

QON: Page 64

Mr BANDT: ... I want to raise the case of Kaye and Michael Downer that was featured on ABC earlier this year. They were a 60-year-old and a 65-year-old respectively who were spruiked a property that Westpac valued at \$400,000 maximum. You did not disclose that valuation to them and you, in fact, lent them nearly half a million dollars. Not only did Westpac not disclose the valuation to them but, when they got into trouble and they saw the bank's files, they found that in fact you had overestimated their creditworthiness and inflated Mr Downer's income from \$60,000 to \$93,000 and Mrs Downer's from \$12,000 to \$28,000. Do you condone that?

Mr Hartzler: The first thing to say is: any situation where someone's house is at risk is terrible and the last thing we ever want to do is throw someone out of their house. It is a disaster for them, it is terrible for us from a reputational point of view, it tends to be very costly and we tend to lose money. So that is not a situation we ever want to see happen. I cannot remember the details, I have to say, on that particular case. We would have to come back to you. I have a vague memory that there is a bit of a dispute about exactly what happened and who did what, but I would be happy to take that one on notice and come back to the committee with more details.

Answer: We note that Mr Bandt has asked a number of specific questions on this case in Questions in Writing. We will provide details on this matter in our response to those questions.