

ICAC

OPEN HEARING

BEFORE THE HON. BRUCE LANDER QC
INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONER AGAINST CORRUPTION

MR. M. RICHES Counsel Assisting

Courtroom 3
Level 7, Riverside Centre Building
North Terrace, Adelaide

FRIDAY, 24 APRIL 2015 at 11:58am

Witness:

WILSON, JULIE, member of the public

THE COMMISSIONER:

Mrs. Wilson.

MRS. WILSON:

Good morning, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER:

Good morning. Could you please just give me your full name? I don't want your address, but just your full name if you don't mind.

MRS. WILSON:

My name is Julie Wilson.

THE COMMISSIONER:

Thank you. And you have a lady here to support you?

MRS. WILSON:

I have, this is –

THE COMMISSIONER:

Yes. No, no –

MRS. WILSON:

– my friend –

THE COMMISSIONER:

I don't need to know her name.

MRS. WILSON:

Mhmm.

THE COMMISSIONER:

Mrs. Wilson, you tell me whatever you want to tell me in relation to the matter in which I am inquiring into.

MRS. WILSON:

Thank you. Commissioner, if you'd just be patient with me, because I just want to gather myself a little bit.

THE COMMISSIONER:

You – you take –

MRS. WILSON:

And I'd just like to – I just want to gather my –

THE COMMISSIONER:

– take as much time as you need to.

MRS. WILSON:

Thank you. I just want to gather my thoughts and I – I'm going to read it. I think that's going to be the easiest thing.

THE COMMISSIONER:

Yes.

MRS. WILSON:

My first entered complaint to the then Police Complaints Authority, the PCA, was April 2004. So I often might refer to the "PCA", meaning the Police Ombudsman.

THE COMMISSIONER:

Yes.

MRS. WILSON:

We needed answers as to why five young men had received differential treatment at the front desk of the Holden Hill Police Station. Two nights later my son Chris was murdered. We all needed a response. We needed a response from my police complaint in order to get on with our lives and to be assured urgent procedural change had been implemented. I believed our case to be a matter of public interest, especially to the wider youth community in our area.

The final Assessments of Recommendations of the then PCA were released in November 2007, three and a half years, with my last dated correspondence from the PCA dated February 2010, six years.

From the start in February 2004 our immediate response to my eldest son, Chris's death, was for us all to ask what went wrong, why, who was accountable, and what changes will be made to prevent a reoccurrence? It was well beyond the resources of the – my surviving son and the other men affected to pursue a matter of police accountability. And trying to get answers on behalf of us all took me well outside the realms of my own experience in life.

In January 2012, my remaining son Mark took his own life.

I'm okay. I look forward –

THE COMMISSIONER:

Take –

MRS. WILSON:

– to the establishment –

THE COMMISSIONER:

– take your time. I’m in no hurry.

MRS. WILSON:

I look forward to the establishment of an effective police complaints system that will serve any South Australian who through adversity find themselves asking the role of police.

Efficacy of the Police Ombudsman, formerly the Police Complaints Authority or the PCA.

I would just like to say that the structure of process is not changed by reshuffling and renaming departments.

In response to my persistence I did eventually feel that the PCA was acting in my best interests. I saw they were actively trying to move forward with my complaint process and I was kept appropriately informed by written correspondence in response to my many concerns. Over the years I made numerous telephone enquiries and requests to their department and I was communicated effectively at this level. These PCA communications offered me a wavering degree of confidence. But as time progressed the incapacities of their role became absolutely clear. The PCA was a toothless tiger in the face of SAPOL and the tribunal process.

Factors that magnified the limited powers of the Police Ombudsman or the PCA.

And I’ve listed three: PCA Assessments and Recommendations were varied by the Commissioner of Police – refer to the Third Varied Assessment and Recommendation (section 32) of the Registered Police Complaint number 188 – 18999. I don’t know about the section 32 bit.

My second point: Nomination by the head of the PCA for me, the mother of the deceased, to attend the closed tribunal proceeding was overridden by the Tri – by, by the Magis – was overridden by the Tribunal. I was expelled by the Tribunal as the nominee of the Police Complaints Authority. So it was overridden even though I was nominated.

THE COMMISSIONER:

Were you not allowed to attend at any time?

MRS. WILSON:

I was ignored. I asked. I asked, it is written a little further in.

And the third point that magnifies the limited powers of the Police Ombudsman is that the Coroner – it was the Coroner who identified 49 police errors and it wasn't the PCA.

THE COMMISSIONER:

I've read the Coroner's decision.

MRS. WILSON:

Thank you. My ejection from the Tribunal, my ongoing need to ring the PCA who in turn had to badger police towards processing my complaint, the PCA's clear frustration in chasing SAPOL to respond and the undermining of the PCA's Assessment and Recommendations. The entire protracted complaint process proved to me that the PCA could not do its job.

The efficacy of South Australian Police (SAPOL) in response to dealing with a police complaint.

This is from me a member of the community. Police secrecy in matters surrounding my police complaint and SAPOL communication inadequacies, and you can refer to the secrecy provisions in the South Australian Police (Complaints and Disciplinary Proceedings) Act 1985, it's 30 years old.

My son Chris was dead. We all knew things had gone des – we knew that things had gone desperately wrong and I was always exp – and I always expected a face to face response from the top rank of SAPOL but it was soon clear that no one in SAPOL was interested in responding to our personal plight. As the mother of Chris and Mark, I fervently wanted SAPOL to take ownership of police mishandlings. The lives of my surviving son, Mark, and the other young men who had gone to the police station for help that night had collapsed and I was experiencing Post Traumatic Stress Disorder myself. I expected and needed communication from SAPOL.

I needed SAPOL to readily deal with us. But entrenched police practices offered us no engagement and an opportunity to manage our trauma was blocked. We were all left dangling.

Since the Commissioner of Police had remained silent I expressed to the PCA my pressing need to be present at the Police Tribunal, to see how the justice system works. I was told I could seek permission from the Commissioner of Police, the Tribunal Magistrate or ask to be a PCA nominee. I undertook all these approaches without success. I was ejected from the Court as a nominee. The PCA on the 15th of November in 2006 had written and conveyed my disquiet to the Commissioner of Police, quote: “asking that he consider these matters and write direct to you about them”. But rather than respond accordingly, the Commissioner of Police ignored any interaction with me.

Rather, I found SAPOL’s energies were entirely devoted towards downplaying our critical incident by: (1) alienating me, the complainant, by not communicating with me; (2) and later frustrating the completion of the Coronial Inquest. See the “State Coroner berates the police” in the Advertiser on the 16th of the 11th 2007, page 38.

With my son Mark’s mental and physical health crumbling I made every effort to rightfully gain

entry to police tribunals. Answers failing, I sat outside tribunal courtrooms in waiting areas wherever I learned a tribunal was to take place.

But SAPOL only react to media. Ethical and Professional Standards Branch rang me at home within days of the Channel 7 News, it now began – it now being three years after the Chris event. And two, the Commissioner of Police signed a letter communicating to me days before an ABC TV 7:30 State related to Mark's taking his own life and that was in March 2012 that – all right – I had that letter. All too late for my son Mark.

At an informal meeting on the 21st of March 2007, this is earlier, brought about by Channel Ten news coverage, helped Nick Xenophon, held in the offices of the PCA, three years after Chris's death, I had listed several questions for the Ethical and Standards Branch member. I asked – among them I asked him what message can I convey to my son Mark now that he has no brother or family, except for me. I was told this was an unfair question. I also asked about quality assurance strategies within police practice. I was very concerned about this because I have worked in the health – I've worked in health and we get on to things much – I mean, I'm on the front line of health and we get on to things. I like to think we do. Specifically I asked this person to convey my need to attend the closed police tribunal to the Commissioner. But all I got was empty answers. I was incensed. I was incensed at the empty responses I was fed. The meeting was patronising. I brought it to an end because it wasn't worth my time. There were two other witnesses to this meeting.

It is critical that those subject to a traumatic event can work towards managing their trauma symptoms. This means confronting the trauma event as well as associated thoughts and beliefs. You've only got to refer to the Australian Guidelines for the Treatment of Acute Stress Disorder and Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, page 15.

For me my presence in the tribunal was imperative.

For me my presence in the tribunal was imperative. Just like viewing Chris's body more than once; standing on the tarmac where he was shot; attending organ donor ceremonies; speaking at the annual organ donor – donor ceremonies; attending more memorial services and more. The Australian Guidelines for Post Traumatic Stress Disorder in adults expound the benefits of exposure therapy towards recovery.

Police Tribunal blockades blocked my avenue to recovery. Justice needs to be seen to be done.

It was only after intervention by Nick Xenophon, a Member of the Legislative Council, a mounting of political pressure, in other words, that I successfully got into the tail end of the very last tribunal. Despite SAPOL ostracising me after my police complaint I did manage briefly to step inside the tribunal court three times: when I accompanied the PCA as his nominee – refer to “Kicked out of Hearing” in the Advertiser 8th of the 12th 2007 – when the Honourable Nick Xenophon legally represented me; I was allowed to enter briefly in the last tribunal and after the police – political intervention. Police secrecy provisions are archaic and they acted directly against our grief and the acute post trauma experienced. This view is supported by the Coroner. Every citizen needs to know how the justice system works.

After coronial findings had identified 49 errors in police procedure and being still without communication from SAPOL – from the SAPOL outfit, I wrote to the Commissioner for Victim's Rights hoping he would – could bring about an apology from the Commissioner of Police. As the mother of Chris and with Mark in considerably poor health, I fervently wanted SAPOL to take ownership of its mishandlings and I wanted this to be conveyed to us all from the Commissioner of Police. I saw communication and an apology could benefit each of us suffering Post Traumatic Stress Disorder relating to the police complaint. I was profoundly upset this significant request to secure an apology was denied. My step to reach the Commissioner had failed, again. Acknowledgement of a systemic failure was never addressed by SAPOL to aid the recovery of any of the victims of the 49 errors who went to that police

station.

And Mark took his own life four years later, after I wrote that letter. A long-term outcome is rather ironical. Eight years after my two sons and their mates went to the Holden Hill Police Station for help, the Commissioner of Police did sign a qualified – I don't call it an apology – a qualified piece of correspondence addressed to me. So those boys never heard anything. It was received in the days before the ABC TV 30 State Report was due to be aired relating to Mark taking his own life. And as I said before, all too late for Mark.

Significantly compounding my frustrations, which were littered throughout the complaint process, record keeping was inadequate. From that front desk at the police station most disturbingly important documents went missing. Refer to the Coroner's findings and recommendations for details.

Impact of police complaint mishandlings.

I believe unnecessary indulgence in time and money could have been averted had SAPOL openly and profoundly dealt with the critical incident. I saw the delays – the delays in responding to my police complaint as downplaying it. The whole process remained unresolved for years. SAPOL internal investigations began for me in August 2005 after the criminal sentencing when they started up interviews again. I later asked the PCA for a copy of this interview because I was unable to trust the police.

I viewed delays in examining my police complaint as a holdup to correcting police errors. If SAPOL did correct anything they never told or assured me or my son or any of the others. I also sensed that with SAPOL frustrating the advancement of the Coronial proceedings, it would muddy the detection of procedural errors and impose an unwarranted risk to the public back at the Holden Hill Police Station. Adjourning the Coronial Inquest in May 2007 and again in – in August, hugely exacerbated the hardship of those directly affected. And I mean the officers

too. I felt sorry for them.

With every Coronial Court adjournment my own emotional and financial burden rose. I was trying to support my mentally shattered son and it was impossible for me to carry on my role in the workforce. I would expect that the coronial financial expenses to our State were hugely exacerbated. Costs were posted as exceeding \$0.5m in the Advertiser, 21st of the 1st 2009.

To create an effective police complaints system we need, this is in my view:

A credible police agency where witnesses to police procedural failings can find sanctity somewhere in reporting these incidents. I had nowhere to go.

The appointment of an independent Police Ombudsman who is allocated appropriate powers.

An independent Police Ombudsman with authority to fully disclose relevant internal investigation to the Coroner as per the Coroner's recommendations: Christopher Wilson Inquest 2008, page 101 (section 48 of the Police Act be amended to remove the barrier).

An independent Police Ombudsman who has powers to facilitate a timely outcome for entire entered police complaints. They seemed to be tied up doing all the other sorts of things instead of getting on with it, it's – I'm heartened from what I heard this morning, Commissioner.

The government to review the Police (Complaints and Disciplinary Proceedings) Act 1985 as per the Coroner's recommendations, Christopher Wilson Inquest 2008, page 101.

To see how the justice system works: the indisputable right of entry to police tribunals for those present at the scene in cases encompassed by fatality.

To see how the justice system works: the indisputable right of entry to police tribunals for

families and/or significant others to attend police tribunals should they choose to maximise their post trauma recovery in this way in cases encompassed by fatality. I don't think that's asking much, Commissioner.

Proactive risk identification by police officers that is supported by the initiation of investigations as soon as possible to protect the community from unaddressed errors. For example, immediate transfer of police officers from the front desk if there has been a breach in their duty of care to a member of the public.

A police complaints system that acts in the best interests of traumatically affected complainants – and police actually. There's a lot of traumatised people.

Senior SAPOL ranks be fully conversant with the Australian Guidelines for the Treatment of Acute Stress Disorder and Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, supported by the Australian Government and National Health and Medical Research Council so that acute Post Traumatic Stress Disorder is understood and meets Australian standards, especially if determining matters related to trauma victims.

And to restore public confidence in the handling of police complaints, I suggest – I've listed about 12, 13, 14:

A police complaints system with an independent arbitrator who is not subject to the direction of the Commissioner of Police.

A police complaints system that in the case of a fatality surrounding the complaint has its own officers conduct the investigation, not this SAPOL Internal Investigation Branch.

A Commissioner of Police that takes no part in selection of an independent Police Ombudsman.

An independent Police Ombudsman with established legislative power that ensures nominees to police tribunals not be overruled.

An open and transparent police complaints system that ensures SAPOL's accountability and removes the secrecy provisions that SAPOL currently fall back on.

A Commissioner of Police that is morally obligated to stand by his word and respond accordingly when that Commissioner has claimed publicly to have no objection to others attending police tribunals. I heard that on ABC 891.

A review of the elements in a Police Disciplinary Tribunal that deny the requested entry of others. Example, family.

An appropriate response to South Australian citizens who dare question police practice. I don't need to be eye – cold-eyed out – sitting outside tribunals.

A financial viability assessment and evaluation of police secrecy provisions. The cost to all this secrecy – blocking me made me pursue it more, actually.

Notification to the complainant of impending Police Disciplinary Tribunals to reassure them the sys – the justice system is working.

A review of the ubiquitous power of the Commissioner of Police role. For me this role fractured my confidence in getting my complaint appropriately dealt with.

I've just added a few more today, actually. This is to restore public confidence in the handling of police complaints: I would like to see more gender balance; if we're reflecting the community, where are the women? Where are other nationalities? We need – we need these people.

And this is another one I've added: there's too many layers in police. There's not enough on the front. It might have been touched on earlier by the Commissioner. There's too many layers. Nobody knows who's what and whose role is what, as it transpired in Chris's case. And I guess it's a career structure that's done this. You just move people sideways and add to it, and there's no one down at the ground doing the hard work. I would just like to say I'm – about quality assurance, those audits would be good.

In conclusion I will just say this now. Sometime after the Coronial Inquest in 2010 The Honourable John Darley MLC drafted the Coroner's Findings Inquest Amendment Bill.

The purpose of the Bill was to amend The Coroner's Act 2003, to require the Attorney General, within 6 months after the making of the recommendations by the Coroner, to provide the Parliament with report outlining details of any action taken or proposed to be taken in consequence of those recommendations, consistent with the legislative requirements that apply to deaths in custody. Where no action is anticipated to be taken, the Attorney General would be required to provide reasons for not taking action or proposing to take action.

The Bill would have gone some way towards providing some accountability on the part of the Government with respect to Coronial Inquests that identify systemic failures – that identify systemic failures. In my case, it would have provided me with the certainty that the 49 failures identified by the Coroner would not be ignored.

The provisions of the Bill were subsequently incorporated into another Bill introduced by the Honourable Stephen Wade MLC Shadow Attorney General. That Bill was passed by the Legislative Council. However, the Government ultimately rejected the proposal.

South Australian citizens left emotionally haemorrhaging after a critical police incident deserve somewhere to go when ordinary pathways are blocked by entrenched protocol.

After all is said and done, a credible early response to my concerns from the upper ranks of SAPOL would only have served to benefit their organisation.

THE COMMISSIONER:

I've read the Coroner's decision and the recommendations he made as a consequence of the inquest into your son Chris's death. I've also spoken to him about it. I think your son's inquest motivated the Coroner to make a submission in relation to this review. I'll have regard to his recommendations in deciding upon what I think to be an appropriate scheme for the oversight of complaints about police conduct. I understand from reading his reasons the circumstances that led up to Chris's death and why you wanted answers in relation to those circumstances. I've read your submission and I've understood the frustration that you've suffered over the years. Do you mind if I ask you a couple of questions?

MRS. WILSON:

Mhmm, please go ahead.

THE COMMISSIONER:

Were you at any stage given any reasons by the Tribunal as to why you couldn't attend in the Tribunal?

MRS. WILSON:

No. I have correspondence at home – that poor clerk, I was ringing – and I did start getting correspondence when the tribunals were happening because I pestered them but I didn't get any response from the Magistrate.

THE COMMISSIONER:

Was it important to you at that stage to participate by way – way of watching –

MRS. WILSON:

Just watching.

THE COMMISSIONER:

– the Tribunal?

MRS. WILSON:

Just I wanted to see it unfold. I needed to see that unfold.

THE COMMISSIONER:

And do you think if you'd seen that you would have been better informed as to what had happened?

MRS. WILSON:

Yes. Yes. It's about justice.

THE COMMISSIONER:

Yes, I understand that.

MRS. WILSON:

Mm.

THE COMMISSIONER:

Was that the most significant hurt in the process which you've outlined today, the fact that you weren't able to participate by watching in the – in the process, or was it the failure of SAPOL to respond in a timely fashion? Or something else, of course.

MRS. WILSON:

Lack of communication all round. I didn't know what was happening. Constantly ringing the

PCA to – what's happening next? I was sort of dismissed, it was like brushing a fly away.

THE COMMISSIONER:

Apart from, clearly, you suggesting that complainants should be entitled to be present during the hearing in relation to misconduct on the part of police officers, do you have any other suggestions how complainants ought to play a part in the scheme?

MRS. WILSON:

If they ask, they need to be considered. I can understand that could – I – I think they need due consideration. I don't feel – I don't even believe I was considered.

THE COMMISSIONER:

I'm sorry?

MRS. WILSON:

They –

THE COMMISSIONER:

I didn't hear you.

MRS. WILSON:

– they need to be considered.

THE COMMISSIONER:

Yeah.

MRS. WILSON:

And if they're nominated – this, this as I say just demonstrated though – I could see that the PCA had no power. Because I was asked to leave. It was the hostility in that room.

THE COMMISSIONER:

And how many occasions did that happen, that you were asked to leave?

MRS. WILSON:

Once.

THE COMMISSIONER:

Once –

MRS. WILSON:

‘Cause then I – then Nick Xenophon got me in –

THE COMMISSIONER:

Yeah, I follow.

MRS. WILSON:

– briefly you know. And then – then things changed a bit. It was like the last minute of the last – it was as if I’m there advocating for my dead son, I need to be there. And my boy that was trying to – and all the others.

THE COMMISSIONER:

You were present I think earlier this morning in this room, when –

MRS. WILSON:

I was.

THE COMMISSIONER:

– the Police Commissioner made his submission.

MRS. WILSON:

I was.

THE COMMISSIONER:

And you would have heard the dialogue that I – the dialogue that I had with the Commissioner in relation to perhaps something what I – might be some improvements in the scheme. Did you want to comment on any of what I might have said or, or what –

MRS. WILSON:

I think –

THE COMMISSIONER:

– the Police Commissioner said in response?

MRS. WILSON:

I think – I think it's a good idea if they – if they can be watched elsewhere, they do their work and without leaving a footprint that they're being watched.

THE COMMISSIONER:

Yeah.

MRS. WILSON:

There's nothing to worry – as the Commissioner said, they have nothing to hide.

THE COMMISSIONER:

No. So you would see some advantage then in an oversight agency being able to audit any complaint made to –

MRS. WILSON:

Yes, yes.

THE COMMISSIONER:

– police, and without police knowing it?

MRS. WILSON:

Yeah. And just pick it up; pick it up.

THE COMMISSIONER:

And take it over, if necessary?

MRS. WILSON:

And let them deem – deem the power to take it over, yes.

THE COMMISSIONER:

Yeah. Yeah.

MRS. WILSON:

Yes, yes.

THE COMMISSIONER:

I also suggested to the Police Commissioner that the scheme ought to have very early assessments so that matters are dealt with –

MRS. WILSON:

Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER:

– as soon as possible.

MRS. WILSON:

Yes, yes.

THE COMMISSIONER:

Do you agree with that as a proposition?

MRS. WILSON:

I do agree with it. It's – I do agree with it.

THE COMMISSIONER:

You experienced 6 years I think –

MRS. WILSON:

Mm.

THE COMMISSIONER:

– in relation to your complaint, is that –

MRS. WILSON:

By the time the case was closed. Because I was still trying – I didn't have any communication. I'm still wondering years later what happened. There were a lot of Standing Orders that were changed but I mean they won't say that that's as a result of my case but I did pursue that and down the track got a lot of change to Standing Orders. But you can have all the Standing Orders in the world, if you haven't got enough people on the ground, you can't do it.

THE COMMISSIONER:

No. No, quite. Was there anything in any of the suggestions I put to the Police

Commissioner this morning that you would have objected to as – as part of the scheme?

MRS. WILSON:

I couldn't agree that he's – that he felt the Police Complaints Authority – or the Police Ombudsman independent.

THE COMMISSIONER:

Well, yes –

MRS. WILSON:

I couldn't – he, he, he says he's independent.

THE COMMISSIONER:

Well, my – my questions were based on the premise that there would be – that there might be an authority with true independence. Now, is there anything you disagree with anything I put to the Police Commissioner?

MRS. WILSON:

No, I can't – I do think – I do think police – the investigations – you have to have police that know the system. I mean I engaged a – a lawyer who was an ex-police officer. Because he knows the system. So, I don't – no I don't. I think, you know, you need the people that work on the front line of ex – worked, experienced police people involved but it's no good under the Police Commissioner because if – I don't know what role, I don't know whether they're ex-policemen or, I don't know. But I mean, I might be wrong here, but I think if nurses are, are – are looked into they – they have police, they have people of other people looking in on their – on, on their error. And as, you know, you have a – a number of people, you have, you don't just have just nurses, well, do you? No, it's a – it's a –

THE COMMISSIONER:

In New South Wales the Police Integrity Commission has oversight in relation to complaints about police conduct and they have access, as I said to the Police Commissioner this morning, to the whole of the New South Wales Police intelligence in relation to complaints about police conduct and the Police Integrity Commission in New South Wales can audit –

MRS. WILSON:

Yes, yes.

THE COMMISSIONER:

– the whole system without leaving any footprint.

MRS. WILSON:

That – that’s it, yes, sounds good to me.

THE COMMISSIONER:

And can if it thinks appropriate require the police to stop an investigation –

MRS. WILSON:

Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER:

– and take it over itself.

MRS. WILSON:

Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER:

Do you see some merit in that? In your experience – thinking about your experience?

MRS. WILSON:

I do because I think police can handle it themselves in that respect. They know their job, I'm hoping they know their job. They're just all tied up with paperwork.

THE COMMISSIONER:

Mm. Mm.

MRS. WILSON:

We need to free police up to get out on – get out doing stuff, front line stuff. Not all tangled up with internal investigations and – I mean with their own stuff but when – certainly in a fatality I believe that it should be moved out of their hands. I had no confidence. I got my lawyer, she actually mentioned – I don't – I don't want those police that when they went the night before then dealing with my case the next day. I had absolutely no confidence in that.

THE COMMISSIONER:

Yes. I understand that. Is there anything else you want to tell me?

MRS. WILSON:

If I could – if you could just give me half a moment –

THE COMMISSIONER:

Of course.

MRS. WILSON:

– I'll –

THE COMMISSIONER:

Of course.

MRS. WILSON:

No, I think that's about it. I just – I just think –

THE COMMISSIONER:

The – your submission will be included in our website in due course and – and your submissions you made today and the discussion we had today. You don't object to that?

MRS. WILSON:

I do not object –

THE COMMISSIONER:

No.

MRS. WILSON:

– no.

THE COMMISSIONER:

That will give people an opportunity to understand your experience with the system. I will also include on the website – I have included on the website the reasons of the Coroner in relation to your son Chris's inquest because they form part of his submission to – to me. Which will also let those who read the website understand the circumstances in which you required investigation. I'm very grateful that you came today; it was very brave of you.

MRS. WILSON:

Thank you.

THE COMMISSIONER:

Thank you Mrs. Wilson.

MRS. WILSON:

Thank you.

THE COMMISSIONER:

I'll resume on Tuesday next week at ten.

ADJOURNED 12:42pm