

PUBLIC

THE PARLIAMENTARY JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION MET IN COMMITTEE ROOM 2, PARLIAMENT HOUSE, HOBART ON FRIDAY 8 MAY 2020.

CHAIR (Ms Rattray) - Good morning, as the Chair of the Subordinate Legislation Committee, I will introduce to you members of the committee - the Honourable Meg Webb, Honourable Ruth Forrest, John Tucker MP, Mick Street MP in the room, and Tania Rattray; we also have Alison Standen who is working from home today. We have with us Stuart Wright and Julie Thompson, our secretary.

We have Ginna Webster, Kristy Bourne, Jim Connolly and Penelope Ikedife. You will be aware that the committee is examining the notices that come in regard to the Covid-19 Disease Emergency (Miscellaneous Provisions) and this is in regard to the Magistrates Court and the Supreme Court notices that were issued.

Ms GINNA WEBSTER, SECRETARY, **Ms KRISTY BOURNE**, DEPUTY SECRETARY (CORRECTIONS AND JUSTICE); **Mr JIM CONNOLLY**, REGISTRAR OF THE SUPREME COURT AND **Ms PENELOPE IKEDIFE**, ADMINISTRATOR OF THE MAGISTRATES COURT, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE WERE CALLED BY WEBEX, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WERE EXAMINED.

CHAIR - Ginna, are you going to give an overview? Or has there been someone appointed to do that for the committee?

Ms WEBSTER - Thanks, Chair. It depends what the committee would prefer. Obviously, given the independent nature of the courts, we have Jim and Penny to talk about the specifics of what is happening at the courts. In relation to the notices we have from the Supreme Court and the Magistrates Court, the Attorney-General has received requests from the Chief Magistrate and the Chief Justice which have led to the notices. Basically, that's in relation to the way that the proceedings underway given the current situation of COVID-19, and in accordance with section 22 of the COVID-19 act, the approved manner specified in the notice means the manner determined by the Chief Magistrate, the Chief Justice, the President, Chair or other head of the tribunal or entity or person nominated by the entity. The Chief Magistrate requested the Attorney General issue a notice to allow the court to conduct proceedings during the pandemic despite section 37 (1) of the Justices Act 1959, section 90 of the Sentencing Act 1997 -

The Chief Justice of Tasmania, the honourable Alan Blow, announced that no jury trials would commence until at least 21 July. The Chief Justice then requested the Attorney-General issue a notice to allow the court to conduct proceedings despite section 91 of the Sentencing Act, section 12A (2) of the Criminal Code 1924 and section 4 (11)(i) of the Criminal Code and section 14 of the Supreme Court Civil Procedure Act 1932.

That provides a background of the notices that were provided, but given the specifics of the court, I am very happy to hand to Jim as Registrar of the Supreme Court or Penny as Administrator of the Magistrates Court in relation to questions from the committee.

CHAIR - Thank you very much for that, Ginna. Jim, would you like to make comments with regard to the Supreme Court?

PUBLIC

Mr CONNOLLY - Certainly, thank you. The first thing to state is that as a matter of principle the Chief Justice and all the judges are very conscious of the need for open justice to occur in Tasmania, even in these rather difficult times that we are facing at the moment. They're acutely aware of that, but these determinations made by the Chief Justice under the notice issued by the Attorney-General are only in place during this time and we will be intending to revert to a traditional model for conducting justice in Tasmania as soon as that's possible. We may carry forward some modified procedures that involve, for example, more use of desktop video conferencing, where that's appropriate, but generally the intention is to revert to a traditional model of conducting court business.

Having said, the notice that was issued by the Attorney-General on 16 April at the request of the Chief Justice was then followed by a determination by the Chief Justice as to how courts were to be conducted.

Mr CONNOLLY - (cont) - followed up by the determination by the Chief Justice into the House, courts were to be conducted. That was published to the community and to the legal profession via a circular to practitioners. This was published about 16 April on our website and is distributed entirely around the legal profession and those involved in the administration of justice.

The Chief Justice's approved measures covers both the original and the appellate jurisdictions of the Supreme Court. The original jurisdiction, that is a single judge sitting, is entitled to conduct proceedings particularly using technology. The Notice itself, I am not sure if the Committee has a copy of the Chief Justice's determination dated 16 April. It sets out in 10 paragraphs the different equation which court business can be conducted.

Obviously, no trials are being conducted so this Notice doesn't apply to a jury trial. For all other business, it enables judges to use audio or audio/visual technology to conduct proceedings and enable the appellate courts - comprising three judges - to conduct business by video conferencing, each from a different location, so they do not have to in the same courtroom.

They do not have to sit in courtrooms. They can sit at any place. In fact, we have judges who are operating from a home base at the moment, but doing business by video conference from there, with the assistance of their staff who are usually based in the courtroom.

The model is the courtroom is the hub for the videoconferencing proceedings. The judges associate is there coordinating all the participants, having them all hooked up to the same video conference. Then you will have remote participants, either solicitors in their office or their home, a prisoner or remandee in one of the prisons, a prosecutor either at the Director of Public Prosecutions office or again they may be at home.

The whole thing is actually working quite well. The important thing to note is whilst these proceedings are being conducted by video conferencing, they are being done through a hub in the courtroom, and the courtroom and the court building is open to the public and media.

There is still the element of open justice being respected even in these strange times.

CHAIR - Would it be possible for the Committee to receive a copy of the Chief Justice's Determination? That would be very helpful.

Mr CONNOLLY - Certainly.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - It may well have saved this opportunity today, but we were not aware that was around and only doing the job presented to us.

We will take questions on the Supreme Court first. Penelope, I will come to you after that.

Ms WEBB - Just a couple, thank you. You have mentioned that was put out to the legal profession when those directions were issued. Can you tell me what sort of feedback you received from the legal profession?

Mr CONNOLLY - There was no opposition. In fact, there was no feedback. The profession accepted in these circumstances that was the most effective way of conducting business. There was neither positive or negative feedback. That was the way the Chief Justice had determined was the appropriate way, and I think the profession have accepted it. They seem to be increasingly more comfortable day by day. The more people use this technology, the more comfortable they become with using it

Mr CONNOLLY - the more comfortable they become with using it, other than myself as you can see with my limited ability with the camera on this videoconference earlier. It is a learning curve for most practitioners and they all accept it is appropriate to use this method at the moment.

Ms WEBB - I am sure they are. We are all making do with all these different things. You described it was working well. Given there are a lot of different participants in the process, how are you monitoring the impact this change and new way of working is having on each element involved in conducting a proceeding in this way? You mentioned the practitioners but there are others involved - other administrative staff, the people who are there presenting at court, and others like that. Can you talk about how you are monitoring that it is working well for the different elements of participants?

Mr CONNOLLY - In that sense it would be a reactive monitoring. If there are concerns expressed they will eventually land on my desk and I would check the proceedings and see if there are any modifications required. It is not a structured monitoring of the issue. I have some figures as to the number of matters we have been dealing with in this COVID-19 period in our criminal jurisdiction in the first instance. For example, with the matters dealt with we have had 87 bail applications. This is from 23 March 2020 onwards. We have had 30 matters where sentences have been imposed, and 32 pleas proceedings, that is the statement of Crown specs and pre-mitigation have occurred. We have had 246 directions hearings and 79 mentions. These are all by video link.

There has been a lot of business conducted. Fortunately, this all helps to keep the wheels of justice turning and to try to limit the negative impact of the coronavirus on court backlogs we are doing what we can.

Jury trials are going to be another issue we have to deal with. We are aiming for late July, as you know, but at the moment they are the sort of numbers we have been dealing with for matters not requiring juries.

Ms WEBSTER - If I can add to Ms Webb's question, the other part is the department is facilitating regular meetings with administration of justice stakeholders, for example, the courts, the Tasmanian Bar Association, the Law Society, and a range of other stakeholders where matters have been raised and addressed. This included in the early stages working with the technology including using the Chief Information Officer of the department to assist legal practitioners with

PUBLIC

the technology we are using. We have had a forum and were meeting weekly for a while. We have dropped those as needed and are in the process of setting up another meeting so any of those issues have been addressed as we hear of them, but we have been quite proactive particularly in the early stages around this model we have had to implement.

Ms WEBB - Thank you for that information Ginna, I appreciate it. Within those meetings was there somebody representing people who are appearing in court and who are in custody in the justice system and involved from that side?

Ms WEBSTER - Not specifically, however, Kristy as the Deputy Secretary, Justice and Corrections, obviously has a crossover between the administration of justice and the prison service. We have not had any any negative feedback from people appearing in court, but of course we could look to extend that if we thought it would be beneficial.

Ms FORREST - Thank you. There's a couple of follow-ups. This one is to Mr Connolly. With the numbers you gave us about the matters that have been dealt with, how does that compare with those similar matters - obviously not things like jury trials? How does that compare with what you would normally do in the same period?

Mr CONNOLLY - I don't have those figures in front of me, but I can obtain them. It would be [inaudible] of me to comment on that at the moment.

Ms FORREST - Okay. It is just interesting to know whether -

Ms WEBB - It is a question of what capacity are we working at?

Ms FORREST - Yes, are we actually keeping the wheels of justice turning? It would be great to think that when we get through this, there is not going to be a great backlog of these matters that you are dealing with now. I'm not asking necessarily for specific numbers, just a bit of a comparison about the workload that you would normally experience in the matters that you have been dealing with, and what you have dealt with under these new arrangements?

You commented earlier about the courtroom being open to the public and the media. I assume that all the social distancing and personal hygiene requirements are in place. How many people from the media have actually been accessing it? You said the courtroom is the hub where the videoconferencing arrangements are established and run from. In terms of media and members of the public, have you had many people actually come in? I'm interested in how members of the public know it's open - I would have thought it was shut if you hadn't told me.

Mr CONNOLLY - The media have been quite scarce, I must say. They also have that view that the courts are closed. I can confirm, yes, we definitely do have social distancing and hygiene requirements from the public health perspective in place - so, that is the case.

As far as members of the public go, again not as many as you would expect in normal business. However, for example, family or friends of people who are making bail applications do attend and they are welcome to sit in to witness the proceedings - but that's about it.

Ms FORREST - It's interesting that the media may even be unaware that the court is actually open for them to go into, and whether it is a fear thing, I don't know. Should that be made more publicly known? Obviously you don't want hordes of people there. But in terms of open justice, it

PUBLIC

would be important to make sure that people are aware - particularly those who have family members who are dealing with matters.

Mr CONNOLLY - Yes. We have a pretty good relationship with the media. They contact us very regularly, particularly if they haven't been able to get to court and need to find out the outcome of a particular case, or any details that can be provided. So, I assume they know that we are open, but they choose to conduct their business in the current circumstances in a different way. I take your point that it might require clarification.

Ms FORREST - In terms of the information that was sent with the package, with the Notice itself, there was a comment. I will read it in full so you have it in context. This is in relation to sections 12A(2) and 411(1) of the Criminal Code -

His Honour indicated that arrangements are being made for appeals to the Court of Criminal Appeal to be held insofar as is practicable without participants, counsel, prisoners, appellants, et cetera, attending court. In the circumstances identified above, it may not be possible for an appellant to present if so desired. His Honour has accordingly requested that despite this subsection, the Court of Criminal Appeal may determine an appeal without any appellant being present in accordance with the approved manner.

Can you tell us how you ensure that appropriate justice is served for the appellant in this case?

Mr CONNOLLY - You will see from the determination that I have sent to the committee secretary that it basically says that when the Court of Criminal Appeal conducts a hearing by audiovisual link, or by telephone, the party whose conviction or sentence is the subject of the appeal must be afforded an opportunity to hear what is said at the hearing by audiovisual link, or by telephone. It also says that if an appeal to the Court of Criminal Appeal is determined without an oral hearing - that is, if parties agree on that - each party is given, if he or she so requests, a copy of every written submission, outline of argument, or other document that is provided to the court by or on behalf of the parties. Those documents may be given by electronic means.

Appeals before the Court of Criminal Appeal can be heard and determined by any form of audiovisual link or telephone, according to the Chief Justice's determination, and alternatively all parties are represented by counsel and they consent. Those proceedings may be determined without an oral hearing. As self-represented litigant will always have an opportunity to be heard and make submissions in person over video link to the court. It will not be simply on the papers.

Ms FORREST - Thank you for that. Once we get that direction, it might remove the need for half of these questions, but I have one further question. It is probably contained in the determination, and if it is, I am happy to await its provision to the committee.

In the closing comment there, the measures requested by the Chief Justice are considered proportionate. This is a letter from the Attorney-General, so it may be better for Ginna Webster to consider this one. The measures requested by the Chief Justice are considered proportionate in the circumstances, and provide adequate safeguards to protect the principle of open justice to the greatest extent possible. Because this is all we received, we had no indication about what sort of measures were going to be in place - hence you are here. I assume all those matters will be addressed in the determination. A message that may go back to the Attorney-General, through the secretary, is that this sort of information should have been provided with the notice.

PUBLIC

Ms WEBSTER - I take that point. I think the determination is publicly available, and perhaps that was the confusion, that it was not sent through, so apologies for that. That should have been sent from the department. It is publicly available on the courts' website, so we will make sure we get that through as soon as possible, but I certainly take that point.

Ms STANDEN - Welcome everybody, and thank you for your time this morning. Forgive me if I do not have indepth knowledge of the workings of the court, and if this question shows a bit of ignorance. I understand that in the early days of the COVID-19 emergency, New South Wales was looking at alternative ways of putting off cases that did not need to be heard, particularly by prioritising those in custody, as long as there was not any disadvantage to the accused. I do not know whether this would apply to the Supreme Court and the Magistrates Court, or one or the other, but I am just interested in the comments about the scheduling of cases, and whether that has been the case in Tasmania?

Mr CONNOLLY - If you would like the Supreme Court's perspective on that, jury trials have been postponed until 21 July 2020. That was chosen at the start of this coronavirus pandemic period, to drive a stake in the ground, to have some reference points, and then we would review the situation in the meantime and see how things were panning out.

At the moment, we are doing some preliminary planning to work out how those sorts of matters can be dealt with. They are quite substantive matters in the sense that the average jury trial could go for a number of days, as opposed to the shorter matters that I mentioned previously for sentences and pleas and directions hearings.

We have to look at the layout of our buildings around the state to see how we can conduct jury trials with distancing requirements, and spreading all the participants out around the courtrooms, and having jury deliberation rooms that are large enough to hold 12 people, subject to all those requirements.

We are doing some preliminary planning on that and also thinking about what types of matters will be brought on first - obviously, custody matters usually get some priority. Depending on how long they have been in the pipeline they get a higher priority than that. Matters involving children or vulnerable witnesses also usually get priority in our court, and matters that might have been adjourned from a previous listing and have been in the queue quite a while, would get some priority.

We haven't determined what those priorities are yet; we're just doing the preliminary planning. No doubt it will very much depend on the readiness of the Director of Public Prosecutions and the Legal Aid Commission as to how they're going to support that sort of strategy to bring as many trials on as possible, as quickly as possible.

CHAIR - Alison, does that answer your question?

Ms STANDEN - Yes, it does, thank you, Madam Chair.

Supplementary to that, 21 July isn't that far away. Of course, none of us have a crystal ball but this pandemic could disrupt business for some time - retail and other sectors, businesses that have been required to have COVID-19-ready plans, [TBC quality communication] or a similar sort of thing in terms of a formal instrument that courts need to have in order to reopen, as it were?

PUBLIC

Mr CONNOLLY - No, because the conduct of the court business is the responsibility of the Chief Justice and the Chief Magistrate. They will determine the appropriate priorities for the matter to be brought on. It doesn't need any formal instrument. The preliminary stages of the processes are in train. Hopefully we can get back to as close to normal business as soon as possible. We are doing our planning on the basis that things like social distancing and other public health hygiene matters will remain in place for a long time to come. We will plan around those assumptions.

Ms STANDEN - Finally, Madam Chair, I am imagining a situation where that 21 July date might be pushed back even further. I respect that none of us have a crystal ball, but would there be resourcing implications should there be a significant backlog? How would the court be positioned to manage that? Will there come a time where there would need to be additional resources in order to deal with that?

Mr CONNOLLY - Potentially, I think that's the case. The larger the backlog, and depending on the strategy for reducing it to reasonable levels, we'll obviously be dependent on resources. There have been previous announcements in the last Budget for a seventh judge for the Supreme Court to take effect in the 2020-21 financial year. Fortunately, at the moment, we have three acting judges who are available to supplement our sixth permanent judge. If we can start trials again we can perhaps have an intensive strategy to reduce the backlog and bring it back into control.

CHAIR - Penelope, as the Administrator of the Magistrates Court, you've heard the discussions that we've had already. Do you have anything to add? Or would you like to make some comment regarding the systems in place at the Magistrates Court?

Ms FORREST - I am assuming that there's a determination there as well?

CHAIR - Yes. We are interested to know if there's a determination that would be available to the committee as well.

Ms IKEDIFE - Certainly, Madam Chair, thank you.

Yes, there is a determination which was made by the Chief Magistrate on 23 April. It's available on the Magistrates Court website and was circulated, as was the Supreme Court's to practitioners, and, I think also, possibly, to the media, via the Department of Justice.

The determination permits a court to be held by any form of audio or audiovisual link and states that in some cases that may not be a matter that is heard in open public court. That is because of the limitations on external people's access if a court is being held by an audiovisual link, or audio link.

To the extent that we have ensured public access, we have done so by specifically advising the media of mechanisms by which they can access audiovisual courts. In particular, we have indicated to members of the media that they can advise the court that they wish to attend a particular court session that is being held by Zoom. We will ensure that they are linked into that Zoom session. This hasn't been used to a huge extent, because, generally speaking, the court's buildings have been open and so media may still attend if they wish to do so, in person. They sit in the back of the courts and carry out their role from that location.

The exception to that has been the Burnie Registry of the Court, which for 13 working days is closed to the public because of additional restrictions in the north-west.

PUBLIC

In Hobart, we have had no requests from the media to attend court sessions by Zoom in the criminal jurisdiction. We have had a few requests, I think, to attend case management conferences in the Coronial Division. There have been no requests by members of the public in Hobart to attend court remotely, so to speak, to observe proceedings. Again, possibly because the building is open, although subject to limitations and restrictions on the numbers of people who may access the building, also the social distancing and hygiene requirements which the Registrar has already referred to.

In all registries, we have been combining remote access, often with a combination of in-person appearances, Zoom appearances, and audio link appearances, sometimes all on the same matter. There are a range of ways people can access court proceedings. We have also taken care to ensure that inquiries made direct to the Registry by people who haven't been able to access court proceedings are provided with information that should be publicly available to them.

Country courts have not been operating except where they can do a video link. Country court matters, say from Scottsdale to Smithton, have been transferred to a [central TBC] Registry, thus limiting the access to people in the regional location. We have made sure that people have access to the outcome of a court proceedings where they have requested it.

Those are some of things the Magistrates Court has been doing to try to ensure that while we are balancing the restrictions and limitations of public health requirements, and attempting to protect staff, judicial officers, and the community, we are also providing open access to justice and ensuring the court proceedings are available to people.

CHAIR - We were provided with some numbers of the matters by Jim Connolly. I am interested in whether you have those available for the Magistrates Court.

Ms IKEDIFE - Not in the same way, I am afraid. Our court sessions tend to run with a large number of shorter matters being dealt with in a single session. We may have a three-hour session that deals with 100 or 150 separate matters.

I can indicate that there is preliminary data from Zoom, which hasn't yet been analysed, that suggests we have had about 100 Zoom court sessions statewide. That is, I would stress, very preliminary data, which needs some finessing. There has been quite extensive use of that audiovisual platform, particularly in the north-west, because of the additional restrictions that have been in place in Burnie.

We have also had some judicial officers from time to time all consistently working from home, so they may be [TBC] their courts by Zoom every day. I am afraid I cannot provide actual numbers.

Ms STANDEN - Thanks, Chair, that seems pretty clear.

Ms FORREST - With the comments regarding the north-west shutdown and the additional restrictions that were placed on the north-west, and the expectation that people would not move unless for essential services outside of their municipal region, how did you deal with that? You talk about the use of Zoom. Many of my constituents are not terribly familiar with some of the technology, particularly some who may need to appear before a court. In terms of access to justice, or open justice for the people from, say, Circular Head where we had a cluster, and the west coast and even King Island, how were they dealt with? Have you had many of those matters dealt with using these other technologies?

PUBLIC

Ms IKEDIFE - Not so much with Zoom, particularly for self-represented parties, but there is always the telephone link option. That has probably been the default option for a lot of people appearing before the court. It is more accessible to many people, and that is something that has been used in conjunction with other technologies. For example, in Burnie, during the period where the court building was shut, prosecutors were appearing by Zoom, and defence lawyers were appearing either by Zoom or by telephone. If the person was in custody they would appear by Zoom, but a person who was on bail would often appear by telephone.

Anecdotally, I can indicate that there has been a reduction in the number of non-appearances before the court as required. This may have something to do with the 'friendly' use of the methods of appearing.

Ms FORREST - That is an interesting point, because it appears to be more convenient for people to access their justice either through a phone or video, so I will be interested to see what the thoughts are. This is perhaps not a question for you, or maybe it is: in the future, when the restrictions are lifted, would that continue to be an option of more people actually turning up?

Ms IKEDIFE - It would certainly be a matter for each individual magistrate to determine the appropriate means of appearance before them. There may be different determinations according to the particular circumstances - whether it is a first appearance, whether it is a hearing, the need for the person to be physically in front of the court to allow the proceedings to occur in the most efficient way.

Ms FORREST - Has there been any negative feedback about people, particularly from those who are appearing before court, that they do not think it is an appropriate or accessible means of accessing justice for themselves?

Ms IKEDIFE - I am not aware of any feedback of that nature. We have had regular meetings with Legal Aid Commission of Tasmania and also the Law Society and the Tasmanian Bar, who I assume would feed back to us any negative comments from their clientele. We certainly have not heard anything along those lines.

Ms WEBB - That probably covers a question I was going to ask, in the same way Mr Connolly had indicated, in a broad sense, that the system was working well. I asked about whether there was some monitoring or checking-in being done about the different elements involved, and tracking that impact or how people were finding it. You have answered that to some extent by answering Ms Forrest's question and indicating you are meeting regularly with those groups. Is there anything else you wanted to add in regard to how well it is working, or any particular issues that are being encountered, or things you are monitoring?

Ms WEBB - to add of being able to comment on how well it is working, or any particular issues encountered, or things you are monitoring?

Ms IKEDIFE - From the Magistrates Court perspective it is a work in progress. We are working through technical issues with the support of the department and IT specialists there. We are keeping in very close contact with all the people involved in appearing before the courts, whether that is police, prisons, child safety services, or community corrections. There is opportunity for people to provide feedback and we are responding to that feedback and assisting wherever we can.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - Thank you. Kristy, is there anything you would like to add? You have been there listening and waiting patiently?

Ms BOURNE - Thank you, Madam Chair. Not really. Both the registrar and administrator captured the extent to which their existing operations have really had to be changed to meet the current pandemic situation. Overall, as Ginna has indicated, the support from the sector generally has been very welcome and collaborative. There are many things the department will be looking at that are within our purview to be able to continue when we are out of this situation because there have been many benefits of increasing access to justice through virtual means. While not within the scope of this discussion, and I am sure will come up in later forums, how the prison has adapted and been interacting with the courts has certainly had some benefit in many ways.

That is probably it from me, thank you.

CHAIR - Thank you very much.

Just to confirm, Jim, Ruth's question on the comparison number of the previous workload could you send that to the Subordinate Legislation Committee email address?

Mr CONNOLLY - Yes, certainly. I cannot guarantee it is available. Like Penny, in the sense we started collecting quite granular details on proceedings when this crisis first hit so we could monitor trends from that data, I can see whether our databases can produce an equivalent level of detail. At the moment I am not 100 per cent sure we can do that level of detail. But, I will -

Ms FORREST - If you can't, that is fine. It may be a matter for a subsequent committee or parliamentary question at a later time when you have more data available to compare. If you can provide anything it would be helpful.

CHAIR - If you cannot, can you let us know? It would be appreciated.

Mr CONNOLLY - Can I add one other point I did not raise before, but I should. If we are talking about open justice, in the Supreme Court judges deliver written judgments and written comments on passing sentence all the time, and they are published on our website. It is another aspect of our accountability in the sense that judgments and sentencing comments are published and are continuing to be published throughout this coronavirus period.

As far as access to justice and the court system, what is going on in it, there are those other established mechanisms we use and are continuing to be used.

CHAIR - Thank you very much. On behalf of the committee, I thank Ginna, Kristy, Jim and Penelope for the opportunity for the committee to further explore those notices. This is important and beneficial information we have received today and we very much appreciate it. Please stay safe everyone. Thank you.

Ms WEBSTER - Madam Chair, if I could put on the record the amount of work Jim and Penny at the courts, their staff and the judiciary have done over this period. It has been outstanding and I am extremely proud of them as members of the agency.

CHAIR - Hear, hear. Certainly, everyone's lifted up a notch in all their areas of work and effort in Tasmania, thank you very much.

PUBLIC

THE WITNESSES WITHDREW.