of profit that your business was making during that period?---No.

All right, now, Mr Masters, when you first commenced working doing contract work for Mr Steyn and Mr Dubois, was there an increase in the amount of work you were receiving from the RMS as compared to the work you'd previously been doing for the Electrical Projects Group?---Yes.

30 And was there a significant increase in the amount of work you were doing at that time?---It increased all the time.

It increased all the time. So between 2014 and 2019, there was a steady trajectory of an increasing amount of work coming your way - - -?---Yep.

- - - from the RMS, is that correct?---Yeah, most of the time it increased.

40 And are you able to explain why it was that there was a steady increase in work over that period?---Only they found out what, what work that I could do and then they would get me more work. So it went from just being generators to fixing waystations and signage, like, you know, electronic signage lights and - - -

So initially you were working on generators, which was the work you'd previously been doing for the Electrical Projects Group?---Yeah, yeah. Yep.

And then you started doing extra works - - -?---Yep.

- - - in relation to signage – what else did you say, I’m sorry?---Like speed signs, power to the roadside cabinets, just like waystation work.

Mr Masters, in 2014 you received payments of about \$15,000 from the RMS.---Yep.

And then in 2015 you received payments of over \$89,000 from the RMS. So that’s a significant increase in the amount of work you’re receiving? ---Yep.

10

And do you say that’s because the type of work that you were doing started to expand?---The type of work that I did I was always able to do. It was what I was asked to do. So I was asked to do more varied work.

You were asked to do more varied work. And then, Mr Masters, I’ve just mentioned that in 2015 you did around 89,000 – you received, I withdraw that, you received around \$89,000 from the RMS. And then in 2016 you received payments of around \$192,000 from the RMS.---Yep.

20

So another significant increase. And are you able to explain why there was that significant increase between 2015 and 2016?---Not without looking at the jobs. It might have either – it’s either more work or it was install work or I’m not sure.

And, Mr Masters, that’s 2016, and then by 2018 you received payments of over \$408,000 from the RMS.---That was all install work.

All install work?---Oh, well, not 100 per cent, but there was a lot more installations going on, you know what I mean?

30

Well, could you explain what you mean by install work?---Well, there was roadside gantries throughout the whole state going on, plus repairs, plus whatever else I was doing, you know what I mean?

So, Mr Masters, you gave evidence a moment ago that the turnover of your business in the relevant period was somewhere between 500 to 600,000, is that correct?---Yep.

40

And so in 2018 I’ve just indicated that you received payments of over \$400,000 from the RMS alone.---Yes.

So it’s the case, isn’t it, that – certainly in 2018 – that the work you were receiving from the RMS accounted for most of your work?---Yes, in that year.

In that year. And in previous years, is it the case that between two thousand and, say, in 2015, ’16 and ’17 that the work you were receiving from the

RMS constituted most of your work?---I don't think it would have been most.

Would it have been a significant proportion?---Yes, yes.

Would it have been more than 50 per cent?---Probably 50, like - - -

Probably 50 per cent.---I'm, I'm, don't have the figures, I don't know.

10 So your best guess is that it was about, RMS work constituted about 50 per cent of the work to your business in 2015, '16 and '17?---Yes.

And then in 2018 it jumps to being close to 100 per cent of your work?  
---Yes.

Mr Masters, did you pay kickbacks to Mr Steyn in return for obtaining work through the RMS in the period between 2016 and 2018?---In the way of phones?

20 I beg your pardon?---In the way of phones, you mean?

Well, did you pay kickbacks in the sense, did you provide him with money, goods, services, favours for free, in return for receiving work through the RMS?---Yeah, not money, but yeah.

You didn't give him money?---No.

Did you give him goods, did you buy things on his behalf?---Yes.

30 What did you purchase for him?---The Apple products that were listed.

You purchased Apple products?---Yes.

We'll come to those later. And did you also provide services to him free of charge?---Yes, yes.

On multiple occasions?---A few, yeah.

40 All right. Mr Masters, you mentioned that you provided services to him. So can I take you first to work that you did on Mr Steyn's home, on his residence in December 2016. Do you recall doing that?---Yes.

And could you just, please, explain how it was that you came to be doing work on Mr Steyn's residence?---I was asked.

You were asked. And can you recall, to the best of your recollection, what it was that Mr Steyn said to you when he asked you to that work?---He was building a house and he wanted to wire it himself, wanted to know whether I

could help him do it, you know, tell him how to do it, so that he could save money. I did a little bit of work on his switchboard. That was it really. Went there a few times.

How many times do you think you went to the house?---More than five, less than 10.

10 And when you went to the house between five and 10 occasions, was that a full day's work or was that for a number of hours?---No, it would have just been a few hours here, a few hours there.

I see. And when Mr Steyn asked you to come and do this work on his house, supervising Mr Steyn's electrical work, did you understand that you were being asked to do that as a favour?---Yep.

Did Mr Steyn actually say to you that he wanted you to do the work free of charge?---No.

20 But you got that impression, is that correct?---Yep.

Are you able to recall what it was that gave you that impression?---No.

And so, Mr Masters, you attend Mr Steyn's residence on five or more occasions, and if Mr Masters could be shown the document at volume 12.3, page 16. Mr Masters, this is a certificate of compliance in relation to electrical work for Mr Steyn's renovation at his home address.---Yes.

Do you recognise that?---(No Audible Reply)

30 And that's a document that you filled out and signed for him?---Yes.

On 17 March, 2017?---Yes.

And that summarises the work that you performed on Mr Steyn's behalf, checking his work, wiring the house. Is that correct?---Yes.

And then on the next page, there is a certification certificate in relation to the installation of smoke detectors?---Yes.

40 And did you install those?---No, I checked them.

Mr Steyn installed them himself but you checked that they were correctly installed, is that right?---Yes.

And so having performed that work, did you then receive any payment from Mr Steyn?---At the start I did, but probably not, that was at the end, so probably not.



So, I'm sorry, when you say that at the start you did, are you suggesting that initially, when you went to the - - -?---I think when I did the switchboard, I think I got some payment.

So in the five to 10 visits, are you saying that in the initial one or two visits you would have received some payment?---Yeah, like, they weren't, sometimes they weren't close together, so, like, maybe like a, a year before that or whatever. I don't know how long it took to build the house, I'm not sure, you know what I mean?

10

THE COMMISSIONER: What was the payment for, Mr Masters?---Oh, just for metering.

About what value?---Hundreds of dollars, you know, a couple hundred dollars.

Right. Thank you.

MS SPRUCE: And, Mr Masters, so you say you've received a couple of  
20 hundred dollars, and was that because you asked Mr Steyn for payment?  
---Yeah, at that point I did, yeah.

So you gave evidence a moment ago that you understood that you were being asked to do work on Mr Steyn's house as a favour.---It become a favour, yeah.

But notwithstanding that you initially asked for payment.---Yeah.

30 And was the payment you asked for at sort of mates rates?---Yeah.

And was it, I take it the payment you asked for was not charging your usual amount that you would charge per hour for your labour?---No. No.

Was it charging significantly less than that?---Yes.

And did you nevertheless make a profit in relation to this work you did on Mr Steyn's house or was it just enough to cover your costs?---No, it would have been barely enough to cover the cost.

40 Barely enough to cover costs. And if Mr Masters could please be shown the document at page 7 of volume 12.3. Mr Masters, this is a tax invoice issued from you to TLE Electrical.---Yes.

I take it TLE Electrical is a supplier of electrical goods.---Yes.

And you have an account with TLE Electrical?---Yes.

And you see here that this is an invoice charged to you but that it's to be delivered to you at Mr Steyn's home address.---Yes.

And in there, the items that have been ordered are a URD Connection Pit Heavy Duty, a lid concrete, and then five white LED downlights.---Yes.

It's thought case, isn't it, that those five downlights you had ordered on behalf of Mr Steyn for use in his renovation?---Yes.

10 And did Mr Steyn pay you for those?---No.

No. Now, just in relation to the other two items, those were items that were required for RMS work, is that correct?---Yeah, I'd say so.

And are you able to explain why you were having those delivered to Mr Steyn's home address?---Probably required onsite, so he was taking them to site, you know what I mean?

20 I see. So, Mr Masters, you've just given evidence that you provided some things to Mr Steyn for free, like the downlights, and that you received some money for the work you did on his house, but only an amount that was barely enough to cover your costs. So why was it that you were doing this work at a significant undervalue for Mr Steyn?---Stay in good with him.

Stay in good with him?---Yep.

And by that do you mean that you needed to stay in his good books in order to continue receiving work through the RMS?---It helps.

30 It helps. All right. And then, Mr Masters, you've mentioned some Apple products - - -?---Yes.

- - - that you purchased on behalf of Mr Steyn, or rather purchased for Mr Steyn.---Yes.

Now, if Mr Masters could please be shown volume 12.4, at page 58. Mr Masters, this is an ANZ bank statement for the S A Masters Electrical Services Pty Ltd.---Yes.

40 So you recognise this as a bank statement pertaining to your company?---Yes.

And it's for the period July 2017. And you can see that, on 10 July, 2017, at the Apple store in [REDACTED], you've made a purchase for \$3,507.95.---Yes.

And are you able to recall what that purchase related to?---No. What was it?

All right. Could Mr Masters please be shown the Apple spreadsheet, the summary document, which is Exhibit 125. Mr Masters, this is a spreadsheet which summarises information that was produced to the Commission by Apple in relation to money spent by you on Apple products in the period July 2017 to November 2018.---Yes.

So if you could just look at order number 1.---Yes.

10 And you'll see there the total invoice price, \$3,507.95. So that's the purchase on your bank statement that I've just shown you.---Yes.

And you'll see there that the purchase was in relation to Apple Pencil and two Apple – I withdraw that. An Apple Pencil, two iPad Pros and a keyboard. Now, does that assist your memory about the items that you purchased in July 2017?---Yeah, that was them.

20 And do you recall which of those items you've bought for Mr Steyn?---One of them. One of them was for myself.

So when you say one of them, there's a number of items there. Is it the case that one of the iPads was for you and one was for Mr Steyn?---Yes.

And is it the case that you also bought an Apple Pencil and a keyboard for Mr Steyn?---I think so.

30 Now, Mr Masters, could you just tell us, to the best of your recollection, what happened when Mr Steyn asked you to purchase these items for him? Was it in a conversation that he asked you to do this?---Yes. Yes.

So could you please, just to the best of your recollection, what were the words he used when he told you that he would like you to purchase these items for him?---I don't remember whether I mentioned to him I was getting one, and he said, "Can you get me one too?"

And so when he said to you, "Can you get me one too?" what did you understand by that?---Can you get him one.

40 Well, did you understand him to mean when you physically go to the Apple store and buy yours, can you also buy one for me and then I'll reimburse you?---No.

No. You understood him, is it correct, to be saying could you buy one for me, and could you bear the cost of it?---Yes.

And do you recall what it was that he said or did that made it clear to you that he was asking you to bear the cost of it?---No, there was no

conversation to say, “Can you get me one and I’ll pay you back,” or, so I gathered that “Can you get me one?” was “Can you get me one?”

And when you gathered that there was no intention on Mr Steyn’s part to pay you back, was that something you gathered before you went and purchased the product, or was it something you gathered afterwards when there was no steps by Mr Steyn to reimburse you?---I don’t know, like, if I ever anticipated getting paid back for it or not.

10 Is it correct that, at the time you went and made the purchase, it was a strong possibility in your mind that you were never going to be reimbursed for this item?---Yes.

Did you consider it likely that you were never going to be reimbursed for this item?---Yes.

And that being the case, why did you do it?---Should never have done it. It was, again, to, he’s giving you work. He just wanted something, you know what I mean?

20

Were you thinking at this time that this was going to be a one-off?---Yeah.

You did?---Yeah.

You thought, this bloke’s giving me a lot of work, I’ve mentioned I’m buying an iPad, he’s asked me to get him one, why not?---Pretty much.

You gave evidence earlier that you’re the sole breadwinner, you’ve got a wife and three children – it was a significant purchase for you, wasn’t it?

30

---Yeah.

But in your mind, it was a worthwhile investment, because it would ease the relationship so that you could continue to get work from the RMS, is that correct?---Continue the relationship, yeah.

Continue the relationship going smoothly.---Yeah.

Did you consider saying no to buying that for him?---I don’t remember if I considered just saying no to him or not.

40

What did you think or what were you afraid would happen if you didn’t agree to buy it for him?---The work would stop.

You were afraid the work would stop. I’m sorry, could you just put the spreadsheet back on? You can leave it up there. All right, so Mr Masters, that first Apple purchase was in July 2017, and you’ve given evidence that you thought it was going to be a one-off purchase. Can I ask you whether

you were surprised when Mr Steyn asked you to buy the iPad for him?  
---Yeah.

You were. Now, do you recall that then in August 2017, so the next month, Mr Steyn now asks you to buy two iPhones for him.---(No Audible Reply)

I'm sorry, you need to give a verbal response for the transcript.---Oh, sorry. Yes. Yes.

10 You do recall that. So if you have a look, Mr Masters, at order 2 on the spreadsheet, you'll see there that in August 2017 you spent another \$2,308 at the Apple Store for the purchase of two iPhone 7s.---Yes.

Now, on this occasion, are both of those iPhone 7s for Mr Steyn?---Yes, I'd say so.

Well, Mr Masters, you're aware, aren't you – I withdraw that. Mr Masters, you use Apple products yourself?---Yes.

20 And you're aware that when you purchase an Apple product like an iPad or an iPhone, it gets registered.---Yes.

So, Mr Masters, if you have a look on order 2 on the spreadsheet that's on the screen, and you go right to the end, you'll see three quarters of the way along that both of those iPhones were registered with Apple.---Yes.

And the first one was registered with the initials BS and an email address of briansteyn@[REDACTED].---Yes.

30 And the second one was registered with the initials CS at Mr Steyn's home address, with the email address of craigsteyn@[REDACTED].---Yes.

So does that assist you to recall that neither of those phones were purchased by you for you?---Yes.

They were both purchased for Mr Steyn.---Yes.

40 All right. So I take it that it was again a conversation where Mr Steyn asked you to buy these items for him?---Was either conversation or a text.

Either in a conversation or a text. And are you able to recall, to the best of your ability, what it was he said on this second occasion, this is one month later, when he's now again asking you to buy him another two items?---I don't remember whether it was a text or a conversation.

Well, putting to one side - - -?---Would have just been, "Hey, can you get me two iPhones? Here's the, what I want," you know what I mean?

Right. And this time, it must have been clear in your mind that he was asking you to foot the bill.---Yes.

Because there had been no repayment in relation to the iPad.---Yes.

So there was no doubt in your mind on this occasion that you were being asked to buy these for him?---(No Audible Reply)

10 So how did you feel about this request?---First one was bad enough, why are you asking for more? You know what I mean? That's pretty much what I thought.

Well, you gave evidence in relation to the first request that you thought it was going to be a one-off.---Yeah.

But now one month later you're being asked again for another significant purchase.---Yep.

20 Of over \$2,000. So you must have been concerned about when this pattern of asking for favours was going to stop?---As it went on, I was.

As it went on you became concerned?---Oh, yeah.

Were you concerned by this point?---I would have been concerned, yeah.

And again can I ask you that why is it that you agreed to buy these iPhones for him?---He was the one giving out work.

30 He was the one giving out work. And so what were you concerned was going to happen if you didn't agree to his request to purchase the iPhones for him?---Well, the work would stop, you know what I mean?

That the work would stop. All right. Now, Mr Masters, do you recall that in October 2017, you put in an application to be accepted onto a heavy vehicle enforcement program panel? There was a tender for what was called the Maintenance Panel.

THE COMMISSIONER: Sorry, I couldn't hear that.

40 MS SPRUCE: I'm sorry, Commissioner. There was a tender in October 2017 in relation to what was called the Maintenance Panel?---Yes.

And do you recall that your company put in an application to be included on the panel?---Yes.

Are you able to recall how it was that you first learnt about the Maintenance Panel?---I think either Alex to Craig said there was going to be a panel

created and one of the other contractors said that, “The panel’s out now, you need to register.”

I see. So, is it correct that either Mr Dubois or Mr Steyn told you about the existence of the panel?---Oh, it might have been, like, prior to it starting, you know what I mean?

Prior to it starting.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Master, could you just keep your voice up a bit?---Yeah, sorry.

Just direct it towards the microphone, please.

MS SPRUCE: And, Mr Masters, you mentioned that one of the other contractors might have said something to you about the panel. Do you recall who that was?---No, I don’t off the top of me head, no.

20 And so you did indeed submit an application to be included on the panel?  
---Yes.

Now, did Mr Steyn or Mr Dubois give you any assistance with the preparation of your tender application of your tender?---No.

And you were successfully appointed onto the panel, is that correct?---Yes.

30 And Mr Masters, that occurred in October 2017, and as I have already indicated to you, in the following year, 2018, the amount of money that you were paid by the RMS increased exponentially. Do you recall that?---Yes, yes.

And at the same time, you’ve started providing Apple products at Mr Steyn’s request to Mr Steyn?---Yes.

So, was there a link in your mind between the Apple products that you were buying for Mr Steyn and your successful application to be included on the Maintenance Panel?---I wouldn’t have thought that I would have been included for that reason, no.

40 Well, what was the reason that you thought you would have been included?  
---From years of experience in what we did.

Well, if you were confident about your inclusion on the panel based on your years of experience, then why was it that you felt compelled to buy Apple products for Mr Steyn when he asked? Why couldn’t you have said no and simply relied on your years of experience to continue to obtain work from the RMS?---I wasn’t just going to rely on that.

You weren't going to rely on that?---No.

Because Mr Steyn was the one giving you the work. That's right, isn't it?  
---Yeah.

And ultimately, if he chose not to give it to you - - -?---It didn't matter whether you're on the panel or not. Just, you didn't get, you didn't get issued a request for quote. You didn't get a chance to quote it, you know what I mean?

10

Now, after you're accepted onto the panel in October 2017, then in January 2018 there's another request by Mr Steyn to buy you Apple products. Do you recall that?---Yes.

If I could have the Apple spreadsheet up on the screen again, please. Now, you see there, Mr Masters, order number 3 in January 2018?---Yes.

This time you spend \$3,817 and this time it's two iPhones, two iPhone cases, some Powerbeats headphones and a wireless charger.---Yes.

20

You recall that?---Yes.

Now, it's the case, isn't it, that all of those products were purchased for Mr Steyn?---Yes.

None of those products were for you?---No.

If Mr Masters could please be shown volume 12.3, page 19. Mr Masters, what is being shown onscreen is a series of text messages which were taken from Mr Steyn's phone.---Yes.

30

And they're text messages between you and Mr Steyn.---Yes.

Now, you see there in number 2 there's a message from you to Mr Steyn saying, "Hey, mate. Let me know what phone models and how many over the weekend."---Yes.

So that suggests, doesn't it, that there's been a conversation already between you and Mr Steyn.---Yeah, there would have been.

40

Where he's asked you to buy phones for him.---Yes.

And are you able to recall now, to the best of your ability, what he said to you in that conversation?---"I want a couple more phones. I'll get you the details."



And, Mr Masters, how were you feeling about these requests by this time?  
---I was feeling under the pump, feeling used, feeling like I was, I don't know, feeling crap.

And in your mind was there any link between particular Apple purchases and specific contracts or pieces of work?---No, no.

10 So it wasn't the case that you thought that if you bought this particular purchase, there was a particular lucrative contract that might come your way?---No, not a specific job.

It wasn't linked in your mind to anything specific.---No.

It was just generally to keep the flow of work coming.---Well, that's what we survive on, getting the next job. You know what I mean?

20 All right. And so going back to these text messages, at line 3, Mr Steyn says to you, "Check your email from Creative Service I sent you on Saturday."---Yep.

Do you recall getting an email from Mr Steyn?---Yeah, I must have, yeah, got it.

And it looks as though the email would have contained the details of the particular phones that he wanted.---Yes. Yes.

Because he was quite specific, wasn't he, when he asked you to buy Apple products for him? He told you exactly what he wanted.---Yes.

30 And then if you look down to message number 8, you'll see there that this is a message to you on 11 January. And he says, "Happy New Year to you and the family, mate. Did you manage to attain those items required for site as yet?"---Yep.

Do you see that?---Yep.

Now, Mr Masters, it wasn't the case, was it, that these items were ever being bought for use on site?---No.

40 They were being bought for Mr Steyn's personal use.---Yes.

And – all right. I withdraw that. Thank you. Now, if we could go back, please, to the spreadsheet. Mr Masters, you'll see there order number 4.  
---Yes.

And this is the next month, so this is one month after the purchase we've just looked at. This is February 2018 and this time you've spent \$3,365.90 at the Apple Store.---Yes.

And you'll see there the product name that this purchase by you was in relation to two HomePods, two AirPods, a drone and a gimbal. Do you recall purchasing those items?---Yes, yeah.

And again, were those items all purchased for Mr Steyn?---Yes.

None of those items were purchased for you?---(No Audible Reply)

10 All right. Now, if Mr Masters could please be shown volume 12.3, page 26. Ms Masters, this is again a text message from Mr Steyn to you on 15 February, 2018, and you'll see there, "Hey, mate. Can you please order the following for site people? Two of each, please."---Yep.

So again there's a reference by Mr Steyn to these being required for people on site. Was it the case that they were required for the site?---No.

No. It was clear to you that they were for Mr Steyn's personal use?---This is how he texted.

20

That was how he texted. It was just a code to make it look legitimate. Is that your understanding?---It's just how he texted most of the, addressed most of the texts.

I see. And then he sends you photos. So at page 27, 28, he sent you photos of exactly what he wants, and then at page 29 there's another text and he adds in to what he's already requested. "And one of this please. So this will only come in March. Thank you, sir." And then he attaches a photo of the gimbal that he's after. And then page 31, please, there's another message to you where he says, "What are your thoughts on this? Shall we get one for you and me and we can drone race in the yard." And then at 32, there's a picture of a drone that he likes the look of, and then at page 33, he sends you another message saying, "This is the more pricey one." And at 34, he attaches a photo of a more expensive drone. And then at 35 he sends you another message, "Is this the one, mate?" And sends you a photo at 36 of a more expensive drone again. And then at 37 you say, "Yeah, that's the one that I'm getting." And so am I correct in understanding from that conversation that the conclusion of it is that you're to buy him the more expensive drone, is that what you understood?---Yeah.

40

And then if Mr Masters could please be shown page 40. So on the same day anything as the previous conversation, Mr Steyn then says to you, "10 K invoice approved form processing, so that should come through shortly." ---Yep.

So that was Mr Steyn's way of saying, wasn't it, "Get me these items and the flow of work will continue." That's how you understood it?---Yeah. That's how I understood it.

And did you also understand that if you didn't get him those items, the flow of work would stop?---Yeah.

Now, Mr Masters, the next Apple purchase was in November 2018. So if we could please have the Apple spreadsheet back. And Mr Masters, you'll see there in order number 5, in November 2018, that this time you spent \$2,198 at the Apple Store.---Yep.

10 And this time there's a purchase of an iPad and some AirPods. There's some other items listed there, but they weren't in stock, so what eventuated was that you bought an iPad and some AirPods. And Mr Masters, those were purchased for Mr Steyn?---Yes.

They weren't for your use. And are you able to recollect how it was that Mr Steyn came to ask you to purchase him these items?---Oh, would have been the same way, either - - -

20 THE COMMISSIONER: Sorry, can't hear you, Mr Masters.---Would have, sorry, would have been the same way, either text or email or conversation.

MS SPRUCE: So Mr Masters, this is now the fifth occasion on which you've been asked to spend thousands of dollars for Mr Steyn at the Apple Store. You must have had in your mind now that this was just a pattern that was not going to stop. Is that - - -?---It's got to stop somewhere.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Masters I cannot hear you.---It's, sorry, it's - - I've asked you a number of times to speak into the microphone and to raise your voice.---Sorry. Thought I was - - -

Please, don't let me have to keep repeating it.---Sorry. Oh, it's got to stop somewhere.

MS SPRUCE: Well, did you ever say anything to Mr Steyn about, is this ever going to stop, is there a limit? Did you raise any concerns with Mr Steyn about having to buy these products for him?---Yeah, I can't keep buying the products, you know what I mean?

40 Did you say that to him, or were you thinking that?---I don't recall. I'm, I'm, halfway through was like, I can't keep buying all this stuff, I just can't keep, I can't afford to keep buying it all.

I take it that was a thought you were having, though. Is that correct? Halfway through - - -?---No, I'm not sure whether I said to him halfway through, "I can't keep buying all this stuff," you know what I mean?

THE COMMISSIONER: So Mr Masters, at some stage, did you have a conversation with him about, you know, "What's the deal here?" When obviously, as Counsel Assisting has observed to you, there's a pattern now. ---Yes, yes.

A number of these gifts in effect, expensive gifts, that you're being asked to provide and you have been providing them.---Yes.

10 There must have been some discussion between you and him, "Well, what's the deal? You know, is this going to be of some benefit to me, or you know, what's in it for me?", that sort of discussion?---No, I didn't. It was just, the benefit to me was getting more work, you know what I mean?

Well, that was more of a hope, I suppose, in you - - -?---Yeah.

20 - - - that if you bought these things, you'd hope that the work would flow. Is that right?---Yeah, there was no, there was no discussion as, you know, "If you buy me this, I'll give you this." There was no discussion like that. It was just, it was my thought, my understanding that, kept him happy, I'd keep getting work.

And did it appear to you that you were in fact getting more work over this period where these gifts were being purchased?---Well, some of the work had already occurred, and the, the, in, in that year, the, the types of jobs that were being asked to perform were all install, all away work, you know what I mean? So that's the reason why the, mmm, the, the price went up somewhat, you know what I mean?

30 Did you at any stage feel as though you were being exploited by Mr Steyn?  
---Yeah. Yeah.

You did. When did you first start to have those thoughts, that you were being exploited by Steyn?---Oh, like after the second or third one.

And he was in a management role, was he not, at this time?---Yeah.

And you had been in the work force long enough as to know what managers can do and should not do. Is that right?---Yep.

40 So did you consider that his requests were improper?---Obviously they were, but I don't know whether I considered at the time.

Did you consider getting some advice from anybody in senior management, "Look, you know, I'm being asked to provide these gifts. I do my work but I'm concerned about what's happening"? Did you ever think along those lines, and if so, did you act accordingly?---No, I didn't. Didn't do anything.

Well, was there anyone in management you could have turned to?---No, there wasn't anybody.

Wasn't anybody?---No.

What about Mr Soliman?---I, I don't even know if he was there, and if I, if I – I knew they had a boss, I didn't really know who it was, and how to approach it with them, you know what I mean?

- 10 Well, did you feel uncomfortable about doing something improper? That is to say, being party to giving gifts to somebody in management when asked?---I was told by my wife that this has to stop, you know what I mean, like, can't keep affording to buy someone gifts.

All right. Yes, Ms Spruce.

MS SPRUCE: Mr Masters, you said that you didn't know anyone in management that you could have reported Mr Steyn to.---Yep.

- 20 Were you ever asked by Mr Dubois to provide kickbacks, buy gifts, do favours?---No.

Did you consider talking to Mr Dubois about the fact that Mr Steyn was asking you to purchase all these products for him?---No.

And why not?---They were, like, they sat next to each other. They were work colleagues, you know what I mean? He wasn't really a boss.

- 30 And, Mr Masters, it's the case, isn't it, that when you sent invoices to the RMS, you emailed them directly to the Finance Department?---Yes, most of the time.

So you'd copy them in to Mr Steyn or Mr Dubois, but you had a direct line of communication with someone in the Finance Department?---Yes.

So did you consider reporting Mr Steyn to someone in the Finance Department?---No, I didn't. Should have.

- 40 You've described that you had quite a degree of experience and expertise in doing the RMS work. And as I understand it, particularly in relation to the generators, you'd been doing that work since 2004, is that correct?--- Yes.

And you'd actually been involved in the fabrication, installation and maintenance of those generators.---Yes.

Was there anyone else who knew how to do the work in relation to those generators other than you?---There was, but they weren't competing with me for work.

So given your expertise and your long period of working for the RTA and then the RMS, couldn't you have been reasonably confident that if you'd reported Mr Steyn that you would have continued to receive the work?  
---No, I don't, I, I didn't report it. I should have. But I don't know why.

Well, Mr Masters, is one of the reasons why you didn't report it because the amount of work you were receiving from the RMS was in fact increasing exponentially from \$92,000 in 2017 to \$408,000 in 2018?---I don't know if that's the case.  
10

I beg your pardon?---I don't know if that's the case.

You don't know if it's the case that there was that increase in - - -?---Yeah, there was an increase but I don't know if that's the reason why I didn't report it. I don't know why I didn't report it, you know what I mean?

Well, it's correct, isn't it, that you regarded the Apple purchases as the cost of doing business with Mr Steyn?---Yeah.  
20

And it's the case, isn't it, that in respect of that cost, it turned out to be a relatively good investment for you because the amount that you were earning through the RMS increased significantly over the period you were providing those gifts?---Yeah, but that work was done so I didn't see – yeah, it was, it was, I considered it helping me get the next job, you know what I mean, and then the next job, and then the next job, and then the next job.

At the end of the day, there was a benefit to you in providing those gifts to Mr Steyn. That must have been how you saw it, otherwise why would you do it? Is that true that you saw there was a benefit to you?---The benefit was work, yeah.  
30

THE COMMISSIONER: Did you ever speak to any of the other contractors at RMS on the subject of Mr Steyn asking for favours or asking for them to do the work in a way in which he would get any financial benefit?---No.

Never heard anything along those lines?---No.

All right. Ms Spruce, how much longer do you think you might be with this witness? I'm just wondering whether we need to bring him back tomorrow or not.  
40

MS SPRUCE: Oh, no, we do need to bring him back tomorrow, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: All right.

MS SPRUCE: Not terribly long tomorrow but there's still - - -

THE COMMISSIONER: No, all right. Well, I see the time. Is that a convenient point?

MS SPRUCE: Yes, it is.

THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Ms Masters, regrettably we haven't been able to finish your evidence today but we will in the morning. So if you would return tomorrow. We're starting at 11 o'clock tomorrow, all right? So if you be here at 11 tomorrow and will Mr Masters be finished by lunchtime, do you think?

MS SPRUCE: Yes, I do think so.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, all right. You'll be away by lunchtime by the sounds of it. That's not a - - -

MS SPRUCE: Although, I'm sorry, we're starting at 11.00, so probably.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: A couple of hours?

MS SPRUCE: Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: That's not a guarantee, Mr Masters.---No.

We'll do our best to get you - - -?---I just didn't know if we could finish today or not, that's all.

30 We'll do our best to get you finished by lunchtime. Anything else?

MS SPRUCE: No, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: All right. I'll adjourn until tomorrow. I'll adjourn.

**THE WITNESS STOOD DOWN [4.03pm]**

40 **AT 4.03PM THE MATTER WAS ADJOURNED ACCORDINGLY [4.03pm]**