

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY FOR THE
AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY**

STANDING COMMITTEE ON LEGAL AFFAIRS

(Reference: supply and safety of fireworks)

Members:

**MR B STEFANIAK (The Chair)
MR J HARGREAVES
MS K TUCKER**

TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE

CANBERRA

TUESDAY, 18 JUNE 2002

**Secretary to the committee:
Mr R Power (Ph: 62050435)**

By authority of the Legislative Assembly for the Australian Capital Territory)

The committee met at 2.09 pm.

REG GAVIN was called.

THE CHAIR: Welcome, everyone, to the inquiry into the operation of the Dangerous Goods Act 1975, with particular reference to the sale of fireworks in the territory, the general safety of setting off fireworks and other related matters. This is the third public hearing.

Mr Gavin, I will read to you what I read to all witnesses before committees of the Assembly. You should understand that these hearings are legal proceedings of the Assembly protected by parliamentary privilege. That gives you certain protections but also certain responsibilities. It means you're protected from certain legal actions such as being sued for defamation for what you say at this public hearing. It also means you have a responsibility to tell the committee the truth. Giving false or misleading evidence will be treated by the Assembly as a serious matter.

It must be also said in this inquiry that there have been a number of allegations and counter-allegations involving named individuals. We have not allowed those details to be part of the public hearings. If you have anything derogatory or adverse to say about an individual, we can go into a private hearing and you can make allegations for the committee to consider. But in the public hearings we have been sticking to more general issues in relation to entities rather actual individuals. I want to make that quite clear.

Mr Gavin: I understand.

THE CHAIR: If at any stage you feel you have to start singling out individuals in an adverse way, we will need to go to a private hearing.

Mr Gavin: Okay.

THE CHAIR: Give your full name and the capacity in which you appear before the inquiry, please.

Mr Gavin: My name is Reg Gavin. I'm the owner of a business called Cracker Man at Fyshwick.

THE CHAIR: What evidence would you like to give to the committee? You've already made a submission.

Mr Gavin: Not so much evidence, just advice or assistance in the inquiry in relation to the legislation and the firework industry in the ACT. I put some notes on paper. I would like to hand those to you to read rather than me read them to you.

THE CHAIR: Thank you. I have accepted 1½ pages. We will have a quick read of that. It will take us a couple of minutes and then you can speak to it.

Mr Gavin: If there are some questions you want to put to me or something that's not involved in that, I'm happy to answer.

MR HARGREAVES: While my colleagues are having a look at that, Mr Gavin, I will ask you a question. One of the things you've said is that some of the fireworks that people are letting off in their backyard over the Queen's Birthday long weekend—and from my knowledge of my own area a week or two before that and at least a couple of days at least after that—are not ordinary fireworks as we would know them. The words you've used are: "Many fireworks acquired by the public appear not to be shopgoods fireworks at all. They were far too powerful." Would you like to expand a bit on that for me?

Mr Gavin: Yes. I went to a function, a privately run function, where the fireworks used were what are commonly known as 19-shot cakes, which have a capacity of approximately 300 grams of gunpowder.

MR HARGREAVES: And would you say they were legal fireworks?

Mr Gavin: They are legal fireworks as display fireworks but not to be used in a private Queen's birthday period.

MR HARGREAVES: So you're suggesting that the people who are using those things really ought to be qualified pyrotechnicians and not just the general public?

Mr Gavin: That's a little hard, because there are people that are able to handle it and may have done in the past in lower grade and have stepped up. But the general public, no. They're only pyrotechnics for mainly displays. But this was a private display just for children on the Queen's birthday weekend.

MS TUCKER: You're saying that you think that a working group should be set up to review the legislation?

Mr Gavin: Yes.

MS TUCKER: That's your proposal?

Mr Gavin: That's the proposal I've put forward—made up of the industry, government authorities or the government statutory sections, the various levels of the government, to look after the whole series of fireworks, yes.

THE CHAIR: What type of legislative changes do you think are needed, especially in relation to the backyard situation?

Mr Gavin: It's so complex that neither the government side nor an administrator on the fireworks side of it can understand it. It's so complex. One person reads it one way, another person reads it another way. The minister on the foreshores of Kingston changed the rules and did it himself. I can't see why the minister can't come along and say ABC and just change it effectively, and the same way in the fireworks industry.

MR HARGREAVES: It's been suggested to us that the Dangerous Goods Act needs updating and a little bit of reality brought into it.

Mr Gavin: Yes, that's true.

MR HARGREAVES: It has also been suggested to us that the subordinate legislation which supports it, the regulations, are our biggest problem.

Mr Gavin: Yes.

MR HARGREAVES: And that they need a big revamp. Would you agree with that?

Mr Gavin: I agree with that. It needs rehashing 100 per cent.

THE CHAIR: You talk about problems with the licensing and permit process. You then say on page 2, second paragraph:

Many fireworks acquired by the public appear not to be shopgoods fireworks at all. They are far too powerful. One only had to stand in one's backyard evening on June the 9th and listen to the explosions to know that. So much for the safety of the public that the Dangerous Goods Act is supposed to ensure.

I have a couple of questions on that. Can you point to parts of the act that are at fault? Secondly, how are those fireworks sold to the public? Are the people selling them breaching the legislation, or is there some other reason?

Mr Gavin: It is a breach of the regulations as per the shopgoods fireworks act, yes. To nominate any individual people, it would not necessarily be the traders here. It could be that someone coming in over the state border sold them. The regulation on how the fireworks are sold by WorkCover is pretty good, as far as we're concerned as a shopkeeper. But they don't seem to be able to enforce it to a 40-gram weight control, which they want for Queen's Birthday period.

MR HARGREAVES: Why do you think that is, Mr Gavin?

Mr Gavin: WorkCover don't have a good working relationship with the traders in this territory. They say that they've had conferences or they've talked to us. I've never had a one-on-one, two-on-two situation with any of the government WorkCover officers over the years in relation to Queen's birthday. They dropped these papers on us approximately late March telling us we've got this criteria to do for Queen's birthday weekend. Insufficient time. No cooperation with the trade. No compassion. And then when we give them something and you say to them XYZ on something else, they're like a lion with no teeth. But one thing about it is that when this commissioner, commonly known as Jocelyn Plovits, was away we had a more working relationship with the officer Wayne Creaser than we have ever had before—cooperation and discussions—though it took a long time to fulfil his criteria as a registered shopkeeper.

MS TUCKER: In your submission you suggested that there could be a pyrotechnics park or fireworks festival park. That would be a fenced area. Is it your idea that members of the community could use that but it would be a more controlled environment?

Mr Gavin: A 100 per cent controlled environment. Subsequently the other parts of that theme park document have been issued to the government at different levels, different sections. It has never been discussed or gone on any further. It has just been left in limbo.

MS TUCKER: This idea?

Mr Gavin: This idea. The idea of this has just been left in limbo.

MS TUCKER: But you can talk to the committee about it if you want to.

Mr Gavin: Only in a closed court room. I'm sorry. This is something that's—

MS TUCKER: Okay.

Mr Gavin: I wouldn't be prepared to discuss it in open, I'm sorry.

MR HARGREAVES: Would you like the opportunity to close the hearing for sufficient time for you to answer that question?

Mr Gavin: I'd appreciate that, yes.

MR HARGREAVES: Mr Chairman, I so move.

THE CHAIR: Ms Tucker, do you want that to happen?

MS TUCKER: Sure.

THE CHAIR: I now close the public hearing into fireworks. We'll go into a private hearing.

(Evidence was then taken in camera.)

Resolved:

That, pursuant to standing order 243, the committee authorises the publication of evidence, written and oral, given before the public hearings this day.

MICHAEL JAMES MINTER was called.

THE CHAIR: Mr Minter, thank you very much for attending. You were here when I read the preliminary blurb for witnesses in relation to these being legal proceedings, the privileges and also the responsibilities?

Mr Minter: That's right. Yes.

THE CHAIR: You understand that?

Mr Minter: I do.

THE CHAIR: If you are going to mention individuals, we have the opportunity to go into a private session. If you're not, we will stay in public session. For the record can you give your full name and the capacity in which you appear in front of the committee.

Mr Minter: Sure. My name is Michael James Minter and I run a business called IN2 Fireworks.

THE CHAIR: And you've made a submission to this committee?

Mr Minter: I have, yes.

THE CHAIR: Thank you. Would you like to talk to your submission?

Mr Minter: Yes, I would. Firstly, I suppose I should just explain how I got involved with fireworks. I was about five and my father brought home a huge bag of fireworks and basically let me enjoy and experience the wonderment that I can only try to grasp really. It was just amazing. That was an experience I never forgot. I came to Canberra and I had an opportunity to buy some fireworks one day from an operator, and I relived my youth. It was like turning a grown man into a boy instantly. I regressed in age by about 15 years.

I suppose that's why I really set about getting involved in fireworks. It's the only product I know that is magical in that way. It can bring anybody from the age of 85 to five together in a community spirit. It's the only product that brings the whole community together. It's the only product that will turn any grown adult into a child instantly. To contemplate removing that wonderment out of society—and believe me, you can't take the scientist out of a 10-year-old boy—would be to delude ourselves.

I got involved with an organisation called Cracker Man. I consulted there for some time. I run a program called fireworks for children with cancer. With the assistance of about 22 outlets around Canberra, we raised in excess of \$22,000 for the ACT/Eden-Monaro

cancer support group. A small percentage of every sale we made went to children with cancer.

Sure, I had some concerns in the firework industry at that stage as a group of people working together. There was a bit of a fallout in this particular operation. But before I go into that, let me just say something. The reason I'm not talking in camera today is this: I doubted whether what I am about to say would've come out in a closed session. I'm concerned that you haven't released our submissions. When I look at an open forum like this, I think it's good that everyone gets to put their cards on the table. To date our submissions haven't been released to the general public. That's something I thought I needed to say.

So getting back to where I was, there I was in an organisation with a group of people. Probably there was about four of us, and there was a split in this organisational structure. At that particular point, I was a little bit, I suppose, resentful. Probably at the time I felt a little bit of vengeance. I decided to call the commissioner of WorkCover to arrange a meeting. At that meeting I basically became what you might call an informant.

I informed the commissioner of WorkCover exactly what she needed to do to effectively remove the problems out of the firework industry. That meeting was held in 1999—approximately February, March or May. The exact date is in a couple of books held by a gentleman by the name of Wayne Creaser. He took notes from the meeting. The meeting went for about an hour and a half.

I detailed out specifically where to check, what to look for, who the rogue elements were. But I had a vested interest as well, a commercial interest. I was working for an organisation operation, and I was trying to remove some attention that we were getting to some other people who had left. What I spelled out was people's names, details, where to look, how they were operating, right down to the extent of what you needed to do with the legislation if you wanted to control it more easily, exactly what fees you needed to introduce. I drew it out on a whiteboard in detail. And from that day onwards everything that I suggested has been implemented in relation to the policy that we now have before us. So I'm here to take ownership of what I've created.

I was misled. I went into this meeting, and I said to the commissioner, "Is it really your intention to clean up the firework industry to make it safer but to continue to make it viable, or is it your intention to close down the industry?" The words I got back were: "No, it is not my intention to close down the firework industry." I believed that. So I proceeded to spell out what needed to be done, in my opinion. And I did so, giving them all the facts, all the details, where to check, what to look for, how to liaise with other agencies, exactly how things were done. I was in the industry. I knew exactly how the industry operates.

What I gave was to improve or to make the industry safer. It was to make it a more workable model. But the information I was giving was actually being used to shut down the industry and make it non-viable—which in fact made it more dangerous. It becomes more dangerous when people are under financial pressure. That's what transpired.

I don't know to what extent you want me to give you the details of what I said and the names of the people. As far as particular organisations here, if I look around the room I can see one, two, maybe three people definitely whose businesses I have affected, whom my actions have actually caused financial impediment.

I'm the only firework operator in this town that hasn't been charged with something. Why is that? Why is it that before me we have 76 or 74 charges? Why is it that I've been left alone?

THE CHAIR: What are you doing now?

Mr Minter: I own the business IN2 Fireworks.

THE CHAIR: You mentioned the act and the regulations. You mentioned that you've given some advice. You mentioned what happened as a result. We've heard a lot of evidence in this inquiry, and all the parties seem to have problems with the act and regulations. Would you agree with that summation?

Mr Minter: The act and regulations are designed at the moment to come in and make the industry non-viable.

THE CHAIR: How do we improve it? What would you suggest?

Mr Minter: You can look at the economic impact of what the legislation is trying to do. Many aspects of it are beyond power. It has to be challenged in the courts. That is a lengthy and extensive process to go through. Withholding licences, not issuing licences, using whatever measure it takes to ensure that one is drained of funds to ensure that one can't continue the fight.

THE CHAIR: Suggestions have been made from all quarters that the act and the regulations are very problematic, and there seems to be a strong thrust coming through that substantial changes are needed. What types of changes to the act and regulations would you suggest, if any?

Mr Minter: I can understand what you're asking. But let me suggest that you've got somebody with the intent to shut down the industry. They took the information that I gave them and set out on a mission to use it to shut down the firework industry. The act gives the commissioner too much power. I don't believe the minister can remove the commissioner. I believe only the Assembly can. All of a sudden now we've got a statutory authority that is acting out of public accountability and using a disguise of safety to affect people's businesses.

MR HARGREAVES: Whether the intent was to clean up the industry or to close it down, the same information applies. The information, valid or invalid, was still there. Obviously you had some concern that the industry wasn't looking after itself. It wasn't acting in a bona fide fashion. Does it really matter what the motives of WorkCover were in that instance?

Mr Minter: It does always matter to me, when I give people information or I'm going to give somebody some information, what their motives are and what position they come from. I need to understand their intent.

MR HARGREAVES: I have no quarrel with that. That's something the committee can't help you with. That's something that only you can help with. The charge we have from the Assembly is to consider what action has to happen with the Dangerous Goods Act with respect to the three types of use of fireworks—use for display, use for cultural activities and use by the general public at large. Whatever the concerns you had and the evidence you gave, with whatever motive and for whatever you got, nonetheless the information itself seems to me to indicate some concern that there were practices going on which you as a person involved in the industry had a lot of trouble with. Self-regulation certainly wasn't working, and the official regulations could have done with a good revamp as well.

Mr Minter: There were certainly some concerns that I had. In particular, the concerns were the attention that the business that I was working with was receiving from WorkCover. People can focus their attention in many areas. What they were doing was focusing their attention on the business that I was with. My intent was to remove that attention away from where we were.

MR HARGREAVES: I don't know about my colleagues, but I'm not terribly interested in names, company names and all that sort of stuff.

THE CHAIR: I don't think that's appropriate in the public part, so he's not doing that.

MR HARGREAVES: I'm interested in the thrust of those things that you were able to bring to other people's attention. Whether or not your company was just as good as anybody else's is by the way for the purposes of my question. I'm interested in knowing the practices that you were concerned enough to tell somebody about. Were they business practices like industrial issues, how people get on with their staff, the way they pay their staff, or were they related to the fireworks themselves?

Mr Minter: No, they were related to how people conducted their business, and it was to show them where they needed to look in that person's business, where they need to ruffle their feathers, how they needed to stir the pot. In every industry—whether it is a mechanic or whatever—there are people that work to better standards or have better systems than other people. The role of the legislation is to ensure the safe use of. That was what I wanted to see happen. I wanted to see the industry grow and evolve for the safer use of. But what I did was to deflect the attention that we were receiving from WorkCover to other people's business, and to get them to look at—

MR HARGREAVES: I think we've got that.

Mr Minter: I didn't tell them, "Look here, look there, do this, do that," but I suggested to them that the rogue element that they were so-called looking for wasn't with our business, was elsewhere. I didn't get down to the specifics.

MR HARGREAVES: I guess I was looking for a distinction about whether or not we're talking about—

Mr Minter: I just deflected a rogue element. The bikie gang element—all these things—came about because of kids with cancer. Let me tell you quite simply. If the firework industry is allowed to attach to sick children with cancer, no government agency would have ever been able to shut it down, because it would have been political suicide to try to put to the public that you're going to take away a fun-type product associated with raising money for children with cancer.

To put it on the record here today, let me say I know there was political interference in having the cancer support group move away from it because of alleged bikie gang involvement, drug dealing, various things that were alleged. Therefore the cancer support group pulled away from a proven money-making exercise. All these rumours, innuendoes and pressure were coming from somewhere. It was quite astounding to me what was going on, even at that time. So there was some agenda. And that's where the bikie allegations all started from. It started back in 1998 or 1999 when the crackers for kids with cancer program was run. It was a shame. I don't know where exactly it came from, but I look at the fact that if the firework industry or anyone was allowed to combine with children with cancer then no agenda to remove the firework industry could have ever happened politically, because it would have been political suicide.

MR HARGREAVES: The fireworks for crackers for kids with cancer are display fireworks, aren't they?

Mr Minter: No, they were shopgood fireworks. We were selling them, and a percentage of each sale was being donated to a charity. It was a working community project. That was when a local shop could sell fireworks. So we had 63 outlets. All of a sudden the legislation turned around and put a \$5,000 fee on a shopkeeper who wanted to sell fireworks. All of a sudden the crackers for kids with cancer program was knocked out the door. How can they have somebody selling, say, \$1,000 or \$2,000 worth over the June long weekend selling period pay \$5,000 as a cost to participate. It limited the number of people able to participate. It destroyed the program.

At the same time I know a donation was made from the Assembly shortly thereafter to the ACT/Eden-Monaro cancer support group. When I had discussions with the group I even suggested, "If they're going to attempt to remove you from this program, maybe they will be able to do something in relation to offering some sort of assistance to you financially." I think at the time an independent gentleman on the Assembly was also a member of the cancer support group, was patron.

I had radio personalities coming to me saying, "We can't get involved in this anymore, because there are bikies and we've had threats," and all this sort of thing. Someone was trying to scuttle it severely. It meant that it couldn't have been touched, because it would have been too politically damning, I believe.

MS TUCKER: You've given WorkCover your views on how you could tighten up what's happening with the use of fireworks. You had that meeting.

Mr Minter: Yes, I did.

MS TUCKER: And you gave suggestions.

Mr Minter: It wasn't really tightening up. It was basically a way to continue the viability. I was coming from a position of deflecting attention from the business that I was associated with.

MS TUCKER: Yes, okay.

Mr Minter: My intent was just to remove the attention and pressure.

MS TUCKER: Right. I would be interested for you to tell the committee where the problem is, in your view. If you're going to have a regulatory framework to ensure safe use of, what for you is the main problem? Is it the illegal sale of fireworks, is it too easy or is it now too difficult? I understand everything you've said. You feel that the new regulations have been used to put financial pressure on the industry, and you say that makes the situation more dangerous.

Mr Minter: It is, yes.

MS TUCKER: It has been argued that if you ban shopgood fireworks there will still be an illegal trade anyway. That will be impossible to regulate. But I would like to know from you what you think the key responses could be to ensure safe use of.

Mr Minter: I believe it comes down to individual accountability for the use of any product. I don't care whether you're driving a car. At the end of the day the system should ensure that the individual who is using the firework has been given safe instructions, safe directions, and that in the event that the firework is misused by that individual, just like with a vehicle that has been misused by an individual, that person is held accountable by the community for a breach and misuse of a product. I can explain to you all the safety instructions, and I can advise you exactly how to use it safely, but once I give it to you and you take it home and you use it incorrectly then how can I be accountable for your misuse?

MS TUCKER: You can require a bigger focus on training. One suggestion is that someone who wants to have a community event should undergo some kind of training. You could still have community events, but not have them as open as they are now, if the fireworks sellers have a licence. I realise it is not very open if you can't buy them at all. There's that possibility.

Mr Minter: I always see that looking at how a firework performs safely and then allowing it to be used by somebody within directions and instructions is always a safe way to go. But I always find that if somebody is accountable and knows they're taking ownership of accountability—how do I get you to take ownership of accountability as an individual—

MS TUCKER: You might make it harder for me to get the fireworks, for example. If I want to have a community event, you're going to make me be accountable by saying, "Okay, you want to do this. It's a big responsibility. These are dangerous things, so you've got to spend a day of your life going through some training so you realise what you're taking on." That is a suggestion. What would you say to that?

Mr Minter: Looking at the type of fireworks that we let off on the Queen's birthday weekend, I'd probably be interested to see the figures relating to injuries or misuse, what sort of situation we had, because that's what we've got to deal with. If we had a season with minimal incidents, we have a community that's already using something in a responsible, safe manner. So I would suggest that would be the best way to look at the feedback that we need to assess in deciding what we need to do.

From the pyrotechnician's point of view, I think it's our responsibility to look at the design and the safe use. We know our products probably better than anybody else does. Then we can determine what we should make available for sale. But we also have Australian standards in shopgoods which are taken on by other regimes in the Northern Territory. They have suddenly adopted a standard that has already been established, and I think quite extensive—

MS TUCKER: Are you talking about the standard of the fireworks?

Mr Minter: The Australian standards, yes.

MS TUCKER: We have also been told that that standard isn't being complied with—and I'd like to know if you think this is the case—and that some fireworks will be branded as a particular standard which is very small, sparklers or whatever, when in fact they're not. They are actually other fireworks, or they're faulty fireworks. We have been told that the testing regime is quite erratic in China, that there's no consistent testing here and that the quality is inconsistent. Is that your experience?

Mr Minter: Not really. It's not in my interest to create a problem for myself as a business owner in the firework industry.

MS TUCKER: You're not creating the problem. When you test, when you're ensuring quality, as you said you do, is it your experience that what comes in from China is of a high and consistent quality?

Mr Minter: It's always improving, because we have American standards and Australian standards. In the Chinese industry a lot of them are now becoming quality assured. They supply to the American market, to the English market, to the Australian market. I'm finding the quality really good. The product only becomes a problem when it's misused, not in accordance with the directions, just like any other product.

MR HARGREAVES: It's hard when the directions are in Italian.

THE CHAIR: Yes, we've heard some evidence that some directions are in Italian.

MS TUCKER: I found a firework on the street that had the instructions in Italian. That would be a problem if you didn't speak Italian.

Mr Minter: That's right, yes. But you get the header card as well. Somebody said to me once, "Where do we head with legislation?" I said, "We'll never take the scientist out of a 10-year-old boy." I hate to see children trying to make their own explosives and putting themselves at great risk. I think to stifle innovation would be a shame in society. We've

got so many great inspiring minds. The magic of fireworks has been around for thousands of years. It's the only product of wonderment that I know.

It brings a sense of community spirit. It brings people together. We used to have a bonfire. I used to know all my neighbours in my whole street. It was the only thing that brought everyone together from the age of five to 85. Okay, some of us got our fingers burnt. I can't wrap society in cotton wool. I can't mother everybody. If I was a legislator and I passed legislation that banned something, it would be like me being a three-year-old child covering my eyes and saying, "You can't see me," believing the problem had gone away.

What we need to be about is responsible management. When I gave the information, I was trying to assist responsible management. But I had a meeting with a person who took my information and turned it around and basically has used it as a tool to try to shut the industry down. That's what I'm most disappointed about. I'm accountable to all the people whose business I have affected by what I've done. I'm not proud of that.

MR HARGREAVES: You talk about community coming together. The community in Ferrett Circuit in Kambah all came together one night three years ago when all of their letterboxes were blown to pieces. They all came together and had a nice chat. How do you fix that?

Mr Minter: How do you fix that? It's a very good question. Whatever caused the anger and the aggression in the people that caused those acts, I don't know. We've got so many problems in society. We've got problems with drug use. We've got a real problem in society. We've got a lot of angry people out there, and they're disillusioned. So many people in churches, the ministers I talk to, are talking about the breakdown of society. Families are working longer. Why that person was so angry to do that in that street, I really don't know. But can you say that they wouldn't do that if there wasn't a firework industry? If they didn't take their anger out in that, what else would they have done to show how angry they were?

MR HARGREAVES: I know we take guns off them.

Mr Minter: Yet we've still got a problem in society with more illegal guns on the streets. If you really want to get a gun, they would still be available. Just because they've been taken out of the hands of law-abiding citizens doesn't mean someone who doesn't want to break the law isn't going to get access to something if they want to cause destruction and harm. Whether they made it themselves, whether they got it from a little fountain and compressed it or got the black powder out of their dad's shed—who knows where the product came from that caused the letterbox to blow up.

MR HARGREAVES: We know.

Mr Minter: We know? Okay, good. They should be reported to the police and they should be held accountable.

MR HARGREAVES: It was

Mr Minter: That's great. At the end of the day we again come down to responsibility. Are we going to ban every type of product out there? I'd love to get a list of the top 10 or top 20 things that injure children and go through and ban them one by one. But then how much fun are we taking away because of the number of injuries? I'd like to get the top 10 things that really harm society and take those out as well. But are fireworks in either of those two top 10? They're not.

THE CHAIR: Mr Minter, thank you very much for your evidence and assistance to the committee today.

Mr Minter: Thank you for your time. I appreciate it.

MR HARGREAVES: Thank you for the courage in coming along.

Mr Minter: I thought I had to.

The committee adjourned at 3.28 pm.