

REPORT ON PROCEEDINGS BEFORE

**JOINT STATUTORY COMMITTEE ON THE
INDEPENDENT COMMISSION AGAINST CORRUPTION**

**INQUIRY INTO REPUTATIONAL IMPACT ON AN INDIVIDUAL
BEING ADVERSELY NAMED IN THE ICAC'S INVESTIGATIONS**

At Sydney on Thursday 25 February 2021.

The Committee met at 09:51.

PRESENT

Mrs Tanya Davies
(Chair)

Legislative Council

The Honourable Trevor Khan
The Honourable Rod Roberts

Legislative Assembly

Mr Mark Coure
Mr Ron Hoenig
Mr Jamie Parker

PRESENT VIA VIDEOCONFERENCE

Legislative Assembly

Mr Justin Clancy
Mr Dugald Saunders
Ms Wendy Tuckerman (Deputy Chair)

The CHAIR: ...experiences at times, and so I thank all those who are involved for participating. Can I please remind everyone to turn off their mobile phones or put them on silent. Thank you. I note that the Committee has resolved to authorise the media to broadcast sound and video excerpts of its public proceedings. Copies of the guidelines governing coverage of proceedings are available. I now declare the hearing open. I now officially welcome Mr Greg Wyllie. Thank you for appearing before the Committee today. Before we proceed, do you have any questions regarding the procedural information sent to you in relation to witnesses and the hearing process?

Mr WYLLIE: No, it's fine. Thank you.

The CHAIR: Thank you. Would you mind just bringing the microphone up quite close to you.

Mr WYLLIE: So it's there. No, it's fine. Thank you.

The CHAIR: Fantastic. Okay. Mr Wyllie, I now move to the swearing in. Will you be taking the oath or making an affirmation?

Mr WYLLIE: I will be taking the oath.

The CHAIR: Okay. Could you please read it out?

GREGORY CHARLES WYLLIE, Teacher, Martial Arts, sworn and examined

The CHAIR: Thank you. For the Hansard record, please state your full name, occupation and the capacity in which you are appearing before the Committee.

Mr WYLLIE: My name is Gregory Charles Wyllie. I teach martial arts in schools. I'm here to talk about my experience with ICAC [Independent Commission Against Corruption].

The CHAIR: Thank you. Would you like to make a brief opening statement before the commencement of questions?

Mr WYLLIE: I just want to thank everyone for giving me this opportunity to speak. Thank you, Mrs Davies. It's been a long time coming. I think it's very recuperative for someone to be able to get up and talk about things and get things off your chest, and I thank you very much for this opportunity.

The CHAIR: You're welcome. The Committee will now proceed to questions. Before we do so, I need to remind you that the Committee is not able to reconsider ICAC findings—

Mr WYLLIE: Sure. Okay.

The CHAIR: —recommendations or any other decisions. The Committee members have read your submission when we finally got it through the IT issues.

Mr WYLLIE: Sorry.

The CHAIR: My apologies for that. Yes.

Mr WYLLIE: No, that's—no, it's my apologies too.

The CHAIR: Yes, that's okay. We do appreciate your assistance today—

Mr WYLLIE: Thank you.

The CHAIR: —with helping us to consider any possible recommendations arising from this inquiry. I would like to add that I understand that this inquiry is particularly challenging for a number of witnesses who are participating in this inquiry. The availability of any mental health support remains available to yourself should you wish to—

Mr WYLLIE: Yes, that was very much appreciated, that too—I really—that was a nice touch, and I thank you very much for mentioning that and putting that idea in my head. Thank you.

The CHAIR: No, you're welcome. I also just want to ensure that, at any point in your contribution today—

Mr WYLLIE: Sure.

The CHAIR: —if you stray beyond the terms of reference of the Committee's inquiry, I will need to—

Mr WYLLIE: Yes. Pull me in line.

The CHAIR: —step in and interrupt you and draw you back.

MR WYLLIE: Certainly. Certainly.

The CHAIR: Great. Thank you, Mr Wyllie.

Mr WYLLIE: Pleasure.

The CHAIR: Okay. Colleagues, I now turn over to yourselves to begin questioning Mr Wyllie.

Mr WYLLIE: Thank you.

Mr HOENIG: Mr Wyllie, the Parliament changed the Act—the Independent Commission Against Corruption Act, effectively on our recommendation, and the impetus was this Operation Hale and the way in which ICAC conducted itself in Operation Hale. The findings of the Inspector were as strong as they can possibly be in relation to the conduct of the organisation, concluding, for example, in respect of your treatment and that of your—of Ms Cunneen as an abuse of power. I think the wordings were:

...another example of unreasonable, unjust, oppressive maladministration on the part of ICAC. There was no support in reliable, credible, cogent material, let alone material elevated to constitute evidence.

That's about as strong as you can get. Now, I understand from what you wrote, which was an eye-opener to us as to what you went through, we're considering whether or not we should provide exoneration protocols. Now, with all due sensitivity, nobody that's faced ICAC proceedings has been so publicly exonerated as Ms Cunneen has been, as, I suppose by inference, you have—

Mr WYLLIE: Yes.

Mr HOENIG: —and your—

Mr WYLLIE: My family, yes.

Mr HOENIG: —family. What more can be done to repair, say, the reputational damage that you refer to in your submission to us?

Mr WYLLIE: I think an official apology would be very much appreciated. Bringing up about the mental health issue too, we—that would have been very nice to have counselling at the time. The Government did acknowledge that a mistake was made by introducing the retrospective legislation and—

Mr HOENIG: Could you say—sorry, I just didn't follow that. Could you say that again?

Mr WYLLIE: Well—

Mr HOENIG: What you just said that—

Mr WYLLIE: —the Government—there was an acknowledgement that a mistake was made because of the retrospective legislation being introduced. When the retrospective legislation was introduced, we had to endure—my wife especially—had to endure further attacks because of it. The Commissioner of ICAC after that proceeded to the DPP [Director of Public Prosecutions] and had a meeting with the DPP and my son and his girlfriend and my wife. It was recommended that criminal charges were to be brought down upon them. This is after we got a good result, a fair result, a proper result in the Supreme Court and the High Court.

After—the DPP, after he looked through all the stuff, all my wife's messages, he put it—recommended that it be passed on to the Victorian Chief Prosecutor, and from there, it was—the Chief Prosecutor came to the conclusion that there were no—that criminal charges should not be—they shouldn't have to answer to any particular criminal charges. There was nothing there. So, in other words, that acknowledgement and that continued—the haunting experience one has when a very powerful arm of the Government goes rogue, and on this occasion, the Government did go rogue.

It was particularly—I mentioned when I spoke to the press about it being a witch hunt, because when we went to our private hearing, there was absolutely—they either—the counsel assisting—I asked—I put it to the counsel assisting whether Sophia had been charged with drink driving. We didn't know. She was not. The counsel assisting didn't know—didn't seem to know or didn't answer that question, so I presume that the counsel assisting didn't know. Now, this comes down to ICAC, its either incompetence or its vindictiveness—vindictiveness. My wife was pursued, and it got to the stage where, okay, we will go through my family. We will attack my family.

We had all our phones taken. My phone was confiscated. My wife's phone was confiscated, of course. My son's phone and my son's girlfriend's phone. It was a notice to produce, initially, and it was signed by the Commissioner, who, I might say, I had known for many years. I'd first met the Commissioner in the mid-80s, and I liked her. She was very gracious towards me back then. Margaret was a part of the Commissioner's sexual assault team, and she thought Margaret was fantastic. That was one reason why I liked her, but she was also very gracious towards me.

When I went to a function—I remember back in the mid-80s, she stood there the whole night and spoke to me, and she was really nice. So I just couldn't believe it when I saw that signature there. Six months prior to

receiving the notice to produce, I was speaking to the Commissioner at Samuel Griffith Barrister Chambers party—Christmas party. We got on very well. She was just as gracious there. She was very nice. I was asking about her son, who I had taught at Cammeray Public School. Then to receive the—not a summons but a notice to produce six months later was a shocking thing. I was shocked. So—

Mr HOENIG: Mr Wylie, did you have any adverse dealing with banks during the publicity associated—

Mr WYLLIE: Have any?

Mr HOENIG: Adverse dealings with banks, your bankers or anything like that? Did they ever speak to you about your accounts or anything like that?

Mr WYLLIE: Not really, but it was very tough. I mean, as you can imagine, we had to finance the Supreme Court and also we—the—we got costs. We got—there were the costs. They acknowledged costs for the High Court because the ICAC did bring down—they took it to the High Court. So they acknowledged that they would—they would take the costs.

Mr HOENIG: So your submission says you're still out of pocket. Is that still the case?

Mr WYLLIE: Well, it was. We were out of pocket. We are—we were, and we still are, to an extent, out of pocket, yes.

Mr HOENIG: I just want to ask you this, though. It goes back to that first question I asked you. I mean—

Mr WYLLIE: Sorry if I didn't answer it, sorry.

Mr HOENIG: Parliament changed the Act in 2017. The impetus was yours and your wife's experience and ICACs conduct to—by adding things like requiring guidelines for procedural fairness, by requiring serious and systemic corruption before they had jurisdiction. What more can Parliament do—is there anything else Parliament can do, in your circumstance, that would enable you to restore your position. I mean, that's what we're considering, is exoneration protocol or some way to restore your position of those people who are presumed to be innocent who have really not done anything wrong because the law says they haven't done anything wrong.

Mr WYLLIE: Well, I think some people have suffered really badly. I think being on the—the webpage is still corrupt. I think some of them are still on the website as being corrupt—not criminally charged, but being corrupt, and I think it might be a good idea to take that off. I think the apology to admit that a mistake was made and—

Mr HOENIG: An apology by whom? I mean, you couldn't get a better exoneration than the Inspector.

Mr WYLLIE: Well, I think the apology must come from—I mean, it's pretty difficult. Because what—the impression I got was that the Government—politicians are scared of ICAC because that's a private—it's a privately run arm of the Government, and that they don't want people to think that we are not hard on corruption. I mean, you're caught between—politicians are—maybe they're caught between a rock and a hard place because of that, but it—for the sake of people who are innocent, it's very important that—the acknowledgement that they are not corrupt. They are not corrupt. They were not corrupt. We made a mistake. I guess that has to come from the Government or it has to come from—and I think it might be a good idea if ICAC—that if—psychologically, I think the person has to be—who wants to be a head of ICAC—and I think we have three Commissioners now for ICAC.

The CHAIR: Chief and two Deputies.

Mr WYLLIE: Chief and two thing—that they have to be psychologically attuned to it, because power can corrupt. Power can corrupt, and all these expressions come to mind. “We can have a free kick when we like.” I mean, it was an eye-opener for me. It was very much an eye-opener for me. “We can have a free kick.” We—adversarial litigation is—adversarial litigation is a lot harder than inquisitorial litigation. This is—I remember this speech being—[you might]—inquisitorial, you can—you can go anywhere you like. You can have a free kick.

That type of attitude must not be in the ICAC. They have incredible power and they must be responsible with that power. And I might add that Sophia, when she—you know, they were going on that she did not have a breath test. She didn't have a breath test. She had better than that. She went to hospital and had a blood test, and her blood was as clear as the driven snow. Now, ICAC, either they didn't know that—which is incompetent—or they did know that and they were being vindictive, conducting a witch hunt. This is—creates a very, very bad impression for a body who has so much power and has so much responsibility.

So, basically, I—they do it with—I know it may [not] be [a good] example, but in United States, when a new president comes in, they clear out the administration, and a whole lot of new administration comes in. If

you get the same people there year after year, I think the culture of the place can suffer, and I think hubris comes into it. I think—yes, basically, hubris and just all-out power, it—drunk with power. That can happen. We've had a lot of people who have—in ICAC who have been there a long time. Also, I mean, yes, Margaret, she had completed a Commission up in Newcastle, a Child Sexual Assault Commission. She was—did a very, very good job up there and she got a great acknowledgement from the Premier.

I remember the Premier ringing up, and she was very thrilled about that. I mean, it must not be political. It must not be political. Margaret—I think some people—the rumour was around that she was going to be asked to be a Supreme Court judge. Not that she wanted to be a Supreme Court judge, but I think there might have been some people out there who were worried. They were worried about that. There must not be any doubt whatsoever. ICAC must be squeaky clean. Squeaky clean. So the proper perception—it gives out the proper perception to the public. I think a start now is that, “We made a mistake.” No one has said to us from ICAC, anything, “We made a mistake” except the Inspector—the late Inspector. He mentioned that. I think Mr Ipp said it was a—mentioned something about that too, that previous—the previous Commissioner said there was a mistake pursuing my family.

The CHAIR: Thank you. Mr Khan.

Mr KHAN: Mr Wylie, can I just ask this. If I can get you to step back from your own circumstance and speak in the more generalised sense.

Mr WYLLIE: Certainly.

Mr KHAN: I'll deal with it in the context of an exoneration protocol, that is, some form of apology being given. So I'm interested in what you say would be the trigger for an exoneration being provided. So I ask you this: if, following an ICAC hearing, the papers are referred to the DPP and the DPP pursues charges of some sort against a person and is found not guilty, do you say that's sufficient to warrant the exercise of some form of exoneration protocol or apology?

Mr WYLLIE: I think so. Yes, I agree. I—the rule of law.

Mr KHAN: Right.

Mr WYLLIE: The rule of law is—I think in our society, the rule of law is the most important way to go.

Mr KHAN: Sure. So if a finding of not guilty would trigger it, I take it follows that if the papers are referred to the DPP and the DPP chooses, for whatever reason, not to pursue charges, you would also say no—sorry, an apology should be given.

Mr WYLLIE: Well, basically, this is coming from my own experience.

Mr KHAN: Yes. I know. Yes.

Mr WYLLIE: My own experience. I am saying that, from my experience, if this happened to me, it can happen to other people too. If it can happen to my family, it can happen to other people, and this is where we've got—we have to be very careful. This is where it's very tricky. I haven't received—I—maybe it's difficult to—you know, it's a very, very difficult thing to negotiate, with all the various ways you have to go, but in my—from my experience, I would like to get an apology. Generally speaking, I think there are some other people out there who might be in the same position as my family is in. Because ICAC made a mistake. ICAC made a mistake. If they had not made a mistake with my family, I would not be here now.

Mr KHAN: Sure. I'm asking in the more generalised sense.

Mr WYLLIE: Yes. Yes.

Mr KHAN: Would you accept that, in a sense, the standard of proof that applies for ICAC is not the same as in a criminal trial?

Mr WYLLIE: True. It is [right] yes, I think it's higher for a criminal trial. Yes.

Mr KHAN: Indeed. It's beyond reasonable doubt.

Mr WYLLIE: Yes. Yes. Yes.

Mr KHAN: So can you envisage a circumstance where a Commissioner acting entirely reasonably—

Mr WYLLIE: Yes.

Mr KHAN: —could come to a conclusion that on the evidence that the Commission has received, it warrants a finding of corruption on the balance of probabilities or thereabout.

Mr WYLLIE: Yes. Yes.

Mr KHAN: But—

Mr WYLLIE: And then it goes to the court—

Mr KHAN: Goes to the court.

Mr WYLLIE: —and it's put under greater scrutiny because of the rule of law.

Mr KHAN: Sure. Right.

Mr WYLLIE: Yes.

Mr KHAN: So can you see that there is, in a sense, a gap of cases where ICAC, acting properly, could make a finding of corruption, but the—

Mr WYLLIE: Certainly.

Mr KHAN: —DPP or a jury could come to the conclusion it does not satisfy the beyond reasonable doubt test.

Mr WYLLIE: Yes, I think it might be—it's an evolving thing, and I think it's an evolution. I think working—ICAC should come—with its standards, it should work in conjunction with the court. It should maybe work in conjunction with the court. I understand where you're coming from. I understand that the ICAC is there to find corruption and to refer corruption to the DPP. But I might say I don't—

Mr KHAN: Well, can I just stop you there.

Mr WYLLIE: Yes.

Mr KHAN: The obligation of ICAC is to identify corrupt activity.

Mr WYLLIE: Yes. Yes.

Mr KHAN: Whatever the test may be.

Mr WYLLIE: Yes. Yes. Yes.

Mr KHAN: That's quite separate—

Mr WYLLIE: Yes.

Mr KHAN: —from any referral papers to the DPP—

Mr WYLLIE: Yes.

Mr KHAN: —for criminal trials. Yes?

Mr WYLLIE: Yes.

Mr KHAN: You accept that?

Mr WYLLIE: Yes.

Mr KHAN: Would you accept also that one of the differences between a criminal trial and what goes on before ICAC—excuse me—is that a witness before ICAC is compellable. They don't have the protection of—against self-incrimination.

Mr WYLLIE: Yes.

Mr KHAN: You agree?

Mr WYLLIE: Yes.

Mr KHAN: So that ICAC can receive evidence under compulsion which is then not available to the DPP at a trial.

Mr WYLLIE: That's right. Yes.

Mr KHAN: You agree?

Mr WYLLIE: I agree. I agree that not a lot of ICAC referrals have—

Mr KHAN: Sure.

Mr WYLLIE: —come up trumps in—with the DPP. Yes.

Mr KHAN: Yes. So you'd agree with me that there is that body of cases where, again, ICAC acting

quite reasonably and quite properly within its powers, unlike what you say in the case of your circumstance, may have identified corrupt practices—

Mr WYLLIE Yes.

Mr KHAN: —but that the evidence is then not available to the criminal trial.

Mr WYLLIE: Yes. I guess that's the perfect system, if they do that. Yes. If they do that. But the question's come up are they doing that? That's the question.

Mr KHAN: Well, that's slightly different. We're dealing in the abstract.

Mr WYLLIE: Yes.

Mr KHAN: So, on the basis of where we first started, do you still say that it's reasonable to provide an apology or an exoneration to a person who has not been successfully prosecuted in the criminal courts when the evidence that was available to ICAC quite reasonably leads to a conclusion that that person was corrupt?

Mr WYLLIE: Well, I see it as a layperson, that if a person goes—like, by the rule of law, if they go to court and they're found innocent, that they're innocent, and ICAC—yes. They're innocent, so, because of that and because they're innocent, I believe that—I—the referral has to be—the reason for the referral has to be—there has to be an inquiry into the reason for the referral. There's a—has to be some sort of accountability, as far as I'm concerned. But you're saying that ICAC—and I understand—ICAC has to do its job. It has to sniff out corruption.

Mr KHAN: Yes.

Mr WYLLIE: And it finds—if something is—if it thinks it's corrupt, it [goes] there. But it's—we're looking at standards. What are the standards? I mean, I have to look at the standards—ICACs standards of corruption and also what happened to us, I believe, was corrupt by ICAC, and because what happened to us—that's the problem. That's what can happen. Because we're [human]. Power—power corrupts. Power corrupts. That's why we have to get psychologically proper people to be in ICAC, because they do have incredible power. What happened to us, to my family, means that, you know, we have to have a good, hard look at ICAC.

Maybe the right people were not—well, I think, in my opinion, the right people were not in there. So they did not exercise their power correctly. And that's the power ICAC has. And there's a doubt. Why did they bring in the retrospective legislation? Why was that put in? And that was brought in and then we were further attacked by someone I consider not psychologically adept to the job. So I think you have to have psychological testing before you go in there, and I think the place has to be squeaky clean, because they have—what you've asked me is that ICAC has a lot of power.

They can go and pick on anyone. They can pick on anyone. My wife was picked on. You've got legal studies kids at school who study the case. They ask the question, why did it go to the High Court? There must be something wrong. There's mud that is stuck. There's still mud that's stuck there. They still think—people come up to me and ask, is this ICAC thing over? I had kids in classes I took. They come up, “Oh, I saw you outside being—talking to the press about this”—of course, they were reiterating what their parents were saying. It hangs over you.

It's an indelible tattoo. So that power—before ICAC wants to put an indelible tattoo on somebody—sorry, pardon me—they have to get it right. They have to get it right. In our case, they didn't get it right, and this is why I'm here. Yes. It's—basically it. Thank you.

Mr KHAN: Thank you.

Mr PARKER: Can I ask something. So, thank you, good morning. Thank you for coming. Obviously, since your matter, ICAC has been radically restructured. There's new legislation, three Commissioner model, CEO introduced, procedural fairness, a whole range of measures. We also have the Inspector who, as you know, published a report that highlighted a lot of the issues involved. We have this Committee that also entered into a very detailed process to examine all of the issues from Operation Hale and other operations. So my question to you is about what you see now there is a restructured ICAC as any way to resolve the feelings of distress that you're expressing and you talked about an apology.

I just want to address that in a little bit of detail. Obviously, first of all, this Committee in 2014 held a full inquiry into prosecutions arising from ICAC findings. The DPP has made a submission about why just because a prosecution isn't carried through it doesn't mean that there is any—that it can mean, for example, that a whole lot of evidence is inadmissible. So I feel that matter has been ventilated aggressively for many, many years. But your issue about an apology is one, I think, that's important for us to consider. I just want to try to get to that point to be really specific.

You said an apology maybe by the Government for a mistake. So, in your case—and I want to be really specific—who would make the apology? What would—when you say they would make an apology about a mistake, what would they actually be apologising for? Because the Inspector’s report is pretty detailed about what the Inspector believes were problems. Can you maybe just go to that issue and—so we can get a better understanding of what that means in your mind?

Mr WYLLIE: It’s—well, it—the late Inspector, I don’t think he was treated with a great deal of respect either from the Commissioner. I mean, I think what the Inspector said was just scoffed at by the then Commissioner. You did mention about a whole lot of changes, which is greatly appreciated. That is acknowledgment—that is a further acknowledgement that there was something wrong with ICAC. That was a further acknowledge and, of course, the Government bringing in the retrospective legislation, bringing in the—that was another reason why there was something wrong with ICAC.

Now, I don’t know what ICAC—you know, I haven’t looked at ICAC now. All I know is that around about 2014, there was something wrong with ICAC—something seriously wrong with ICAC, because I personally felt the fire of ICAC for no reason whatsoever. This is the doubt that has come up. Now, you’re asking who would make the apology. Well, who brought in the retrospective legislation? I think those people, it would be a good idea if they made the apology, because I—the politicians thought—was it a soft option or were they just scared of ICAC or did they want to give the right impression that they’re not soft on corruption?

They—that was a mistake. Retrospective legislation was a mistake. In our case—and I’m talking for me, my experience now. It was a serious mistake—error of judgment. So I think the people who came to that conclusion that, yes, let’s bring in retrospective legislation, they should be the ones to apologise, because we copped a lot of grief after that was brought in. They had a—they got into their free kicking again. They had a—I mean, there was some speech about pulling wings off butterflies and things like that. “We have a—just a free—we can go anywhere we like.” That attitude. This is what we—

Mr KHAN: Mr Wyllie—

Mr WYLLIE: —we were putting up with in 2014.

Mr KHAN: Mr Wyllie, that speech to which you refer was before your matter. It was, in fact, a speech given—just—

Mr WYLLIE: Isn’t that a reflection of how the person thought?

Mr KHAN: Just hold on. Just so we’re clear, that was a speech given to a group of young barristers—

Mr WYLLIE: Yes.

Mr KHAN: —by the Commissioner—

Mr WYLLIE: Yes.

Mr KHAN: —at or about the time of her appointment. So it wasn’t related to your case. It was a generalised—I have to say, I was quite critical of her at the time.

Mr WYLLIE: I know, but it—I agree with you totally, sir.

Mr KHAN: Yes.

Mr WYLLIE: But I think it’s a reflection of attitude. It’s a reflection of attitude.

The CHAIR: Mr Wyllie, could we perhaps—we’re just coming to the end of our time. Perhaps—

Mr WYLLIE: Sure.

The CHAIR: —some more specifically—

Mr WYLLIE: Sorry for talking too much. I apologise.

The CHAIR: No, no, no, no. That’s why you’re here, to speak to us. But maybe just be a bit more specific in terms of the—

Mr PARKER: That’s okay. I’m fine.

The CHAIR: You’ve got the answer you need?

Mr PARKER: Thank you.

The CHAIR: Yes. Do you have anything further to add? Colleagues online, anyone there want to ask any questions? No? Wonderful. Mr Coure, all good? Everyone else?

Mr PARKER: I’m fine. Everything is in the statement as well.

The CHAIR: It's all good? Yes. Cool.

Mr HOENIG: Yes, it's all [been dated] there.

The CHAIR: All right. We've got just a few more minutes. Any concluding remarks in relation to the terms of reference for this Committee? Exoneration protocol we're looking at. Any other safeguards or remedies to address the issues that you've experienced? Any final comments to make Mr Wyllie?

Mr WYLLIE: I'd like to say again thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to speak. I really do appreciate it. I appreciate all the questions. The one thing that, you know—very important thing too that ICAC breached with my family was our security. Margaret has been a prosecutor. She has successfully prosecuted many people; many, many people over the years. And, for some reason, I don't know how it happened, but the press was camped outside our place as soon as this broke down. The whole of New South Wales knows where we live. I did not associate my name with Margaret.

When I walked out there and spoke to the press, they said, "Who are you?" They had no idea, because I—for security reasons, I—our names were not linked, but they are linked now. I'm proud of Margaret. I'm proud to be linked with Margaret, but the thing is, security is the top priority, because we have kids, and to have your children—have my son and his girlfriend—my girlfriend—oh, not—his girlfriend, I should say. She was involved in a terrible accident. It could have ended her life, and she did not receive any sympathy whatsoever. She was accused of being a criminal that whole time.

Mr HOENIG: Mr Wyllie, the non-legal members of this Committee probably don't appreciate this, but if you are a Crown Prosecutor—in fact, if you're a public defender—you represent or are involved in prosecuting or defending the most serious crimes that involve organised crime personnel and a whole range of the worst of crimes, and security—your addresses are withheld from drivers licences—

Mr WYLLIE: Yes.

Mr HOENIG: —and from the RTA [Roads and Traffic Authority]. Security of where you live and those sorts of things are absolutely paramount.

Mr WYLLIE: And silent voting too. Yes.

Mr HOENIG: Yes.

Mr WYLLIE: Yes. Well, they—everyone knew about it after that, where we lived. Everyone. The whole of Sydney—well, the whole of Australia. I think it went Australia-wide.

The CHAIR: Yes, you mentioned that in your submission.

Mr WYLLIE: Yes. Yes.

The CHAIR: The issue with the media. Yes.

Mr WYLLIE: Yes, but, look, thank you very much for giving me this opportunity.

The CHAIR: No, you're welcome.

Mr WYLLIE: I greatly appreciate it. Thank you.

[Unknown MALE]: Thank you.

The CHAIR: You're welcome. Thank you. Well, thank you for appearing before the Committee today, Mr Wyllie. The Committee may wish to send you additional questions in writing.

Mr WYLLIE: Yes, certainly.

The CHAIR: The replies to those questions will form part of your evidence and be made public. Would you be happy to provide a written reply within two weeks upon receiving those questions?

Mr WYLLIE: Certainly. Most certainly will. Yes.

The CHAIR: Great. Wonderful. Thank you very much, Mr Wyllie.

Mr WYLLIE: Thank you very much. Thank you.

The CHAIR: Thank you.

Mr WYLLIE: I do—okay.

The CHAIR: All good.

(The witness withdrew.)

The CHAIR: All right. We'll conclude the public broadcast at this point of the Committee.

The Committee adjourned.