

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 15 March 1994

Mr Speaker (The Hon. Kevin Richard Rozzoli) took the chair at 2.15 p.m.

Mr Speaker offered the Prayer.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Consideration of Urgent Motion: Suspension of Standing Orders

Mr WEST: I seek the leave of the House to move that so much of the standing orders be suspended as would preclude consideration of the urgent motion notice of which was given this day by the Leader of the Opposition.

Leave not granted.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

JUVENILE OFFENDER CAUTIONS

Mr CARR: My question without notice is directed to the Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Ashfield to order. I call the Minister for Health to order.

Mr CARR: At 8.55 a.m. yesterday did the Minister publicly defend cautioning juvenile car thieves? By 9.15 a.m. had the Minister jettisoned this policy? Why?

Mr GRIFFITHS: Yes, yes, and for very good reasons.

SMOKE DETECTOR AND ALARM REGULATIONS

Mr TURNER: Will the Minister for Energy and Minister for Local Government and Co-operatives advise the House what action he proposes to take in light of the New South Wales Coroner's recommendation that smoke detectors be installed in all new houses?

Mr WEST: I thank the honourable member for Myall Lakes for his timely question. The Government has listened to the recommendations of the Coroner following the Bonnyrigg fire disaster and the many other fire disasters which have been reported upon.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

Mr WEST: The Government has also listened to what the industry has had to say. We have listened to the experts in our own departments, in the Building Advisory Committee and in the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation. Based on all relevant information available to me, I have decided that from May this year all new class 1 buildings - and that covers all new residential dwellings - will be fitted with smoke detectors and alarms. I have made this decision despite the fact that the Australian Building Codes Board has yet to make any recommendation on the compulsory installation of smoke detectors in new homes within New South Wales or across Australia. New South Wales will no longer allow the situation to exist where new homes do not have this safety factor built in. These smoke detectors will be hard wired and will have battery backups.

It is worth noting that in 1991, following the fire in the backpackers hostel in Kings Cross where six people died, the Government introduced regulations making it compulsory for smoke detectors and alarms to be fitted in guest houses, lodgings, hotels, motels, residential schools and institutional health care buildings. We are now taking those regulations into the residential home area. Whilst there will be no retrospectivity in these regulations, the local government approvals regulation enables councils to require as a condition of building approval that an existing building be brought into conformity with the Act where the building is subject to an application for alterations or additions. I hope that owners of existing homes will install these devices. Research carried out by numerous academics and the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation shows that deaths in homes with smoke detectors are about 50 per cent lower than in those homes without them.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

Mr WEST: These changes will require class 1a buildings - all residential houses - to be built with an automatic, self-contained fire detection and alarm system, designed to ensure that the occupants are given adequate warning so that they can evacuate the building if a fire breaks out. Automatic, self-contained fire detection and alarm devices are often called single station detectors and will be available on the market. Multiple station detectors which are interconnected will also be available on the market. The detecting element may be activated by smoke, heat or both. There has been a wide-ranging debate in Australia on this issue over a long time. A lot of evidence has been considered by researchers. Whilst people have been promoting battery operated detectors, without being wired into the system, research shows that after two years about 50 per cent of them are inoperative.

Clearly, that is why the decision has been made to go to the hard wiring process. One of the questions that clearly would be asked is: what number

Page 682

of detectors would an average house need? That number would be determined by the design of the house. The detectors would be ideally placed between the living room and bedroom areas of the house. It is expected that most houses would need two detectors. It has been indicated that it would cost approximately \$175 to purchase and install two detectors in each house. I believe this is a very important program to help many people and to avoid the tragedies which occur all too often.

TERRIGAL CONFERENCE ON JUVENILE JUSTICE

Mr ANDERSON: My question is directed to the Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Eastwood to order.

Mr ANDERSON: Did the Minister agree to speak at a Terrigal conference on juvenile justice on 15

April sponsored by the Australian Institute of Criminology? Did he yesterday withdraw from the speakers list? Why did he withdraw?

Mr GRIFFITHS: Bring on the debate. Was that a leadership challenge, a preselection speech or a farewell speech? Yes, I agreed to speak at that conference. The reason I withdrew is that on that day my wife will be operated on.

CABINET SUBCOMMITTEE BUSHFIRE MANAGEMENT REPORT

Dr REFSHAUGE: My question is directed to the Premier and Minister for Economic Development. Did the Deputy Premier today cancel the release of the interim report of the Cabinet committee on bushfire management and control? If so, why? Is the Premier now at odds with his Deputy Premier as well as his Minister for Police and Emergency Services?

Mr FAHEY: We know which members are at odds with one another, and they are all on the other side. Even in the electorate of Marrickville the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has people at odds with him. It is very clear that in desperation Opposition members seek to trot out all sorts of weird and weak questions. The subcommittee of Cabinet under the Deputy Premier has worked very well and very assiduously. It has canvassed significantly. Notwithstanding that, what do we hear from the honourable member for Liverpool, the man under preselection challenge? Yesterday he said publicly, "We are not going to see changes to bushfire arrangements in this State without full and proper debate". Some 450 submissions have been received by the subcommittee and there have been many discussions with members of the community.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Bulli to order.

Mr FAHEY: There was no submission from the honourable member for Liverpool.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much interjection from the Government benches.

Mr FAHEY: He purports to be the spokesperson at this time on emergency services -

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to order.

Mr FAHEY: - but he had nothing to contribute to make bushfire operations better in this State.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Riverstone to order. I call the honourable member for Burrinjuck to order.

Mr FAHEY: We had a considerable discussion on that matter this morning which progressed the matter significantly. There will be continual progress and action will occur in the very near future. We canvassed widely many matters that needed to be canvassed fully by all the Cabinet. As I said, that process will continue and when we have the plan in place, which will be very soon, the Deputy Premier will announce it.

STATE TRANSIT AUTHORITY ENTERPRISE AGREEMENTS

Mr MERTON: My question is addressed to the Minister for Transport and Minister for Roads. Has State Transit negotiated enterprise agreements for a large number of its staff? If so, what improvements have resulted in services for the travelling public?

Mr BAIRD: I thank the honourable member for Baulkham Hills for his question on enterprise

agreements.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Granville to order.

Mr BAIRD: It is a great pity that the Leader of the Opposition did not introduce enterprise agreements for members on the frontbench. After recent events he needs one for the honourable member for Kogarah to make him lift his performance. The State Transit Authority has successfully negotiated enterprise agreements covering 96.4 per cent of its staff. It is fair to say that the results have been nothing short of outstanding. We have set a series of targets for reducing absenteeism, workers' compensation claims, complaints, and for improving on-time running. All these targets are monitored at two levels: first, by a consultative committee at each depot and, second, by the chief executive and senior union officials.

Since the introduction of the agreement for bus operators in August last year results have included a 30 per cent reduction in absenteeism. Before the agreement the level of absenteeism was 12 days a year for each employee. This has been reduced to about eight days a year, and we want to get it down even further. We aim for a 30 per cent reduction in workers' compensation claims. They have already been reduced from 120 in July last year to just 59 this

Page 683

year. The benchmark for on-time running has been set at 95 per cent. This target has already been substantially exceeded with an actual on-time running figure of 98.8 per cent achieved for January this year, which is an outstanding performance by any criterion. Compare these figures with the directionless disaster under Labor.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

Mr BAIRD: The previous Government never in its wildest dreams could achieve that on-time running performance. It is this Government that has made it happen.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Drummoyne to order.

Mr BAIRD: All associated with State Transit can take pride in the figures. Most importantly, they reflect the way in which State Transit is achieving major benefits for passengers. It is very common for passengers to write letters of congratulations in relation to individual staff members or particular bus drivers -

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Kogarah to order.

Mr BAIRD: - and how helpful they have been in assisting passengers to get on and off buses, providing a real level of service.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Mount Druitt to order.

Mr BAIRD: The agreement also has substantial cost saving implications for the people of New South Wales. For instance, we have abolished spare bus operator positions and introduced casual, part-time and temporary employment. The bus fleet is now being serviced on a kilometre basis. State Transit has introduced flat rate payments to staff on rail charters on Saturdays, Sundays and public holidays. State Transit staff will also benefit from the enterprise agreement. For the first time career paths have been included in an agreement for bus operation's and ferry operation's wages staff. So they can look forward to career progression within State Transit. Under the previous Government they were employed as drivers and that was the end of it. Now they have a career path. A skills audit has been drawn up to identify any extra skills required by staff so that training can be provided. Let me give the most glaring example of how efficiency has been improved under this Government compared with Labor's maladministration.

In March 1988 when the Australian Labor Party was thrown out of office State Transit was carrying 35,357 passengers for each person employed. That figure has risen to 51,328 passengers per employee - a 45 per cent improvement in productivity per employee. This is a remarkable achievement under this Government. Government contributions to State Transit have fallen from \$238 million in Labor's last year in office to \$163 million this year - again a remarkable achievement. That is equivalent to a 31 per cent decline in taxpayer contributions.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Kiama to order.

Mr BAIRD: It is the shame of members opposite that they totally oppose enterprise agreements. We remember the cries. They said this would mean the employers could exploit the employees. This agreement has worked for State Transit and employees. For employees it has meant career progression, which never occurred before, and it has also worked for State Transit as it has recorded the best times that have ever been achieved for on-time running. There has been a dramatic reduction in absenteeism, workers' compensation and in running costs. Once again, we show that this is a can do Government.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Londonderry to order.

MATURE AGE UNEMPLOYED

Mr MORRIS: My question without notice is addressed to the Minister for Community Services, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Minister for the Ageing. What action is proposed in relation to the problems faced by mature age workers seeking employment in the New South Wales work force?

Ms Allan: That will be you, Barry.

Mr LONGLEY: On the contrary, I thought that would be an appropriate topic for members of the Opposition.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order. The Minister will answer the question. I call the honourable member for Cabramatta to order. I call the honourable member for Moorebank to order. There is far too much interjection. Members' interjections and responses to them may prevent additional questions being asked in question time. The Minister should be allowed to answer the question in silence.

Mr LONGLEY: I thank the honourable member for Blue Mountains for his question. He has a demonstrated commitment to the issue of ageing because he is committed to the interests of his constituents. This is an increasing proportion of the population that is obviously treated as a joke by the Opposition. As all honourable members will be aware, next week is Seniors Week. Seniors Week is now a firmly established event in the calendar of the year and is one of the most important events for the seniors in our community and for our entire community. This year's Seniors Week is very special because we are delighted and honoured to have with us in Sydney Betty Friedan, the eminent pioneer of so many social issues, beginning with her landmark work *The Feminine Mystique* published in 1963 and now her most recent work, which deals with the issue of ageing, *The Fountain of Age*.

Honourable members may have seen the article in this morning's *Sydney Morning Herald*. Betty Friedan is a remarkable person whose profound

Page 684

insight into important social issues has already changed the world and is changing and continues to challenge established thinking - particularly honourable members opposite. She has a very full program of events and appearances during her visit to Australia and has quite clearly excited a great level of

interest among our local media. The Government was delighted that she could join the Premier, my colleague the Minister for Industrial Relations and Employment, and me at the media launch for Seniors Week yesterday. What a launch it was.

[Interruption]

It is obvious that the Opposition is clearly quite uninterested in what would have to be the most significant issue facing this country not only for the rest of this decade but well into the twenty-first century. The fact that the Opposition has no credentials in this issue and may fabricate remarks about older citizens -

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Blacktown to order.

Mr LONGLEY: - stands in stark condemnation to its lack of policy, lack of understanding of the principles -

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Bulli to order for the second time.

Mr LONGLEY: - and the fact is that the Labor side of politics, even federally, is nothing but a complete disgrace. New South Wales is leading the way.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Newcastle to order.

Mr LONGLEY: The Federal Government has not even bothered to outlaw age discrimination.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Hurstville to order.

Mr LONGLEY: Age discrimination is not outlawed by the Federal Government because it does not care. The Federal Government still has compulsory retirement. It is living so far in the past that it is a disgrace to all senior citizens in our community.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Londonderry to order for the second time.

Mr LONGLEY: This year's Seniors Week will be the best yet. It has been launched with a very important initiative; that is, a \$2.25 million package to tackle discrimination against mature age people in the work force and particularly to improve job prospects for older people.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Ballina to order. I call the honourable member for Ashfield to order for the second time.

Mr LONGLEY: The package was developed jointly by me and the Minister for Industrial Relations.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Kogarah to order for the second time.

Mr LONGLEY: It is the first of its kind in Australia. It complements the other landmark initiatives that the Fahey Government is taking against age discrimination and unemployment.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Smithfield to order.

Mr LONGLEY: The mature workers' program package of initiatives recognises that older people have a great deal of experience and skills to contribute and they have a right to a long and fulfilling work life. The package of new initiatives includes: the establishment of a best practice award for employers who show leadership in relation to the recruitment, training and management of older workers; the development of joint ventures with business to assist both workers and employers to develop innovative

and productive workplaces where the abilities and experiences of mature age workers are acknowledged and utilised; the establishment of a mature workers advisory committee to oversee the establishment of the initiatives and to provide advice to government on ageing and employment issues; a public awareness campaign promoting the experience and skills of older people under the banner of the Age Adds Value campaign. As I have said, New South Wales leads the nation in promoting ageing as a positive thing for individuals and for the community, and in working for the interests of older people.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber. Members who wish to converse may do so outside. Those of us inside the Chamber who are interested in the proceedings would prefer that members remain silent. The Minister is the only one with the call.

Mr LONGLEY: I remind the House that we are still the only State to have abolished compulsory retirement and introduced age discrimination legislation, and we are pioneering better health and better community care for older people. The mature age workers initiatives which were announced yesterday by the Premier are a further step forward and New South Wales is now being recognised as a world leader in this vital area of social policy. When honourable members look at social policy, they recognise that it is this Government, the Fahey Government, that is putting people first. It is the Labor Party which repeatedly does deals with its mates and does not care at all about people.

[Interruption]

The Labor Party puts people last and, indeed, has repeatedly demonstrated no understanding of these issues. It has repeatedly said that it not only has no understanding but does not care about the needs, concerns and interests of older people.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Wollongong to order.

Page 685

Mr LONGLEY: It is this Government which is making the real achievements and which is a leader - not only in Australia but around the world - in issues relating to ageing. May I close by quoting Betty Friedan who had this to say following yesterday's announcement by the Premier -

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much audible conversation in the Chamber, as I have indicated on a number of occasions this afternoon. I would ask all members to pay attention in silence to what is being said and enable question time to proceed in an orderly fashion.

Mr LONGLEY: Betty Friedan, who has an unparalleled reputation around the world, said:

You are on the cutting edge worldwide in the new social policies. I don't know how much you realise what the Premier has said here and what your Ministers are doing - what a departure this is from the way that I think the whole rest of the world is seeing age only as a problem for society . . .

It is awesome that you are doing this in New South Wales and I trust you are there in the vanguard for Australia but you will also be for the rest of the world . . .

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Blacktown to order for the second time.

DISBURSEMENT OF BUSHFIRE RELIEF DONATIONS

Mr McMANUS: My question without notice is directed to the Premier and Minister for Economic Development. Of \$16.2 million donated to bushfire appeals, has \$7.7 million been allocated for personal hardship relief and \$1.8 million distributed for clean-up and re-establishment grants? Is it the case that

these grants have come from donation moneys only and that the Government has not contributed a cent towards them?

Mr FAHEY: Obviously the honourable member for Bulli has little or no knowledge of what has happened over the past two months. That does not surprise me because he rarely takes much notice of what is happening in New South Wales let alone on the South Coast of New South Wales.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for The Hills to order.

Mr FAHEY: I can spend some considerable time informing the House of what has occurred since those early days in January when the bushfires hit New South Wales over a 600 kilometre front. By the time those fires were extinguished or brought under control three weeks later, a total of some 800 fires had been reported. The sad fact about those 800 fires is that more than 50 per cent were deliberately lit. From the moment the fires commenced and the community needed support, the Government did its utmost and moved into action to give support to the community. The bulk of the support came through the family and community services area. Disaster relief organisations were established in many areas that were in proximity to those at most risk and those affected most by the fires. Instantly, when those fires started and there was a need to give support of an immediate nature - food, clothing and accommodation - the funds were available, the support was there and it was given.

In a way that is unparalleled. Certainly there is no record of a similar effort. Funds were donated not only by the New South Wales community, but from all around Australia and in fact beyond Australia. It became apparent to the Government in the very early days when those funds were established that there was a need to ensure an equitable distribution of the funds donated by the community to the various organisations. At my request the Minister for Community Services convened a meeting involving 22 organisations that were behind the individual funds, to ensure that there was co-ordination. It was never the wish of the Government to determine just how those funds were distributed. It had to be the community that decided how the funds were distributed, and it was through the committee established at that very first meeting that the priorities were given to those most in need and most in distress.

The Community Disaster Relief Fund account has been operating within Government hands for some considerable time. It was used, for example, during the Nyngan floods. The funds were distributed by organisations such as the Red Cross and those administering the Lord Mayor's appeal, and the priorities were worked through. Statistics have been released publicly in the form of advertisements. If the honourable member for Bulli wants statistical details, he could obtain a considerable amount of that information from the advertisements that were placed only last week in the newspapers. Last weekend the committee determined that the remaining available funds should be used in an area that had not been touched before. That involved the use of a total of about \$12 million to assist those who had both home and contents insurance.

Previously I have said in this House that one of the statistics that emerged from this particular effort is that about 55 per cent of those affected by having their homes destroyed or damaged were either underinsured or not insured. That is a little scary. Nevertheless, the committee had to address that. Despite some comments in both the electronic media and elsewhere that I can only describe as ill informed, I emphasise that the determinations of who got what came from organisations like the Red Cross, Lions International, the Sydney City Mission, the St Vincent de Paul Society, and other organisations of that ilk. Those organisations are the experts in caring for people who are in distress or who are in crisis situations.

After reading a number of stories in the print media, I felt inclined to go public on a number of them because they were simply not true. Money had been paid, but one has to be careful about trying to be patient when working through the distress these people

Page 686

are suffering. Last weekend the remaining applications were assessed. They related to those who had

both contents and property insurance. The cheques were available yesterday morning to be distributed to those people. Up to date an amount in excess of \$11 million in round figures has been allocated to the victims of the bushfires. Some money remains in the Lord Mayor's Fund. The Lord Mayor and those at city hall who make such determinations have indicated that they would like the bush fire brigades to receive the benefit of those funds.

They are working, together with a team that has been put together by the Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services, to formulate a sensible approach to the distribution of that money, which will ensure ultimately that those who fought so valiantly and courageously during January will get some benefit from the generosity of the community. I am sure that in the not too distant future final determinations will be made in relation to those funds and money will be distributed to the various emergency services, including the volunteer bush fire brigade. It ought to be pointed out that during this period more than \$1 million in cash was allocated. In those early days a good slice of that came from the Government. An additional \$1 million in further assistance was provided by the Government.

The administration was carried out by the Department of Community Services, but the decisions were made for those distressed as a result of the tragic bush fires by experts in caring for people in crisis. In terms of timing this exercise was a remarkable effort because literally hundreds of applications were received, all of which had different aspects. Each one had to be treated individually. In many instances it was necessary to liaise with insurance companies. The last figures I saw in respect of distributions from insurance companies indicated that more than \$19 million had been paid out in cash to those who had lost property. Something like a further \$24 million had been approved, and the bulk of that was progress payments for cottage construction.

I want to say two things publicly. First, thank you to those volunteer groups who gave an enormous amount of their time in a caring fashion to make every effort to give to those who were most in need and to ensure that everyone received something that was fair; second, thank you to the community for being so generous to those who suffered in the bushfires. It was an unprecedented effort, unparalleled in Australia's history. It was a fantastic effort by so many volunteers who simply came forward and said they would support those in the community in their time of crisis, and many others in this State and right around Australia who said, "We cannot be there, it did not affect us, but we will put our hands in our pockets and give to those who were affected". At times like that one feels pretty good about the community and about being Australian. To suggest anything to the contrary can only reflect on the man who asked the question and on the sour grapes that continually emanate from the other side of the House.

TOTAL CATCHMENT MANAGEMENT

Mr COCHRAN: My question without notice is addressed to the Minister for Land and Water Conservation. Is it a fact that the New South Wales Government is continuing its strong support for the practice of total catchment management. If so, will the Minister provide details of the Government's commitment?

Mr SOURIS: I am grateful to the honourable member for Monaro for his question, for his commitment to total catchment management, for the ability he has shown in chairing the ministerial committee, and for the tremendous amount of fieldwork carried out so far as the committee is concerned. It is obvious that the Opposition needs to be told what the initials TCM stand for - total catchment management. Total catchment management is sweeping New South Wales with great success. It started in 1989 and was an initiative of the Government, in the hands of my colleague the Deputy Premier. At that time the legislation was passed by the House.

The bipartisan approach that was adopted, unlike the squall honourable members have just heard, produced a tremendous spirit of co-operation throughout the community. I am pleased to say that this week the Government allocated \$1.5 million as extra special funding for total catchment management,

which is in addition to the Government's \$45 million commitment to total catchment management. The \$1.5 million will be matched dollar for dollar by the community and will result, undoubtedly, in projects worth a great deal more than that. In fact, the average success rate of the matching is more like \$6 for every dollar of government seeding.

The work will involve issues of water quality, salinity, stream bank erosion, pest control, feral animal control, vegetation management and the conservation of aquatic biota. In case the Opposition does not realise it, March is national Landcare month. As a result, the Government takes the opportunity to celebrate the great success of TCM in New South Wales and the leadership it is providing throughout the rest of Australia. New South Wales has 27 catchments committees, three catchment trusts and 570 landcare groups. In fact, 90 per cent of the State is covered by catchment management committees, which is a far cry from the 24 per cent figures associated with the Opposition and particularly with the Leader of the Opposition. Total catchment management -

[Interruption]

If I had 24 per cent, I know what I would do if I were the Leader of the Opposition. I would do the decent thing. I would offer myself and I would go quietly. I would give the Opposition a chance, while it has a year to go, to pick a leader and get on with the job. But which leader? All the potential leaders are engaged in their own battles. I would have thought that if he were a leader he would, at least, be supporting the frontbench in the minor matter of

Page 687

preselection. But the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Twenty-four Per Cent, is desperate. I know what the strategy will be. The strategy will be not to get involved in preselection, to leave that to the party and, with a bit of luck, one or two of his competitors will be knocked off.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order and the Minister will return to the question.

Mr SOURIS: TCM is about co-ordinating community and Government efforts to ensure sustainable use and management of our land, water, vegetation, animal life and other natural resources on a catchment management basis. It involves landholders, government agencies, local government, and environmental groups. That is a very powerful combination, which is producing the will, the education and the action on the ground to achieve total catchment management which the Government has pioneered and which has become such a success story.

Mr Speaker, with your good will, there is an exhibition in Parliament House on total catchment management. I encourage all honourable members to take the opportunity to inspect that exhibition and to avail themselves of the briefings occurring in Parliament House in the next couple of weeks. All catchment management committees are coming to Parliament House to explain to their members of Parliament the success and achievements of the problems and their hopes and expectations for the future as far as total catchment management is concerned.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Coogee to order.

Mr SOURIS: TCM does not mean the cappuccino man: it means total caucus malaise.

POLICE SERVICE INFRINGEMENT QUOTAS

Mr SCULLY: I ask the Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services whether revenue from parking and traffic fines increased 132 per cent to nearly \$176 million in the five years to June 1993?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The House will hear the question in silence. I call the honourable member for Eastwood to order for the second time.

Mr SCULLY: Is this increase nearly five times the increase in the consumer price index for that period? Why is the Government increasing fine collection as a backdoor tax measure?

Mr GRIFFITHS: I think it is very good tactics that today we hear from the honourable member for Smithfield because the Leader of the Opposition has promised him and the honourable member for Moorebank that, when the honourable member for Ashfield and the honourable member for Liverpool are knocked off on Saturday week, they will come on down. It is a good opportunity to hear from him. I will seek advice on the specifics of the question.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Smithfield to order for the second time.

ABORIGINAL CULTURAL CENTRE

Mr HAZZARD: My question is directed to the Treasurer and Minister for the Arts. What progress has been made in establishing the State's first Aboriginal cultural centre. What will the Government do to ensure that Aboriginal artists are given consideration equal to other arts organisations?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Ashfield to order for the third time.

Mr COLLINS: In this year's budget, provision has been made for \$1.5 million -

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the Leader of the Opposition to order.

Mr COLLINS: - towards the cost of an Aboriginal cultural centre in Walsh Bay and the Government is also seeking Commonwealth assistance to develop the centre at an estimated cost of \$5 million.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Broken Hill to order.

Mr COLLINS: By way of background I should explain that it is proposed to completely refurbish and upgrade Bond Store 3, Walsh Bay as a cultural centre for Australia's indigenous people. This centre is ideally located to become one of the principal showcases for Aboriginal arts and culture for overseas visitors to Australia. It has become apparent that all Australians, as well as visitors to this country, are increasingly interested in Aboriginal culture and arts. Indeed, the honourable member for Wakehurst, who asked the question, as a member of the Government backbench committee on Aboriginal affairs, is one of a number of members of this Parliament who has an Aboriginal painting in pride of place in his electorate office.

Mr Gibson: Yes, they all live on the North Shore, too.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Londonderry to order for the third time.

Mr COLLINS: If the honourable member for Londonderry has any interest in Aboriginal art, I would be happy to see him after question time. I may be able to provide him with more information. The Government has, as well as initiating this project at Walsh Bay, provided a further \$1 million to the Art Gallery of New South Wales for a new gallery of Aboriginal art, that gallery's first permanent Aboriginal art gallery, which should be in place in the near future. In this way, visitors to Sydney as well as Sydneysiders will have access to first-class examples of Aboriginal arts and culture. Negotiations are under way with the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission with a view to matching the State's funding for this important and exciting project at Walsh Bay.

With the assistance of my colleague the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, the Ministry for the Arts will establish appropriate mechanisms to ensure that the

proposed Aboriginal tenants and the Government contribute co-operatively to this project's success. In January of this year the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and I officially welcomed the Prince of Wales on a visit to the bond store, which will become the Aboriginal Cultural Centre. This proved to be most successful. It featured a performance by Bangarra, a performing arts company which, under Stephen Page, has achieved a world-class reputation.

[Interruption]

The honourable member for Coogee would not want to buy into this argument too heavily. His knowledge of Aboriginal arts would be exhausted very quickly. In fact, I think he has already outlined it to the House. The visit also showcased examples of Aboriginal artworks courtesy of Boomalli. I am sure that all who were there came away with two things: an enhanced regard for the world-class stature of Aboriginal performing and visual arts, and a glimpse of the opportunities to be afforded by the new Aboriginal Cultural Centre. At that time negotiations were nearing completion with the Maritime Services Board and the Ministry for the Arts on the duration of the lease.

The Cultural Centre Executive Committee had expressed concern at the seven-year lease on offer from the Maritime Services Board. This committee represents the Bangarra Dance Theatre, the Boomalli Aboriginal Artists Co-operative, Black Books, Blackfella Films, Bula Bula Arts and Crafts, and the Aboriginal Artists Management Association. I am very pleased to announce to the House that following a recent meeting with my colleague the Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works and Minister for Ports, a 20-year lease on bond store No. 3, Walsh Bay, has been agreed to. This Government believes that following the success of last year's International Year for the World's Indigenous People, it is important to achieve long-lasting and valuable results, and we are confident that the Aboriginal Cultural Centre will do that.

In the six years that I have been Minister for the Arts, one of my priorities has been the establishment of a suitable centre to showcase the outstanding work of our Aboriginal artists. I am very pleased that this has been achieved by this Government in my time as Minister. As all honourable members would be aware, two outstanding examples of theatre and dance - the Sydney Dance Company and the Sydney Theatre Company - have had their home in pier 4-5 for many years. The establishment of the Aboriginal Cultural Centre will add a most welcome new dimension to Walsh Bay, which is undoubtedly Australia's most vibrant cultural location. I thank the honourable member for Wakehurst for his pertinent question and for the opportunity to affirm on behalf of the Government our commitment to the Aboriginal people and our acknowledgment of the great achievements of Aboriginal arts.

PETITIONS

Capital Punishment

Petition praying that the House will enact legislation to reintroduce capital punishment in extreme cases of murder where there is absolutely no doubt that the offender committed the crime, received from **Mr Windsor**.

Serious Traffic Offence Penalties

Petition praying that the House review the laws relating to road accident fatality or grievous bodily harm and institute severe penalties, received from **Mr Shedden**.

F6 Freeway Emergency Telephones

Petition praying that the House will consider the installation of emergency telephones on the F6 Freeway from Yallah to the north of Wollongong, received from **Mr Rumble**.

Female Genital Mutilation

Petition praying that legislation be introduced to make female genital mutilation illegal, received from **Dr Refshauge**.

Shellharbour Public Hospital Children's Ward

Petition praying that the children's ward of Shellharbour Public Hospital be reopened, received from **Mr Rumble**.

Bulli, Coledale and Port Kembla District Hospitals

Petition praying that the present level of services be retained at Coledale, Bulli and Port Kembla district hospitals, received from **Mr Sullivan**.

Warilla Police Station

Petition praying that more police be allocated to Warilla Police Station, received from **Mr Rumble**.

Morgan Street Petersham Youth Refuges

Petition praying that the youth refuge at 71 Morgan Street be relocated or closed, and that the refuge at 41 Morgan Street be supervised 24 hours a day, received from **Mr Whelan**.

MINISTER FOR POLICE AND MINISTER FOR EMERGENCY SERVICES

Consideration of Urgent Motion: Suspension of Standing and Sessional Orders

Motion by Mr Carr, as amended by leave, agreed to:

That standing and sessional orders be suspended to allow:

(1) The consideration forthwith of the following motion:

That due to his continued maladministration of the Police portfolio the Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services no longer possesses the confidence of this House and accordingly the House calls upon the Premier to remove him from office.

with precedence of all other business except private members' statements at 5.15 p.m.;

Page 689

(2) The following time limits to apply to the debate:

Mover of the motion and Premier
Minister named
Unlimited
Other speakers
20 minutes
Minister named, in reply

Unlimited

20 minutes

Mover in reply

20 minutes

Motion of No Confidence

Mr CARR (Maroubra - Leader of the Opposition) [3.10]: I move:

That due to his continued maladministration of the Police portfolio the Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services no longer possesses the confidence of this House and accordingly the House calls upon the Premier to remove him from office.

The Opposition's case is simple: this Minister has misled the House about parking infringement quotas, and if the Minister deceives the Parliament he deceives the people of this State. But our condemnation goes wider. Getting this Minister on parking infringement quotas would be like getting Al Capone on tax evasion. What we are contending in this debate is a pattern of policy confusion, incompetence, indifference and arrogance; in other words, maladministration - all part of an approach and attitude which render this Minister unfit for his job. This is the Minister who, confronted with a problem, declares to the world, "The buck stops with everyone". No matter how many times he slips on a banana skin he gets up and boldly walks forward into an open manhole. As a very wise older observer of State politics said to me recently, as a Minister and as a man this is someone who would cross the road for a custard pie fight.

Time after time the Minister has been forced to back down and reverse his policies. In this Government of policy shambles and with this Premier a Minister can get away with that. The Minister has shrugged off damaging reports by the Ombudsman and the Independent Commission Against Corruption. Worse, and shamefully - as we will explore in this debate - he sought to discredit the Ombudsman. The Premier let him get away with that. The Minister presides over the deepening demoralisation of the Police Service. He scorns growing community concern about the service, and his Premier lets him get away with it. Now he has been caught in the act of misleading this House. He must not be allowed to get away with that. Misleading the House and maladministration of his portfolio: that is the case against him today. The House must do the job the Premier squibbed. Let us look at the issue of quotas. On 29 April last year the Minister boldly declared, "Under my administration there are no targets set for revenue raising". Outside the House he underscored this statement, saying, "There are no quotas for police in traffic enforcement. I make that statement unequivocally, quite categorically".

By 2 March when he released a review of highway patrols by Inspector General Don Wilson, the Minister had altered his view. He said that there were no formal quotas, just an informal quota system that "some commanders had allowed to exist". Last Wednesday the Minister said not once but three times, "there are no formal quotas in the New South Wales Police Service". That is his assertion. It is overwhelmed by the evidence. Let us summarise it. In April 1993 the Opposition produced leaked documents showing that the Government was setting revenue raising targets of up to \$1.3 million for highway and traffic police in Chatswood. In June last year the Opposition revealed a plan to transfer the New South Wales police traffic infringement bureau to the Treasury to diffuse the quota issue. By transferring fine revenue direct to the State's central revenue-raising body the Minister simply confirmed the public's suspicions.

On 13 January this year it was revealed through freedom of information processes that four Albury Highway Patrol officers were transferred after a work audit found that they had booked too few motorists and issued too many cautions. One officer concerned, and the Police Association, criticised the audit for ignoring road safety issues in measuring work performance. One of them said, "They only looked at our work rates, the number of traffic infringements issued". Of course, there was last week's revelation that the Police Service enterprise agreement contains a quota provision entitled the "management specification figure", which stipulates 10 parking tickets per officer per shift.

That is the same formula that was used to threaten parking patrol officers with the sack back in 1991.

And the Minister says that that is just a coincidence! If that is not setting a target, if that is not enforcing a quota, words have lost their meaning. If the Minister knew the content of the Police Service enterprise agreement, he has deliberately misled the House. If he claims not to have known, he is guilty of gross incompetence. Either way, this House has been misled and the Minister responsible ought to pay the penalty. There could not be a more serious charge against the Minister. If you deceive this House, you deceive the people of this State. If this principle is allowed to pass unremarked on, unenforced, the parliamentary system is the weaker.

That is all I want to say about quotas, but the case against the Minister goes far, far wider than quotas - issue after issue, blunder after blunder, crisis after crisis. On 10 May 1993 the most reprehensible one occurred when the police Minister made that extraordinary and unsubstantiated attack on the New South Wales Ombudsman, Mr David Landa. Members will recall the Minister rising in the House at question time to voice a complaint from a discredited police officer about the former professional and personal relationship between Mr Ainsworth and Mr Landa. In other words, on the basis of a complaint from a discredited police officer the New South Wales Minister for Police implied in this House that the Ombudsman, Mr David Landa, was corrupt. That was an extraordinary thing to happen. He placed himself in a position in which he was doing the work for a possibly compromised police officer. There was no justification for such criticism, and the Minister knew it. The matter was investigated by the Independent Commission Against Corruption and the report produced on 10 June 1993

Page 690

was damning - not damning of the Ombudsman but damning of the Minister. Page 3 of the ICAC report reveals:

... no impropriety of any sort in the processes which led to the preparation of the Pinnock Report on the part of Mr Landa, Mr Pinnock or any other staff of the Office of the Ombudsman.

So much for the implication, the smear, that he was so cheerfully pleased to give voice to in this House, that the Ombudsman was corrupt. As for the Minister, the ICAC report said that he acted in a way "calculated ... to cast doubts upon the integrity of not just Mr Landa but also Mr Pinnock, staff of the Office of the Ombudsman and the Pinnock Report into the Ainsworth's matter". The Minister was caught out. The investigation discredited not only the allegation but also the Minister. The *Australian* editorial on 18 June 1993 said it all:

By publicising what appears to be a baseless complaint, Mr Griffiths inevitably turned it into a more serious matter and hastened the ICAC into a formal investigation - which to no one's surprise cleared Mr Landa and his staff of any impropriety.

Mr Griffiths has handled this matter poorly and continues to do so ... There is no hint of an apology for his picking up an unsubstantiated allegation and running with it in public.

They are damning words about the mentality, the whole cast of mind, of the person with political responsibility for policing in New South Wales. Of course the Minister for Police, as is usual with bullies, refused to apologise for smearing the reputation of an honourable man and a dedicated servant of this State. We contrast that deplorable behaviour with his behaviour on another front. In June 1993 the Minister refused to acknowledge Mr Landa's plea for the restoration of the Ombudsman's powers to investigate police corruption, which had been deleted by the new Police Service Act.

The Minister ignored the Ombudsman's correspondence and consultations for six months. On 14 December 1993, forced by the Minister's lack of action, the Ombudsman made a special report to the Parliament called "Urgent Amendment to the Police Service Act". Its purpose could not have been clearer. In that report the Ombudsman outlined how the Minister's amendments to the Police Service Act prevented him investigating police misconduct. The Ombudsman's office estimated that 30 per cent of complaints concerning police would be left uninvestigated if the Minister for Police did not fix the Act. The Minister, instead of responding, dismissed Mr Landa's concerns.

On 14 December the Minister told reporters that the Ombudsman had never had greater powers over the Police Service, and he wrote to the Ombudsman threatening to challenge him in court if he proceeded with the investigation of three officers who were alleged to be involved in a serious assault. By 31 December the Premier had overruled his Minister. As we will see, it was not to be the first time. The Minister had been instructed to do something - to fix the problem. We should never have been left with the problem. The Minister should have acted at the first expression of concern from the Ombudsman. The Minister eventually was ordered to bring proposals to Cabinet to increase Mr Landa's powers to investigate police, whether the Minister liked it or not.

We have been waiting for eight months and still have not seen those amendments. At the same time as the Minister was declaring war on the Ombudsman, talking about taking him to court and resisting his pleas for action on the legislation, the public was being bombarded with extraordinary instances out of the police force. In March 1993 five Sydney detectives were questioned over their involvement in a \$1 million jewellery robbery in Victoria; in May two detectives faced serious charges for stealing \$90,000 of a \$1.4 million Armaguard robbery at Orange; in the meantime there was an internal police inquiry into whether investigating police officers stole part of the proceeds of the Orange robbery; and complaints against police increased by 370 per cent since 1987.

The Minister admits that 56 corrupt police officers were sacked or forced to resign in the past 17 months, six officers under 24-hour surveillance, 34 under suspension and a further 19 facing criminal charges - all this from a Minister who told Parliament last October, "We have the best police force in the world", and thus signalled that all was for the best in the best of all possible worlds. All this from a Minister who says police corruption in New South Wales is "now covert, opportunistic and sporadic". In other words, the Minister is saying there are no systemic problems. Let me declare and make very clear, this brands the Minister the only advocate of the discredited rotten apple theory. He is arguing that in the police force there can be no institutionalised corruption and no systemic problems; it is all opportunistic. The evidence does not support that hopelessly, optimistic interpretation of the facts.

The Minister was overruled on amendments to the Police Service Act in December, as he was on security for Prince Charles a month later, on 27 January. On 1 March he was overruled by the Premier on his plan to introduce harsh disciplinary procedures. He was told to drop proposals to suspend without pay officers committed for trial on criminal charges. The issue here is not the rightness or otherwise of a proposed action; the issue is, again and again, how the police Minister has to be overruled by the Premier. On his own, the Minister cannot get anything right. The plan formulated by the Minister on the last matter was to take effect on 28 February 1994. Suddenly he announced it was deferred. Listen to what he said on that occasion. He said on 2 March, "You don't win everything". I might interpose, just one win every now and again would be a welcome change. He went on to say:

I've said it quite clearly in my portfolio as Minister for Police and Emergency Services, I want to be tough but fair.

He then said - and this next statement is a beauty - "Clearly the Premier believes that I am too tough . . ."
The Opposition will bring out a little

Page 691

booklet on the best quotes of Terry Griffiths. Can we resist that temptation? We cannot resist that temptation because there will be some bobby dazzlers later on, some real beauties. He went on to say, "Well, the Premier thinks I'm too tough". The *Daily Telegraph Mirror* reported the next day:

The only member of the force to be reprimanded appears to have been the minister, who was given a dressing down in Mr Fahey's office yesterday morning.

Mr Griffiths: Do you believe everything you read?

Mr CARR: The Minister seemed to take a lot of notice of what was published yesterday in the paper. One glimpse of the morning press and a policy declared on Thursday was jettisoned by 9.30. Talk about taking the media seriously! The Minister was so embarrassed and humiliated about this that he had to publicly assure everyone that he still had the Premier's support. Listen to what the Minister said, "Well, I don't believe I haven't got the total support of the Premier".

Mr Griffiths: When?

Mr CARR: When did the Minister say that? The *Daily Telegraph Mirror* of 2 March 1994.

Mr Griffiths: And you believe it?

Mr CARR: You did not say that? Meanwhile, up the street the Premier was saying at his press conference, "I have expressed my dissatisfaction to the Minister". The Minister and the Premier ought to be on "Instant Recall". The pattern is now established. The Minister gets a rush of blood to the head, makes an announcement and within hours the Premier has overruled him. But the Minister says he is too tough or too fair, whatever the occasion justifies. The Minister has one distinction: in a royalist party, he is the only Minister who can say he was overruled by Buckingham Palace. What a distinction that must be at Liberal Party cocktail parties.

All the royalists are winning their preselection ballots these days; it obviously counts for something. On the night of the attack on Prince Charles the Minister said local security had followed palace guidelines. Quicker than the Premier contradicts him, Buckingham Palace declared it was not the case. The final humiliation! To be overruled by the Premier is one thing, but to be overruled by Buckingham Palace when you are a member of a royalist party must be the final degradation, until yesterday morning. There was the Minister defending the policy on Alan Jones' radio program and other radio programs. Within one hour the whole policy had been abandoned. The Minister claimed that was because of public feedback. For goodness sake - it lasted 20 minutes on Alan Jones' program including advertisements!

This is the Minister who says he is too tough; he gets into trouble because he is too tough. This record of persistent dereliction can only be explained by the Minister's total approach: the bombast, the brushing aside of all valid concerns and criticisms. He set the pattern from the very beginning. He began as Minister declaring he would shake up the New South Wales police force. Almost immediately he was faced with the crisis of attempted suicides in police cells. How did he respond? On 20 January 1993 the new Minister blamed everyone but his own Government, saying that political and media attention had caused a copycat syndrome to develop within the prison system. The media was blamed for a string of suicides in police cells. The *Illawarra Mercury* said:

Mr Griffiths' efforts to sheet the blame home to the media and the Opposition smacks of a Minister way out of touch with reality. It's simply a cop out by a Minister who should know better.

Since 4 April 1993 three innocent people died because of high speed police car chases. Another five, including a police officer, were injured. The Minister's response - roadblocks - was dismissed out of hand by the Premier. This time it was not Buckingham Palace, not the White House, but the Premier who overruled him. Beaten, the Minister referred the matter to the Staysafe committee for a report. Yet for seven months he has sat on a comprehensive report calling for drastic changes to police car chases. Task force Alpha recommended in September last year that:

The Service consider prohibiting all pursuits involving use of excess speed and ignoring of traffic control lights in traffic, with the single exception of interdicting persons posing an immediate threat to life, such as intoxicated drivers.

The Minister for Police has made numerous claims that he would be the person to reform the Police Service, that he would lead the assault on corruption. When he was given responsibility for police he

said he would make "revolutionary" changes to the Police Service. He sounds more like Lenin than a royalist - revolutionary changes. He said too many people were driving desks. He claimed he had a vision for the Police Service. But what did the splendid new vision turn out to be? When pressed about his vision the Minister described a reformed police hierarchy as "a trio of pyramids sitting on top of each other". This was the sum of his practical vision for the senior New South Wales Police Service. What did they make of that down in College Street? On 5 April 1993 the Minister released a document called "Accountability, Integrity, Management". It was supposed to be his outline of reforms to the Police Service. But again he mucked it up. As the *Sydney Morning Herald* reported, a key recommendation by the Inspector General, Mr Don Wilson, to ensure the accountability of senior police in the internal investigation process was completely overlooked. Mr Wilson's recommendation said:

It is appropriate for the Commander, Professional Responsibility to report directly to the Commissioner.

But there was no trace of that in the Minister's proposed reforms. Last month came the release of the Independent Commission Against Corruption report into the relationship between police and criminals. Commissioner Temby said:

Page 692

It's worse than I'd imagined.

. . . and it's a lot worse than any of us should have to tolerate.

The report recommended that a total of 10 people should face criminal charges, including nine serving officers and a former New South Wales police officer. The Minister again claimed he would provide "action, not rhetoric". So, what was his response? It deserves to be famous - I quoted it earlier and I cannot resist referring to it again. At his press conference when asked, "Where does the buck stop?" he put his arms out, looked helplessly around the press room downstairs, and said, "The buck? The buck stops with everyone". Consider the Frenchs Forest affair; consider the Ombudsman's report on the Cabramatta bashing - let alone the ICAC report on the relationship between police and criminals - and our starting point must be that there are systemic problems in the force. There are not just rotten apples. That view had been thrown out in the early 1980s as inadequate, but the Minister has set out deliberately to undermine the most effective instrument for continuing reform, a great achievement of the former Labor Government, namely, the Police Board.

Since 1983 the Police Board has had a pivotal role in overseeing the Police Service. Together with the ICAC and the Ombudsman, it was a crucial window into the workings of the Police Service. The Minister's hostility toward it is unforgivable and longstanding. In the wake of the Angus Rigg affair the Parliament moved to strengthen the board's power over the commissioner. This Minister responded by undermining its other powers. Formerly, the board and its full-time chairman had been responsible for the overall administration and management of the Police Service. The board oversaw the Inspector General, and together they drove reform in the Police Service. The Minister made the position of chairman of the board part time. He shrank the focus of the board to senior appointments, training and career development; shifted responsibility for general management and policy to the commissioner; and made the Inspector General part of the Ministry. In fact, the Minister has thrown doubt on the very need for a board. On 31 March he told the House:

The question is whether the Police Board is essential in an environment that has undergone fundamental changes since the completion of the Lusher Report.

So, the eight-month delay by the Minister in appointing a chairman to replace Judge Thorley is predictable. The delay was so disturbing to the *Sydney Morning Herald* editorial writer that the paper claimed that:

The circumstances of the delay raise serious questions about the Government's commitment to it.

That is, the Government's commitment to a police board. A chairman was finally appointed in January. The cause of the delay was, as we now know, his opposition to Gary Sturgess's appointment, the deadlock in this Government over this most serious question of the composition of the Police Board; and the reason for his resistance was the pressure being brought by the Police Service. As the *Sydney Morning Herald* editorial stated:

. . . Mr Griffiths has fallen into the position, dangerous for a Police Minister, of being driven by the Police.

Compare this assessment with the one provided a week earlier by his commissioner:

I can't imagine a better or more healthy relationship between a Police Commissioner and a Minister.

It gives me no comfort to quote this Minister's view on the Parliament, this great institution of democracy. The Minister said:

Democracy is about the will of the majority of this Parliament and the people of New South Wales to support our Police Service.

That is how he defines democracy. That is his sense of parliamentary accountability and oversighting of the police. It is ludicrous. It is not only ludicrous but illiterate. The sad fact is that running a police force is one of the big areas where public policy in New South Wales has been found wanting over the past 70 years - on both sides of politics. It is an area where public policy has failed. That is why, despite all the reforms, beginning with the police discipline package of 1983 through to the most recent work of the ICAC, the public is entitled to continuing concern about the operations of police in this State. We know, for example, that the code of silence is alive and well.

As the Ombudsman's report uncovered by chance through a tapped telephone conversation, there was evidence of conspiracy by police to rort investigations of complaints into police. The public is entitled to ask, "How much has changed?" If it can happen to Mr Buu Vo, it can happen to anyone, to you or to me. The circumstances of the Vo assault and the subsequent cover-up, and those surrounding the botched Children of God raid by police, are well known to members of this House - as is the Minister's handling of both matters which must be regarded as abject. The honourable member for South Coast has maintained an urgent need for a royal commission into policing in New South Wales. That is one response to the persistence of problems with the New South Wales Police Service.

The Opposition would need further convincing that a royal commission will uncover material not revealed by the ICAC, the Ombudsman, the State Crime Commission or the recent parliamentary committee. In any case, we are here today to focus on responsibility at the level of the Minister. That is the focus of this debate, whether ministerial direction has been adequate or inadequate; whether the direction of the Minister inspires the confidence of the public or whether the public ought be worried by his performance. Is this Minister up to the job? That is the question for today.

If there was a royal commission without changing the Minister, would there be any hope that its recommendations would be carried through? The focus of today's debate has to be the performance of the Minister - his adequacy or inadequacy. The recommendations that flowed from all those recent inquiries must be implemented. The police bureaucracy and ministerial inadequacy must not be

Page 693

allowed to frustrate them. So, we must ask, how alive to this is the present Minister? Confronted with questions on his administration, he declared on 13 October 1993 - another quote for the little booklet that

is going to come out:

The New South Wales Police Force is the best in the world.

After the ICAC inquiry the Minister maintains that the New South Wales police force is one of the best. Given the history of policing in this State, that is a painfully deficient philosophy. It leaves us exposed to the dangers of complacency at the very top, and it cannot be allowed to remain in place. Blinded by his self-importance, bloated on his ego, the Minister for gadgetry cannot bring himself to tackle the ingrained and entrenched problems. How can a Minister who argues that the service is still one of the best ever bring himself to tackle the problems of an entrenched police culture - the problem the Ombudsman's report on Mr Vo highlighted? I rather suspect that, if this motion is not carried and if this Minister survives for the time being, we will inevitably find ourselves reopening this debate. If this man's performance is any guide, that will be sooner rather than later.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Georges River - Minister for Police, and Minister for Emergency Services) [3.39]: It is no wonder the Leader of the Opposition is Mr Twenty-four Per Cent. I could not imagine anyone being more confused, befuddled or hopeless. Let me deal with some of the comments he made. He talked about the Police Board, but his team forgot to tell him that a bipartisan approach was taken to changes to the board. He was probably having a cappuccino when the vote was taken, but his own side of politics supported the changes to the board. He talked about the great reform under Labor. I will deal with that in detail. He then talked about "the buck stops everywhere". It does, if one replaces the word "buck" with "accountability". Time and again I have said I am ultimately and totally responsible for the New South Wales Police Service and emergency services, but I hold everyone accountable for their actions. [Quorum formed.]

To repeat what I have said, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Twenty-four Per Cent, is so confused and befuddled that he does not even know about the bipartisan support taken to the changes to the Police Board. He has criticised that. He talked also about the great reform under Labor. I will deal with that in great detail. He talked about "the buck stops everywhere". I have made it clear that the buck does stop everywhere. The ultimate responsibility is mine. I will not walk away from that, but I will hold every officer, patrol commander, district commander, regional commander and senior officer up to the rank of commissioner totally accountable for their actions.

The Leader of the Opposition talked about pyramids. He cannot even read properly. On each occasion he quoted from the *Daily Telegraph Mirror*. What I said appeared in the *Sydney Morning Herald*, not the *Daily Telegraph Mirror*. I spoke about triangles. Anyone who has had anything to do with leadership training is aware that placing triangles on triangles involves putting down a baseline that leads to an apex, to the senior ranks, as it progresses. The Leader of the Opposition is too foolish to even understand that principle. It is a well-known Opposition tactic in this House to attempt to contrive a crisis by moving a no confidence motion in a Minister or in the entire Government.

The Leader of the Opposition made great play of this enterprise agreement I hold in my hand, and claimed that I misled the House. The Leader of the Opposition is not the slightest bit interested in this no confidence motion. He has left the House. He has left poor Anderson on his own once again, and that is where he will be on Saturday week. He is finished and the Leader of the Opposition has left him. They will not even support him. I ask the Leader of the Opposition and the honourable member for Liverpool if they will both resign if there is no mention of quotas in the enterprise agreement.

There is no mention of quotas in the enterprise agreement. I have not misled the House. Resign if that is the case? You are not even an opposition. The Leader of the Opposition walks into this House, tells his Labor lies to the public and then walks away. The document is on the table; it is a matter of public record. Even the Public Service Association said, "No way". A motion such as this is one of those traditional expedients that desperate Oppositions, devoid of policies and sagging in the polls, resort to when faced with a strong and popular government. The Premier has an unprecedented popularity

rating of 65 per cent. This competent Premier will lead this Government to victory in 1995. The problem is that when he is up against Mr Twenty-four Per Cent there is no competition.

This motion is a particularly desperate move. The reason behind it is the accelerating slump in the electorate's opinion of the Leader of the Opposition. Look at what is happening to the remainder of members on the Opposition frontbench. It seems the honourable member for Liverpool and the honourable member for Ashfield are so unpopular that they will soon be dumped by their own party in yet another of the factional blood-lettings which is a major activity of those opposite. The honourable member for Smithfield and his mate are very happy because they will come down from the backbench to replace them. The only problem of the honourable member for Smithfield is that he does not know which half of the seat of the honourable member for Liverpool he will occupy.

To divert attention from its internal problems, the Opposition has decided to attack a Minister whose portfolio without question always guarantees a headline even though the issue has no merit. The pretext on this occasion is that I have misled the House on traffic quotas. That is nonsense, as I will shortly establish beyond any doubt. As all honourable members know, this issue will not be determined by a logical impartial assessment of the available facts. The Opposition will vote in favour of the motion,
Page 694

completely uninfluenced by the evidence. Its attitude is cynical and predictable. Its primary concern is to try to achieve a mention in one of tomorrow's newspapers. The Leader of the Opposition believes everything that is written in newspapers. If that does not happen, the long-suffering constituents of Liverpool and Ashfield may soon forget entirely who is supposed to be representing them. They are poorly represented now.

The Opposition's crass political motives are clear for all to see and cannot be hidden by hypocritical statements of concern about public interest. The real interest in the outcome of this debate centres on the Independent members of Parliament. The honourable member for South Coast, the honourable member for Bligh and the honourable member for Manly are all signatories to a charter of reform. They say they are interested in issues and are determined to ensure that the processes of the Parliament and of government are fair and of the highest integrity. They have consistently portrayed themselves as being above the manoeuvring of party politics. They insist they want principle to prevail over expediency. Their votes on this motion will demonstrate just how high-minded they really are.

As all honourable members know, I have made no secret of my attitude to many of the political decisions of the honourable member for Manly, the honourable member for Bligh and the honourable member for South Coast. As a result it can fairly be said that there is little love lost between us because my opinions and feelings are open and honest. On this occasion I ask of them only that they apply the principles they say they adhere to and reject this party-political attack, which has as little to do with the public interest as the honourable member for Liverpool has had to do with his electorate in recent years.

Among other things the motion alleges I misled this House. That is a serious allegation which is totally untrue. At all times I am mindful of the need to be careful and accurate when providing information during the proceedings of this House. In relation to the current beatup by the Opposition on traffic quotas, I have been nothing less than accurate. Furthermore, I have been nothing less than frank and open about the issue outside this House. Let me deal specifically with quotas. At the heart of this motion is an allegation made publicly by the Opposition last week that in some way I have condoned the use of quotas. More seriously, it is alleged that I misled the Parliament on that issue in answer to a question without notice asked by the honourable member for Liverpool. Let me deal with the more serious allegation first. Let there be no mistake, no doubt in the mind of any member of this House: I did not mislead the Parliament and I will prove it, just as I did to the Independent members last Thursday. I refer every member to *Hansard* of 9 March. The honourable member for Liverpool asked:

Did the Minister state publicly last week that there are "no Government formal quotas" in the New South Wales Police Service?

He went on to ask:

Why then does the 1993 enterprise agreement between the Police Service and the parking patrol police stipulate a quota of 10 parking tickets per officer per shift?

My answer to his question was:

There are no formal quotas in the New South Wales Police Service, there is no revenue raising effect by this Government, and there never will be.

The answer to that most serious question is a relatively simple matter of fact, which can be disposed of very quickly. I refer to the document tabled last week entitled, "The Enterprise Agreement: Parking Patrol Officers" dated 24 December 1992 and certified on that date by the Industrial Registrar. Nowhere in that document, the same one to which the honourable member for Liverpool addressed his question, is anything even resembling a quota mentioned. The dictionary definition of quota is an allotted share. That is close to what the public understands of the term as applied to traffic policing - the allocated share of a total expectation of infringements imposed and enforced by management.

The honourable member for Liverpool certainly understands what a quota is. Here is a letter from the time when he was a Minister. He bemoans the fact that using highway patrol officers for random breath testing diverted them from being, in his words, revenue makers. This is from the honourable member for Liverpool when he was Minister. He should hang his head in shame, not lie about what he believes I have done, but hang his head in shame. He proposed also that an additional 200 highway patrol officers should be employed to pay for other police increases when he proposed to the then acting Premier that:

Taken over a full year of operation in general road patrol activities, this addition to police strength would not only be self-funding but would, I submit, also largely fund the provision of other additional police through the increased revenue generated.

Those are his very words which demonstrate that he knows all about using police as revenue raisers and quotas. In fact, the honourable member for Liverpool was the original architect of police quotas. Under Labor, Peter Anderson put a cash register in the glove box of every highway patrol car in New South Wales. Shame! What a disgrace - and he was a Minister! If we go to the document which was supposed to form the basis of the Opposition's aborted censure motion last week, what do we find? We find mention on page four of a workload analysis. The purpose of that is solely to note:

... that the allocation and locations of positions may need to be varied in the interests of the service in accordance with overall increases and decreases and the incidents of infringement against parking and other regulations.

In other words, it acknowledges that officers may be moved to where parking problems are the worst. That is the truth of the matter and it is supported by the record. It is also supported by both parties to the agreement - the Commissioner of Police, whose letter I tabled last Thursday, and the Public Service Association by its press release of the same day. In

Page 695

the face of that evidence no single member of this House could support this motion. To do so would bring absolute discredit not only on themselves but also on the fair processes of the Parliament. I turn now to the implied proposition that, in some way, I condoned the use of traffic quotas. I am happy again to stand on my record in this area since I became the Minister for Police.

When allegations concerning the highway patrol came to light, what was my reaction? Did I attempt to cover up the allegations? Did I stonewall? The answer is, simply, no. I commissioned the Inspector

General to conduct a full inquiry into the allegations and to report to me. Are they the actions of a Minister deserving of the most serious condemnation that can be given by this House? What did I then do with the report? Did I hide it? Did I put it on a shelf? Did I ignore its findings? Again, the answer to these questions is an unequivocal no. The report's findings were made public as soon as I had the chance to properly consider them. What else did I do about the problem, a problem that has been around for many years and certainly existed when the honourable member for Liverpool was the responsible Minister, known as cash register Pete?

Honourable members may recall that there was a Staysafe committee report in 1985, almost a decade ago. What did the former Government do about that? Obviously nothing. The cash registers kept clicking under Pete. The Inspector General concluded that in 1994, while there are no formal quotas, some districts operated in a way which created performance pressures. What did I do about it? I not only made the report public, but I directed the Commissioner of Police to remove any system which could be used to divert any highway patrol officers from their primary task, and their primary task is to save lives on the road. That was done by an urgent directive to all region, district and patrol commanders. I asked also, and received written assurances, that each commander at every level understood the Government's policy on this matter.

Are these the actions of a Minister deserving censure of the House? The answer again is no. I acted openly, rapidly and responsibly. I acted in what I believe is the only way to act - in the public interest. I ensured that the message was loud and clear. This Government and this Minister are not interested in raising revenue; we are interested only in saving lives on the road. I have referred already to the abortive attack by the honourable member for Liverpool on the issue of parking patrol officers. I proved him wrong then and I have proved him wrong again today. On that occasion, the Independent members listened to the facts, saw the evidence and would not support the Opposition's touted censure motion. They acted in accordance with the facts and the evidence. I believe they will do so again today. Today is as much about the integrity of the Independents as it is about the desperate political plight of the honourable member for Liverpool. Judgment day is Saturday week for the honourable member for Liverpool.

Let me now turn to the other allegations which have, if it is possible, even less credibility than that concerning traffic enforcement in this State. Let me deal with each of them seriatim. First, the issue of Frenchs Forest was raised by the Leader of the Opposition. I turn to this outrageous allegation before the House today, that is, that in some way my dealing with the issues raised at the Frenchs Forest police station was unsatisfactory. That contention is not only ludicrous, but illustrates the unbalanced and exaggerated way in which police related issues are often approached in this Parliament, sadly so.

Although the circumstances uncovered at Frenchs Forest police station were serious indeed - no question about it - and had implications for many areas of police performance, one factor has been conveniently overlooked so far in this debate, that is, who was responsible for putting in place the process which uncovered the truth of the affair? Was it the honourable member for Liverpool? Was it the honourable member for South Coast? No, of course not. It was the honourable member for Georges River, the Minister for Police. I put the Crime Commission into Frenchs Forest because I was not satisfied with the police investigation and I was not satisfied that it was progressing properly. I announced that step publicly. I made no secret of it. I also tabled the interim report of that investigation in this House.

Everything I have done in this matter has been done with the utmost integrity, openness and public accountability. This House may also rest assured that I have a continuing interest in the matters that have already made sure that the commission's reference remains active. Although some in this place may not like the findings of the Crime Commission, they are nevertheless what the evidence disclosed. My obligation is to deal with facts and evidence. I cannot be deflected from the responsibilities of my office by approaching cases on the basis of what I would like the evidence to be - unlike the honourable member for Ashfield who constantly does that in this House and fantasises - or on the basis of a deep

and abiding bias against any particular individuals. If I lose objectivity, I lose my reason for being here.

Again, this is a Minister of the Crown to be censured for acting when failure to act would have been an inexcusable sin. I have said many times in this place and publicly, "Do not criticise me when I find corruption. Criticise me when I lack the courage to look for it and deal with it when I find it". I would now like to turn to the suspension policy, which the Leader of the Opposition raised. It is said that the House can have no confidence in my administration because of a change in the policy whereby police under criminal investigation are suspended without pay. This is not a question of whether that was good or bad policy, for that is largely in the eye of the beholder. The question was whether I had acted in good faith and in the public interest, for that is the true test of public confidence in any Minister of the Crown.

Page 696

When I found that the taxpayers of this State were paying \$1 million a year for officers who had not done a day's work in six years, I wanted to know why and what could be done to fix the problem. The Commissioner of Police submitted a proposal which I adopted. That proposal was to remove officers from pay when they had been charged with a serious criminal offence and had been found by an independent tribunal, in the shape of a magistrate, to have a case to answer before a jury. That policy did not find favour with the Police Association, and that is hardly surprising. Yet where was the Opposition on this issue? What was its policy? The answer is, as usual: the Opposition was invisible. That is almost impossible for the honourable member for Liverpool, but the honourable member said nothing, did nothing and has no policies. I have never heard his policy.

I ultimately reviewed the new policy at the request of the Premier and restored the principles of the original approach. Those who expected me to be unhappy about that were to be disappointed, quite clearly. I accepted the counsel of my Premier - as my leader, as the Leader of the Government - without question. I also accept that as head of the Government he necessarily takes a broader view of issues than a Minister who is intimately concerned with problems of his own narrow area of responsibility. Speculation about a rift between the Premier and me on this issue is only Opposition disinformation, too readily swallowed by the media. It is media hype. There is no question that I am a team player, as opposed to the honourable member for Liverpool who soon will no longer have a team to play on as his captain has washed his hands of him. He will not even let the honourable member carry the drinks to the second 11.

What came out of that exercise? What came out of it was ultimately to the greater good of the people of this State. First, there was a commitment on behalf of the Government and the unions to find suitable ways of employing these officers so that they were not being paid for nothing. That is a major breakthrough. Second, there was a commitment to finding ways for public officers to be dealt with speedily before the criminal courts - again, to lessen the financial burden on the State and the trauma to individuals. Though my means were not supported, my purpose was vindicated. My action created an opportunity to remedy a problem that has been around for many years.

Let us deal with another issue raised by the Leader of the Opposition; that is, the Ombudsman's powers. I now turn to the allegation that in some way I have frustrated the proper place of the Ombudsman in providing independent oversight of the Police Service. Nothing could be further from the truth - another Labor lie. Let us examine the two substantive issues contained in this allegation. The first relates to the specific manner in which I have dealt with the general issue. Recently the Ombudsman made a special report to Parliament concerning section 121 of the Police Service Act. He maintained that recent amendments to the Act have left him powerless to investigate the alleged misdeeds of off-duty police.

I must point out that this report was made despite there being a persuasive joint opinion from the Solicitor General and the Crown Advocate to the effect that the Ombudsman had more than sufficient power in the area. Nevertheless, the report was still made. In the interests of clarifying this matter for the

Ombudsman - which clearly he felt he needed, for I accepted his concern as genuine - I have already gained Cabinet approval for a clarifying amendment. Yet we hear the rubbish and nonsense of the Leader of the Opposition that we have ignored it. We have not ignored it; we have rectified it. That amendment will shortly be introduced into this place for consideration of all members. Again, I acted speedily and in good faith, even though the senior law officer of the Crown advised that the Ombudsman's view of the law was not correct. The Ombudsman was proved wrong, but I have still clarified that so that will leave no doubt in his mind whatever.

I can add that in respect of a particular case which gave rise to the Ombudsman's concerns, I went as far as obtaining a second joint advice from the Solicitor General and the Crown Advocate. I understand that in the face of such a weighty opinion the Ombudsman decided to continue his inquiries. In a somewhat ironic twist, I also understand that the police officers concerned may challenge that decision on the basis of the Ombudsman's own report to Parliament. The outcome of any jurisdictional challenge is a matter for the courts. The matter for this House is whether my actions on this issue are open to criticism for any reason whatsoever. It is inconceivable that it could be said that in some way my treatment of this issue could be raised as a ground to support a no confidence motion. I can only ask how that could be when my original position was vindicated by the Crown law advice and I have taken the necessary action to clear up whatever interpretative problems there may have been.

The Leader of the Opposition made great noise about the juvenile caution. Let us put the facts down. It was not a week ago; it was approximately one month ago. The way that the Police Service interacts with the rest of the criminal justice system is one of the most important areas of social policy the Government is required to address - nothing is more important. We must achieve a reasonable balance between the rights of the community and the dangers of placing young offenders on the downward spiral of the criminal justice system. My view was that in rare - I stress, rare - but appropriate cases a caution would be appropriate. I believed that a caution firmly administered to a first time offender, coupled with a wider diversionary program of restitution, counselling and attitudinal change, would have been appropriate in some rare cases.

My overriding concern was to tackle the underlying problems that cause some juveniles to commit offences. I accept that this change in direction has little or no support in the community. I am realistic enough to accept that; I will not accept that it was the Government going soft on juvenile car thieves. That is not true. It is clear to me that this

Page 697

type of change must have broad community support if it is to be successful. It did not have that support. Having heard the community, I moved quickly to return to the former position. Is that the action of someone who does not have the confidence of the community? On the contrary, I believe that in this matter I have acted as a responsive representative of the community.

Sometimes we forget in this House that we are elected by people, we represent people and we are here to fight for the people we represent. When we forget that we also lose our reason for being here - and sadly I think there are too many who do. If I am wrong, I never hesitate to admit it. Too many times in the past we have seen members of this place persist in a mistake and compound their errors. Often that is ultimately to the great detriment of the public of this State. That is not something I ever want to be accused of. The Leader of the Opposition made much noise about the security of Prince Charles. Let me deal with that in detail also. It was today suggested that the House should have no confidence in me because of public statements I made at the time of the recent incident involving His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales.

Again, my statements only reflected the truth. I said that His Royal Highness was not in any real physical danger from a man with a starting pistol. That was truly the case. It was instantly recognised by His Royal Highness's own personal protection officer. Despite attempts by some to suggest that this meant that I was in some way seeking to dismiss the gravity of the situation, that was simply not the case. I expressed my strong concern to the commissioner that anyone carrying a starting pistol could get so

close to a distinguished visitor to this State. I sought a full explanation. I found the situation totally unacceptable. A report was duly forthcoming and was supplied to the Premier, who was equally concerned about that incident.

The fact remains that it is impossible to absolutely guarantee the safety of any individual without wrapping them up in cotton-wool or putting a total cordon around them. To His Highness's great personal credit, that is not his wish and we must respect that wish. His Highness belongs to that class of distinguished visitor for whom it is important to have direct contact with as many members of the public as is possible. The inherent security risk is obvious, but it is accepted because the alternative would be to make such welcome and popular visitors as Prince Charles totally inaccessible to the ordinary people that he represents. Again the Opposition would condemn me for telling the truth. The Opposition builds on Labor's lies but wishes to condemn me for telling the truth. That is what I felt, that is what I said. I said to the public that I represent the truth.

While such a habit is admittedly exceedingly rare on the other side of the House, it is not one which would cause the public or the House to lose confidence in my administration. I might go so far as suggesting that members on the other side might benefit from learning the meaning of the word honesty. Let us go on a fantasy trip. Let us take some time to revisit the land which the honourable member for Liverpool constantly inhabits - the past. A man with no achievements in recent times, he is wont to talk endlessly about his moment of fame, the time when Peter Anderson was Minister for Police, the most hated Minister in New South Wales.

Mr Mills: No, that was Ted.

Mr GRIFFITHS: That is debatable. The time is a dozen years ago. The honourable member for Liverpool presided over a police force which was tolerant of corruption, entrenched corruption. He was the Minister and he presided over a Police Service in which detectives greenlighted Neddy Smith. The ICAC told us that. What a shame. What a disgrace. This is the Police Service of Roger Rogerson, as my friend recalls, and Bill Allen. Do not forget Bill. This is the Labor Government of Rex Jackson and Bill Crabtree. This is the State in which Murray Farquhar was Chief Stipendiary Magistrate. This is the Labor hall of infamy. All well-intentioned members of this House will shudder when they recall the bad old days which the honourable member for Liverpool loves so fondly to recall - except he gets his facts wrong, as he has them wrong today.

The early 1980s was a time when Peter Anderson was dragged kicking and screaming towards police reform, when a reluctant Premier forced an even more reluctant Minister to introduce a police board. Today his leader lauded it but he did not even know that he was in the House to vote for it. He was forced to introduce the Police Board and to adopt some of Lusher's long overdue reforms. He did not rush into them; he was dragged kicking and screaming - the Minister who presided over entrenched corruption in the New South Wales Police Service which greenlighted crooks. What a disgrace. And he came back into this House. He should have stayed out of it. If we want proof of the type of police force Peter Anderson presided over we must read the ICAC Milloo report. It is compulsory reading. The ICAC told us that from 1976 to 1988 there was entrenched corruption. And he was Minister for Police for a large slice of that period. He cannot be proud of that and he should be totally ashamed of it.

It is not surprising that the man whose legacy is so soiled should resort to hypocrisy over such a matter as traffic quotas. He talks to me about traffic quotas; I want to talk to him about entrenched corruption. He was a disgrace as a Minister. The association knew it, the public knew it and his colleagues knew it. It is surprising that he can be so easily caught out in seeking to use the highway patrol as a cash cow, as he did constantly, and to fund election promises for his mates. He thinks it is funny that he milked the Police Service to get money for his election promises. What a disgrace. How can he sit there with his head up. Folding his arms in a defensive position is a true reflection of his shame.

I understand completely. No wonder the rabble opposite are ready to remove him from both the front bench and the long suffering electorate of Liverpool. As I said, on Saturday week - bye, bye, Pete. His legacy will be a grab bag of tired old promises, cheap gimmicks which his equally desperate leader laughingly calls Labor's law and order program. I call it Labor's pea and thimble trick. I think that is more appropriate.

Let us contrast Labor's lies with my real achievements as Minister for Police. I became Minister for Police nearly 18 months ago in circumstances of great drama and total controversy. By any standard a real crisis of confidence in police administration in New South Wales clearly existed. Now, after a period of real reform and achievement, the Opposition is attempting to create a false crisis which has the potential to undo much of the good work which has been done with the New South Wales Police Service. Mr Speaker, I will now take some time to detail exactly what has been achieved under my administration. From the time of my appointment the Government embarked on an ambitious program of reform designed to build a police service which is more accountable, has greater integrity and is better managed. In undertaking this program the Government was able to build on the legacy of my predecessor. As the former Minister found, reform of such a large and complex organisation as the Police Service is not easy or quick, but already real gains have definitely been made.

Let me deal with the key issue of accountability. The acceptance by police officers of accountability for their actions is the essential ingredient in maintaining lasting police reform. Accountability starts at the top. On my initiative the Parliament passed legislation which placed the Commissioner of Police on a five-year performance based contract. That legislation, the Police Service (Management) Amendment Bill, also clearly defined the responsibilities of the Minister, the commissioner and the Police Board. My legislation was endorsed by the Joint Select Committee upon Police Administration. The legislation will ensure that the events of September 1992 will never be repeated. As I have said before, upon becoming Minister I saw that the standard of Police Service management was lacking. The chain of command, means of effective communication and real accountability were in need of reform. In April last year I announced a major structural reform of the senior management of the Police Service. This produced clear lines of command and control designed to better support the officer on the beat - the men and women whom this is all about.

Within the Police Service every officer, no matter what rank, reports to a single commanding officer. The accountability of operational police has been reinforced by the introduction of aggressive random auditing of drug exhibits. This is carried out by the Police Service's anti-corruption wing, the professional integrity branch. The capabilities of patrol and specialist units are being tested by operational readiness audits. The audits include the assessment of overall competence and preparedness of staff, the capacity of commanders, commanders' knowledge and implementation of policies and procedures for the standard emergency operations, and deficiencies which require remedial action.

I believe that the Police Service is now more accountable than ever. The product of greater accountability has been greater integrity. On becoming Minister I encountered an attitude among police of all ranks that the great battles against police corruption had been fought and won. I was not convinced. I saw no reason for complacency. Immediately on becoming Minister I instructed the Police Service to work more closely with the ICAC on corruption matters. My policy is now paying dividends - quite evidently. At my instigation and with the support of the ICAC the Police Service, for the first time in its history, has introduced a corruption prevention plan which is now being supported by strategies introduced across the service and within local commands.

Steps taken to promote integrity and prevent institutional and individual corruption include the devolution of the gaming and vice units and the rotation of staff from high risk areas - such as major crime squads. An internal informers policy has been established to provide real support and assistance for the courageous men and women who discover and act on incidents of corruption. Let there be no mistake: wherever police corruption is exposed I will act. My response to the recent ICAC Milloo report gives proof to that assertion. Directly that report was released action was taken to suspend and prefer charges

against the officers named.

I am sure that it has not escaped the notice of honourable members that events so eloquently described by Commissioner Temby in his report mostly describe the police force presided over by the honourable member for Liverpool when he was Minister - 1976 to 1988. That is what Mr Temby told us. It was the green light State with the Rogersons and the Neddy Smiths. And Peter Anderson was the Minister. He presided over a corrupt police force. Shameful. Commissioner Temby said that there is no institutionalised corruption such as that which flourished under successive Labor police Ministers. Yet Bob Carr was in fantasy land today with his comments. I do not think he read the report. He did not know that he was in the House when a vote was taken. He obviously does not know what the ICAC report says, and obviously Pete has not briefed him.

I assure the House that no Deputy Commissioner of Police, supported and sponsored by successive police Ministers, will ever be found to have received bribes under the Liberal Party-National Party Government. More important than the sorry tales detailed in the first Milloo report is the opportunity to meet the challenges ahead, which will be presented by the second Milloo report that I anxiously await. That report will detail major strategies to improve the management of criminal investigations, the relationship between police and informers, and other issues that will substantially reduce the opportunities for officers to engage in corrupt behaviour.

Page 699

Another area of integrity to which I have paid particular attention is the investigation of complaints against police. Make no mistake: it is an area of major concern. Last year I introduced major legislation that reformed the way complaints against police are handled. The Police Service (Complaints, Discipline and Appeals) Amendment Act was introduced with bipartisan support. Someone should send the message to Bob Carr that his party also voted for it - I thank the Opposition for its support of that effective legislation. The use of conciliation for complaints was highlighted. These legislative changes were supported by the introduction of a new internal investigation system that gives regional commanders greater authority and greater responsibility but demands greater accountability for their actions and those of every man and woman under their command.

This led to a sharpening of focus of the professional responsibility command. The introduction of a customer assistance telephone line has made the service more responsive to complaints and capable of prompt resolutions. It is working very successfully. As part of the Government's ongoing program of reform, internal investigation and police discipline is being examined by the Cabinet justice committee. Whatever the outcome of deliberations, let there be no mistake that I resolve to act and to act decisively. The House should remember that it was I who ordered the Crime Commission to examine the report on the events of Frenchs Forest police station; it was I who introduced random audits; and it was I who saw the charges preferred as a result of the Milloo report.

The third leg of the Government's police reform program is improved management. Poor management has been a problem that has dogged the Police Service for many years. It is a problem for which there are no quick fixes and no glib responses, but it is absolutely vital for the future of the service that it be rectified. The first step towards improving management of the police portfolio was to give the Minister an independent source of policy advice. Accordingly, a small Ministry for Police was established in September 1992, and without question the ministry has been an unqualified success. The honourable member for Liverpool has acknowledged as much.

In May last year, in agreement with my colleague the Minister for Justice, I was pleased to announce the real transfer of police from non-police duties. More than 200 police officers have been released from prisoner escort and court security work to operational policing. These police are now working in key areas across the State; many of them in Cabramatta, some of them on the South Coast. As someone who has been trained in command, I acknowledge that the key to improved management is better

training. Action is well advanced towards the introduction of a high command training program at the police academy. This will offer police professional training in the essential elements of management and command.

The report of the Joint Select Committee upon Police Administration confirmed one of my earliest impressions of the Police Service: the poor standard of record keeping. I have given the commissioner the task of undertaking a complete overhaul of the services records management system. This will be completed by the end of this year. Under Peter Anderson records were kept in garages and the boots of cars and under beds. On 4 April the computer operated police system - COPS as it is known - will go live at a cost of some \$6 million. This will provide operational police with state-of-the-art information gathering, storage and retrieval systems that will greatly assist record keeping and intelligence storage. I acknowledge that the Police Service has performed very poorly in this area.

In recent years the Police Service has made great strides in making itself more open to the public. Its success in part has been reflected in the record community satisfaction levels obtained under my administration. One significant step in improving police community relations has been the introduction of volunteer policing. Under the terms of the trial I announced last year, some 72 volunteers ranging in age from 19 years to 70 years are deployed at eight trial sites: Coffs Harbour, Hurstville, Bankstown, North Sydney, Gunnedah, Bega, Seven Hills and Wagga Wagga. Training of volunteers was completed on 5 November 1993. From all indications the program has been well received and, without pre-empting the result of the trial, I can competently predict an expansion of the program.

In finance the Police Service has constantly proved its managerial capacity. Treasury has confirmed that the financial performance of the service has been outstanding. Unlike my predecessor in the big spending Labor administration, I do not have to constantly go cap in hand to Treasury each year to supplement my budget. I now turn to some of the operational initiatives in which I have been associated as Minister. More police than ever before are walking the beat. The single beat policing trial has been successful. A range of initiatives designed to make police custody safer has been implemented. A real improvement in police-Aboriginal relations has been achieved. One important initiative that I was recently pleased to announce was the introduction of the child abuse action plan. This involves the establishment of two pilot programs with joint investigation teams comprising specially trained police officers and Department of Community Services staff. This will provide the blueprint for future reform of child abuse.

By any objective measure, I believe I have produced significant achievements in my first 18 months as Minister for Police. Mine has been a reforming administration. Like all reforming administrations, I have had my critics, and I will continue to have critics. However, I will never resile from the need to take action if we are to have a Police Service that is accountable, displays integrity and is well managed. In closing I reinforce two points. The first is the Labor lies. There is nothing to say about

Page 700

quotas. If anyone wants to talk about quotas, the honourable member for Liverpool was the architect. He put a cash register in the glove box of every highway patrol car in this State. My second point is that this motion is a nonsense, it is a destruction, and it is a waste of taxpayers' money.

Mr ANDERSON (Liverpool) [4.27]: It was quite fascinating to listen to the Minister for Police attempt to defend himself. Indeed, the best way to sum up what we have just heard for some considerable time from him is that it was a plea of guilty with an explanation. I am delighted that the Premier and all his colleagues finally entered the Chamber when the quorum was sounded, and the Premier remained. As the Minister made some statements it was interesting to watch the faces of the Premier and a number of the Minister's colleagues, because some of them have been here much longer and will be here much longer than the Minister for Police. It is fascinating that the Minister could think that he has convinced everyone that he did not mislead the House with regard to the enterprise agreement. The document from which he quoted today -

Mr Griffiths: Is the enterprise agreement.

Mr ANDERSON: It is not the enterprise agreement. The Minister referred to page 4. He cannot get it right now. The Opposition released, first, a document dated 19 July 1993 signed by M. B. Tiltman, Director, Industrial Relations, New South Wales Police Service. The bold block heading is, "Implementation of Parking Patrol Officer Enterprise Agreement". That is what the official document says, not what the Minister says. The third paragraph of that letter says:

Attached is an advising to Patrol Commanders with relevant documentation for their information in this final stage of instituting the provisions of the Agreement. A copy of these papers should be forwarded by your office to each Patrol Commander in your District where the patrol includes one or more PPOs.

That refers to parking patrol officers.

Mr W. T. J. Murray: It was not approved.

Mr ANDERSON: "It was not approved," said my colleague the honourable member for Barwon. Let me tell the honourable member that during the estimates committee hearing in 1992 I specifically asked the Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services why, after 18 months, the enterprise agreement with the parking patrol officers had not been resolved. Do you know what he said? He said, "It has been, recently. It was one of the first things I did when I became the Minister and it is an outstanding agreement". The document referred to by Tiltman is a letter addressed to the patrol commanders - right throughout the State; all of them who had a parking patrol officer - and signed by John Greig, Manager, Industrial Relations Directorate, on 16 June 1993. It was addressed to all patrol commanders and the first two paragraphs read as follows:

On 30 March, 1993, information on, and a copy of, the PPO's Enterprise Agreement was forwarded to you for your information.

Attached to this memorandum is a copy of a document outlining the agreed processes adopted to facilitate the implementation of the Agreement.

To assist the advisers I will read from page three, halfway down the second paragraph, where it says:

However, consistent with the need to attain and manage the Management Specification Figure (currently 10 P.I.N.S. per PPO per shift) it may well be necessary in the early stages of implementation of the Agreement, and following the initial round of promotions to re-allocate existing resources to ensure attainment of the existing, or any new Management Specification Figure calculated as being appropriate.

Currently 10 parking infringement notices per parking patrol officer per shift! When the Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services attempted the same defence of his position on an Australian Broadcasting Corporation radio program at about 8.30 a.m. last Thursday, Jennifer Byrne - standing in for Andrew Olle - tore him apart. She said, as I do, "That's English. What else does it mean". The Minister tried to justify his position. He could not justify his position and he said to Jennifer Byrne, "If somebody intelligent like you says that is what it really means, I will have another look. I will clarify this. I will have this rewritten". What a load of hogwash. Everyone knows what it means - the journos knew, the general public knows and the Minister knows - so let us put that one to rest.

Let me refer to how the Minister acted responsibly, in response to Inspector General Wilson's report that he commissioned. Wilson made reference to the Albury matter, a matter that both the Police Association and the Opposition separately raised. What has been the outcome? What has the Minister really done about the Albury situation? He has done nothing. Four highway patrol officers transferred

after many years from highway patrol duties to general duties allegedly because the assistant commissioner in charge of the region said they were too old; that they were older than the people they were coming into contact with on the street. I have big news for the Minister and for the assistant commissioner involved. During the next four years there will be another 4,000 senior constables, because that is the bubble from those recruited nine years ago. They will come through and be added to those now in the Police Service. The Minister will have staff with so many stripes that he will think he has fallen into a tiger's den, because that is the reality. To make that type of defence in respect of what was done to those four police officers is a disgrace. The audit document was produced. Why does the Minister not tell honourable members what happened?

Mr Griffiths: Are you saying the commissioner lied?

Mr ANDERSON: It has nothing to do with the commissioner.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the Minister for Police to order. I call the honourable member for Ashfield to order.

Page 701

Mr ANDERSON: The fact is that a bombing task force headed by a sergeant from somewhere else went down and bombed the citizens of Albury, and the local highway patrol jacked up about it. The Minister should read the papers. As a consequence of their objection to what the interlopers did - and I am talking about the local highway patrol's objection - an audit was done. Who was sent down to assist the officer in charge of the audit? The bloke who was in charge of the task force that went down to Albury in the first place. What type of joke is this? Talk about Caesar to Caesar. When it was brought to the attention of the Minister he did nothing about it - so he need not tell me what he did about that. The Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services told honourable members what a good job he did with the Frenchs Forest issue; he told honourable members he put the Crime Commission in. Who does the Minister think created the Crime Commission, for goodness' sake? Does he want to talk about the select committee report?

When will the Minister introduce the committee to review the actions of the State Crime Commission? He is not doing that one, is he? The Minister has a very selective memory. The same applies to the Minister's criticism of the Leader of the Opposition for voting for the provisions relating to the Ombudsman's legislation and the complaints procedure. Of course the Opposition supported the legislation, and if the Minister reads *Hansard* he will note that I led for the Opposition and I said why. I said it had been a great pity during the many years of reform that Labor had undertaken that we had to do it fighting the coalition every inch of the way - you, the association and everyone else. Labor did it and, to his everlasting credit, the Hon. E. P. Pickering in another place gives credit for what Labor did - but the Minister for Police does not. In the eyes of the people of New South Wales I am probably better off having Ted's endorsement than the Minister's, any day of the week - and, I would suggest, within the Liberal Party of New South Wales as well.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Monaro to order.

Mr ANDERSON: They are dropping their eyes. The Minister said he had not heard from the Australian Labor Party what its suspension policy is. He could not have been listening too well because I said quite clearly that the Opposition supported the proposition that the officers be paid. I will give honourable members the history of the matter. Prior to the 1988 election the police rules provided for the commissioner to make a decision as to whether he would pay a police officer on suspension. It was - as was the abolition of juvenile cautioning - part of the Government's police policy and policy generally, and Greiner went to the conference before the election and promised police officers that they would be paid if suspended. Greiner and Pickering promised it in black and white, as the Minister well knows. It was implemented once the election was over and they had won.

That was the Government's policy and the Opposition believed that the people had spoken. I will tell honourable members what changed my mind. It was changed when I came back into this Chamber and for several years continued to have contact with the victims of Operation Raindrop. Some officers went to gaol, some were committed for trial, and it went on for six and a half years. Most are out of the police force, despite the fact that they should never have been committed for trial; despite the fact that, when requested, the Government batted on with it even though Judge Court in the District Court lampooned the two prosecution witnesses as perjurers and heroin dealers. Every time the Opposition attempted to raise the issue the Government took a point of order on sub judice. In the end justice prevailed in respect of Operation Raindrop.

Do not tell me that because a magistrate commits for trial there is a presumption of guilt. There most certainly is not. As a result of the way the law is framed in New South Wales, if there is enough evidence upon which a jury could convict, the magistrate is obliged to commit for trial. It is not like the law was many years ago. In addition to that, so many learned people make so many impassioned speeches about how police officers and other public officials ought to face a harder prosecution test than other members of the public face. I happen to believe in the principle that one is innocent until proved guilty. At such time as the New South Wales Police Service and the New South Wales justice system are revised and appropriate legal aid is available, I might change my view about how these things should be dealt with. The history of recent years quite clearly shows -

Mr W. T. J. Murray: You are allowed to change your mind but no one else is.

Mr ANDERSON: I have not complained about anyone changing his mind.

Mr Griffiths: But you criticise every time anyone changes his mind.

Mr ANDERSON: But you did not change your mind. The Premier and Minister for Economic Development changed your mind. If you had changed it, it would be all right.

Mr Griffiths: That is what you believe.

Mr ANDERSON: It is what the people of New South Wales believe. Let us not hear any more about that. The Minister gave a long explanation in relation to how he changed his mind about section 121 of the Ombudsman Act.

Mr Griffiths: No, I did not change my mind. I took action after listening.

Mr ANDERSON: The Minister did not change his mind; he took action. He should read the press clippings about how he, day after day, said that it was not necessary. The Premier suddenly said that it was and that the change will be implemented, but for goodness' sake not to rush it. It is like the roadblocks

Page 702

legislation. Honourable members should also bear in mind the Operation Milloo report of the Independent Commission Against Corruption. That is another grievance I have against the Minister and the Government. Mr Temby handed down the phase one report, and what was the Minister's response? His response was that he had given the Commissioner of Police 14 days to prepare an action plan.

My argument is that it is not a matter for the Commissioner of Police to determine an action plan. It is the responsibility of the Government and the Minister to prepare the action plan and announce what they intend to do. That is what used to happen and what ought to happen. Regrettably, it has not on this occasion. I shall await the phase two report, which is due shortly. It will deal with the issue of the police culture, which was considered by the Independent Commission Against Corruption. Honourable members will learn what regard is paid to my service in the position against that of the current but

not-for-long incumbent Minister. I am prepared to put my track record as a police Minister up against his any day of the week. I do not take particular offence at what the Minister said about me.

Mr Tink: That is a worry.

Mr ANDERSON: Why should I? I only take offence at people who I think are actually saying something.

Mr Whelan: No one takes the Minister seriously.

Mr ANDERSON: Even the Premier does not. I note that the Premier is speaking to the Minister again. There is an imminent change in the wings. Anything can happen. The fact is that John Avery and Cec Abbott deserve a little better than the shot the Minister inadvertently had at them in his comments. I suggest he should read the history of what happened in New South Wales. He might just learn who appointed Murray Farquhar. He might just learn when the real trouble for New South Wales started.

[Interruption]

The honourable member for Barwon would know because it was the Askin Government.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Members will cease interjecting and discussing matters across the table. The honourable member for Liverpool will address his remarks through the Chair.

Mr ANDERSON: It is interesting that the Minister also commented about his child abuse action plan. I suggest to him and his advisers that the best thing they could do is to reinstitute the southwest region child mistreatment unit, which was abolished, so that the same approach will be taken to victims of child abuse in southwest Sydney as is taken to victims in every other area of New South Wales. That is the best thing the Minister could do in relation to a child abuse action plan. I want to return to some very specific matters. It is clear to everyone that the reason the motion has been moved is that the Minister for Police does not understand the Westminster system of government and, particularly, the Cabinet process.

I cannot believe that any Minister, from either side of the House, would contemplate a major reversal of government policy without discussing it with the Premier of the day and with Cabinet. However, it is clear that on the recent issue of juvenile cautioning, as with other issues, that the Minister did not consult. It was then up to the Premier to again overrule him. The problem here is the problem I have referred to as gently as I could in past debates, but I will have to be less subtle today. The Minister is too close to the New South Wales Police Service. The former Deputy Premier laughs. He does not understand. The fact is that the Minister is not the Minister for the police. He is the Minister responsible to the public for the police.

[Interruption]

The honourable member for Barwon is now talking about the Police Association. Let me make a fearless prediction. At any minute a letter of support from the Police Association will be produced.

Mr Griffiths: You have got a copy.

Mr ANDERSON: I have not got a copy.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have already warned honourable members about interjecting.

Mr ANDERSON: I do not have a copy.

Mr Fahey: You gave it away.

Mr ANDERSON: I have never seen a copy.

Mr Fahey: You are misleading the House.

Mr ANDERSON: I am not misleading the House, and I resent the implication. I do not have a copy. I have never seen a copy of the letter to which I am referring, which I understand was issued today. I am sure if the Minister goes back through the files he will find many letters from the New South Wales Police Association attacking me when I was Minister. I am proud of each and every one of them, because the association was attacking me about the discipline package and the reforms that were introduced. You lot opposite fought us every single part of the way. I remember that part of the coalition's election platform in the 1988 campaign was to abolish the Police Board when it came to government. Honourable members opposite should not frown. Nick Greiner and Ted Pickering almost talked themselves hoarse about it. The minute they came to office they changed their minds, because they realised how important the board was. I seek an extension of time.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition contains no provision for extensions of time. To put the matter beyond doubt, the motion provides for the following time limits: mover of the motion, unlimited; Minister, unlimited; other speakers, 20 minutes. There is no provision for extensions of time.

Mr ANDERSON: The final point I was making was about the Minister being too close to the Police Service. He has a responsibility to represent the public through the Parliament. He is not the
Page 703

mouthpiece of the Police Service. That is another reason why the Opposition, when it comes to office, will not have the police Minister in the same building as the Police Service. That was the position when the Labor Government was in office. Anyone who has done any reading about the significance of police reform worldwide - whether in the United States, the United Kingdom or Europe - will know that those whose police reforms are highly regarded believe that the quasi-military structure must be rejected. It is no longer relevant to policing. Indeed, it could be argued that it never was, but it certainly is not now. What is happening now? There are commands, commanders and all that type of thing. New South Wales needs a police service that reflects the community of which it is part and which it serves. That result will not be achieved while ever the Minister mismanages his portfolio responsibilities as poorly as the present Minister.

Mr FAHEY (Southern Highlands - Premier, and Minister for Economic Development) [4.47]: No more serious motion can be moved in this Chamber than the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition. The motion seeks to remove a Minister from his responsibilities on the basis of a lack of confidence of the House in his administration of his portfolio. Such a motion ought to be moved in circumstances of the utmost gravity and should be supported by arguments of absolute substance. The motion is framed in two parts. It refers to the administration of the portfolio by the Minister and to the administration of certain areas of the Police Service in this State based on quotas. The motion is poorly drafted and weak in substance. No argument has so far been put forward that comes close to confirming what this House should do or allowing this House to make a decision based on any set of facts.

The motion typifies the approach of the Opposition to any matter that comes before this House. The Leader of the Opposition goes through a series of statements prepared by someone else. He selectively quotes, selectively misquotes, cuts and pastes and tries to draw a conclusion. It must take more than that to get rid of a Minister on the vote of this House. A former Minister for Police, the Opposition spokesperson on police matters, the honourable member for Liverpool, has done little to back up his leader; he has not put forward a substantial argument to support a motion that would bring about the demise of a Minister in my Government.

I would ask this House to consider the circumstances in which this motion was brought. Those circumstances are based upon the honourable member for Liverpool, bayonet fixed, charging up the hill - perhaps not even moving that fast - because of a preselection matter. We all read somewhere at Christmas time that the honourable member for Liverpool had issued one press release in one whole year. We know he is a carpetbagger, a carpetbag member for Liverpool. He does not live in the electorate. He visits it occasionally. Having done nothing to satisfy his preselectors, he is now fighting desperately to build his profile in the hope of overcoming the problems that are in front of him.

That is the only conclusion that honourable members can come to in relation to this particular motion. It was signalled last week. He gave notice to all and sundry, to all who would listen to him, that he was going to move this motion of no confidence on the basis of what he claimed to be a misleading of the House. Honourable members may not like the Ministers in this Government because of their personalities or otherwise - and do not have to - and may not like all that they do, but those are not sufficient grounds to attempt to remove them by this most serious of motions. The motion must have substance. There must be proof, and it must be based very clearly on fact. That has not occurred this afternoon.

If I could now go to some of the matters that have been raised by the Opposition in support - very poor support, I might add - of this particular motion. It claims that the police are operating on quotas. The Minister, in his response to that charge, has clearly demonstrated the revenue-raising approaches that were taken by the Labor Government in the days when the honourable member for Liverpool presided over the Police Service in this State; when he sought to get support from his then acting Premier, because the Premier was not around at the time, to increase the revenue of the Police Service by virtue of getting into this area that the Opposition alleges this Minister is guilty of presiding over. It has not occurred.

We have seen only two examples of revenue raising. Whatever interpretation is placed on the Inspector General's report on the matter at Albury, it is very clear that the officers involved had been there a long time and had become quite settled. That is understandable. They became attached to Albury. The honourable member for Albury would understand that more than anyone else. When administration decided it was time to bring in more junior officers and to move these more senior, experienced officers to other places, there was resistance. But that resistance was not in any shape or form based on any quotas. There is nothing in the report of the Inspector General to show that quotas were set or that officers were asked to perform on the basis of quotas.

By their very nature, parking police officers are required to do certain things in respect of illegal parking. The Opposition seeks to throw up an enterprise agreement that is supposed to encompass a quota on each of the shifts of those parking officers. There are no such words in that enterprise agreement. Some time down the track, as a management prerogative, there could be a redeployment of parking police officers if a review of the occurrence of illegal parking leads to a determination about the number of parking police officers in any particular area, whether it be one, two, three or four. It will be based on a long history of the experience of parking police officers in the course of their duty. It is not in the enterprise agreement and it is misleading this House to suggest that it is. It is misleading on the part of the Opposition and misleading on the part of the Leader of the Opposition, but that is a common occurrence.

Page 704

The suggestions that there are quotas in the police force have not been substantiated. It is a very difficult task for those involved in policing our roads - the highway patrol part of the Police Service - to justify their activities. But those activities and that judgment have to be based upon many criteria and the least of those, as far as this Government is concerned, is the number of bookings they have made. What upsets me most of all about this motion is that the Minister for Police has, on numerous occasions,

demonstrated to this House that information in relation to quotas has been given to him by the Commissioner of Police. Therefore, a vote of no confidence today in the Minister for Police is a vote of no confidence not just in the Commissioner of Police - although he is very much involved, being a chief adviser on matters of police operations to the Minister for Police - but a vote of no confidence in the Police Service generally, and that cannot be substantiated.

I have deliberated for some hours about whether I should mention this, but I believe it is appropriate to mention it now. The Minister for Police has ably demonstrated that police administration in this State and the services to the community have improved significantly over the past six years but in the past 18 months, during which this Minister has been responsible for the Police Service, the service itself has been subjected to numerous inquiries, not the least being an inquiry by this Parliament. Many members in this Chamber at the moment have been part of that process of inquiry into police administration in this State and into the relationship between the former Minister for Police and the current Commissioner of Police. Notwithstanding that extensive inquiry, thousands of pages of evidence and numerous hours of hearing, other activities have occurred in respect of a the scrutiny, review and investigation of the Police Service, particularly and most notably by the Independent Commission Against Corruption.

In a discussion I had with the former Commissioner for the ICAC only last week, his words to me were - and I believe they are important and very relevant right now - that it is time that the Police Service in this State got on with the job; it is time it was allowed to settle down, with the improvements that have been made, and allowed to go forward and deliver that service without this constant disruption based on political opportunism that we see time and again in this Parliament from the Opposition. I believe that suggestion is appropriate, because I believe we have in place in this State a system that will allow proper monitoring and proper scrutinising of our Police Service. That is because of the efforts and the work of this Minister, endorsed by the bipartisan report of a committee of this Parliament following a very exhaustive and extensive inquiry.

Recent reference has been made to the administration of the Minister for Police in relation to matters upon which he has indicated a certain direction and subsequently indicated, quite honestly and openly, that the public had spoken and that when the public speaks he is prepared to listen. We must all be prepared to listen to the community and be prepared to respond to what the community believes is the proper approach to any area of administration in the State. The day we stop listening is the day we are not doing our jobs. Therefore, how is the Minister for Police guilty of the ultimate offence as a Minister, which is the charge facing him today, when he has listened to the community and responded?

We heard the honourable member for Liverpool give a dissertation of law on the actual criteria used by a magistrate in determining whether to commit someone for trial. He completely ignored whatever those criteria are. I do not believe it is incumbent on any of us, whether our backgrounds happen to be in police prosecution or in law, to indicate what the law is in this particular area. The honourable member for Liverpool has indicated today that the criteria are such that to be committed for trial is effectively to be found guilty. Heaven forbid that the presumption of innocence does not prevail and that one is innocent until proved guilty. The Minister recognised that. The Police Association made submissions on that matter, recognised the problem and, of course, made that decision - a decision initially taken by this Government to overturn the approach taken by Labor six years ago and even before that.

The Leader of the Opposition talked about the conflict between the Minister and the Ombudsman with respect to whether the legal advice given by the Crown or the legal advice given to the Ombudsman was correct. He referred to dates in December. The Minister made that decision after we discussed it - and I can assure honourable members that it was the most convivial of discussions in the context that one legal advice said that there is no need to change the Act and that the Ombudsman has the power to investigate a constable whether the constable is on duty or not. That is what it was all about. Can the Ombudsman investigate actions taken by a police officer - prescribed in the Act as a constable - if the constable happens to be off duty at the time of the alleged offence? The Crown said, "Of course the Ombudsman has that power". The Ombudsman's legal advice, taken independently of the Crown,

suggested that the Act prevented him from doing that.

The Government wants the Ombudsman to be able to investigate a police officer who is involved in any illegal activity, whether or not the police officer happens to be in uniform at the time on a normal shift, after the shift is over, during the weekend, on a day off, or otherwise. The Minister and I took about five seconds to say, "We have two differing legal views on it. We do not want uncertainty in this matter. We will therefore bring forward legislation to remove any doubt and to make it abundantly clear that what we want will occur". Today the Leader of the Opposition referred to the period of time leading up to Christmas. I think at one stage he said, "By 31 December the Minister had decided to change his mind again".

I recall a conversation - and other people were present at that conversation in this House in November - when we agreed very quickly that we did

Page 705

not want the uncertainty, and away we went. That is the sort of evidence that is supposed to hang this Minister today. It is ridiculous in the extreme. I am sure that all members of this House will see that as being the case. The honourable member for Liverpool referred to the fact that there was probably a letter from the Police Association here today in support of the Minister. I would have thought that if the Minister was doing his job awfully, badly, and in a way which demoralised the troops - in the words of the Leader of the Opposition - the Police Association would be the first to put it up his ribs; the association would be conducting a campaign, quite properly if there was substance behind the allegation, to discredit the Minister. That is not the case.

Of course the association has disagreements with the Minister, as it has disagreements with the honourable member for Liverpool. The association is a union and such disagreements will always occur. Today the Police Association has made it abundantly clear what it thinks about the motion before the House. It is worth bringing its view to the attention of all honourable members. I am happy to table this letter if it is suggested that I might be leaving something out. The writer of the letter, referring to juvenile cautioning and traffic quotas, states:

Whilst these matters have caused much publicised disagreement between this Association and the Minister, such disagreements are quite normal between a responsible trade union and its relevant Minister. They are not matters which should be used for the politically opportunistic attempt to remove the Minister from his current portfolio.

The Association believes Minister Griffiths to be an honest and caring man, who has vocally supported his Police and like us, has a genuine commitment to policing.

That is part of the letter from Mr Tony Day, President of the Police Association of New South Wales. Where is the demoralisation of the police force brought about by the administration of this Minister? Where is there mention of a situation that would prevent this Minister continuing to bring forward improvements that have been recognised by Mr Temby as being a vast improvement on the days when Labor presided over the police force that could only be described as being in the realm of corruption.

There has been reference to the Milloo inquiry and the report which was brought down recently. There was reference to an indication in that report that there had been more corruption than any of us would have liked to see in the New South Wales police force. But any objective appraisal of that report and the evidence taken at the inquiry would clearly point to the 12 years of Labor as being the time when those officers who are now in some difficulties as a result of the recommendations of Mr Temby should have been dealt with. They are being dealt with because this Minister did not walk away from the fact that they had to be dealt with. They had to be dealt with by way of departmental charges or criminal charges.

The one thing we know about the police force in this State today is that if police officers step out of

line there is a system in place to ensure that they are dealt with. I would have thought that this afternoon's paper is somewhat symbolic. The afternoon edition of the *Daily Telegraph Mirror* has a story entitled "Police face 65 ICAC charges". They face those charges because this State has a system to root out corruption and to deal with it appropriately, whether it be in the police force or anywhere else in public administration. That system is in place because this Minister moved on it. As Mr Temby indicated quite clearly in his release of the report in respect of Milloo, the police Minister and the police commissioner have his full confidence in that they have acted to do their utmost to stamp out those areas of corruption that were in the force and that may still be in the force but have less chance of surviving now than they ever had.

The Police Service is not perfect. This Minister has never said that it was. Many other areas of administration in this State will have to be constantly looked at, worked at and improved because public accountability in our administration of government in this State, from the police right through to all the other agencies of government, is paramount. We must have a Police Service that has the confidence of the entire community. The community must believe when they complain to police, whether it be about another police officer or not, that it will be dealt with properly, recognised and not brushed under the counter.

The legislation that this Parliament has passed and the approach that has been taken by this Minister and by this Government have given the people far more confidence in the Police Service of this State than they ever had before. I assure honourable members that we will continue to work on it as and when we can. The Leader of the Opposition referred to the fact that this Minister is guilty because of the Frenchs Forest affair. Again, he selectively quoted certain things about the Frenchs Forest affair. That matter has been given considerable attention, not only by the select committee but by the Hon. E. P. Pickering in another place. There has been debate on that matter which canvassed the issue and covered a great deal of territory.

Whatever our views on that particular matter, a select committee of this Parliament had every opportunity to examine the evidence and to come forward with reports. The honourable member for South Coast - who I think was supported by the Hon. Elisabeth Kirkby - had a differing view on the outcome of the parliamentary inquiry. The Opposition and the Government produced a report, which had unanimous support, on the way in which we should take the matter forward. Again, proof was not brought forward to suggest anything to the contrary. If we believe that people are innocent until proved guilty - the honourable member for Liverpool said that he believes that - we must also ensure there is sufficient evidence before we take somebody out, whether that person be in the Police Service or in Cabinet. The evidence was clearly not there, as the Hon. E. P. Pickering indicated in terms of what may have occurred. We have problems, and this Minister is addressing those problems. One of the matters of concern to me -

Page 706

[*Interruption*]

This is not funny. I will tell the honourable member for Smithfield why this is not funny. It is a matter we should view very gravely. I do not like the fact that every time officers in the police force are in trouble they run off to a psychiatrist and are off work to a point where they cannot be brought before any type of inquiry - whether that be Assistant Commissioner Cole or the people who were involved in the jewellery store robbery in Melbourne or otherwise. It is just too frequent. There are too many people out there who have conveniently managed to get a psychiatrist's report. I ask the Opposition to address that issue.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Smithfield to order.

Mr FAHEY: We are doing our utmost to do it, to see how we might ensure that people skirting

behind psychiatrists' reports again and again are not able to avoid even the questioning and Police Service disciplinary processes, let alone criminal charges. We must address those matters to ensure that we have an even better Police Service. That is one matter. As I have indicated, there are many matters which must be looked at not only in the context of the improvements that we have made but to ensure that there are continuing improvements. The Opposition has not established a case for a Minister losing his portfolio, which would be the outcome if this weak, opportunistic, politically motivated charge is sustained by a vote in this House. It is important to look at some of the good things that have happened. We tend sometimes to get bogged down in debate, in the political game.

I go back to the words of Mr Temby last week. Give the police a chance to get on with the improvements and the system that has been put in place to ensure that they can serve the community better without constant disruption and constant breach of their opportunities based upon the destruction of their morale. We have in place now a system which in my view makes the Commissioner of Police accountable. This Parliament approved of that process. It made it abundantly clear that in operational matters the Commissioner of Police was the person who should be at the helm exercising leadership. But in no circumstances should the Commissioner of Police be any different in terms of administration from any other officer in the public sector serving the community in this State.

The Commissioner of Police must be accountable as every other officer in the public sector must be accountable. That occurred as a result of legislation introduced by the Minister and passed by Parliament. The police ministry is there to ensure that there is a facilitation of the people's wish and a service to the public. If there is a complaint about the service to the public, that is dealt with appropriately and properly through the process. The Police Board has been given the right powers, particularly in discipline, appointment, promotion, et cetera. The board is being challenged today because the Leader of the Opposition has sought to denigrate the Minister for his lack of faith in the Police Board. That has never been apparent to me. I say that as honestly as I can say anything. It has never been apparent to me that the police Minister has anything but the utmost respect for the role which the Police Board must play in having an accountable and proper Police Service.

The Police Board has a prominent role to play. It meets every week and it does its utmost to ensure that there are checks and balances in the system so that we have a Police Service of which the public can be proud. The State has laws to ensure that any police officer who breaches his role as a police officer or fails to live up to his duty and responsibility with propriety in the enforcement of the law and investigations is dealt with appropriately. That is occurring. I instance the headlines in this afternoon's newspaper which are a credit to this Minister. What happened under Labor? The matter was swept under the carpet in a way that we all must simply shake our heads at. We might see the rejuvenation or the recycling of some former Ministers. They have completely turned about from the way in which they administered their portfolios in days gone by and they seek to establish some credibility. "We did that then but we are going to be different in the future". That is what we constantly hear from the Opposition.

The fact is that the Opposition did not take the tough decisions on police administration or on anything else. It allowed the endemic problem to exist for far too long. The honourable member for South Coast was here in those days and he saw it. Not just the present Minister but also his predecessor took on the Police Service in a way that made it abundantly clear that this Government is not prepared to tolerate what had occurred for far too many years. It was allowed to happen under an administration that was tired and incapable of facing what was happening in police administration. The Opposition realises its shortcomings but is motivated by the honourable member for Liverpool. He must put forward his bravest face to convince some people at this time that he is worthy of their support even though he does not live in his electorate and put out only one press release last year.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! It being 5.15 p.m., pursuant to sessional orders the debate is interrupted.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

SLEEP APNOEA SERVICES

Mr GIBSON (Londonderry) [5.15]: A constituent of mine, Cecilia Pena of Mount Pleasant, is a lady of 44 years, a single parent with three children, the youngest being six years of age. She is devoted to her youngest child and likewise the child is devoted to her. Cecilia suffers from a sleeping disorder called severe sleep apnoea, which has caused her to be in a desperate physical and emotional state. The illness is very debilitating and greatly impedes

Page 707

her in her daily functions. She falls asleep while talking to people or doing something, which could be potentially very dangerous. Extreme fatigue is affecting her emotionally. She is becoming depressed and has little or no family support. If she is able to sleep, she has difficulty waking up. For hours after she has awakened she feels as though she is suffering from a very severe hangover.

When most of us sleep our air passages remain open, but air passages of people suffering from this disorder close when they fall asleep. The disorder makes it almost impossible for Cecilia to sleep. When she does fall asleep it is almost as though World War III is occurring in her mind because her brain keeps telling her to wake up because she is not getting any oxygen. She has been tested many times. During an eight hour sleeping period she would wake up about 200 times, which means that she never sleeps properly. In my office the other day she was talking to me and two seconds later she was sound asleep. It was impossible to wake her. After she awakens she continues to speak from where she was before. She fears that she may have to give custody of her six-year-old daughter to her former husband, which she does not want to do.

There is a simple solution to the problem of this lady. The Government tells us how much money is being spent on health in western Sydney. This lady has been trying since 1992 to get an apnoea machine to allow her to sleep. Such machines cost only \$1,600. She has applied many times and been knocked back many times. Dr Leon Laks is a consultant physician at the sleep and respiratory disorders unit at Randwick and maintains that this lady cannot live without a nasal constant positive air pressure machine. For the sake of a lousy \$1,600 the problems of this lady could be solved. She gets no rest whatsoever.

We constantly hear of the amount of money saved in the health portfolio and the amount going to western Sydney. But the true health needs of people are not being addressed by the Government. Dollars going to western Sydney for health are being spent on bricks and mortar with the result that people in western Sydney have to forgo health services and things such as sleep apnoea machines. This is one such service. I ask the Treasurer and Minister for the Arts to investigate this situation and I ask him also for \$1,600 to solve a problem for a lady in western Sydney that is probably a far greater problem than any of us ever will face. This lady should be given a badly needed sleep apnoea machine so that she may achieve some peace and quiet. For 44 years she has had torment; it is now time someone did something for her.

SUTHERLAND SHIRE HERITAGE LISTINGS

Mr KERR (Cronulla) [5.20]: I wish to draw to the attention of the House the attitude of Sutherland Shire Council to heritage listings. I have received a letter from a resident who is in her 80s and who was attempting to sell her house so that within three months she could take up residence in a nursing home. However her home has now been placed on a heritage list without her consent. This has caused further complications in selling the property. It is quite wrong for a resident of Sutherland shire who has given many years service to the community to be placed in this situation.

Mr Nagle: Have you taken the matter up with the shire council?

Mr KERR: I will not wilt under the devastating cross-examination of the honourable member for Auburn. The answer to the question is that three shire members called upon the council to extend the time for the listing of heritage buildings. Shire residents should be informed about heritage matters. Council members might take time off from campaigning against the State Government and inform the residents about heritage concerns. What was the method that was used by the council to determine a heritage listing? Apparently a consultant was employed for this purpose.

Mr Nagle: It must have been a Government consultant.

Mr KERR: No, it was not a Government consultant; it was a consultant appointed by Sutherland Shire Council - a Labor council. I call on the council to make the consultant's report public. It seems that Sutherland Shire Council has a sense of history because when it comes to roads in the shire it wants them maintained in the same way as they were for the pioneers. It seems that potholes have a unique historical attraction to Sutherland Shire Council. The council has a sense of heritage for its roads because it has maintained the road network without any interference. A resident recently wrote to me about his experience with the council in relation to La Boheme Avenue. He had organised a petition by residents and wrote to the local council. The council wrote back as follows:

I refer to your petition dated 21st February requesting the provision of kerbing and guttering in La Boheme Avenue.

I do not think "La Bohème" was a comic opera but this is becoming a comic tragedy with the council. Funds have not been allocated for such roadworks. The letter continues:

I regret to advise that funds have not been allocated under the 1987 Works Programme for such works.

Council is aware that there are many streets within the Shire in need of kerbing and guttering, however, the work able to be carried out in any one year is limited by the funds available. It is not possible to indicate when your street will be kerbed and guttered, however, you may be assured that La Boheme Avenue will be given every consideration when future Works Programmes are being determined.

That letter was dated 16 March, 1987. We are approaching its anniversary. I received a further letter dated 20 February from the shire president which said:

I wish to advise that La Boheme is not included in the draft programmes for 1994, 1995 or 1996.

Page 708

The final act is not even in sight. The residents are demanding that the council stop trying to get councillors into State and Federal parliaments and get on with their civic duties. Surely a local council should be concerned with roadworks, surely it should be improving - *[Time expired.]*

Mr DOWNY (Sutherland - Minister for Sport, Recreation and Racing) [5.25]: It is an interesting argument that the honourable member for Cronulla has put forward. No one would argue that local communities should not look at their heritage and seek to preserve that which is worth preserving. The simple fact is that the residents whose properties have been affected had absolutely no idea that their properties were to be placed on the heritage list. A consultant was employed to take photos and next thing the residents received letters saying their houses had been heritage listed.

A classic example of this heritage listing relates to a set of gates on North West Arm Road, Grays Point. Photos were taken and the owner was notified of the heritage listing. The interesting point is that the lovely wrought-iron gates with stone pillars were placed there only 15 years ago; they had no connection to the local area. The owner bought the gates because he thought they looked good and is now searching for ways to remove them since they have no heritage value at all. The point of the exercise is that the council must inform the residents of their rights in respect to heritage listing. The shire is in total confusion. Residents do not know how to respond and do not know their rights. It is about time Sutherland Shire Council informed the residents of their rights under the heritage listing proposal. If those gates are an example of other properties that have been listed, obviously the council has missed the boat completely and should be condemned for what it has been doing.

SCHOOL ASSISTANTS

Mr J. J. AQUILINA (Riverstone) [5.27]: I raise a matter that has been referred to me by Betty Thompson, who is a school assistant at Mount Lewis Infants School. The school has 99 students comprising four classes, two kindergarten classes with 24 and 21 students, a first class with 28 students and a second class with 26 students. The school has a full-time teaching principal. Obviously the ancillary staff work that falls on the shoulders of Betty Thompson is an incredible amount. No time is left for the principal to attend to the many tasks and duties of a principal's lot in a small school when the principal is teaching five days a week from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.

Recently a decision was made by agreement between the Teachers Federation and the Public Service Association that gave a pay rise to ancillary staff of schools with 201 students or more. Ancillary staff of grade 2 status received a considerable increase in salary to compensate for their onerous duties. It seems to be common opinion that those who work in a school of 200 students or fewer have fewer duties to perform than those in a school of 201 students or more, even though the circumstances in those smaller schools are exactly the same as the marginally larger schools. In many cases the tasks are even more onerous in smaller schools. Many Government members would be aware of specific problems, particularly those who represent country electorates where small schools are very much the go as opposed to the relatively few number of small schools in city electorates, such as Mount Lewis Infants School.

I refer to some of the onerous duties carried out by these school assistants in small schools. Betty Thompson says that she is totally responsible for the running of the office and the financial aspects of the school. We need not dwell upon the fact that with global budgeting that burden is now quite substantial. Her duties include budgets; all aspects of the Oasis finance; receipting of money; banking; all ordering, including ringing up suppliers; reconciliations; and reports. When goods are received the school assistant is responsible for unpacking, checking and putting away all stores and resources because, as most honourable members would be aware, there are no general assistants in these small schools. Therefore, the ancillary staff have the key task of carrying out general duties, many of which would fall within the domain of a principal, were the principal not teaching a full class load.

Betty Thompson is responsible also for the typing of all school correspondence, including the weekly newsletters; photocopying; filing; library clerical work; reception of visitors to the principal; questions from parents, both friendly and irate because the principal is not present to receive the telephone calls; lost property; sale of uniforms; stocktaking; and all the rest. Quite frankly, it is an impossible situation. The most direct, appropriate and sensible solution is for the position of school assistant in small schools to be reclassified as school assistant grade 2 as soon as possible and thereby be entitled to the same benefits as those general assistants at schools of 201 pupils or more. This is an issue of great concern to small schools. School assistants employed in schools of 200 students or fewer deserve the same justice as those in schools of 201 pupils or more. On behalf of Betty Thompson and the many members of this House who have small schools in their electorate, including the honourable member for Lakemba and honourable member for Port Stephens - *[Time expired.]*

OVERSEAS TRAVEL INSURANCE

Mr COCHRAN (Monaro) [5.32]: Once again I wish to report an act of great courage and to deliver a warning to overseas travellers, particularly young people, who might be travelling through the United States without the benefit of insurance to cover themselves against accidents. I raise this issue because I received a letter from Mr Barry Belt, the regional fire officer for the Bush Fire Services in the southern region of the State, an area that encompasses my electorate. I sadly report that in September 1992

Page 709

his son Craig was involved in a serious accident in Louisiana in the United States. Mr Belt has asked me to pass on information to the House to ensure that we understand that young people travelling overseas can experience problems if they are underinsured or uninsured. I read the letter from Messrs Snedden, Hall and Gallop to Craig Belt's mother:

On September 19 1992 Mr Belt was the victim of a hit and run accident in Jefferson, Louisiana in the United States of America. He was in America working for "Camp America" in Greenwich, Connecticut, but at the time of the accident he was on holidays in Louisiana. As a result of the accident Mr Belt sustained severe head injuries. He was hospitalised in the US until the 7 November 1992 when he returned to Australia and entered Woden Valley Hospital. He remains significantly disabled with multiple physical, cognitive and behavioural problems.

The police report of the accident indicated that the driver of the car that hit Mr Belt deliberately drove onto the wrong side of the road. At the time Mr Gary Saltamachia, was driving on a cancelled drivers licence and he had a blood alcohol reading of 0.192. According to the police report he was clearly at fault in the accident.

Despite the attempt of Mr Michael Johnson of Galloway, Johnson, Tompkins and Burr, (our Louisiana representatives) we have been unable to locate a defendant from whom we could claim the medical expenses incurred in America. Mr Belt had been employed by "Camp America" however by the time of the accident he was no longer an employee. "Camp Americas" insurance only covered Mr Belt for a limited amount of time after he finished working for them, and consequently the insurance available from "Camp America" only amounted to \$50,000.00. This money was quickly expended by the hospital accounts rendered in the early stages of his treatment.

The driver of the car, Mr Saltamachia, was uninsured and had very few other assets so a claim against him was not pursued. The owner of the car Helen Lemoine also had no insurance over the car.

Louisiana has no third party insurance scheme, no victim compensation legislation and no nominal defendants scheme by way of a safety net. Consequently there is no longer any prospect of Mr Belt claiming compensation under US law. Mr Belt is therefore personally liable for the significant medical costs incurred whilst he was in America.

The letter goes on to say that the solicitors have written to the hospitals and medical practitioners to whom money is still owed, asking them to try to alleviate the pressure being placed on Craig Belt. This is a serious matter and one of which all young travellers should be made aware. In reporting this matter to the House and issuing this warning, I pay tribute to the bush fire brigades in the southern part of New South Wales who raised a substantial amount of money, including some significant amounts from the Jerangle bush fire brigade - for example, \$200 was donated out of their funds. The generosity of individual members of the community and the bush fire brigades was commendable.

I also praised the parents of Craig Belt, Barry and Rachael Belt, for their courage in standing by Craig during this most difficult time. Despite the fact that a few weeks ago Craig was totally immobilised and totally paralysed, he has recovered to such a degree that he recently walked up the steps of the

office of the Department of Bush Fire Services to meet Commissioner Phil Koperberg and express his gratitude for the efforts of Bush Fire Services in raising funds to assist him during this difficult time. The warning is there to all young overseas travellers. Thanks are expressed to those bush fire brigades in the southern region who, at the time they were called upon for assistance, certainly provided assistance to their mate Barry Belt and his son Craig.

ILLEGAL FISHING

Mr MARTIN (Port Stephens) [5.37]: The matter I raise relates to the lack of fisheries signs in my electorate and in other areas, and the major problems that exist because of the removal of pipis and worms. I want to refer also to the issue of infringement notices to people who do not know what the problems are. There is a very large pipi fishery at Stockton Beach in the electorate of Port Stephens and many people of ethnic background go there and collect large volumes of pipis. All in all it is causing great angst in my electorate. I call on the Government tonight to seriously consider the erection of signs in a number of different languages, or such that they can be understood by all parties. I understand the same problem exists on the northern beaches where there is a fairly intensive campaign to satisfy the desire of the honourable member for Manly to control the removal of invertebrates from the intertidal zone there.

A similar matter was raised with me today and it relates to a person who received an infringement notice with a penalty of \$100 because he went, incorrectly, to Gunnamatta Bay. The document I have says he was offshore in Gunnamatta Bay and was pumping for nippers. When the person concerned challenged the officer as to why there were no signs there, the fisheries officer indicated that signs were continually being removed - although the council signs are in pristine condition. The person concerned has taken a video film - which I have here - showing the park with all the signs. There is one small sign in Gunnamatta Park, yet this person, who lives well away from the area, was apprehended for taking nippers. For the Government to be able to rightfully challenge these people who are doing the wrong things, appropriate signs need to be erected. I draw the attention of the House to the matter in respect of Gunnamatta Bay on 21 February 1994. As I say, there is only one sign there, and that was nailed to the back of a council sign.

In addition, my electorate and every other area along the New South Wales coast have major problems. A great deal of worm digging for bait is taking place. That is totally unacceptable close to houses, and it is illegal adjacent to oyster leases. However, that is now well publicised. In the absence of a good education program, people cannot be expected to know every fishing regulation. Such a program is obviously lacking. The need for signs cannot be stressed too strongly. I therefore seek bipartisan support from the Government for dealing seriously with the issue of signs, particularly in Gunnamatta Bay and at Stockton Beach in my electorate.

Page 710

MATURE AGE UNEMPLOYED

Mr MERTON (Baulkham Hills) [5.42]: I wish to speak about a matter of grave concern to me and to many others in the community. I refer to the unemployment crisis facing people in my electorate, particularly people of mature age. For some time now I have been aware that many people, when they reach the age of 40, find themselves on the unemployment scrapheap. Although economic conditions and, indeed, the recession have certainly caused some of this unemployment, those factors are not completely responsible for the predicament in which many find themselves. In parts of the Baulkham Hills electorate the situation is so bad that people pretend to go to work and, I suppose because of feelings of guilt and shame, are not prepared to acknowledge that they are unemployed. They carry on the pretence of leaving for work so that the neighbours and others in their areas will not realise that their families have problems.

Mr Nagle: That is very sad.

Mr MERTON: It is very sad. The fact that many of these people are living off savings makes the situation even worse. Savings, of course, do not last for ever. When the savings are finally exhausted, people approach banks seeking loans. However, they have no borrowing capacity because they have no earning capacity to repay loans. That crisis point has hit many families in my electorate, as indeed I suppose it has in other parts of New South Wales and Australia. Unemployment for any individual of any age is tragic and a matter of grave concern. Mature age people who face unemployment for the first time in their lives simply cannot adjust. Many people who previously occupied middle management positions and interviewed applicants for jobs now find that the roles have been reversed and they are the job interviewees.

During the past three years I have endeavoured to speak with staff from the local Home and Community Care Service and other such organisations about what might be done to assist these people. At one stage the Government provided a special one-off allocation to provide an officer to encourage these people to find work, help them with curricula vitae and things of that nature. Many people seeking work visit my electorate office. They need assistance in the preparation of curricula vitae. My secretarial staff and I are only too pleased to assist them in the preparation of those documents. In relation to one man we sent out about 50 applications for employment with a curriculum vitae prepared in my office. I am proud to be involved in the provision of that service to my constituents.

The man to whom I have referred has three or four young children. For the first time in his working career he faces the dilemma and tragedy of unemployment. I am pleased the Premier realises that such unemployment is tragic and is aware of the disaster it can bring to families and the lack of self-esteem it engenders. Unless action is taken now, the damaging long-term consequences will certainly affect the quality of life and financial independence of a major proportion of the population well into the future. The New South Wales mature workers task force has raised concerns that because of the longer life expectancy, mature age people face the prospect of 40 years in retirement.

As I understand it, the Commonwealth Government has no package as far as mature age workers are concerned, whereas the New South Wales Government led by the Premier, John Fahey, has recently announced a package worth \$2.25 million to tackle discrimination against mature age people in the work force and to improve job prospects for older workers. Clearly, people with a few years' experience under their belts have assets that money cannot buy. They have experience and the ability that comes with maturity. Those assets give them an advantage when dealing with people. I draw to the attention of every member of this House the dilemma of mature age workers so far as employment prospects are concerned. I know that every member of this House shares my concerns. We should try to make every possible avenue available to these people to enable them to re-enter the work force.

BUILDING SERVICES CORPORATION DIRECTOR OF INVESTIGATIONS

Mr AMERY (Mount Druitt) [5.47]: I wish to raise an issue relating to the Building Services Corporation that has come to my attention from a number of sources. I have been advised of what could not better be referred to as a sham relating to the appointment by the Building Services Corporation of a so-called inhouse Ombudsman - or, to use his official title, director of investigations - to investigate its own past investigations. One case involves Maria Vucic of West Pymble. She lodged a complaint with the corporation about a builder and a number of inspections were carried out by a corporation investigator. After numerous unsatisfactory attempts to have the matter resolved, she made representations to the Premier of New South Wales seeking his assistance. The corporation responded to her representations to the Premier by advising, in a letter from Graham Mostyn, General Manager of the Building Services Corporation, that ". . . in response to these representations, Mr Robert Coles, the Building Services Corporation's newly appointed Director of Special Inquiries has been asked to

reinvestigate the matters . . . raised".

The irony is that Mr Coles was the original inspector who carried out numerous inspections in this case. One has to ask how the Building Services Corporation can permit an inspector to investigate his own case and expect that the results of that investigation will be unbiased and in the best interests of the owner or the consumer. In another case Mr Brett Piskulich was interviewed by a spokesman from the Building Services Corporation, who told him he was "the inhouse Ombudsman". I believe he is now known as the director of investigations, as I said earlier. Once again, it was a closed shop. This case also involves Mr Coles. My comments are not designed to discredit or attack Mr Coles. He happens to be the person involved in both cases.

Page 711

I would like to know how the Building Services Corporation can confidently carry out investigations into owner-builder disputes and remain unprejudiced when it appears that former builders are inspecting builders and former inspectors are inspecting inspectors. Earlier this year responsibility for the Building Services Corporation was transferred from the Ministry for Housing to the Ministry for Consumer Affairs. In a statement to this House the Minister has indicated that the Building Services Corporation is to be overhauled. It is hoped that the change in ministry will shift the emphasis of the corporation's operation from licensing to protection of consumers. Undoubtedly the Minister for Consumer Affairs is now familiar with the continuing campaign by the Building Action Review Group, known as BARG, to obtain a better deal for building consumers.

These issues are common with most building disputes, namely, how impartial are the adjudicators? They point out that the requirement that arbitrators have building experience has resulted in many claims of bias. The compulsory arbitration clauses, rigorously enforced in the past, sent many consumers broke trying to settle their grievances, while the lawyers had a field day. I note there has been some progress in that matter. Another matter they raised was that the inadequacy of the Building Disputes Tribunal's previous jurisdictional limit of \$10,000 offered little hope to most complainants. I note that in a statement last week the Minister announced an increase in this jurisdictional limit to \$25,000, despite Commissioner Dodd's recommendation that the monetary jurisdictional limit be lifted to \$50,000.

Now that the Building Services Corporation has been transferred to the Department of Consumer Affairs, I call on the Government and the Minister to revisit the many cases that have caused public discontent with the Building Services Corporation. In the Government's review of the Building Services Corporation operations, I suggest that the BARG Group be extensively consulted in bringing forward an acceptable working model for consumers to get satisfaction from their complaints.

In the meantime, if the Government is genuine in its desire to have past disputes reinvestigated, surely it must start by ending the current practice of having reviews of complaints assessed by the same inspectors, under another name, who conducted the initial inquiry that resulted in the complaint in the first place. Obviously, without casting any aspersions on those inspectors, it must be very difficult for a person with a new senior title to reinvestigate the case that he, in a more junior position, had investigated previously. I ask the Minister to take this matter into account when she continues with her campaign to overhaul the workings of the Building Services Corporation.

Ms MACHIN (Port Macquarie - Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister Assisting the Minister for Roads, and Minister Assisting the Minister for Transport) [5.52]: I thank the honourable member for Mount Druitt for advising my office of his intention to raise this matter, which is always a constructive approach in dealing with private members' statements. I certainly note the matters he raised with regard to Mrs Vucic, his constituent in West Pymble, and I will obtain further details. I think that perhaps he is misinterpreting the role of the in-house "ombudsman". He is not really an ombudsman, but an in-house person who is reviewing a number of longstanding cases that should not have been on the books for anywhere near the length of time they have.

He is reporting to the general manager, who is keeping me closely informed of the issues and how we can resolve them quickly, including examining issues of compensation where in the past some constituents have been delayed and messed around by the BSC and it can be proved to be the fault of the BSC. We are really trying to review those cases, to get a fair deal where it is deserved. It is not a case of the investigator investigating his previous investigation. I have met with BARG in the past few weeks and have, again, sent them the draft consumer policy we hope to put through the BSC. The draft was originally sent, but BARG did not comment on it, so I have asked them to have another look at it. I have also made the offer to assist in dealing with Mrs Onorati's files. She is an individual trying to deal with a large number of files, so I made the offer for her to provide me with that information and we will keep a tab on it.

The Government is moving away from compulsory arbitration, and in fact would like to ditch it entirely. The honourable member will have a chance to examine some of these proposals, hopefully in the next few weeks and months. As he acknowledged, the Government has lifted the jurisdiction of the Building Disputes Tribunal to \$25,000. The reason for not lifting it to \$50,000 is that the other part of the recommendation was that there be two referees sitting together, and we want to review the referees before taking that next step. *[Time expired.]*

DOG ATTACKS ON KOALAS

Mr RIXON (Lismore) [5.54]: I seek the assistance of the House with a rather special problem that would be suffered by only a very few towns in New South Wales. It involves two types of animal. The first - dogs - that many people in towns have as pets or to protect their property or whatever. The second is the koala. Goonellabah in Lismore has a large number of koalas. One afternoon recently, when walking with my children in that suburb, we counted five koalas within a distance of a couple of hundred yards of my house.

Recently a number of koalas have been attacked and savaged by dogs. I have spoken to Friends of the Koala, an organisation within the town that has been working hard to plant more trees to protect koalas, and to restore to health koalas who have been found ill or in some way affected. Those people recognise that within the villages and urban areas, people have the right to own dogs. But, as anyone would

Page 712

understand, they recognise also the need to protect something that is unique. Not many urban areas could claim to have koalas living within their community. The Dog Act covers the situation to a small degree. It says:

Dogs attacking or injuring persons or animals

6.(1) The owner of a dog that attacks or causes injury to a person or animal shall be guilty of an offence against this Act and liable to a penalty not exceeding 10 penalty units.

(2) Subsection (1) does not apply if the attack or injury by the dog:

(a) occurs on any land, vehicle or premises:

(i) of which the owner of the dog is an occupier; or

(ii) on which the dog is ordinarily kept . . .

That is sensible. If one has a dog and it is kept in one's yard, that is fair enough. The dog is in your yard to protect your property from people coming on to your property for illegal purposes. That is where

the conflict arises, because the koala does not recognise the property rights of dogs, and dogs can be quite possessive of their areas. Another section of the Act refers to liability if a dog attacks or injures an animal. Once again, the same thing applies. Action can be taken against a dog that causes injury to an animal, except when it attacks or injures that animal on the land of the owner, or on land on which the dog is normally kept. The problem that we are facing becomes obvious. The Dog Act does not take into account this special case.

People who live in Goonellabah and in the rural residential area known as Billen Cliffs would like to be able to make special provision to protect native animals. I am seeking suggestions for ways in which to overcome this problem. Members of Friends of the Koala and I are going to meet with the Mayor of Lismore and the Town Planner of Lismore in the near future and put to them the idea of perhaps changing the legislation to include a koala zone within the village area, allowing the council to have that area declared, and providing the council with special provisions for the control of dogs within that area. In doing so we need to keep the interests of the dog owner at heart and we need to keep the interest of the koala at heart. One can see the difficulties of this problem.

Mr Neilly: Call it an each way bet.

Mr RIXON: As the honourable member said, we are looking at an each way bet because we want both the co-operation of the dog owners and the protection of the koala. If anyone has a sensible suggestion on how to overcome this problem, we will be interested to hear it. If anyone has any suggestions on how the Dog Act could be changed to allow a special koala protection zone to be established and managed within an urban or rural residential area, I would be pleased to hear it also. *[Time expired.]*

CONCORD HIGH SCHOOL CLEANERS

Mr J. H. MURRAY (Drummoyne) [5.59]: I draw the attention of the House to the school cleaning fiasco at Concord High School. The Chief Secretary and Minister for Administrative Services told the House last week that privatisation of school cleaning would have no impact on the cleaning standards in State schools. The Minister has deliberately misled the Parliament. Eighteen months ago Concord High School had eight internal cleaners and one outdoor cleaner. During this period the internal cleaning staff has been cut to five and yesterday a representative of Berkeley Challenge informed the cleaning staff their numbers would be cut to three. This means that in a period of 18 months the indoor cleaning staff has been reduced from eight to three. Further, the hours of work have been cut from 30 to 28, which is approximately a 10 per cent reduction in cleaning time.

This change will be a disaster, impacting on the hygiene of the 940 students and 70-odd staff at Concord high. I can vouch for the current cleaning staff, who are diligent, efficient, and do an excellent job. Unfortunately this Government has reneged on its undertaking to guarantee the standards of cleaning at Concord high. On top of this fiasco, the outdoor cleaner has been told he can now clean only one-fifth of the school playground each day. This means that the other four-fifths of the outdoor area will go uncleaned each day. What a joke! The cleaner is employed to clean the outdoor area but is now able to clean only one-fifth each day. I just wonder whether he will clean the area around the tuckshop each day and leave the rest, or will the area around the tuckshop be cleaned on one day and then left for the other four days? It will be a disaster. There can be only one result from this dramatic slashing of cleaning hours at Concord high. Hygiene standards will fall at the school, and that will impact on the health of more than 900 students attending that school.

Privatisation creates a further difficulty in relation to security aspects of the school. Currently the cleaners work broken shifts, with the outdoor cleaner starting at 5.30 a.m. and finishing at 2.30 p.m., and the indoor staff commencing their afternoon shift at 2.30 p.m. and finishing at 6.00 p.m. This means that staff are present at the school and providing a form of security from 5.30 a.m. to 6.00 p.m. Under the

proposed changes there will be no broken shifts; cleaners will start later in the morning and finish earlier in the afternoon, thus exposing the school to a greater propensity for vandalism and other problems associated with the lack of security in high schools.

The cleaning staff is scared. They see their jobs going, and as most live handy to the school they see little opportunity of gaining suitable alternative employment, because with most of them cleaning is their only trade. But Berkeley Challenge did offer a glimmer of hope for the cleaners, who protested that they could not work any harder and still do the job efficiently. I understand that Ms Pamela Kelly from Berkeley Challenge indicated that they would be given special training in working faster, and issued with feather dusters to improve their productivity. This is just an absolute joke. The Minister has advised the House that there will be no cleaning cuts; yet at Concord the cleaning numbers have been slashed from eight to three.

Page 713

Outside staff can now only clean one-fifth of the playground each day, and a top-notch set of cleaners at Concord high will be disbanded. The losers will be the pupils and staff at Concord, whose health will suffer. I call on the Minister to investigate this downgrading of cleaning activities at the school, and ensure that a quality cleaning service is provided for pupils and staff at Concord high.

ALCOHOL ABUSE BY YOUTHS

Mr O'DOHERTY (Ku-ring-gai) [6.4]: I would like first to commend the New South Wales Government for the theme it has set, through the Minister for Education, for Youth Week 1994, which is to be held this year from 10 to 16 April. The theme of Youth Week this year is Making it Happen, and the campaign will be sponsored by the Department of Health's Drink, Drunk, the Difference is U campaign. Of course the question of teenage drinking is one that I am sure perplexes every honourable member and members of the community alike, and this year there will be a particular emphasis on teenage drinking and the Department of Health's clever slogan, Drink, Drunk, the Difference is U.

There are some encouraging statistics about the incidence of youth drinking in our society. For example, a 1992 survey of children aged 12 to 16 years conducted by the Department of Health in New South Wales found that there had been a decline in alcohol abuse by teenagers. It is, however, still an issue. The survey found that 16 per cent of girls and 20 per cent of boys reported a regular use of alcohol. They are awful figures. Sixteen per cent of girls and 20 per cent of boys aged 12 to 16 in New South Wales reported a regular use of alcohol. We might throw our hands in the air and say, "Where are the parents? Where are the community standards? Where are they getting the alcohol from in the first place? Who are the people who ought to be rescuing them from the awful effects that that alcohol use will have on them at that tender age?" Seventeen per cent of girls and 22 per cent of boys in the 12 to 16 year age group described themselves as heavy drinkers. That is astounding.

Just before I came into the House I was talking on the telephone to my two-year-old son. He was describing to me what a busy day he had been having and telling me some of the things he had been doing with his grandmother, who is looking after him today. It seems as though it has taken almost no time at all for him to get to two years of age, and it will not be long before he is 12; and it fills me with horror to think that at the age of 12 he may be involved in some of these activities. When I think about his tender mind and the aspirations that I have for him, the love that I have for him and the hopes that I have for him as he grows up during the next 10 years to the age of 12, it is unthinkable to me - and I am sure it would be unthinkable to others - that at that age he could be involved in alcohol abuse. But I have quoted the statistics; there they are. The question we must ask ourselves is, just why is this happening? We must think what is being done about it, and what can be done about it. There will be a focus on this problem during Youth Week 1994, as I have said. The New South Wales Government has allocated \$100,000 to 75 local councils throughout the State to conduct activities on this theme during Youth Week.

I want to particularly commend an initiative in my area. Last Friday I officially opened the Jack's Island Youth Cafe, of which I am the official patron, on disused railway property at Hornsby Station. I am pleased to be able to say that the State Rail Authority, following my discussions with it 12 months ago, has granted the Fusion Organisation, a Christian youth group, a lease to operate a youth cafe on that site. The lease has been signed, and there has been very generous community support, especially from the Ku-ring-gai Rotary Club. I want to commend members of that club, and David Moore, its President. David Forsythe, the spouse of the Hon. Patricia Forsythe in another place, Alan Rodgers and Andrew Cripwell, together with others including Bob Steer and Ian and Sheila Turner are community members who have also done a fantastic job in getting this project off the ground. Jude Brigeland from the Fusion Organisation and Mal Garvin, a well-known national figure who started Fusion in Hornsby 15 years ago, have also been the driving forces behind the youth care project.

It will be a place where the youth of my area will be able to come to a drug-free and alcohol-free environment, enjoy each other's company, and come into contact with people who stand up and say that young people do not need alcohol in order to have a good time; they do not need it in their lives, they do not need it to have a good time. As a community we need to protect our youth from the kinds of figures reported in the survey that I mentioned tonight. I commend the Fusion Organisation and the community groups that are involved in the Jackson Island Youth Cafe. Ku-ring-gai Rotary raised \$15,000 for the project, which is a marvellous contribution, and I commend the Government for its program for Youth Week 1994. *[Time expired.]*

Private members' statements noted.

[Mr Acting-Speaker (Mr Tink) left the chair at 6.9 p.m. The House resumed at 7.30 p.m.]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Suspension of Standing Orders

Motion, by leave, by Mr West agreed to:

That so much of the resolution of the House agreed to this day to suspend standing and sessional orders to allow consideration of a motion of no confidence in the Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services be suspended to allow the contribution of the Member for North Shore to the debate on the Address in Reply to the Governor's Opening Speech.

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH: ADDRESS IN REPLY

Sixth Day's Debate

Debate resumed from 10 March.

Mrs SKINNER (North Shore) [7.31]: Standing on the tip of Cremorne Point in the heart of my electorate, I have a vision of what Australia has achieved, what must be preserved and what potential lies ahead. What do I see from Cremorne Point? Across the harbour - bustling or leisurely depending upon the day, sparkingly serene or turbulent and gusty depending upon the weather - I can see what Australians have created in 200 years. I see a thriving city linked by our famous bridge to Australia's fourth largest central business district of North Sydney, and as I turn I see homes - some luxurious, some more humble; modern mixed with the elegantly restored - lining the hills down to the water's edge. And at the edge, the tide laps at the rocks that have been there for centuries, and strollers take leisure on the

foreshore reserve that was once home to the Cammerragal tribe remembered in a plaque in the park behind me.

Surveying the scene, I see the electorate of North Shore, my home since 1979. The scene I described is a central point of North Shore. I can describe just as easily many other views from different points of the electorate. Perching on the rocks at the tip of Bradley's Head, I saw part of the sardine packed but good natured crowd on a hot summer's day enjoying the spectacle of boats, ships, fly-pasts and salutes that comprised the Royal Australian Navy's seventy-fifth anniversary celebration. I see the children's birthday picnics at Ashton Park, where dried gum leaves crunch underfoot as socialising parents dart from the group to monitor the safety of young buccaneers climbing the ancient cannons or exploring the maze of tunnels down which they were manhandled by early colonists.

I can see the ancient patterns eroded into the rock promontory on Balmoral Beach, and feel the sense of well-being engendered by sun-warmed skin cooled by salt spray. I can feel the sense of quiet and reflection, sitting on the bench in Lavender Bay park, watching the small craft putter by, the ferries chug, and the sleek and speedy seacats settle and glide to the wharf. I could describe the cosmopolitan eateries that line the streets of North Shore - the new sidewalk cafes of McMahons Point, the Crows Nest curry bazaars and the 82 restaurants within a one-kilometre stretch of my home at Neutral Bay.

I could describe the energetic small businesses and exciting new initiatives, such as the Crows Nest main street project aimed at putting life back into that community; the elegant retail outlets throughout the electorate; the fruit and vegetable markets and butcher shops that take as much pride in display as the elegant boutiques. I can see the sun glinting off the high-rise corporate sentinels of North Sydney. These glimpses of North Shore are not just what I see, but what I feel about this beautiful area. I have lived in many beautiful cities: Melbourne, Adelaide, Hong Kong, San Diego, San Francisco, Los Angeles and Washington DC. I have lived in the country, on farms, close to the city and in outer suburbia. But Sydney, and specifically the lower North Shore, is where I choose to be.

It gave me much pleasure, when attending the opening of Parliament, to acknowledge the Governor, His Excellency Rear Admiral Peter Sinclair. As a Navy wife of many years standing, I have had the privilege of previously meeting the Governor. It is also a great privilege to represent an electorate which I love and to be in a position to implement many of the fine ideals and programs outlined in His Excellency's address. North Shore is a dynamic electorate with many landmark tourist attractions, including Taronga Zoo, the Balmoral Bathers Pavilion, May Gibbs' Nutcote, and Luna Park, currently under renovation. The area offers many local amenities, such as the North Sydney Olympic Pool, the Ensemble Theatre in Kirribilli, cinemas in Cremorne and Mosman and Woolworths' largest Southern Hemisphere supermarket at Neutral Bay.

North Shore is only minutes from the city, but birds abound in the leafy gardens. It has a diverse population with many long-term residents, yet a high turnover amongst mobile renters. Most are aged between 20 and 50, but there are many elderly. There are large numbers of widows in the community, remaining in sizeable gracious family homes, but often with limited ready resources. Many find difficulty in everyday chores that to others are a routine task. They worry about changing light globes, about fixing leaky taps, and about getting out and about. Many experience the loneliness of the aged in a fast paced society and keep to themselves the worry about ill health and being able to cope physically for fear of being a burden on now busy children with careers and families of their own. They worry about financial security and personal safety.

As their State representative, I will take a keen interest in government policy on ageing and programs for them outlined in the Governor's address. I will be participating in the development of the aged services social plan being guided by the four lower North Shore councils of Mosman, North Sydney, Lane Cove and Willoughby. Having already met with the mayors and other representatives of both councils which fall within the boundaries of the North Shore electorate, namely North Sydney and Mosman, I am confident that there are many other projects and issues of mutual concern which we can

effectively address together.

There are disproportionately more women than men in North Shore, most of them in the paid work force, many with partners, but many raising children on their own. Many are successful business women, some in the corporate sector, others engaged in small businesses - with many running their own in many cases. As a mother, I have shared the responsibilities they face: organising child care and pre-schooling, supervising homework, chauffeuring to sporting and other events and, as children grow older, lying awake until all are home safely, and then handling the moment when they strike out on their own. I have experienced the responsibilities of combining career and care of the home and family, and of assisting ageing parents.

As a former member of the New South Wales Women's Advisory Council and founder and convener of that body's business and economic development

Page 715

subcommittee, I have a particular interest in initiatives which assist women achieve financial independence. The people of North Shore are well educated and thoughtful, concerned about personal everyday events, but interested and engaged in broader issues. The daily activity of getting children off to any one of the 16 schools in the electorate is extended to an interest in the quality of education, the paths that will be taken to tertiary study and on to fulfilling careers. The routine task of recycling household waste is extended to widespread interest in the environment, in concern about pollution and care for conservation of the natural and built environment, and development of structures that are empathetic with the existing surrounds.

North Shore is a small electorate in physical terms, but densely populated. It boasts many renovators, like the Skinner family, who spend an inordinate amount of time scraping kalsomine from 100-year-old walls, patching ceiling roses and matching Victorian or Federation paint samples. There are also many modernised and new homes which take advantage of spectacular harbour and skyline views, spacious turn of the century apartment blocks, and glass glistening high-rise units. People are house proud and their concern extends to fear of overdevelopment, exhaustion of the outdated sewerage and stormwater systems, shortage of car parking space and increase in traffic.

They share with others on the Manly Warringah Peninsula a frustration over traffic problems created by Military Road and the outmoded Spit Bridge. They need and deserve a solution to this overcrowded thoroughfare, which splits the communities north and south of the roadway. Keen on participating in decision-making, electors have welcomed the Government's announcement to establish a section 22 committee to consider options to overcome these problems. They realistically acknowledge that the solution will not come tomorrow, but they demand that progress is made. And that progress must be an holistic approach to transportation which addresses problems of cars and public transport.

Public transport use is high among North Shore dwellers. They make good use of trains, buses and ferries, and appreciate the recent upgrading of these facilities. But there is more to be done long term, such as installation of ramps or lifts at Milsons Point station. Residents along the harbour foreshore and the ridges of McMahon's Point are angry about noise created by increasing helicopter flights over and circling the area. They are frustrated in their attempts to report offending craft, and are strongly opposed to the siting of a heliport at Pyrmont. As their representative in Parliament, I honoured a commitment I made to them when I was elected to oppose the establishment of the heliport at Pyrmont by abstaining from voting with the Government on the bill introduced by the honourable member for Port Jackson last week.

With the subsequent defeat of that bill in another place, I will continue to impress upon the Minister my opposition to the siting of the heliport at Pyrmont, and to draw to his attention community concerns, which I share, about noise levels disruptive to the daily lives of people living near helicopter lane R409. Conscious that monitoring and control of craft using that lane rests with the Commonwealth Government, I will continue to urge the State Government to press for remedial action to be taken by colleagues in

Canberra. As the representative in Parliament of the people of North Shore, my commitment, to echo the words of the Governor, is to work in partnership with individuals and the community to ensure there are opportunities which result in rising living standards and prosperity for the people of North Shore.

I have an open door policy; I am accessible to people and their individual and collective concerns. I regard very seriously my obligation to listen and to give of my best in addressing their needs and to facilitate the meeting of parties to resolve conflict and find acceptable joint solutions. Phillip Smiles was a most able community representative of the people of North Shore, and I wish to pay tribute to the boundless energy and dedication he gave to the electorate. In the years of Phillip's representation there were major improvements to schools, police stations, fire brigades, at the zoo, at all the railway stations, to wharves and to roads.

My commitment is to represent all the people of North Shore, regardless of their circumstances, backgrounds, interests or political views. But I particularly want to thank the many people who have supported me over many years. Many deserve special mention. I hope they will forgive that I limit specific reference to just a few. No aspiring member of Parliament can do without tremendous family support and mine have provided this unreservedly - Chris, my husband of 22 years; Amy, who is a student in New York; Simon, doing a commercial pilot's course and evincing mixed feelings in his mother with descriptions of flying lessons; and Robbie, a year 8 student.

Special thanks to Marilyn Cameron, for many years my loyal friend and supporter, confidante and assistant extraordinaire; to Roxanne, her daughter, who takes after her mother; and to the Cameron males, Bob, Stuart and Andrew - all of them surrogate family to mine when the need has been there. Thanks also to those who have worked so tirelessly with me and the Liberal Party in North Shore over many years - Barry Williams, John McDermott, Robert Orrell, Graeme Rogers, Joan Vernon, Stephen Kuhl, Ken Wiener, Elspeth Westwood, Anne DeLacy, Don Jenkins, Bill Raine, Frank Hooke, John Watts, Liz Story and Julie Royale, to name a representative few. Particular thanks to all those who put in such an extraordinary effort in the February by-election. That effort came from all quarters, and I am particularly indebted to the assistance provided by Liberal Party State Secretary Barry O'Farrell and others within the organisation.

I have come away from the by-election with the greatest respect, admiration and appreciation for the enormous support and warm friendship extended by Premier John Fahey, Deputy Premier Ian Armstrong,

Ministers and members of Parliament. It was a campaign in which all were in touch with the people in the street, at the supermarket, on their doorsteps, at ferry wharves and at bus stops. It was an exhilarating experience and filled me with a great sense of camaraderie. I make a particular mention also of the many, many young people who assisted, particularly members of the Young Liberal movement. Their participation was especially apt because of my well-known interest in young people.

Which brings me now to that particular section of the community - those aged 15 to 25. They comprise around 30 per cent of the population of the North Shore, and the issues which confront and concern them are also of concern to their parents, grandparents and friends. My interest in young people dates back to my active involvement as a member of parent bodies at Neutral Bay Public School when my children were students there. I have always believed that the nurturing of young people, whether that be in the form of family care and love, or through the provision of quality support and services provided by the community, including government, is a measure of the worth of that society. As I wrote in a column in my local newspaper in 1988, before the coalition Government came to office:

. . . the more I've looked into the process of nurturing the young through to maturity, the more I see gaps in our system.

I have a vision where young and talented Australians have a greater chance to realise their full potential and can see their skills to fruition through a link between their education and our developing

country.

We too often dismiss as childish dreamers, the youngsters who announce they are going to invent the next generation microchip or build the world's fastest aeroplane. We've become wearied by the obstacles that lie in the path of allowing such dreams to become reality.

I believe governments have a role in removing obstacles to dreams becoming reality. That has been my philosophy in working in youth affairs and that is very much the theme of the New South Wales Government's youth affairs policy released in 1991. It is a social policy which addresses the needs of all young people with a particular focus on creating opportunities for those most disadvantaged. It pays particular attention to the need to use resources most efficiently and effectively in meeting the needs of over one million young people who live in New South Wales - almost a quarter of the total population of the State, and one-third of Australia's youth population.

It notes the importance of consultation with young people and their communities and the co-ordination of services to best meet their needs in an holistic manner. It addresses topics ranging from education, training, employment, health, accommodation, justice, transport to the environment. Many people were involved in the development of the youth affairs policy - young people, youth workers and others in the community with particular expertise and interest, and dozens of service providers from within the New South Wales public service. The work was driven by the team of dedicated, totally committed and professional people who make up the New South Wales Office of Youth Affairs.

I have had a varied and fascinating career. I have met and worked with people who are the masters of their fields, among them internationally recognised names in the journalist world when I lived and worked in South-east Asia during the Vietnam war and later returned to the parliamentary press gallery in Victoria. I have worked with bright and successful people in business - with clients ranging from BHP and Shell to small enterprising Australian manufacturing companies - when I ran my own editorial consultancy based in North Shore. But I have never worked with a finer, more innovative and totally committed group than I did at the Office of Youth Affairs. I wholeheartedly support the sentiments expressed by the Premier during question time last Wednesday, when he said:

. . . one of the revelations that have come to me in my six years in government is that the belief that private is better than public is a fallacy. The good people are already in government . . . They perform magnificently, do their best for the people of this State, and concentrate all their attention on the agencies they are working for.

The achievements of this Government in youth affairs, so ably supported by the work of staff within the Office of Youth Affairs, and of those within the Ministry of Education and Youth Affairs where it is located, have been recognised across Australia. It has been acknowledged that New South Wales leads the nation in youth affairs, not only in terms of the programs it provides, but in that New South Wales was the first government in Australia to have a comprehensive youth policy, annual youth budget statement, youth strategic plan and annual report. Ministers from other States have visited the Office of Youth Affairs to see how we have done it in New South Wales. [*Extension of time agreed to.*]

The national youth policy, endorsed by State, Territory and the Commonwealth youth Ministers in 1992, is based on the New South Wales policy. The Queensland youth policy released last year follows the same format and uses words from the New South Wales policy. Other States are following suit. Messages that I received following my election were most gratifying. They came from people in the private sector, from across the New South Wales bureaucracy, across all portfolios, from the community and from other State youth bureaus - messages like those expressed in a press release issued by the New South Wales youth peak organisation, the Youth Action Policy Association, on 4 March, which said:

The creation of a youth specific unit in the government has been essential in highlighting and promoting youth issues to the Cabinet and community.

. . . extensive consultations have taken place with young people in Wollongong, Western Sydney and the Hunter.

I might add that consultations are currently being conducted also on the far North Coast of New South Wales. The press release continues:

These consultations have resulted in improved services and coordination for young people. In addition, over 25,000 young people have been assisted and supported through training programs such as . . . the Helping Early Leavers Program.

Page 717

The project manager of one of those programs has written to the Minister for Education, Training and Youth Affairs. She has given me permission to quote from that letter. John Hildebrand from Byron Bay wrote:

The HELP program has had some truly amazing results. A young 20 year old who, four years ago lived on the street as a prostitute and IV drug user, is this year attending university as a second year Arts student and first year Law student.

This transition was not an easy one and involved returning to Year 10 High School after completing a HELP program. The young person also received ongoing support through her High School studies and has returned to live in her home town to be with family.

I speak of these programs with a great deal of pleasure. There is no greater satisfaction or reward for many hours' work in developing, implementing and operating such programs than seeing the grinning faces of young people as they graduate from their courses, their sense of achievement, excitement and hope for the future is almost palpable. But there is more to it than "feeling good". And equally, a more important outcome of such programs is often overlooked. I am speaking of the economic benefits of effective social policies and programs such as HELP which underpin those policies.

Very little indeed is done to determine the cost, for example, of unemployment to the economy and the community in general and to governments in particular. Among the costs of unemployment to government one has to include, first, the cost of unemployment benefits. Estimating the costs of unemployment benefits is complex because of the variety of factors which are used to determine the amount an individual receives. The Brotherhood of St Lawrence 1992 report entitled "Unemployment: the economic and social costs" suggests that the cost is greatest for a family breadwinner with a dependent spouse and children to support but the cost is not much less in the case of a single person over 18.

The second direct economic cost of unemployment is through lost tax revenue. Determination of the extent of this lost revenue requires complex calculations which take into account variations such as unemployment for portions of the financial year, assumptions about the level of income ranges forgone through unemployment, and concessional taxation arrangements which apply to redundancy and separation payments. The Brotherhood of St Lawrence report provides some examples which suggest that, using fairly simplistic calculations of lost wages being at average weekly earnings in the 1991-92 financial year, the total net cost to government for a single female was nearly \$10,500 and for a single male just over \$14,000.

The report estimates that, using March 1992 unemployment figures, the total cost to government in providing income support payments and taxation forgone was between \$10 billion and \$18 billion. A third factor to be taken into account in determining the cost of unemployment to government is the cost of providing support services. Unemployment can, and frequently does, create increased demand for other

government services such as public housing, transport concessions, education grants and health care. And there are many that are difficult to quantify particularly because of the difficulty of identifying causal relationships between unemployment and need or demand.

For example, frequently described consequences of unemployment, particularly long-term unemployment, include reduced confidence and self-esteem; increased ill health, particularly mental health problems; increased family tension; and greater involvement in anti-social or criminal activity. The economic cost to governments and the community in general in providing services to deal with these issues is difficult to calculate but would have to include, at least in part, funds for family and community support services, police, courts, prisons and so on.

A further but desirable consequence is the number of students remaining at school for the full 12 years. Many young people state unequivocally that they would normally have left school after year 10 and sought work, but because of their decreased expectation of finding jobs they are staying on to complete the higher school certificate. Whilst all governments applaud higher retention rates, the cost of catering for increased school populations is considerable. The difficulty for State governments is that the provision of these services is most frequently their responsibility, and they must usually be provided without additional funds.

Let me go back to my HELP graduation ceremony. Whilst watching the young graduates I not only "feel good" for them. I know that HELP is not only part of equitable and effective social policy; it makes sound economic sense. I do not think you have to be a genius to understand the gain to the individual, the community and the Government, in both social and economic terms in the changed circumstances of John Hildebrand's HELP graduate. In "Reinventing Australia", Hugh McKay claims:

Politics has become virtually synonymous with economics and has, in the process, seemed to many Australians to have retreated from a concern with human values and social justice.

I believe the HELP program and the many others described in the New South Wales youth policy statement and associated documents put paid to any suggestion that the New South Wales Government has retreated from a concern for human values and social justice. And the Governor mentioned many more such policies and services in his address to the Parliament. He mentioned, for example, education policies, with which I am proud to have been involved, the "Directions" policy statement, with a major focus on removing barriers between schools and other education and training providers, and the New South Wales policy framework currently being developed for equity in education and training.

These are sound social policies which have a highly beneficial impact on the economic well-being of individuals, our community and our State. But

Page 718

there is rarely enough analysis of the cost-effectiveness of such policies and programs. I believe it is important for governments to take into greater account and to better explain to the people they represent the significant economic benefits which flow from effective social policies and programs such as these.

Debate adjourned on motion by Mr Downy.

MINISTER FOR POLICE AND MINISTER FOR EMERGENCY SERVICES

Motion of No Confidence

Debate resumed from an earlier hour.

Mr FAHEY (Southern Highlands - Premier, and Minister for Economic Development) [7.57]: Before the interruption of the debate I made a number of points centred on the fact that the most serious of

motions has been moved in this House against the Minister for Police and that that motion was based on a two-pronged accusation against the Minister relating to what the Opposition alleged were quotas and his maladministration of the Police Service in his portfolio responsibility. Instead of bringing forward substance the Leader of the Opposition in leading the debate attempted to carry the argument with a series of jokes. He showed utter contempt for the Parliament and for the Independents, upon whom the motion will swing, and utter contempt for both the Government and Opposition.

It is appropriate to remind the House of the memorandum of understanding which applies to the Government and the Opposition as I understand it. In relation to motions of no confidence the agreement states that the Independent members agree to vote with the Government on all motions of no confidence except where matters of corruption or gross maladministration are involved which reflect upon the conduct of the Government as a whole. They are the terms upon which the motion must swing when the count is taken. Where is the gross maladministration on the part of the Minister for Police? Where in his administration, over a period of 18 months, can there be a case made out for gross maladministration?

This is the most sensitive of portfolios, the most difficult of areas. The Leader of the Opposition - and if I could paraphrase his words - indicated that for 70 years public administration has not got the Police Service right. That was a nice little shaft on his former Minister for Police, the honourable member for Liverpool, but it cannot be pointed to this Government in the manner in which the Leader of the Opposition sought to do. From this Government's beginning it sought to address the issues relating to police, and the shortcomings, and to bring the system into better line with public expectation. The Government did that first under the Hon. Ted Pickering and subsequently under the current Minister for Police.

In all instances the present Minister has acted on the advice of the Commissioner for Police, the Police Board and the system which is designed under the legislation, approved by this House, to back up the manner in which police administration occurs. One cannot condemn a man based on personality problems, yet that is all I have heard this afternoon from the Opposition. There is a dislike of this man's personality. In no way has it been proved that maladministration has occurred - no way whatsoever. It may well have been a shortcoming had the Minister failed to take the advice of the Commissioner for Police, or had he failed to take notice of the Police Board and the other structures that Parliament has approved. But to attempt to condemn him on the second leg of the motion, allegedly leading to maladministration, that is, his change in policy, would simply mean that this House would become irrelevant.

If the Government of the day does not have the right to respond to public perceptions, public views and public feelings of concerns by changing its policy, then we are in all sorts of difficulties with democracy in this State. The House must deal with this motion for what it is. It is an attempt to disrupt this House. In many ways it is designed to take considerable time away from members who wish to speak about the genuine concerns that they have for their electorates. In many ways it is designed to attempt to discredit the Government, based in part on the success that this Minister has had. I might say that this Government has had more success in that it has had a better Police Service than any other government that preceded it.

I have said on many occasions that the Police Service of today is a far better Police Service than that of yesterday, and that the Police Service of tomorrow will be even better still. That will happen because the Minister now responsible for the Police Service is a caring minister. He is a Minister who is strong. He is a Minister who believes in developing morale and harmony within the Police Service that he serves on behalf of the people of this State. He is a Minister who knows the meaning of teamwork and getting the job done. But, as much as anything else, he is a Minister who calls a spade a spade. Sometimes, when you are strong, you ruffle feathers. Sometimes, when you tackle something front on, you ruffle some feathers. Obviously this Minister has ruffled the feathers of many opposite, but he has responded to the community.

Whatever our views are on the Police Service in this State - a better Police Service today and an even better one tomorrow - if they are not views complimentary of the Police Service, we cannot take it out on this Minister. This motion today is a joke. I cannot describe it any other way. It is a joke and I invite all members to reflect upon the comments of the Leader of the Opposition as he led this debate. He did not lead the debate with substance. He led it with a series of jokes. He tried to introduce all sorts of overtones, whether they be Buckingham Palace, quotable quotes or otherwise. He did not make a case out in the most serious of all motions that come before this House.

There is no precedent with motions of no confidence, but I would have thought such a motion must have substance. No substance has been shown

Page 719

today, no case has been made out. This Minister does not deserve to be listening tonight to an attempt to disrupt government and score political points. Finally I refer to the union, the Police Association - it is no friend of this Government. I think it is fair to say that all unions are not likely to side with this Government. The reasons for that are historical, but at least the Police Association has been fair minded in this instance and recognised this debate for what it really is. The words of the president of that union today were that this effort is politically opportunistic in its attempt to bring down this Minister. The union has condemned it, as the community of this State will condemn it, if there is an attempt by the Opposition to play games and to manipulate the members of the crossbenches in this instance. I say no case has been made out; this man has no case to answer.

Mr WHELAN (Ashfield) [8.5]: The Premier's so-called defence of the Minister for Police lacked substance on the major issue of why the House is considering this time a motion of no confidence against the Minister of Police. There was no justification by the Premier of his role in regard to the comments made by the Minister for Police relating to police pay suspensions, juvenile cautioning or quotas. The Premier was an integral and essential part of the dealings with this Minister that resulted in this Minister changing his mind on those three occasions. This motion of no confidence is about the lack of confidence that the people of New South Wales have in this Minister for Police as a result of his indecision, his insecurity, his making policy on the run, his changing his mind repeatedly, and his creating uncertainty in the community on those three issues - his vacillating, his duplicity and his double standards. That is the very reason that this House is faced now with a motion of no confidence against this Minister - double standards. The motion should be carried. The Minister said of police pay suspension, when he made the announcement:

I believe that any officer who has committed a criminal offence or has been charged with a criminal offence, should not be paid from the taxpayer's purse.

The Premier was silent. He did not tell us what he told the Minister on the phone, although we have our own beliefs about what was said.

Mr Photios: Have you been bugging the phones?

Mr WHELAN: No, it is your party that bugs phones, not the Labor Party. The Opposition has its own views about what would have been said and what has been said here. The Minister for Police likes military jargon. I imagine that at 0600, after the ablutions, Terry had a view about juvenile cautioning, then at 0915 he suddenly had a phone call from the Premier that caused him to do a complete about-face. He did a complete backflip on the issue. In that phone call the Premier said, "Fourth class constable Griffiths" -

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much interjection in the Chamber.

Mr WHELAN: The Premier said that the Minister had to change his mind on the double and he did, because that is what the Premier told him to do. Is it any wonder that people have no confidence in the

Minister for Police when there have been three instances when he changed his mind in recent times and when he has been guilty of duplicity. The Minister said that officers charged with criminal offences should be denied their pay. What duplicity! What double standards! The Minister served in the same government as Phillip Smiles, Tony Packard and any other member on that side faced with criminal charges. They were faced with all sorts of tax -

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Monaro to order for the second time.

Mr WHELAN: But did the Minister say to them that they should be suspended from Parliament? No. What did government members do? They supported those members, when they should have been removed from Parliament. Government members went out of their way to ensure that Smiles and Packard received all the perks, lurks and pay that members are entitled to.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much interjection from the honourable member for Monaro and the Minister for Police. They should remain silent while the honourable member for Ashfield makes his contribution to the debate.

Mr WHELAN: But if a member of the New South Wales Police Service has been charged, this Minister says that person is guilty. In other words, if the police say they are charging someone, as far as the Minister is concerned that person is guilty and should be denied pay, rights and entitlements. That is why no one has any confidence in the Minister. Does the Minister know that more than 50 per cent of people committed for trial never get to trial and are proved by the courts to be innocent? The Minister wants to take away the rights and pay of police officers. But the Premier has said, "Terry, will you please do me a favour and change your mind?" Nothing will distract the Minister from his inability to make a decision because he probably believes the headlines that were printed. The Minister said when he leaves Parliament he is going to run a bankrupt business. He has tried to do that with the Police Service.

Mr Griffiths: I did not say that.

Mr WHELAN: I did not see the correction in the paper.

Mr Griffiths: You are like Bob Carr, you believe everything you read.

Mr WHELAN: Certainly. I look forward to your -

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have already warned members of the Government to cease interjecting while the honourable member for Ashfield is speaking. I ask them to adhere to that direction, or risk being removed from the Chamber.

Page 720

Mr WHELAN: Mr Speaker, I plead with you not to do that because this is a very -

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I will not have any flippant comments from the honourable member for Ashfield either. He will continue with his contribution to the debate.

[Interruption from gallery]

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There will be no interjection from the public gallery.

Mr WHELAN: Sydney has won the Olympic Games bid and the Minister is creating a new event in world Olympic history - the five-minute backflip. The Minister will be the first recipient of the first gold medal for the five-minute backflip. The Minister has done it on not one but three occasions, first, in relation to police pay suspensions; second, in relation to cautioning; and third, in relation to quotas. On

the question of juvenile cautioning -

Mr Griffiths: What is the backflip on quotas?

Mr WHELAN: I will come to the quotas in a minute, but first I want to read what the Minister said to Jennifer Byrne on the Australian Broadcasting Corporation, notwithstanding his patronising, condescending remarks to that journalist. The Minister drew up his policy for juvenile cautioning on the run. He might have had his heart on his sleeve that day when he was asked the question, but surely he must ask himself - I certainly do - how he can make policy decisions on the run and without consultation. When he made those decisions, whether on police pay suspension or juvenile cautioning, what type of edict did he give the commissioner as a result of his stance? What did he say to his staff? What did he say to his parliamentary staff - "Set this in train"?

Mr Griffiths: You recommended it, you clown.

Mr WHELAN: But the Minister opposed it in 1988 - his pamphlet says oppose it, throw it away. The Minister has been on the road to Damascus since 1988: he was going to stop juvenile cautioning and now in 1994 he wants to reintroduce it because he thinks it is a fantastic idea; it is the best idea. The Premier picked up the phone and said, "Now listen here, Terry, I want to talk to you about your second change of mind". The plain fact is that the Minister vacillates. He does not put policies through his department. He is obviously looking for the cheap headline, but he has run into the chief headhunter. The Premier has picked up the phone and said, "Listen Terry, this is the second time I am going to warn you. Stop it or you will be out of the ministry". No matter what happens here tonight -

Mr Griffiths: You did not listen to him.

Mr WHELAN: The Premier did not defend him at all, and the rest of his colleagues left the Chamber. For the first time in my 18 years in Parliament I saw members leave the Chamber during a motion of no confidence. The Minister was on his own, trying to justify things for himself. Does he know why his colleagues walked out - because they know he is guilty, that he is on the skids and heading downhill fast.

Mr Photios: On a point of order: it is quite clear that the honourable member for Ashfield, while fixated with the question of preselections in future, given that he will not have an electorate soon, is straying from the issue and is clearly addressing his remarks not through the Chair but directly to the Minister and the public gallery. I ask you, Mr Acting-Speaker, to ask the honourable member to direct his remarks through the Chair and not to flout rulings given by Mr Speaker only a few moments ago, and not seek to disrupt the debate.

Mr ACTING-SPEAKER (Mr Rixon): Order! I am sure the honourable member for Ashfield was making only a passing comment on other matters and that he is about to return to the subject of the debate.

Mr WHELAN: I was merely replying to inordinate interjections that seem to take place every time I speak. The central issue is that this Minister does not deserve the confidence of the House. That was clearly in evidence by the lack of support. The Premier never justified his position or explained it to the Parliament. What the Premier did not tell the Parliament is what he said on three occasions to this Minister, who has clearly erred in the administration of his portfolio. The Minister has misled the public. He has misled the Parliament; he has misled the people. He certainly deliberately misled the people of New South Wales who listen to the ABC.

When he was asked the question by Jennifer Byrne, and made that condescending remark to her, he said, "Well Jennifer, you're an intelligent woman. If you read it that way, then I need to clarify it". What the Minister is talking about is the Minister for Police saying, "I need to clarify". This is what the Minister

said, "Consistent with the need to attain and manage the management specification currently 10 parking infringement notices per parking patrol officer per shift". The Minister has to clarify what that means to the ABC journalist. Everyone knows what it means. He tried to say it really is not a formal darg or formal quota; it is an informal quota. Also during the interview he says -

Mr Griffiths: There are no quotas.

Mr WHELAN: During the ABC interview, when asked that very question, "Is this another informal quota perhaps?" the Minister said, "Well, Jennifer, I have to find that out".

Mr Griffiths: Quote it correctly.

Mr WHELAN: I have quoted it correctly.

Mr Griffiths: Quote it correctly. I will read it for you.

Mr WHELAN: It is quoted correctly. That is where the Minister hangs himself. He says there are no informal quotas, yet on the radio interview, in answer to the question, "Is this another informal quota perhaps?" his answer was, "Well, Jennifer, I have to find that out". In other words, the Minister is not on top of his ministerial portfolio. He denies that there is a formal quota system. Anyone in New South
Page 721

Wales knows that parking and traffic police have to get a certain number of bookings per week otherwise they are brought to the senior officers, formally or informally, and told that they must lift their game.

Mr Griffiths: You are misleading the House.

Mr WHELAN: I am not misleading the House. I am quoting you directly, Minister.

Mr Griffiths: You are lying.

Mr WHELAN: I am not lying. The only one who has lied, and lied on the ABC, is the Minister, because to this question, "Is this another informal quota perhaps?" he said, "Well, Jennifer, I have to find that out". At that time he said, "I have to find that out", that is, find out whether there is an informal quota. The answer to the question is yes, but the Minister indicted himself even further. The Minister's integrity is on the line. His inability to manage his portfolio is the issue. He can try to interrupt and scream and shout as much as he likes - because he may think he will survive, and he may tonight - but he is doomed. Next Saturday is the sixth anniversary of the Minister's parliamentary election. It is funny that I should mention that because this is ironical. I remember when this Minister was elected as a member -

Mr Photios: On a point of order: it is clear that, despite the rulings of this House, the honourable member for Ashfield is directing each and every remark directly across the Chamber to the Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services. The debate concerns a motion of no confidence in a Minister of the Crown and deserves some degree of seriousness. I put it to you, Mr Acting-Speaker, that even if the honourable member has a fixation with next Saturday - which, of course, is the preselection day for Ashfield - it is certainly not relevant that he direct his remarks in the manner he has done, flouting the rules and provoking the Minister.

Mr ACTING-SPEAKER (Mr Rixon): Order! I am sure the honourable member for Ashfield was replying to an interjection and will address his remarks through the Chair.

Mr WHELAN: The essential issue is that the Minister has been caught out, as I have said, because of his duplicity. I raised the issue of how he could make this policy on the run, considering the position he took in respect of members of Parliament, putting them in a much different position; and the fact that he says police are guilty as charged - if they are charged once and committed for trial, they are guilty.

No one believes that, not even the most right-wing politician in New South Wales.

Mr Griffiths: Your Government did it.

Mr WHELAN: It does not matter. When the Minister considered this policy he must have thought about his ministerial colleagues - the Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries and Minister for Mines, the honourable member for Barwon and the honourable member for Ballina.

Mr Griffiths: Rex Jackson.

Mr WHELAN: Rex Jackson was charged and proved guilty. I doubt that Rex Jackson and the honourable member for Ballina would have much in common.

Mr Griffiths: Paul Whelan and Rex Jackson?

Mr WHELAN: Maybe, but it must be remembered that Rex Jackson went to gaol when the Labor Party was in government. Honourable members should consider what I said before about appearances before the Independent Commission Against Corruption. Under the Minister's edict about police, those members of Parliament would not have been afforded the privilege that the Minister is attempting to take away from New South Wales police. Because they went there, under the Minister's edict they were guilty as charged.

Mr Schultz: They were not charged.

Mr WHELAN: They were guilty as charged -

Mr ACTING-SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member addresses his remarks to the Chair, I am sure there will be fewer interjections.

Mr WHELAN: Enough of this rank hypocrisy by the Government, particularly by this Minister, as to why this motion of no confidence should not be passed. The Minister had a policy on juvenile cautioning. Again Premier Fahey had to override the Minister. On three policy decisions the Minister was carpeted -

Mr Griffiths: You lie, you lie.

Mr WHELAN: I am not interested in what the Minister says - whether he says an untruth about me lying. I have read the facts as recorded by the Australian Broadcasting Corporation and I have given him the transcript. They are there for everyone to read. The Minister has not misled - he has deliberately lied. He indicated with absolute certainty on 10 March on ABC radio that he had to find out whether there was an informal quota system. But on the same day he denied it existed. How can the Minister have it both ways? How can he say it exists and then say, "I do not know whether it exists". It was said on the ABC. The Minister is gone. As I said, the vote of no confidence will succeed or fail upon the numbers of the House. One thing is absolutely certain about the future of this Minister: he is on roller skates, on the way downhill, and he is on the way downhill fast because he has committed a cardinal sin. He has done things unilaterally; he has not consulted with his party or Cabinet colleagues about those three major issues. He made those decisions on the run and that type of immaturity is not allowed in government. That is why people get thrown out of the ministry. That is why he will be thrown out of the ministry.

Mr Griffiths: Is that why you were sacked?

Mr WHELAN: I did not get thrown out of the ministry. If the Minister is interested I can tell him why - because I did not have the numbers. That is exactly what will happen to the Minister. When the

Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services won his seat he had a dummy candidate named Pickering. Is it not ironic that Pickering got him in, because Pickering was a dummy Liberal candidate and helped him win his preselection; is it not ironic that the person who is going to see him out of his job as Police Minister has a like name? The Minister will survive as a Minister but his mouth will be the end of him as a Minister within the next 12 months.

Mr ARMSTRONG (Lachlan - Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works, and Minister for Ports) [8.25]: In any Parliament under the Westminster system the moving of a motion of no confidence against a Minister is extremely serious; it is a grave action. The Opposition in this Fiftieth Parliament has decided today to make an absolute mockery of the Westminster system, and to try to further its own progress when it is in desperate straits with leadership; when a number of its members - including the last speaker, the honourable member for Ashfield - are desperately trying to score some points in the local press in order to prop up their positions before facing the preselection process this weekend. The Opposition has chosen to use the time, resources, good will and office of this House for its own spurious, devious purposes.

In addition to that, the Opposition is prepared to attempt to sacrifice a man who has worked hard, diligently, sincerely, honestly and faithfully in serving his portfolio as Minister for Police and Emergency Services; a man who has sacrificed his family on many occasions and potentially his own health. The Opposition - for a political stunt, for its own selfish purposes and not even for the good of politics - is prepared to go ahead with this travesty. The last speaker, the honourable member for Ashfield, has been a member of this House for many years and was at one time a serving Minister who was sacked by his own party. He knows better, but even he has stooped to the lowest tonight because he is prepared to use a good man for his own spurious purposes. The irony is that the honourable member for Ashfield has only four or five more days in this place until he is shown up for exactly what he is, a fraud, because his own people are not going to wear him.

Motions such as this have far-reaching implications and demand a great deal of responsibility on the part of those who move them. Motions of no confidence require a sound basis of proof and fact if they are to be genuine, otherwise they make a mockery of the process of Parliament. The motion has no substance to support a vote of no confidence in the Minister. It is big on rhetoric, big on assertions, big on one-liners, but pathetically light on fact. No confidence motions, if they are to succeed, need overwhelming argument as to why a Minister has lost the confidence of the House. Mere theatre - and I might say very poor theatre at that - is not enough. The Leader of the Opposition - presumably the Opposition's best card - failed abysmally to support his own motion. Indeed, I think it could be rightly said he even lacked conviction in his own motion. He did not have any drive or belief; he had not done his homework. He knew it was a stunt, a theatrical act, and he knew he had lost the support of those on the opposite side of the House. It was interesting to watch the so-called body language of his own party members during his presentation. They were ashamed of their leader.

Mr Cochran: They were cringing.

Mr ARMSTRONG: They were ashamed of their own leader. They were cringing. The honourable member for Monaro makes the point that the Leader of the Opposition does not have even the fundamental support of his own people. They cringed in their seats with embarrassment and shame. Indeed, they realised that they do not have a leader, let alone a leader that has put forward anything like a cogent argument that might support a motion of this gravity. The Leader of the Opposition produced nothing but a collection of media stories, quotes and differences of opinion involving the Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services. He proceeded to dress them up as a crisis of confidence. Were the House to apply the same yardstick to the performance of the Leader of the Opposition as a Minister and as Leader of the Opposition, he would be compelled to withdraw from this House in abject embarrassment. The Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services, instead of being subjected to the baseless allegations of the Leader of the Opposition, should be acclaimed for the many sound reforms he has introduced into the New South Wales Police Service during his term of office.

The Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services deserves the full support of the House because of his success in introducing improved accountability, integrity and management expertise to the Police Service and because of improved operational standards and improvements in our emergency services. The Leader of the Opposition did not care to mention the high standards of discipline and loyalty the Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services has inspired in the Police Service or the new pride that has now developed throughout the service. The Minister has demonstrated a forthright ability to tackle problems head on. He has not taken a backward step in the face of misguided criticism.

The Minister's style might not suit everyone, but there can be no doubt as to his intention to achieve high standards, to improve the New South Wales Police Service, to tackle corruption head on and to make our streets safer for our families and visitors to our country. Some members of the Opposition were members of the previous Labor Government who voted against a motion of no confidence moved by the then Opposition in the Minister for Corrective Services at that time, Mr Jackson. That motion, which was truly a genuine motion based on overwhelming facts and evidence of corruption, was defeated by a Labor Government protecting a corrupt Labor Minister. The honourable member for Liverpool was then the Minister for Police. He presided over a corrupt police force and a corrupt Government.

Page 723

Mr Cochran: And he did not know it.

Mr ARMSTRONG: That is not the point. He now has the absolute gall to support a motion of no confidence in the Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services that is based on nothing more than a spurious allegation of maladministration. There is no evidence of corruption or deceit, and no evidence to equal the damning material produced against Mr Jackson, but at that time the honourable member for Liverpool and his Labor colleagues had no trouble in voting against a motion of no confidence. I would be amazed if any Independent member of this House could find justification from the case presented by the Opposition for supporting this motion. On the basis of a fair go, this motion could not survive. It has no legs; it has no substance. It is purely politically motivated.

The motion completely disregards the requirement that a no confidence motion must be based on justifiable grounds. It is sobering to remind ourselves just how deeply entrenched corruption had become under the previous Labor Government of this State. New South Wales has come a long way since 1988. Law and order has been rescued. The other States of Australia realise this. Even those of our opponents with common sense, those who are fair and reasonable and have a balanced sense of judgment, realise that the improvements made in law and order in New South Wales under this Government have been outstanding. They remember what it was like back in 1988, in the days of the Wran Government. They remember the incompetence of the then Minister for Police, who is now the honourable member for Liverpool. They know that the honourable member for Liverpool, who has attempted to bucket the hard-working Minister during this debate, was an embarrassment.

Those who were members at that time remember question time during the term of office of the Wran Government. The honourable member for Liverpool, the billy boy, would come into the House blustering, huffing and roaring, and use steamroller tactics, all without substance, to cover his own incompetence and lack of capacity to provide leadership and, most important, his and the Government's lack of capacity during those Labor years to gain the confidence of the police force. The Wran Government did not have the confidence of the public or the police force, and could not win the confidence of the media.

It is clear that during those dark years of Labor Government until 1988, corruption was allowed to run its own race, and the police were virtually allowed to do their own thing because of an incompetent Minister. There is now law and order and respect in the community. Now that there is trust between the police, the Government, the Minister and the community, the Labor Party has attempted to bring into

disrepute the man who has been the architect and mechanic of reforms to the Police Service. New South Wales is a better place because of the administration of Terry Griffiths. Tonight the street in front of this place, Macquarie Street - Sussex Street or whatever street one likes to name - is much safer. The community has greater respect because of the administration of the Hon. Terry Griffiths. It is now much more difficult to be a criminal in New South Wales than it was under the open slather system of corruption supervised by Labor. It was not difficult to be a criminal then, but it is now because the Minister is, and has been, prepared, at any cost to himself, to meet the challenges of cleaning up the criminal element in this State.

This motion does a great disservice to the dignity of the Parliament and even greater damage to the credibility of the Opposition. Shortly after question time this afternoon, a senior backbencher from the North Coast of New South Wales walked into my office and said, "Do you know that in the past couple of days two people have said to me, 'That Terry Griffiths is doing a good job'". That is the opinion of the people. The trouble with members of the Opposition is that they do not listen to the public; they do not understand. They think they know the feelings of the people but they have no rapport with the general public. They do not have the necessary feeling or understanding. They do not understand that the ordinary citizen in the street is saying, "Terry Griffiths is doing a darned good job". That was reflected by the unsolicited comment of the backbencher who walked into my office this afternoon. It was one of those things that just comes up as one talks about question time and the events of the day.

That comment says a great deal about the policies and programs of Terry Griffiths. It also says a great deal about the Opposition, because it cannot make those sorts of claims about police Ministers or Ministers who were in charge of this State during the term of office of the Labor Government. The Police Association, which is certainly not a traditional friend of government, has supported the Minister. That is almost unprecedented. It stands alone in what it means to this debate. The only thing that can be said about this motion is that it is spurious, mischievous, lying and deceitful. It is a motion that has come from a gossamer thin Opposition, an Opposition that is acknowledged as one of the weakest in this State since the end of World War II, an Opposition that has no confidence in itself, no relationship to the broader community and is not trusted by the public service, an Opposition that cheats on itself, an Opposition that cannot even hold its own pre-selection ballots. The Opposition that does not understand the political game because it has decided to move a motion of lies and deceit against a good, honest man. The broader community of New South Wales realises that the Minister is doing a good, honest job, even if the members of the Opposition are too ignorant to realise it.

Mr HATTON (South Coast) [8.39]: I came today with new material and a long speech prepared, but I will not be giving it. I spoke with the Leader of the Opposition about my having unlimited time to speak to the motion. I indicate to the Minister that the situation is serious. I decided that I will not make
Page 724

that speech tonight, but I will make it at a later date in this House because the situation in the police force is serious. Whether this House recognises it or not, I will keep plugging the seriousness of the situation in the face of the rhetoric and the words that wash around this House.

This debate is about the removal of a police Minister, it is not about the change of systems. It is not about Commissioner Lauer's lies to a parliamentary committee. It is not about his part in the Frenchs Forest cover-up. It is not about a change in police culture. It is not an attack on the entrenched old mates cover-up by internal affairs. When the time is opportune I will put this material before the House and I will call for a royal commission. We do have the ICAC and we do have the Ombudsman and we do have the State Crime Commission, but as I pointed out in the Parliament last week, we do not have a proper structure to invigilate a commissioner, because each of those organisations depends on the commissioner and they depend on seconded officers from the police force to make their inquiries. I said to Mr Temby -

Mr Schultz: Why don't you get on to Winchester?

Mr HATTON: If you would like to talk about Winchester, bring on the debate and explain how between \$5 million and \$8 million worth of marijuana went missing while under the supervision of the New South Wales police force. Debate me in this Parliament on that question and I will take you on any time you like. Let us go from there. These organisations do have some officers from other police forces, but they depend heavily on the New South Wales police. They depend heavily on investigation by officers who have to go back in to the police force, who have to answer to the commissioner, and who have to, somehow, maintain for themselves a future career. I will explore that at a later date.

I live for the day when parliamentarians will really stand up for the vast majority of honest police who do a difficult, dangerous and sometimes very messy job in a tough social climate; when they will stand up against the destructive police structure, the vilification and humiliation of honest police, and the destruction of whistleblowers. I have plenty of evidence of that, the suborning of honest police, the inadequate, inefficient, distorted and corrupted investigations and, in some instances, prosecutions - I am talking about 14 years of experience. The Police Association stands up for the vast majority of honest police below the commissioned officer level. I look forward to the day when it stands up with its full force and supports a whistleblower member. I look forward to the day when this Parliament is not laid low with political flu when the Police Association sneezes.

They may not be in the gallery now, but they were in the gallery this afternoon when the Premier read a letter and said, "Look at the support from the Police Association for the police Minister". No one on the front bench of either side of the House has the guts to take on the Police Association; that is quite clear. But, more important, the Premier knowingly misled this House. He said that the police committee had every opportunity to examine the Frenchs Forest matter. That is not true. The committee could not examine Frenchs Forest because the committee did not know about it when it was sitting. When Assistant Commissioner Cole, head of internal affairs and professional responsibility, was sitting in the witness box giving evidence, he showed no sign of mental illness. He was not shaking. He was confident. He did not tell the committee about Frenchs Forest. And the Minister did not tell the committee about Frenchs Forest. He did not know about Frenchs Forest.

The *Sydney Morning Herald* told the committee about Frenchs Forest after it had finished its work; so the committee revisited Frenchs Forest. It wanted to talk to Cole, but what happened? Cole is not there any more. He is off sick. Wait until I get the opportunity to tell you how that is fixed; how police officers are boarded out of the system when, in fact, the police union and the commissioned officers have as much say in the process as the medicos. That man escaped, and I will tell you what: he is not sick; he is cunning. The simple fact is that he did not tell the committee what he knew. The Commissioner of Police knew about Frenchs Forest, and that is a clearly proven fact. If you want me to run right down on Frenchs Forest, I can give it to you chapter and verse.

Let me mention again: Constable Bourke, stabbed; 12 months later, shot; 12 months later, the Commissioner of Police says he knew nothing about the drug-related circumstances at that police station. Do any of you believe that? When I cross-examined the commissioner in the committee, I asked him about that particular incident. He said he had doubts about Bourke's story. But a year later he knew nothing about it. Why? Because Cole did not tell him. A question on notice: Is it not normal for the Commissioner of Police to visit officers in such circumstances? Why did you not visit constable Bourke when he was shot? "I had doubts about the story he was telling", he said, but 12 months later he did not make any inquiries. Cole never told him. Cole is just down the corridor, and Myatt is in there somewhere - the man that Commissioner Lauer stood up for against an honest whistleblower, Cook. The situation stinks and you know it stinks.

Talk about numerous inquiries! Milloo was not the wide-ranging inquiry it should have been. I was critical of Temby because of the stuff handed to him by Sturgess and not examined. But the simple fact is that Milloo did not even look at all of the gaming squad, but recommended charges against a heap of them. There is a whole range of stuff. I asked Mr Temby has he ever sent people in to seize files in internal affairs? He has never done that. Has he ever seconded people from interstate to do that job?

He has never done that. When I come to talk about internal affairs, I can tell you about how this Minister and how other people are snowed by internal affairs. It is crook. Lauer was the head of internal affairs and he knows where the bodies are buried, so let us not talk too much about that at this time.

Page 725

The Premier walks out on a thin limb, I think. He adopted and supported the committee report. Okay. The commissioner threatened his Minister. How brave of this Premier immediately to renew his term for five years; to do nothing about supporting his fellow Minister who got shafted - an honourable man who stood up in another place and misled the Parliament on a technicality and resigned on it. But then he went further. The Premier denied and he adopted the rhetoric about the police force. I will tell you what, he will be sorry if he adopts the rhetoric about the police force because there is a real mess in the police force, and it will come out.

He said that the police committee had every opportunity to examine these matters, but that is nonsense. Its terms of reference were to look at the relationship between Minister Pickering and the commissioner and, in passing, your Minister talked about lack of security on \$200 million worth of drugs and being able to get into the place with a pocket knife. Fifteen months pass and no real action is taken. Your Minister talks about rackets to do with stolen cars and police, rackets to do with drugs and police, rackets to do with paedophiles and police, and the Premier knows - either that or he is not interested - that we never got anywhere near investigating that stuff, and anyone who is on that committee knows it.

The members of the committee came away with a sick feeling in their gut that something was seriously wrong in that police force. How can you lose 412 items off the commissioner's computer? How can you do that? He can do that. I said to him in the committee, "Of all the organisations in the world, should not the police force have a back-up?" He said it was a personal computer. It was a personal computer that had all of these items of correspondence of sufficient importance to go to the commissioner's office, and he lost the lot, 412 items. Come off it! You have to be joking! Cole loses his appointment notebook. Newberry, personal assistant to the commissioner, loses the stuff off the computer, loses his diary, loses notes, loses his secretary. I detailed all that last week and at the time of the inquiry.

Newberry, personal assistant to the commissioner, expects us to believe that. You see the collusion in statements, the evidence on Operation Fog - the police are unable to locate the media consultant Brien when our committee lifted up the phone and rang him. They did not want to find him, I detailed all that last week. Commissioner Lauer lied to us about the Telecom records - transcript page 82 on 28 October 1992. He said:

I am informed that Telecom accounts for the media unit fax lines are not itemised either at the time of the incident in question or currently. Telecom has further advised me, after enquiries in Sydney and Melbourne, that there are no itemised records of fax transmissions relating to the exchanges that we use in Sydney.

Again on 10 November 1992, at page 486, Mr Lauer said:

We are still working through Telecom in Melbourne to get details. We hope to be able to locate it by STD records. There is some other evidence that there is some difficulty in confirming fax connections but I will continue to proceed with those enquiries on behalf of the committee.

That was a lie. After a simple telephone call to Telecom by committee staff the Telecom billing was produced. It clearly shows a call to the commissioner's home at Penrith and on the relevant date no record of any call to the Minister's home on the same date. That blew him right out of the water. He said the Minister was informed. He knows damn well the Minister was not informed. And let me remind members about the corrupt specifications through Honeywell on the security of drugs and how it was your

Minister, an engineer, who had to devise a scheme to prevent the police from turning off surveillance cameras inside a room which holds \$200 million of drugs at any particular time, and a room you could get into with a pocket knife, a room that was unsecured for 15 months, in a situation where legislation does not require a test of purity of drugs. So you can walk in there with \$5 million worth of heroin which is 90 per cent pure and exchange it, and you can leave the same parcel with the same number of kilograms of drugs that is 10 per cent pure and nobody knows the difference. The cameras are switched off and although there is supposed to be two sets of keys - two people with two keys - one person has one set of keys and you can get into the place with a pocket knife.

Are you people fair dinkum? The Premier knows his own weakness for not standing up for his Minister; he knows that he should not have supported Lauer when the committee unanimously found that he threatened his Minister saying, though I do not like to use the words, "if you put shit on me I'll put shit on you". That is how it operates. And then the Premier has the hide to talk about the charter of reform, and again he misled this House. We stuck by that charter of reform and it covers motions of no confidence in the Government, not in individual Ministers. We will not support motions of no confidence in the Government, and we will not move motions of no confidence in the Government unless it involves a matter of gross maladministration or corruption which impinges on the whole Government.

But specifically we are free to vote whichever way we like on a motion of no confidence against the Minister, and I certainly will have no hesitation in doing that. As I indicated, when the time comes, I look forward to having a royal commission into the New South Wales police force. I do not think that is the most efficient way to do things but I think it is unavoidable, and I will certainly be pressing for it. As far as this motion is concerned I am going to do something I have never done in my Parliamentary career: I am going to abstain. The jury is still out on this. In terms of whether there is sufficient evidence to show that the Minister misled the House, I am not convinced that there was sufficient evidence. I am still equally not convinced that there is not an informal traffic revenue collection system, but the jury is out for another reason. That is, until I present new material to this House on the performance of this Minister and on the performance of the commissioner, I do not intend to vote for or against the Opposition's motion.

Page 726

Mr BAIRD (Northcott - Minister for Transport, and Minister for Roads) [8.57]: It is clear that this Opposition is in desperation mode. The Leader of the Opposition goes to his office these mornings and they run the rule around and decide which Minister they are going to move on and attack this week or on a particular day. The reality is that they cannot find policies to object to with regard to decisions made by Ministers, and so they play the man and not the ball. Last week it was my turn, and the Hon. Virginia Chadwick's. This week it is the Minister for Police. They attack individuals and personalities, as they have today with this motion of no confidence in the Minister for Police. Last week they got nowhere in their attacks on me, and they will get nowhere today with their attack on the Minister for Police.

This Minister has done more for police morale than any Minister has in recent times. There is no doubt that the previous Minister made significant strides and significant changes with the operation of the police force, and we all applaud the achievements that the present Minister has made in turning around the police force from what it was under the Labor Government to what it is now - and both Ministers deserve our congratulations. But I think more than anything Minister Griffiths deserves great commendation for what he has done to lift the morale of the police force. When you go around the hustings you talk to individual police officers, and they speak highly of this Minister - whether it be police at very senior levels or police constables.

There are very few places in country New South Wales, when you go on tour, that you do not meet the police. They often come out to see what Ministers are doing and to make sure there are no problems. We talk to them about these issues and there is no doubt that they speak highly of this Minister. That is an important aspect. Many members would have as their prime objective the routing out of corruption, which was so endemic under the previous administration. That is significant and it is

important. We need only remember back to what it was like under Premier Wran and some of the excesses that occurred - with the Roger Rogersons of this world and his ilk. I had my own personal experiences with people like Clarrie Briese, and the whole corrupt environment that was allowed to run rampant under the previous administration. It is this Government that established the Independent Commission Against Corruption, and it is this Government that has attempted to move against corruption in the police force in a significant way.

It is this Minister who has 66 officers before the Independent Commission Against Corruption - something that never occurred under the previous administration. So when it has come to moving against corruption, there have been significant changes under this Government, under the previous Minister, Ted Pickering, and under this Minister. Members should not underestimate the importance and the significance of morale within the force, and the need to talk to police officers. I have a close relative who is a member of the force, and I know the hours that he has to work around the clock, under enormous pressure, out there looking at accidents, deaths on the roads, and the family violence situations they have to deal with, and the actual injuries they sustain.

It is difficult, and there is pressure on the family. They are moved around different parts of the State. The role of the police officer is often lonely. That is why from the very top you need loyalty, and it is this Minister who has shown loyalty to his troops and led them in a significant way. It is very easy to criticise and just broadbrush the whole of the police force, to say that the sole preoccupation must be on corruption. That is important and significant. This Minister and the previous Minister made their significant inroads, but in lifting morale this Minister has had no peer.

Let us look at some of the achievements of this Minister. If you walk around any electorate you will see extra beat police, which means extra safety for families throughout the State. It is this Minister who pushed for the return to beat policing to make the streets safer. It was this Minister who approved single unit policing, which allowed more areas of the State to be covered by police patrols, and again meant greater safety for the public. And of course it was this Minister who implemented the child abuse action plan. If there is any matter we should be concerned about in this State it is child abuse. My wife, as a school counsellor, sees the results of child abuse. There is probably no more damaging factor in our society than child abuse. This Minister has taken significant action in implementing the child abuse action plan. We all hold as predominant the protection of our children. I would like to see the Minister take further steps in this area.

Let me list some of his other achievements: random drug audits, which have been significant - the previous Minister was concerned about that, as the honourable member for South Coast would know; the corruption prevention plan; and the restructuring of the Police Service and the Police Board. I think that was long overdue. They moved out of the antiquated system into the modern system, which is in line with contemporary police forces around the world. The Minister restructured the gaming advice squads and internal affairs. These are all measures which have improved the police force and improved the safety of the community.

The Opposition has suggested that there is some rift between the Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services and the Premier. Nothing could be further from the truth. The Minister for Police is a team player. Members opposite want to talk about team players. When we pick up the newspapers and read about how various members will be challenged there is not a word from the Leader of the Opposition as to his view and his support. There is no leadership. The Opposition may make its comments about the team, but this coalition team is firmly together. We have our leader and we are supporting him. There is no question that this Minister is also leading his troops in a very significant way.

Page 727

The Opposition has also tried to criticise the Minister for reversing his decision to reinstate the juvenile cautioning system for car theft. It is amazing that this attack has been brought on because the

Minister changed his mind. He responded to public opinion. When has it been a crime for a politician to respond to public opinion? That is what we are meant to be here for; we are meant to be here for the people of New South Wales. Everyone talks about politics of the warm inner glow and the secret agendas. The bottom line is that we are all here reflecting the requirements and needs of our electorates. I am very happy to talk at any time about those issues. They are the predominant concerns of members of this House.

The Minister made an assessment, reacted to public opinion and responded to it. There have been comments about the suspension of officers. I am sure that all of us become frustrated at officers in the police force who betray the trust that has been placed in them. Obviously the Minister felt passionately in that regard. He knew that they had betrayed their trust and addressed the issue. There are many reasons as to why he came forward with those proposals and then subsequently changed them. This is not a basis on which people have no confidence in a Minister. This Minister has not been tickling the tin. We have not had a situation like we had in a previous administration, where the then Minister for Corrective Services kept letting prisoners out. When this Minister was responsible for corrective services he reformed the prison system like no other Minister has in 20 years.

I watched a program on Channel 2, of all places, which actually praised the Minister for the great reforms he was making. Has anyone in this debate suggested for one minute that this Minister has been corrupt? Not once. Has any member suggested that the Minister has used his office for personal gain? Absolutely not. What we have here is a grab bag of non-issues that the Opposition has come up with. The Opposition is desperate because it is well behind in the polls. It has come in here with these claims in an attempt to say that the Parliament has no confidence in the Minister. Of course the Minister has changed his mind on a couple of issues. How pathetic!

It has been claimed that the Minister misled the House with respect to quotas. It has been clearly established by the commissioner that those quotas do not exist. What basis does this no confidence motion have when the commissioner has said that no quotas exist? That should be the end of it. If the Opposition brings a motion against the Minister on the basis of something that he said which turns out to be true, we could all give it away, go home and do something else. However, the reality is that the Opposition will do anything to throw up dirt on individual Ministers and to throw up questions with respect to their credibility. The Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services needs no apologist. His time as Minister, both as Minister for Corrective Services and as Minister for Police, has been outstanding. He has a strong military background and he has been a leader in the scouting movement. He has shown compassion in the corrective services and police portfolios.

I am sure that he has changed his mind because of compassion. When has it been a crime in our society for a Minister for Police to show compassion? It is not as though the Minister is not being tough on the criminals - his record shows it. I was in Albury yesterday and spoke to the police down there. Their record in reducing the road toll is incredible. If we look at road safety alone, under this Minister we have the lowest road death figures in 40 years. I think that is an extraordinary achievement. That does not occur by accident. Although people such as the Roads and Traffic Authority draw up ground rules, it is the police who have to implement them and they have to make sure that we have a safer environment on the roads.

I spoke to the police in Albury about how they changed the environment on the roads. Heavy vehicles and trucks used to tailgate and cause accidents because of the way they were driven. They were driven at excessive speeds. I am sure, as the honourable member for Burrinjuck would agree, that we still have further to go. If we look at the trend with respect to road safety we see that the level of fatalities has decreased. It is now about half of what it was 15 years ago. That tells us a lot about the police and their performance in New South Wales. It is not as though the police are not doing anything, just waiting to get their quotas up.

It has been a time of achievement. There are more police on the beat and we are taking action on

social issues, such as child abuse. We are taking action with respect to road safety; we are building new police stations; and we are also building morale in a significant way. At the same time we are co-operating with the Independent Commission Against Corruption in its attempts to weed out those corrupt officers. In my early days in this House - as the honourable member for South Coast would well remember - I was intimidated by the previous Premier, Mr Wran, over the question of Clarrie Briese. We then felt the full force. I came into this House without a great deal of experience with respect to the previous administration.

Mr Davoren: That is true.

Mr BAIRD: The honourable member for Lakemba should be the last one to talk; he thinks the railways should just be a social club. Honourable members should read his speech. He said, "If only we could return to the grand old days of the railways when people could come together in the morning and have a social time and enjoy life".

Mr Davoren: No, I did not.

Mr BAIRD: The honourable member should read his speech. When I came into this House we found a strong move against Clarrie Briese because Neville Wran did not like what Clarrie Briese was saying about corruption in this State. He did not like what Clarrie Briese was saying about Lionel Murphy in this State. I used to meet with Clarrie Briese.

Mr Scully: What is wrong with Lionel Murphy? Wash your mouth out.

Page 728

Mr BAIRD: I do not intend to wash my mouth out. I know what was going on. I used to meet regularly with Clarrie Briese. He knew what it was like to be under pressure from the New South Wales right-wing and the police. Corruption was organised at very senior levels and pressure was put on. All he was trying to do was tell the truth. What happened to him? The previous Labor Government tried to sack him and get rid of him. The sweat would be pouring down his face. Labor Party members tried to discredit him by running around the press gallery saying, "The man is mental. He is deranged. He is not with it. He has lost the plot".

I said to a group of press people, "These are absolute lies. If you want to see a man who has got his credentials totally together come to meet Clarrie Briese. See what you think". When they met him they saw that he had his act together. His major crime was speaking out, speaking the truth. The honourable member for South Coast has been in Parliament for a long time. He knows that there was endemic corruption. There is no doubt about it. The pressure started right from the top. I remember those days with Clarrie Briese as we sweated it through. He thought his career was absolutely finished as the people at the top started to move. Fortunately, those days are over for all of us.

Labor tried hard to get rid of Clarrie Briese. It wanted him out. There was no question. Fortunately, some members of this House supported his position. Some people in the media - some of them are still around - recognised that this man was being given a tough time. He survived. It took a Senate inquiry before he was vindicated. People who want to see the difference between the present situation and what this State was like should look at some of the things that happened under the previous administration. For all the excesses of the ICAC, nevertheless there has been a significant change. It has been put on notice that any police officer is subject to investigation.

The old days of institutionalised corruption are over. Coalition members always wanted the old convict days that were part of the colony to be over. We wanted a modern society which valued truth and integrity and which objected to the corrupt practices that were occurring before. The police force will continue to be under the spotlight as we unearth those officers who should not be in the force. The

Minister for Police has pointed out that the majority of police officers are totally decent and trying to do a good job. My close relative has told me many times about the determination of police to rid the force of people who do not measure up. The average officer is dedicated to moving against organised crime.

What are the implications for the Minister of the motion? We should be saying that we have confidence in the Minister to carry out his duties. What has been his track record? He has been an outstanding administrator, a man of compassion. He has been concerned about corruption on the one hand and restructuring of the Police Service on the other. That is not easy. I know where my confidence lies. What do Opposition members have to boast about in their record? Where was their grand scheme of administration? No doubt individual members opposite attempted to do significant things when they were in government but the record of the 12 years of Labor administration stands. There may have been problems with other administrations but the 12 years of Labor will stand out as a period of organised corruption, a time when the police force was out of control.

Mr Davoren: Tell us about Askin.

Mr BAIRD: I would be happy to debate that too at some stage. What we are talking about is what the Americans would say is a paradigm shift. There has been a significant shift in the culture brought about by a number of people in this House. The change has been painful for many of the people involved in the process but the spotlight is on corruption in New South Wales in a way that it has never been before. This has been brought about by a combination of the operations of the Independent Commission Against Corruption and the actions of interested members. But it has also been a result of the actions of the Minister for Police.

One thing I know above all else about the Minister is that he is totally clean, and nobody has dared suggest otherwise. In choosing a Minister for Police more than anything else I would want to find somebody honest - absolutely honest and with great integrity. The Minister for Police is a person of enormous honesty and great integrity. On any criteria he should be given the confidence of the House. I am delighted to say that I am proud of my colleague and look forward to working with him for a long time.

Mr SCULLY (Smithfield) [9.16]: I listened with interest to the Minister for Transport and Minister for Roads but I have to say that I was extremely disappointed. He was locked in the past, in a piece of irrelevance about what happened or did not happen in the Wran era. He chose to ignore the fact that the predecessor to Premier Greiner as a Liberal Party Premier was none other than Robin Askin, who we know was a criminal. The Minister should not tell us what happened during the Wran years while choosing to ignore that the coalition had a criminal for a Premier for nearly 11 years. We are not interested in the past; we are interested in the present and this Minister for Police and whether he should continue as Minister after tonight. I have long been concerned about the Minister's competence, his lack of attention to detail -

[Interruption]

You may laugh, Mr Hazzard, and the mountain man. You laugh but I suggest you treat this debate seriously, because if this motion is carried he ceases to be a Minister. The honourable member for Wakehurst may be of the view that that is his only means of getting on to the front bench after his ICAC debacle. He should listen to this very carefully. At the very best the Minister for Police is not up to being

Page 729
a Minister. At worst he is dangerous. He stands charged with being reckless and incompetent and I do not believe he should have the confidence of this House. Let us look at parking infringement quotas. We know that the Minister is an expert at parking tickets. It is well known that when he was Minister for Justice and left a function he saw a patrol officer issuing a ticket for his car and said, "Do you know who I am? You cannot give me a ticket. Do you know who that car belongs to? It is mine. I am Minister for Justice. Tear it up".

Mr Griffiths: You lie.

Mr SCULLY: The Minister denies it. I have it on good authority from reliable people. They saw and heard him do it.

Mr Griffiths: Say it outside the House. No guts.

Mr SCULLY: They are people I believe. I do not believe the Minister is telling the truth. This man is an expert in parking tickets. I think that is why he got confused last week and misled the House. Everyone in this House knows that there is an informal quota system. When this Minister got himself tied up into a tortuous explanation as to how there is not an informal quota system he made a fool of himself and of this State. The Minister stands condemned. How can he lie to this House and pretend to the people of this State that we do not have a formal quota system? The attack on the Ombudsman was disgraceful.

We often hear the Minister interjecting in the House, "Withdraw and apologise". He did not withdraw and apologise when he attacked the Ombudsman. It seems to be the preserve of the coalition: there are other members of the coalition Government who have made similar attacks on the Ombudsman, but we are not here to attack them at the moment. The honourable member for Liverpool very appropriately suggested the Minister should prepare policy with a pencil. He has a pencil in front of him, but he has no eraser. No doubt he will use that pencil to work out his new position on juvenile cautions. This Minister believes it is okay to nick a car. That is the message going to the electorates and what the people of Smithfield will be told. I will tell them that this Minister has not changed his mind and thinks it is all right to nick a car.

Mr DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Blue Mountains to order.

Mr SCULLY: The Premier told him to reverse the policy. The Minister still believes it is all right to nick a car. He is disgraceful!

Mr DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Blue Mountains to order for the second time.

Mr SCULLY: I refer to the payment on duty issue. The Minister believes it is okay that you are guilty until proved innocent. He has not changed his mind. The Premier told him to reverse his policy - get the rubber out, rub out the pencil markings on his policy documents and change the position of the Government. The Minister still believes police are guilty until proved innocent and that it is okay to nick a car. On those grounds alone he ceases to hold the confidence of this House and ought to have his commission as a Minister withdrawn. He is the Minister for gadgets. While he should have been concentrating on telling people his real views about it being okay to nick cars, he is driving terrain hugging helicopters, looking at Minister for Justice watches and using the fax in his car.

Which Minister has a television in his car? This Minister. He loves the lurks and perks of office. He loves blowing his chest out and trumpeting his irrelevant views to the people of this State. Minister, you have made a fool of yourself. The honourable member for Wakehurst wants substance. He should look at the Frenchs Forest incident. The honourable member for Coffs Harbour is now the chairman of the Committee on the Office of the Ombudsman. I invite him to look at some of the early evidence given by Col Cole. The honourable member for South Coast was a member of the committee at the time when Col Cole talked about how wonderful the police culture was, how they dealt with police corruption, and how that was a thing of the past.

I did not believe that evidence. I thought, "This is a bit rough. It is all very well for the generals at the top of the ship not knowing what is going on down at the coalface". What happened? As soon as

there was a bit of heat on Col Cole he does the bolt and gets a fake medical report that suggests he ought to be allowed to hide behind mental illness. We all know that is rubbish. The Premier tonight said something ought to be done about it. What did he say ought to be done about it? Basically he said, "I am the Premier. I have not got the faintest idea what to do about it".

A reading of *Hansard* tomorrow will show that the Premier confirmed my worst suspicions: Col Cole got a crook medical report and he stands disgraced. The Minister should be asked what he intends doing about it. Col Cole has not been questioned, cross-examined or scrutinised about the Frenchs Forest incident. The Minister has allowed him to snigger and laugh all the way to the bank as he holds the fake psychiatric report. One should look at the shopping centres near where Col Cole lives. It is a great joke: there he is shopping with a big grin on his face laughing at this Minister.

Mr DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Monaro to order for the third time.

Mr SCULLY: The Minister has not told the House what he intends to do about crook cops such as Col Cole who have abused the process of collecting their superannuation and getting off the hook. Minister, you are responsible for determining the policy of the police management of this State.

Mr DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Smithfield will direct his comments through the Chair.

Page 730

Mr SCULLY: I call on the Minister to start managing the Police Service and tell us what he is going to do about this particular issue. He stands condemned. On those grounds alone I say to the Independents that the Minister's miserable failure to properly manage the Police Service would justify supporting a vote of no confidence. I refer to the Cabramatta incident, of which I probably have better knowledge than anyone in this House. I note the honourable member for Cabramatta has entered the Chamber at an appropriate time. The Minister's blithering incompetence and lack of action for this incident alone also renders him unworthy of his commission.

Most members are aware of the facts: December 1990 two constables dragged a Vietnamese motorist from a motor vehicle and bashed his head on the boot of a car. When a witness was asked why the driver was being so attacked, he was threatened with being arrested and charged with obstructing police in the execution of their duty. What duty? Their bashing of a motorist. Mr Vo attended my office in a distraught state and asked me to take up the matter, which I did. Most members would be aware that three internal investigations were conducted and subsequently an Ombudsman's inquiry.

What damning evidence that produced. What damning evidence the telephone intercept transcripts showed. I am absolutely appalled at the way this Minister has given those police officers the kid gloves treatment. I said to him at the time, "Those officers should be charged and dealt with by the courts". It was not until the Minister was flushed out by the urgency motion that he directed the commissioner to have them charged with misconduct. In his press release at the time the Minister said:

Two constables are likely to face criminal charges over their role in the alleged assault of a motorist at Cabramatta.

After reading the Ombudsman's report, that would be evidence to satisfy any tribunal or court that those two officers had committed the crimes of assault and of perverting the course of justice. I thought that was fine, the Minister had acted. His action may have been a bit slow, but he has dealt with the matter. What happened? It was not as if the Minister was not aware of the incident; it had been on his desk, it had been cooking in his brain while he had been flying his helicopter. Last week I raised the issue again. I publicly announced my outrage that four months later the officers had still not been charged with a

criminal offence. You are shameful, Minister. The Minister said, "I do not know why they have not been charged. I will check it out". He tried to blame the Director of Public Prosecutions. In the press release of 9 November 1993 the Minister said:

Criminal charges have been recommend by the Director of Public Prosecutions following a review of the Ombudsman's papers.

We then have this cock and bull story by the Minister that he was waiting for the Director of Public Prosecutions to recommend whether or not charges ought to be laid. There is no question in my mind: this Minister is treating these two officers with kid gloves because they are policemen. If anyone else in this House or in the community had behaved in this manner, I know what would have happened. They would have been brought to the police station, charged, humiliated, fingerprinted, photographed and would now be rotting in gaol. What happens? The Minister says, "They are facing criminal prosecution".

I was informed that as of yesterday the officers still have not been charged with a criminal offence. Minister, what are you doing? Are you telling lies? The press releases of 9 November and 8 March are lies. One would never guess the next development: they will be charged by summons! The summons will be posted to them. The department will find out their private addresses, get one of the clerks to type up the summons, fold it up, post it and hopefully one day it will reach them. Minister, are you telling the New South Wales public that that is how you deal with police officers? You stand condemned. You want to ignore this issue. I can tell the characters opposite that they can visit western Sydney and talk to the ethnic communities. They know what went on in this matter. Calling Vietnamese people gooks, calling Italians wogs and people that complain about Ministers boofheads, Minister, is not acceptable. What are you going to do about it?

I would like your assurance, Minister, that it is not a Mr Vo that has caused the delay with these charges. I want to assure the Vietnamese community in the electorate of Smithfield that the fact that this is a Mr Vo has nothing to do with the fact that these officers have not been charged. What does the Minister propose to do? This case produced evidence of collusion by police before inquiries and tribunals; it produced evidence about the fabrication of evidence; and suggestions that there are systemic problems of this particular nature. The Minister dismissed them out of hand and said, "This is an isolated incident. It only occurs from time to time". As a lawyer you would appreciate the fact that the Minister is unable to tell the people of this State that we should have confidence when police officers give evidence.

Mr ACTING-SPEAKER (Mr Hazzard): Order! The level of conversation is getting out of hand.

Mr SCULLY: The Minister often trots around saying that the vast majority of police officers are acquitted and that we should be very careful who we prosecute when investigating crimes by police. I say to the Minister that if he reads the Ombudsman's report it may provide an explanation as to why there are so many acquittals of police officers who are brought before the courts. The Ombudsman has suggested that this may be evidence of systemic collusion and fabrication of evidence by police before courts and tribunals. This Minister has not done anything about it. I can give him the report; I have it here. I do not think he has actually read it. Has he made any attempt to approach the Police Service across this State and say, "Look at this police culture. Look at what happens"?

Page 731

This was an accidental discovery of the most disgusting conversations imaginable by police officers, colluding. I can show the transcripts to the Minister and to members opposite if they want to read them. The Minister might laugh about it, but it is very serious stuff. The Minister should come out to Fairfield and Cabramatta. The people in my electorate - and I say this with all genuineness - are frightened. The honourable member for Cabramatta, who will be speaking to this motion, can provide some examples. They are frightened that the police are not doing the right thing. I want an assurance from the Minister

that he will deal with racism. Can he assure us that this locker room language of calling people "gooks" and "wogs" and "boofheads" has disappeared?

I would like to know what the Minister proposes to do about it. The Minister should talk to the Ombudsman, who is not all that impressed. This Minister flicks one hundred grand for an Ombudsman's inquiry into racism and thinks that that is the end of racism in the police force. This Minister comes out, flicks a couple of press releases and thinks: we will forget about police being charged with criminal offences. He wanders down to a press conference and says, "This is not systemic, this is an isolated incident. The Ombudsman has got it all wrong". I would like to know how many isolated incidents have been brought to the attention of the House by the honourable member for South Coast. I imagine it would probably be 100.

I am tired of the Minister and the commissioner trotting down to press conferences and saying, "This won't happen again. We have dealt with police culture; we have dealt with corruption". It is systemic, and the Minister's miserable failure to deal with the Vo issue is proof enough of his contemptible record as a Minister for Police. Laugh as members will, I can say that the smiles would be wiped off the faces of those opposite if the Independents were to support the motion. Members opposite attempt to justify this buffoon and his record. Do they think he has a good record? The Minister has attempted to justify these two press releases.

Mr ACTING-SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Smithfield will direct his comments through the Chair.

Mr SCULLY: I want to hear the Minister for Police in his reply justify this pathetic and contemptible record on the Vo incident. I want him to apologise to the Vo family for the manner in which he has treated this case, and explain why it has taken him so long to have those individual officers charged. I want to hear his explanation as to what he is doing about the systemic corruption and the police culture in this State; and I want him to explain to the people of New South Wales why it is that he thinks he can tear up a parking ticket and use his position as a Minister of this State to escape prosecution.

Mr SOURIS (Upper Hunter - Minister for Land and Water Conservation) [9.34]: I am very pleased to be able to speak to this debate in support of the Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services, my colleague and friend, on this motion of no confidence. I do so as Deputy Leader of the National Party, supporting the Leader of the National Party and the Premier of this State. I know that I carry with me, together with the support of my two leaders, the full support of my party for the Minister in this debate. I apologise to other members of my own party who will not be able to speak to this debate - indeed, I apologise to the honourable member who was required to make space so that I could speak. I do so quite deliberately, in order to indicate that the National Party stands firmly behind the Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services.

This began last week as a debate about a quota system. That proved to be a total failure; proved to be a debate without substance; and failed to produce any evidence whatsoever or give any indication of maladministration, corruption or even of misleading the Parliament. Unfortunately we have had to go through the entire performance today of a motion that has been broadened so much that it is really nothing more than a matter of public importance, as a result of the failure by the Opposition to mount a sufficient case. That is what we are debating today and what we have wasted the time of this House debating - a matter of public importance, a totally baseless and frivolous day in the life of the Parliament of New South Wales. Honourable members have seen the Leader of the Opposition prancing about, making light of the whole matter, and member after member of the Opposition coming forward with their obsessions about police matters and attempting to bring into the debate all of the broadest possible issues.

But what an utterly unconvincing charade it has been. The whole thing is spurious and it is a pity that we have had to go through the process to establish the strength of the ministry of our colleague; and

be in a position to offer him the friendship and support that he deserves to rebut the load of nonsense honourable members have had to listen to. The last speaker, the honourable member for Smithfield, was an excellent example of how utterly ridiculous the accusations and the type of case the Australian Labor Party is trying to mount are. Much has been said of matters to do with the Police Board. So far as I can see, it was through the work of this Minister that the Police Board was able to achieve a new focus - integrity in the promotion and transfer system; a new role in training - and bring a community component into the whole culture. The types of accusations that have been made, for example, are well and truly rebutted by an examination of the way in which the Minister has produced a new culture in the Police Service and in the Police Board.

I received numerous phone calls and messages of support from the community, as well as from members of the Police Service, for the Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services during last week - and, indeed, at the start of this week when it became known that this issue would be raised and the Australian Labor Party telegraphed its intention to move a motion of no confidence. I am pleased to be

Page 732

able to convey those messages from my constituents to the Parliament as strong messages of support and confidence in the Minister from members of the Police Service and members of the community. Those messages have come from Mudgee, to which the Minister paid a recent visit. He supported the construction of a new police station and the establishment of a 24-hour police force, which has been much needed and is well and truly appreciated; from Gulgong, where new works are being constructed for a police station; from the small towns of Merriwa and places such as Aberdeen; and from other bigger towns such as Muswellbrook. They have come from all over the electorate of Upper Hunter.

I know that the Minister has support throughout the electorates of my National Party colleagues. I would have thought that if a motion of no confidence had any substance whatsoever the community would not rally behind the Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services. If the motion of no confidence had any substance, Government members would speak one after another as if by routine and requirement and support the Government by supporting the Minister. That has not happened. Speaker after speaker for the Government has spoken from the heart and with conviction. That demonstrates the strength of the argument on the Government side of the House. Government members support the Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services, a Minister of accountability and integrity. He has been responsible for improved management. He respects the chain of command and has sought to improve communications wherever possible. He has given the Police Service an operational focus and, indeed, has proved his worth, particularly in emergency services, during the recent bushfires.

Who in New South Wales, when contemplating the performance of the Minister during the recent bushfires, would possibly believe that within a month or so some grubby little termite from the other side of the House - desperate to win a preselection ballot, to make some kind of a hit, to save his bacon at the end of the week, or whenever the preselection ballot is held - would support a no confidence motion in the Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services? Which member of the volunteer bush fire brigade would believe a motion of no confidence in the Minister would have any substance whatsoever? In the past fortnight it has been evident that the Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services is a team player. I have complete sympathy for the difficulties the Minister has encountered in relation to various policy issues. They were issues of policy, not issues of confidence.

Issue after issue has presented the Minister with various problems. He holds a difficult portfolio. I am pleased I do not hold the police portfolio. The Minister has had the strength and courage to deal with these difficult issues, to stand firm when that has been required and to defend his position and the policies as and when required. That has brought great credit to him. He is, indeed, a team and family player. Many of the views expressed by Government speakers are intended as words of support and comfort to the family of the Minister. Government members know that the Minister is a man of integrity and accountability who does not deserve to be the focus of this pathetic attempt to try to secure preselection for a particular member, to try to broaden the issue as much as possible, to try to generate

as much debate as possible, and to try to produce something where there is nothing. The debate on this motion has had the least substance of any debate ever heard in this House. It is the most substance-free debate ever heard in this Parliament.

Mr Nagle: So what?

Mr SOURIS: Precisely. So what? The day has been wasted. The Parliament has serious business to deal with. Opposition members have participated in a sham and a charade and they should all be utterly ashamed of themselves.

Ms MOORE (Bligh) [9.43]: As an Independent member in a hung Parliament I am aware of the importance of my vote in a no confidence motion in a Government Minister. As an Independent I am removed from the party politicking and, indeed, the political motivation that may lie behind such a motion. I am interested in the substance of the motion: the mismanagement of the police portfolio and the misleading of the House about the existence of formal quotas. In relation to formal quotas, I should like to say that after examination I found the material put forward by the Opposition inconclusive.

Although police officers are apparently focusing on traffic infringements rather than crime, such as drug dealing, street crime and violence, which impacts on the community in my electorate, there is simply not enough clear and unambiguous evidence to show that the Minister has misled the House. However, I am particularly concerned about the whole issue of parking infringement notices and the policy that appears to have developed of revenue raising instead of service. I am concerned about what appear to be misplaced priorities. I should like to refer to a letter that I wrote to the Minister in July last year. I said this to him:

I have had a number of quite disturbing complaints about the action of police relating to parking matters and their attitude to the public. Please find attached, a sample of three representations about this issue.

I went on to say:

It seems from representations I have been getting, that many police still consider their primary role to be revenue gathering agents, rather than acting in the broad interests of the community.

The seeming deliberate harassing of a doctor and nurses responding to an emergency situation at St Vincent's Hospital, the ignoring of an obviously disabled person in a wheelchair in Oxford Street, and the issuing of infringement notices to a woman resident who parked on the right-hand side of the road in her short dead-end street causing no obstruction, seems to demonstrate a mindless and bureaucratic application of the law and an anti-social attitude to community interests.

At the same time, I have a constant flow of complaints about street violence, dangerous driving in residential streets, theft and damage to property . . .

Page 733

I should like to refer to a letter that was written at that time by a constituent of mine, a visiting doctor at St Vincent's Hospital, Darlinghurst. He said:

I am a Visiting Anaesthetist at St Vincent's Hospital, Darlinghurst and was called urgently at 11.15pm on Tuesday 15 June to St Vincent's Private to anaesthetise a critically ill 84 year old man. I parked my car . . . as usual, in the "No Standing Authorised Doctors Vehicles Only" area in Victoria Street. The car has, and had, clearly displayed a current Authorised Vehicle sticker and is regularly parked in this area at least four days a week.

After surgery, when the patient was transferred to the Intensive Care Unit at 1.30am, we were told by the night nursing supervisor the following grim story. She told of a police car, with four officers, arriving outside the Hospital at about 12.45 in the morning and the occupants then proceeding to inspect the cars parked in the area described above. The Hospital Security Officer left the front desk to explain, before the issue of any infringement notices, that the vehicles there belonged to female theatre sisters, also called urgently, and the man's daughter, who had come from Strathfield, and that all were there because of extreme urgency. Needless to say, there is nowhere else close to the entrance of the Hospital late at night in Darlinghurst, for unaccompanied women to park, and the hospital car park at the rear is closed because of security.

So, now knowing why the owners of these cars had parked harmlessly in an otherwise empty street, at 1.00am, not interfering with any "Authorised Vehicles", not even mine, these officers proceeded to issue parking infringement notices. This was the story, and we thought it impossible to believe.

As I left the hospital at 1.50am the security man confirmed the story, and told me they had also been near my car. There was an infringement notice under the wiperblade directly covering the 'Authorised Vehicle' sticker. I was very upset, for the theatre sisters, for the patient's daughter, for the inconvenience which I now incorrectly faced, and for the heartless stupidity of the whole situation. I immediately went to Kings Cross Police Station, confirmed that it was their traffic division responsible, explained the outrage, and asked Sgt. Shirley to inspect my car to see the authorisation and confirm the error in the ticket. He refused. He said that while it may be authorised now, that did not mean it was at the time of "offence". Was he suggesting I'd authorised my vehicle between 1.50am and 2.00am?

Before I move away from the issue of targeting illegal parking, I should like to refer to the signs that have been around my electorate, particularly in Kings Cross, which until last Thursday said "Targeting Illegal Parking". After I raised this matter with the Minister the signs were changed to read "Targeting Defective Motor Vehicles". One sign at the beginning of Darlinghurst Road highlights the problems of revenue raising rather than service to the community and misplaced priorities. One only has to go further down Darlinghurst Road to see the street kids overdosing; the spruikers from the strip clubs who harass tourists and residents who merely want to catch a train at the station; the prostitutes, some of whom are incredibly young and others who are hardly able to stand upright; the drug trafficking; the robbery; the violence; and the drunkenness. It is all there on Darlinghurst Road. At Christmas time one shopkeeper told me that conditions in Darlinghurst Road are now the worst they have been in 20 years and that at that time someone was thrown through a plate glass window of his shop. That is what is happening in Darlinghurst Road and in streets just off Darlinghurst Road.

I should like to turn to the second part of the no confidence motion dealing with the mismanagement of the police portfolio. I have serious concerns about the very real deterioration of the Police Service in my electorate of Bligh since Minister Griffiths has taken over the portfolio. I am particularly concerned about the cutbacks that occurred at Kings Cross. I should like to refer to the letter I wrote to the Minister when we experienced these cutbacks in Kings Cross last July. I said to the Minister in my letter:

I am appalled at the announcement that staffing at Kings Cross police is to be cut by 7 officers.

Kings Cross is a densely populated residential area which faces an unacceptably high level of street violence. Elderly people form a large proportion of residents, and they constantly face the risk of assault. The large proportion of tourists and visitors to the area also confront this threat.

The Kings Cross area is the drug and crime capital of New South Wales and prostitution is a serious problem. There is a large population of homeless youth, many of whom are caught up in drugs and prostitution.

Minister, these circumstances call for additional officers to be allocated to the area, not cuts in staff. I understand that half the positions cut from Kings Cross staff will come from the beat unit, which will reduce the number of police directly involved in crime prevention and combating street violence.

Minister, I ask for your assurance that these cuts will not go ahead.

The Minister said tonight that more police are on the beat in New South Wales, but not in the area described recently by a senior police officer as "the toughest patrol in the State; no doubt about that". I should like to describe briefly a safety audit I went on last Saturday night in Kings Cross, organised as an East Sydney project and involving St Vincent's Hospital, the council and various community leaders in the area. Our role was to walk around various parts of Kings Cross and Darlinghurst and look at ways that the physical environment could be improved to reduce violence and crime, and increase safety. As I drove to the meeting place at the Rex Hotel in Kings Cross I happened to notice a couple of police cars and quite a few officers in New South Head Road. However, when we did the safety audit from 9.30 until after 11 around that Darlinghurst Road-Bayswater Road area the two conclusions we drew were a conspicuous absence of the police and the appalling lack of lighting. Sydney Electricity is already dealing with the lighting problem.

Policing is a problem I have raised with the Minister, with the commissioner and with the commander as recently as last night. I should like to say to the Minister that we desperately need a reinstatement of those seven officers and for the Kings Cross patrol to get its priorities right and provide a desperately needed service to the community. When we walked down Darlinghurst Road on Saturday night it was a desperately depressing situation. A young girl, probably 14, was out to it completely and an ambulance was there. When we did the circuit down Darlinghurst Road she was gone, probably taken away in the ambulance. Lots of street kids and prostitutes, spruikers very much in evidence, drunkenness very

Page 734

much in evidence. I suppose Saturday night was the coldest night recently. The President of the Chamber of Commerce and the owner of the Tunnel Night Club, who was on the audit with me, said that probably fewer people were in the area on Saturday night than would normally be the case. But even so it showed how much policing is needed in an area that is one of our leading tourist areas and a magnet for people with problems, as well as being the centre of the drug trade in Sydney.

Another area of concern in my electorate of Bligh is Woolloomooloo. In 1989, because of the high level of crime, the former Minister and the Premier came to the opening of a shop-front police station and follow-up meetings were held about reducing the incidence of crime in the area. Following the opening of that shop-front police station, and an increased police presence in the streets, the community had nothing but praise for the Government, the Minister and the officer in charge. People said they felt safe in their area, in their neighbourhood, and the quality of life improved dramatically. That shop-front has all but shut down. Lawlessness is again rife in Woolloomooloo, particularly youth violence. Drug activity flows down from the Cross - there is definitely a drug problem - and the community feels there is a lack of police presence on the streets.

Last night a long meeting was attended by the district commander, the patrol commander and the newly appointed officer to that shop-front police station. Residents at the meeting quite passionately requested that that shop-front police station be regularly staffed, particularly at night and that a uniformed police presence be put back on the streets at Woolloomooloo. I hope that the Minister is able to give those resources and that back-up to the police, who made commitments last night and have agreed to come back in three months to see if we can get the same sort of improvement we got after the Premier and the former Minister took action in 1989. The shop-front needs to be opened at night. Woolloomooloo needs that uniform presence. It will reduce the terror that people in that area feel. Like other Department of Housing estates, Woolloomooloo has a large number of people with HIV-AIDS, mental illness, schizophrenia - which is a real problem - a large number of elderly, and single young mothers. It is a community very much in need of support and protection, and it has been lacking.

Another area in real need in my electorate, where violence has been well documented and where we have and we need an active community patrol, is in Oxford Street. It is not only important to my electorate of Bligh, but it is probably one of the major entertainment areas of Sydney. To reduce violence in this area, particularly homophobic attacks on the gay community, a mobile police station was opened by the commissioner. I attended that opening a couple of years ago. However, the police mobile has been moved and I have recently raised this issue with the district commander. That mobile needs to be reinstated on a permanent basis because its mere presence stops gangs of youths coming into the area to bash up members of the gay community, stops them in their tracks and creates a safer environment for pedestrian and other users of that area.

Street prostitution has increased dramatically in residential areas in Darlinghurst and East Sydney, not to mention the prostitution in back lanes in Surry Hills, Paddington, East Sydney and Woolloomooloo. It is not confined to these areas, but includes other parts of my electorate moving down towards Point Piper and Darling Point. Part of the reason for that spread of crime is that Rose Bay police station has not been reopened, and there has not been a police presence in that area. Once again there is a flow down from the Cross towards Darling Point and the real problem of drugs, prostitution, increased muggings and violence are seen. Notwithstanding the frequent photo-seeking opportunities of the honourable member for Vacluse, Rose Bay police station has not been reopened, even though the former Minister said that it would in 1994.

I have been impressed with the sincerity and the commitment of the majority of the patrol commanders and police officers I have worked with in the past six years in a complex and diverse area. I have covered some of those diversities and those complexities tonight. Many of those officers are energetic and committed, and I admire them very much. However, I believe they are operating under enormous difficulties, not only because of the area and the complexities, but also because of diminishing staff levels. I should like to call upon the Minister to adequately resource the Police Service and to ensure adequate staffing levels. I have outlined serious inadequacies in policing in Bligh. However, I do not believe these inadequacies or the unconvincing case put up by the Opposition are sufficient to support a no confidence motion tonight.

I believe that the establishment by this Government of the ICAC is a great step forward in dealing with endemic problems of corruption in the State and I commend the Government for it. I also commend the work of the committee and its outcomes set up in the wake of the breakdown of the relationship between the former Minister and the commissioner. However, notwithstanding my praise for both the ICAC and that committee, and the other inquiries that have occurred and the reforms instituted by the current Minister, I believe there are still very real problems in the New South Wales Police Service in relation to corruption. Obviously this is an area that my Independent colleague the honourable member for South Coast has done a lot of work in. He has said tonight that there is a very real need for a royal commission. I should like to refer to a statement made by the former Minister in a letter to the Police Board in July 1992 where he said:

If I were to describe at some future date to the NSW Parliament all the trials and tribulations I have experienced in curtailing the activities of some police involved in the selling of illegal drugs and much more insidiously the trouble I have had from day one to this very day with the Service in ensuring the proper security by police of seized

Page 735

drugs, I am confident the Parliament and the community would immediately call for a Royal Commission into the Police Service.

The honourable member for South Coast is also saying that we need a royal commission to get to the bottom of this problem. I see the end results of this corruption in drug trafficking. I see it on Darlinghurst Road. I see 14-year-olds passed out after having overdosed. I see young prostitutes zonked out. Walking around there on any night is depressing, but even more so at the weekends. That is the end result of police corruption and drug trafficking, and I will certainly give my support in this Parliament to any

move to try to deal with corruption in a systemic way. That is why I support the call by the honourable member for South Coast for a royal commission as the most effective means of resolving these long-term systemic problems, but tonight I will not support this no confidence motion.

Mr TINK (Eastwood) [10.1]: The contribution from the previous speaker was most interesting, and I agree with her conclusion about the no confidence motion. It is interesting that the debate started off with the Opposition leader using the sort of high rhetoric with no substance that he has become well known for, and has degenerated into a series of contributions which, whilst very important in the context of the motion, relate more to police problems in particular electorates. That is not to say that the members who have spoken before me do not have very genuine concerns that should be raised in this House with the Minister, but those concerns have absolutely nothing to do with this motion which puts the future of this Minister on the line.

We are getting to the fair dinkum department. I have always found the Minister to be extremely approachable on my local problems, and I am sure that just about everybody in this House, when they are being honest, would acknowledge that they have found him to be the same way. Some of these problems are by their nature extremely difficult to solve. They involve complex legal issues, and allegations of very serious criminal conduct, with regard to which it is not easy for a Minister to ride in over everybody and say, "This is what I am going to do; this is how I am going to fix it". There are all sorts of court proceedings and complex issues that overlie all these things. But I have to say in all honesty that I have never found this Minister wanting or without energy and some commitment in trying to get to the bottom of the issues that confront his portfolio. I have seen that as a local member, and I think many other members of this House, if they were honest, would say the same thing. They may not, but they certainly would if they wanted to be fair dinkum about it. In that department there is absolutely nothing wanting.

On the macro front, if I can put it that way, a number of interesting issues have been canvassed tonight. I listened very closely to the contribution made by the honourable member for the South Coast, and I am on the record also as having expressed some concern about certain outstanding matters. Indeed, a week or so ago I had some words to say to Mr Temby about the Operation Milloo report. What I would like to say to the House, and particularly to the member for South Coast, is that where in the Operation Milloo report Mr Temby made recommendations by way of some sort of final proposal for action against individual officers, this Minister has acted with great speed and great force. For evidence of that members need look no further than this afternoon's issue of the *Daily Telegraph Mirror*, which the Premier has already referred to. I think it is a very significant article.

If I could say to the honourable member for South Coast: when it comes to the execution, if you like, of the recommendations which have been made by Mr Temby - putting aside for the moment the reasoning behind them - and assume, as I do, that action needed to be taken on them, it seems that this Minister has acted with great force and great speed. It seems also that he has taken perhaps the unusual step, but a very strong and forceful step, of telling the commissioner that the Crown Solicitor is going to prosecute the nine serving police officers; that that will be taken out of the hands of the police.

That is the level of seriousness and the level of commitment that this Minister has for the findings of the ICAC on the Milloo menace. That puts to one side, I suppose, the concerns that I have about some aspects of Milloo that the ICAC commissioner said need further investigation, and I put that to him. But as far as executive decision-making and executive follow-through by this Minister is concerned with the Milloo matter, I frankly cannot fault him. In fact, he has taken some initiatives to expedite it, take it away from the Police Service and get it into the hands of the independent prosecutors. That is an example of somebody acting on very serious findings in the best possible way.

I shall not grace the contribution of the member for Smithfield with any response whatsoever. I thought it was an absolute disgrace and totally unbecoming of him. If he is the sort of person that the Australian Labor Party is seriously going to put up in the event that people like the honourable member

for Ashfield and the honourable member for Liverpool fall over in the next preselection round, I just say "Heaven help you." His contribution was absolutely disgraceful and contributed nothing to the serious matters which ought to be discussed in the context of a motion of this type.

Going to some of the issues raised by the Leader of the Opposition - because I think it is important to make some comment about them - I noted five in particular and I believe there is an appropriate answer to each in the context of whether this Minister has carried out his duties. The first issue was related to police complaints. That matter was considered by the parliamentary committee some little time ago, and the honourable member for South Coast made a valuable contribution in assisting to get over some key teething problems. The Ombudsman identified this as the third most important thing that has happened during his entire term of office. In an executive sense - because that really is to my mind the key to the Minister's

Page 736

responsibility - the Minister has followed through very positively on this, and last year he sponsored what in my opinion was very important legislation relating to police complaints.

It transpired later that there was a hiccup in relation to how off duty police should be dealt with, and that was a matter raised by the Leader of the Opposition earlier this afternoon. The point I would like to make, though, is that both the Crown Solicitor and the Crown Advocate gave advice about the adequacy of the Act as it then stood on that issue, and the Minister acted on that advice. Nevertheless the matter continued to be of serious concern to the Ombudsman and is now to be rectified by legislation. But on the big picture issue of expanding the Ombudsman's powers in relation to handling police complaints in a way that has not been seen before in this jurisdiction, the Minister got on with the job. You have only to read the Ombudsman's last annual report to see the importance that he places on that initiative. And again from an executive point of view, the Minister put the runs on the board.

There are a couple of other issues that I want to refer to. I agree that the whole question of quotas seems to be monumentally beaten up, particularly by the honourable member for Liverpool. If you were being overgenerous about the whole matter, you might conceivably agree with the view of the honourable member for Bligh that it is all inconclusive. I prefer the view of the Public Service Association, that this enterprise agreement that has been bandied all over the place, and I think in fact tabled in this House, has no significance so far as quotas are concerned. There has been talk this evening about the Police Association being no friend of the Government. But I do not think as a matter of course that the Public Service Association is either, and consequently I think that its comments are of some significance.

The Leader of the Opposition made a lot of comment tonight about the role of the Police Board. It needs to be remembered that the Opposition supported the Government when it introduced legislation that changed the role of the Police Board last year. Again that was part of an overall package of legislation which emerged as a result of the select committee into police issues. I think it has to be said that on any objective analysis the Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services perhaps foresaw some of the matters that might arise. He acted on the matters that came out of that inquiry. Again, executive action - and I probably sound like a broken record about this - seems to be fundamentally the most important test that is applied to a Minister who is the subject of this type of motion. All along the way there has been action on all these fronts. Major changes have been made to accountability in the Police Service as a result. Those changes have arisen not only from the select committee but also from the Ombudsman with respect to his increased powers to deal with police complaints.

That takes me to the other matter relating to the Ombudsman. When somebody makes an allegation in relation to the Ombudsman - as somebody did; the matter that was referred to the Independent Commission Against Corruption - people with our responsibility cannot pretend that the allegation has not been made or should not be investigated. It was. Like a lot of other people in this House, last weekend I watched "Sunday" on Channel 9 and saw the item on the ICAC, Mr Greiner, et cetera. I distinctly recall the Ombudsman saying that it was extremely important that that matter had

been publicly ventilated. He was obviously very pleased with the outcome. I distinctly recall his saying that it was a matter that had to be dealt with and finalised. Though that was not pleasant for him, it is precisely what the ICAC was there to deal with.

When it is all said and done and we get back to the fair dinkum department, that is what that matter was about. It was a serious allegation and it had to be looked at. The Ombudsman conceded that. The matter was cleared up. I understand that he took the view that it was something that had to be looked at. The constant allegations made about the Police Service to members of Parliament and the judiciary will never go away. They have to be vigorously pursued at all times, and I think the Minister has a track record of doing that.

I refer to the "Sunday" program again. Some of the comments Nick Greiner made about the ICAC were interesting. He referred to his disappointments - obviously he had many - with that organisation. He referred to some of the disappointments that he and Gary Sturgess had with what they saw as the lack of vigour of the ICAC taking up some of these issues. They came from a period in Opposition - as the honourable member for South Coast well knows - where much issue was made of this in the 1980s. They came to government and Ted Pickering was the Minister - and an extremely vigorous Minister he was. They were still expressing this level of frustration. I think it is a pretty tall order to sheet it all back to the incumbent Minister for Police. I think Greiner was trying to say - and he is an authority on these things - that if the ICAC is still having difficulty coming to grips with some of these allegations, they are inherently complex problems.

Some of the allegations made in the more hysterical contributions of Labor Party members opposite tonight were a bit unfair. If by this motion they are going to visit on this Minister's shoulders all these shortcomings, they have the wrong person. Not only do they have the wrong person, they have someone who is setting about doing something about this and has a track record to prove it. I think the motion is misconceived. It was borne out on the high-blown rhetoric that the Leader of the Opposition is famous for. His forte is to name backwards all the Secretaries of State of the United States who have held office since, I think, 1786. He has a certain approach to these sorts of problems; he has a high-blown, intellectual, rhetorical approach. As we have seen on three occasions in the past two weeks, he lets common sense get away from him completely.

At the end of the day, on a motion this serious, I know that the electors of Eastwood would want me to look at the issue from a commonsense point of view, not a high-blown, rhetorical, nonsensical point

Page 737

of view. I listened very closely to the Minister for Land and Water Conservation speak about his constituents in the Upper Hunter and what their expectations are. I think every member's constituents would want this matter to be dealt with on a commonsense basis. And when we get down to common sense, we come back to the track record of the Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services on following through in an executive way some of the difficult recommendations of parliamentary committees and the ICAC.

I do not think we can fault the Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services on his execution of those issues. To me that is what is very important. There has been a lot of talk in the media about policy differences of one kind or another. I do not think there is anything wrong with having a little bit of robust debate about policy. No member should be in the position of having to apologise, much less be facing a motion of no confidence, for discussing policy matters. They are matters that are being resolved and discussed in public forums. That is about all one could say about that.

To me, the far more serious allegations that have arisen are the suggestions from the ALP speakers - I certainly did not understand the honourable member for South Coast to be making this case - that the Minister has been sitting on his hands over the burning issues of the day, particularly as they have emerged from parliamentary committees. I do not believe that that case has been made out at all. Whilst I have concerns about the police, whilst I am on the record about having those concerns and whilst

I pursue them, I do not think any of it is sheeted home to the way in which the Minister has followed those recommendations. I support the Minister.

Mr NEWMAN (Cabramatta) [10.17]: The speech of the honourable member for Eastwood would have to be one of the most boring contributions to this debate. The honourable member for Wollongong has gone to sleep as a result. It just shows that rhetoric has a certain melody that will put a person into a slumber. It has not been a good year for the Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services. Indeed, it has been a terrible year for him. What a terrible start. In January we saw the Minister refuse to let the Ombudsman investigate police misconduct. What happened? The Premier straight away over-ruled the police Minister and ordered stronger powers, virtually telling him that he is in a one-way street going the wrong way. It reminds me a little bit about the Irishman on a roundabout trying to make a left-hand turn. That is our police Minister.

The incident on Australia Day at Darling Harbour shocked everybody. What shocked people even more was what the Minister said about the attempted protest by a person firing a pistol. The Minister said that he thought security was fine. What a ridiculous statement to make. It is no wonder that the Premier, who did one of his terrific jumps, came out and criticised the security position. I was present on Australia Day - being a patriotic member - and I was shocked that there were no plain-clothed policemen sitting in the front area between His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales and the crowd.

For the Minister to say that security was fine is simply amazing. The story goes on. The Minister said, "The days of police charged with criminal offences thinking they are still entitled to receive full pay while awaiting trial in the higher court are well and truly over". That did not go very far. The Premier had to sing out to the police Minister, "You are in that one way street going the wrong way". The Premier changed the policy again. The story goes on in respect of cautioning for juvenile car thieves. A radio talkback show had the Minister change his mind. I wish the Minister would get on a radio talkback show with me with respect to Asian crime and home invasion incidents in the Cabramatta area and elsewhere. I wish he would get on talkback radio and listen to what people have to say on those matters. His view would be changed.

Mr Griffiths: You have been given tremendous support and assistance.

Mr NEWMAN: Minister, I take you back to the debate last year. There was a thrilling debate on a matter of public importance raised in this House. Pressure was brought to bear on you. You are right: you gave extra police to Cabramatta finally and I did thank you. But first, Minister, I was just a simple messenger in this place telling you about the problems. There I was with the ball running up the field and all I was getting from you was head-high tackles, stiff arms and spear tackles. But I kept with the ball. That was last April when we debated that matter. What has happened since? When debating a motion of no confidence in a Minister it is important to consider these matters. It is one thing for the Minister to state in the Parliament that he has increased task force Oak from 18 to 30 investigators and provided extra police to Cabramatta, which I did appreciate; but what monitoring has gone on since then?

The headlines from the *Advance* newspaper today state, "Gangs Rule the Streets". What a deplorable position we have reached when again in Cabramatta the police are outnumbered by the gangs. We are in a worse position than we were in April 1993. That is shameful. The Minister visited the area and had a lot to say about what he thought the problem was all about. He reflected on the community and said that it was a cultural problem. Then he had the hide to say that until the community takes responsibility for the problem it will not be solved. What a ridiculous statement to make - blaming the community of Cabramatta for the development of the situation. What about your policies, Minister? What about the policy that you should be adopting with respect to the gangs that are currently multiplying every day and making it difficult for your police officers?

Minister, are you aware that one of the gangs has more than 200 members? Are you aware that there are about half a dozen different gangs active in the Cabramatta area? Are you aware of the 5T

gang

Page 738

and what it represents? Let me tell you what the 5T means. The first T stands for Tinh, which means love and sex - and I suppose they participate in that. Tien, another T, means money. Tu, the third T, means jail. The fourth T stands for tu, which means death. The fifth T, for toi, means conviction or charge. It appears that the gang members in their initiation must satisfy those prerequisites to get into the gang.

There are a number of other gangs there as well - including the Trai Lu Lac gang. Others have different meanings and different symbols. The fact of life is that those gangs are increasing in numbers and in momentum. I know the Minister is ignoring that because the problem has reached the point at which the police are calling for greater resources to handle the situation. The Fairfield-Liverpool area has a high unemployment level of those under 24 years of age - about 43 per cent. There are 431 juveniles in custody in the State: 106 of them are from non-English speaking backgrounds and 112 of them are Aborigines. That is nearly 51 per cent of the total. Southwest Sydney has 83 in custody: 32 from non-English speaking backgrounds, eight Aborigines and the others from English speaking backgrounds. So 48 per cent is represented by the Asian grouping and Aborigines. This says something about the problem in the area. We are losing our young people to gang activities and the juvenile centres do not have an answer for it.

I put to the Minister for Justice some time ago that there ought to be consultation with the Minister for Police about what happens to young people in juvenile centres and particularly what happens to them when they get out of juvenile centres. I put forward the view that they must find alternative family links, otherwise they will be back with the gangs again. All that happens is that they multiply in those gangs. I suggested to the then justice Minister that there ought to be an Asian juvenile offenders review board made up of senior Asian elders from the church groups and community groups. That review board ought to monitor the progress of young offenders and help them to return to the community. About a third of the Asian gang members at the moment could possibly be saved in some way if we could give them an alternative to the gang mentality they have at the moment.

The juvenile arrest rate in Cabramatta is fairly high. For example, in a four-month period in 1993 there were 26 in January, 20 in February, 33 in March and 18 in April. They were simply being used as runners for drugs and other offences. They are easy prey for some of the Mr Bigs in the area to use, and that is what is happening. The Cabramatta community has been writing to me over the past 12 months and the correspondence has been most positive. I have been commended on my action in fighting crime. The people have encouraged me to keep going and to write to the Minister asking for initiatives to do something. Our local newspapers give good examples of the situation existing in the area and the lack of initiative on the crime scene. From one week to the next in the police sections of the newspapers there are reports of the problems in the area. One of the papers had an article headed "Derelict court yields over 100 syringes" referring to an abandoned squash court. There were also reports that police were searching for a man who smashed goods inside a chemist shop; a motorist threw away eight grams of heroin after being challenged by the police; a 14-year-old girl was assaulted while walking through Adam's Park at Canley Vale; a body was found outside a block of flats; two people were assaulted and robbed; two armed men wearing balaclavas held up a motor inn at Lansvale; and another home invasion occurred in a Canley Vale unit.

The cost of crime to business is one matter that must be taken into account. On Tuesday 1 March the *Daily Telegraph Mirror* reported that the Australian Institute of Criminology had estimated that approximately one in every four businesses is burgled each year, and that the total cost of crime to business was \$9 billion per year. Many small companies refuse to spend money on security. The police Minister should take note of these facts because in this State insurance companies impose a loading on those living in areas with high-risk postcodes. On many occasions I have urged the Minister to take note of those postcodes and to station additional police in those high-risk areas. For example, in Cabramatta the cost of comprehensive insurance for a Commodore family vehicle is \$300 to \$500 more than the cost

of insuring a similar vehicle in Mosman, an area of medium risk. A difference of \$100 to \$260 applies to household insurance. The police Minister should consider those figures, but he has ignored them.

I am concerned also about public relations and lack of funding across the State. My electorate of Cabramatta has suffered. Local police need more resources and funding for public relations because in multicultural communities like my electorate it is necessary to advertise in several languages. In addition, I have asked the police Minister to consider transferring back to Cabramatta police officers of Vietnamese descent who are currently in other divisions around the State. It amazes me that police officers with Vietnamese language skills and knowledge of culture and traditions are stationed in areas other than Cabramatta. Only one officer has been stationed in Cabramatta. He lasted two months.

For reasons unknown to me he no longer wanted to work there and was transferred out of the district. That is ridiculous because approximately 22 per cent of the population of the Cabramatta district is Asian, of which the Vietnamese community has the highest proportion, 16.9 per cent, yet the district has no police officers of Vietnamese descent. That is one of the reasons for debating this no confidence motion. I am sure the Vietnamese community does not have a great deal of confidence in the police Minister. Officers of the Police Service of Vietnamese descent are allowed to go to the areas they choose.

Page 739

I do not know why they are not stationed in Cabramatta. We should be able to say to them, "You can speak fluent Vietnamese, you know the customs, you can walk the streets". Young, red haired freckled-faced recruits are walking the streets in my electorate, taking the same risks as everyone else. I do not understand why a police officer of Vietnamese descent, once he has completed one year in the force and has gained a little experience, cannot be stationed at Cabramatta and do the community some good. Frankly, it mystifies me. A little over a year ago I was in the United States. Police officers there of Vietnamese descent are happy to work in areas populated by Asians. They are doing an excellent job.

So far as the public relations of the Police Service are concerned, the Minister for Police must understand that in areas like Cabramatta publications need to be distributed in various languages. The Minister is aware that I have been active in distributing circulars and leaflets warning the Asian community about things such as home invasions. I have suffered as a result. The police Minister knows that on three occasions my vehicle has been paint bombed: last November, January and on Saturday, when my car was parked in front of the Smithfield Returned Services League Youth Club where I teach. No doubt those bombings are the result of my continual calls for action in relation to gangs that operate in the area.

On many occasions I have asked the police Minister - and I appeal to him again now - to transfer police officers of Vietnamese descent to the Cabramatta patrol, to establish a Cabramatta police community liaison committee, to locate a task force in the Cabramatta district for a 12-month period to implement an immediate blitz on gangs, and to put some money into the public relations program which is aimed at improving the police image in Cabramatta. The image needs improving only because of past actions that have made the community think twice. Cabramatta police are not racist. The vast majority of them are caring and hard working. Unfortunately, the actions of some officers have caused concern. The Cabramatta electorate needs six additional detectives.

Consideration should be given to inviting some Los Angeles Asian police officers to Cabramatta on a reciprocal basis. Cabramatta needs increased after-hours beat patrols. It is vital that something be done to quell the rising tide of Asian gangs, which monopolise the streets of Cabramatta and even put the Police Service in fear. The Minister should take note. I hope some initiative is soon undertaken because year by year the same conventional policing continues. That is not working. I have contributed to the debate on the no confidence motion because no policy emanating from the Minister is working.

Mr KERR (Cronulla) [10.37]: I should like to express my confidence in the Minister for Police and briefly outline -

Mr Hazzard: The confidence of all members on this side.

Mr KERR: As the honourable member for Wakehurst said, the confidence of all coalition members. The number of people that have taken part because they want to support the Minister is extraordinary but hardly surprising. The Leader of the Opposition commenced his contribution to the debate on his motion of no confidence by talking about custard pies and claimed that he had spoken to a wise and experienced former Minister. The honourable member for Manly also recalls that incident. I wonder who that wise and experienced former Minister was. One might think it was the Hon. Neville Kenneth Wran, because he would take that sort of approach. The Leader of the Opposition was a member of a Labor government that presided over a remarkable period of law and order in this State.

Dr Macdonald: Law and disorder.

Mr KERR: Law and disorder, as the honourable member for Manly rightly points out. The term of office of the Chief Stipendiary Magistrate, Mr Farquhar, was extended by the former Premier, Neville Wran, against the wishes of the justice Minister at the time, Mr Mulock, but he was overruled.

Mr McManus: Lightning Jack.

Mr KERR: The honourable member for Bulli is making a State visit to the House.

Mr Nagle: There is no second prize.

Mr KERR: There would not be too many identification witnesses for the honourable member for Auburn, because we have not had a chance to brief him too often. To continue, how did Mr Allen become a Deputy Commissioner of Police? He presided over an inquiry into tow truck drivers. The then Premier, Mr Wran, was so impressed that he promoted him to Deputy Commissioner of Police.

Mr Cochran: He was handy.

Mr KERR: He was handy, as I am reminded by the honourable member for Monaro. Who was part of that Government? The present Leader of the Opposition! I have to say I would have thought no one had less right to bring a motion of no confidence in a police Minister than the present Leader of the Opposition having regard to what he did in the old days. This Government set up the Independent Commission Against Corruption. It started tackling police corruption in an organised and determined way. That is in contrast to the approach of the previous Government.

The former Premier set up an inquiry into police administration and recruited Mr Justice Lusher to conduct that inquiry. He provided a very good report on police administration - the Lusher report - but very little was done with that. In fact, many problems that are encountered today with police administration would not exist if that report had been acted upon. In contrast to this, during the time this Minister has been in office the Joint Select Committee upon Police

Page 740

Administration, of which I was a member, presented two reports. In relation to each of those reports the Minister provided a timetable in relation to action he would take on the matter. In contrast to the lax attitude of the previous Government - a previous government of which the Leader of the Opposition was part - we have a Minister who has acted energetically and quite boldly in terms of police administration and has acted at all times in accordance with the advice given.

The Leader of the Opposition made much of this in terms of the Ombudsman, but what he did not say was that the Minister for Police acted on the advice of the Crown law office in saying what he did in

relation to the power of the Ombudsman. Nevertheless, in order to put the matter beyond any doubt, the Government introduced legislation, but the Minister acted upon the best legal advice that was available at the time. It is time the debate was brought back to the leave of the motion. The basis for the lack of confidence is that due to his continued maladministration of the police portfolio, the Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services no longer possesses the confidence of this House, and accordingly the House calls upon the Premier to remove him from office.

Mr McManus: That is true.

Mr KERR: The member for Bulli says that is true.

Mr McManus: Of course it is true. He lied about the number of police in Wollongong.

Mr ACTING-SPEAKER (Mr Rixon): Order! The honourable member for Cronulla has the call.

Mr KERR: What basis is laid down for that? The quota system, and much has been made of that. If the honourable member for Bulli refers to the *Hansard*, he will see the following question that was asked and the answer that was given by the Minister:

I thank the honourable member for one of his last questions in this House, as he is leaving us soon.

That is what this debate is all about. It is about attempting to save the honourable member for Liverpool from a lynch mob, because he has been challenged by Paul Lynch.

Mr Cochran: A left-wing lynching.

Mr KERR: A left-wing lynching, and that is what it is really all about. The answer to the question made it clear that there are no formal quotas in the New South Wales Police Service. It stated:

Let us be very clear about the question that has just been asked: are there any informal quotas?

I know the honourable member for Manly has at least taken the trouble to look at the enterprise agreement, in which there is no mention of quotas. The Public Service Association - despite its affiliation with the Labor Council, despite the fact that it could hardly be regarded as a cheer squad for this Government - has denied that there is any official quota system. It goes further than that. The Police Association - despite its affiliation with the Labor Council, despite the rather colourful history that it has had with various Police Ministers -

Mr Cochran: But it understands justice.

Mr KERR: It understands justice, as I am reminded by the honourable member for Monaro.

Mr Cochran: And a sense of fairness.

Mr KERR: And a sense of fairness. The Police Association has come out in support of this Minister. Would it have done so if he was wanting in confidence? The Police Association speaks for its membership in relation to this matter. The ordinary police officer has confidence in this Minister. As I travel around my electorate I find that is true. In the Sutherland shire a 24-hour police station has been opened in Menai. Honourable members will recall the Minister's leadership during the bushfires. I wonder who would have dared to bring a motion of no confidence in this Minister at the time of the bushfires. Yet matters going back some time have been regurgitated here. This is one of the most tawdry and cheap political stunts -

Mr Cochran: And cowardly.

Mr KERR: And cowardly - that has ever been brought before this House, by yesterday's men who have their backs firmly to the future. Reforms that have taken place since 1988 have been astronomical considering what took place in the last 12 years. The former police Minister, Mr Pickering, and the current police Minister are men of courage who have been prepared to take on the cleaning up of corruption in this State. If the House has any conscience, it will support this Minister. None of us has trooped in here, as Opposition members have, merely to convey the party line. The speech of the honourable member for Cabramatta was extraordinary. A motion was brought and the supposed basis for the motion was laid, but what do we hear from the honourable member for Cabramatta? Not a word about quotas, not a word about maladministration. All we heard was the fact that this Minister has supplied more resources than any other Minister.

If the honourable member for Cabramatta had any decency or conscience, he would be putting up a retrospective motion in relation to Mr Anderson, Mr Paciullo, and every other Minister who provided fewer resources than those provided by the current Minister for Police. The Opposition talks about justice. That is the real injustice that is occurring here, because this is one of the most hypocritical exercises it has ever been my misfortune to witness in this House. I believe anyone with any conscience will support the Minister because what he has been about in the last 12 months is what all of us should have been about in terms of law and order in this State.

Dr MACDONALD (Manly) [10.47]: I would like to open with a message to the Premier. I do not feel at all intimidated by his suggestion that the Independents have no right to take a position on this
Page 741

matter because it is a no confidence motion. I merely wish to support the remarks of the honourable member for South Coast that that is a distortion of one of the inclusions in the charter of reform, and it gave the Premier no credit when he made that remark. I would like to make a statement at the outset that I find this debate very unconstructive. No one has really spoken constructively about the long-term solutions. A number of Government members have paraded in here, basically all rallying around their Minister and propping him up. I have not heard a great deal of substance in the debate about any acknowledgment that there are real problems within the Police Service. On the other side, the Australian Labor Party has paraded in here with a lot of vindictive hypocrisy, which in my view has done nothing to help the debate.

First, we need to acknowledge - and there should be a clear recognition - that there are systemic problems in the Police Service. That was highlighted in the course of the police committee and by the dissenting reports that came out of that committee. In a very eloquent speech tonight the honourable member for South Coast walked honourable members through a number of areas of concern. I will not repeat all of them, but some grave issues which point to a real malaise and a problem in the Police Service were raised by the police committee. That is probably the reason that the previous Minister for Police was keen to see the establishment of a royal commission. The honourable member for Bligh quoted the fact that as a result of the evidence the former Minister claimed he would support a royal commission.

I have in my possession letters that show the sheer frustration of former Minister Pickering when trying to get proper auditing of drugs. I remind the House of this merely as a means of supporting my allegation and the allegations of others that there are problems in the Police Service that need to be addressed. Despite the efforts of the former Minister, he was forced to resign. I believe that is very sad because, from my reading of these reports, he is one of a few Ministers in the history of the police force who was really prepared to take it on. The police committee disclosed grave areas of inefficiency. There were cover-ups and the former Minister was frustrated and blocked at every attempt he made to exercise control over the Police Service.

My question is: what was the reaction of the Australian Labor Party representatives on the police

committee? I reserve strong criticism of the ALP for its inaction in responding to the police committee report. If it were possible, I would suggest to the Opposition spokesman on police matters, the honourable member for Liverpool, that he review his position and, for instance, recommend that Lauer should go; that he support the Hatton-Kirkby position. I ask the honourable member for Liverpool why, if he is so concerned about doing something about the Police Service, he did not support the honourable member for South Coast and the Hon. Elisabeth Kirkby.

Today the Opposition is accusing the Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services of not taking on the police management. What has the ALP done? What did it do when the honourable member for Liverpool was Minister? I have had an opportunity to speak to people who are aware of matters that took place during his ministry, and it is alarming stuff. As I said, the ALP members did absolutely nothing on the police committee. It is the height of hypocrisy for the ALP which was in office in the days pre-1988 to have had members on the committee who responded weakly to the recommendations and did not take a very strong line against the commissioner. If honourable members want to get to the heart, the very core, of the police department and revolutionise the culture in the police department, it will not come simply by taking ministerial scalps or commissioners' scalps. We need to go beyond that. That is why I throw my support absolutely behind a royal commission. The establishment of a royal commission is a serious matter and must be substantiated. My understanding is that evidence is available to substantiate the setting up of a royal commission.

The Independents have a crucial role to play and it is not an enviable one - in fact, it is unenviable in many ways. On the other hand, I do not believe the Independents are prepared to shirk that role. One of the reasons Independents are elected to Parliament - and I do not believe anyone could argue with it - is that they have an opportunity to keep the political process honest. It is not only the Government and Ministers who must be kept honest; it is also the Opposition. We need to remember that we must direct that energy in that way. I am not prepared to be part of any political ploy. I do not know who will be next. It may be Minister Chadwick for activities concerning the Board of Studies; it may be someone else.

I signal to the ALP that I am aware certain games are being played. There have been comments by honourable members about preselection and the 24 per cent popularity rating of the Leader of the Opposition. I am not going to buy into that debate. This is a very serious matter and there should be serious debate in this place. As an Independent I am not prepared to be used as a pawn by the Opposition. I do not believe that the ALP has made any of the hard decisions. Its members did not support the honourable member for South Coast and will not support a royal commission. It is fiddling around the edges. The political curtain must be drawn aside. Let there be no more political games. This debate should yield some lasting benefits. I am not as close to a lot of the history of corruption as some of my colleagues and therefore am prepared to stand back and listen. I am not prepared to be caught up in any short-term political gains. If the process today in any way focuses on gaining lasting benefits, that is good. But we need to go beyond that.

The political process is such that it is often extremely difficult for Ministers to come to grips with these issues. Honourable members recall what

Page 742

happened following the last debate on a similar motion. That is why I believe a royal commission would be of great benefit. I acknowledge that a royal commission would be an expensive exercise but attempts to use other tools have failed. The Independent Commission Against Corruption has a function but deals only with specific issues of corruption. Parliamentary committees do not work because politicians who serve on such committees are hampered by the party political process. I understand that the Fitzgerald royal commission in Queensland was successful.

We should not be afraid of a royal commission and I believe the public would welcome one. It can always be argued that it would cost \$15 million, \$20 million or \$30 million but it is well worth that price to get to the heart of the difficulties within the Police Service. The constant attacks on police Ministers and

on the commissioner have a very serious downside and undermine the Police Service and the morale of police officers. That is difficult to measure and is why we should move to a royal commission process. Let us put the uncertainties to rest and not have police corruption used as a political football; let us go in the direction of a fully independent royal commission. The Minister would undoubtedly know that my experience of the Manly police has been good. Apart from the leniency extended to Bronwyn Bishop in respect of a parking ticket, I have not had any recent complaints.

My view is that the police committee found sufficient evidence to make its recommendations. The evidence of what happens in the Manly precinct would lead one to believe that the Police Service is well run. However, I have read the reports and have a copy of the précis. The police committee found enough evidence to warrant further investigation. Material has been highlighted by the honourable member for South Coast and the Hon. Elisabeth Kirkby in another place in their dissenting reports, which I found to be alarming. The former Minister urged that there be further probing and a royal commission. The motion before the House is a motion of no confidence in the Minister for Police and therefore it is only fair that I should make some comments about him and the way he has performed. The Westminster system calls upon members of Parliament to judge their colleagues. As a fellow human being I find that a difficult task. I do not shy away from it but each of us can be called to account and mistakes may be found in what we do. I am sure that is the case with many other Ministers.

My comments are directed at that Minister and of that Minister. I think he did make some mistakes from the start. Maybe it was to do with personality but I think it was a great mistake to support the commissioner for a five-year contract straight away. That was an unwise move and sent out a wrong message. As I understand military backgrounds, there is a military principle about how one automatically supports senior and junior officers. Though that may be relevant in the army, I think it is not relevant in the police force, where one has to stand back and wait and see. That will get the Minister into trouble, if I can give him some gratuitous advice.

It is often better to keep your powder dry on these things and hang back and see exactly how they go. I have not heard the Minister go through this in detail but I wonder if he really did investigate all the matters raised by the police committee. The material that came from that committee was cause for some very grave concerns. Has the Minister really got his teeth into that, torn it apart and called into account all the issues raised here? I hope he has. It would give me great assurance if that was the case. The other matter that initiated this debate was the so-called parking quota issue. The Leader of the Opposition referred to it as Al Capone's tax return. It was inept in the way that it was handled.

I have read the question and answer a number of times. I do not believe the Minister misled the House at all on 9 March. He was quite right: there is no formal quota process, but there certainly is an informal one. The Minister did not deny that when he answered the question. If one speaks to the troops out there, as I am sure most honourable members have, they will admit to the existence of an informal quota process. The available documents are misleading. There is a letter from John Greig that is very confusing. I heard the Minister speaking on radio with Jennifer Byrne, who tried to tie him in knots.

Frankly, it is difficult matter. I am not sure whether it is a management tool, a resource tool or a productivity tool. It is very hard to say as it is a poorly written document. Whatever it is, it is interpreted at the coalface as an unofficial, informal quota. Certainly police will say, "Yes, we do tend to use it as an informal quota". But that is hardly enough to hang a Minister. Of course, the Australian Labor Party realised it looked silly when it moved this motion of no confidence in the Minister; and it tried to broaden the debate. Apparently the Minister failed to consult on this issue of juvenile cautioning. It does not look good for a Minister to backtrack after half a dozen people have spoken on the radio. That is something the Minister would regret.

The Minister has not shown a great deal of competence in some areas, but sacking him will not make any difference to curing the ills of the Police Service. I am not prepared to support this motion

tonight. That does not mean that I could rule it out at a future time, but the House does not have the evidence before it, and I do not believe that the ALP has proved the case. I believe the commissioner should have resigned in October. The honourable member for South Coast called for the commissioner's resignation in the committee's first report and I supported it on 20 October in the media when I was asked about it. But again, talking about trying to treat the disease rather than the symptoms, I wonder whether the Minister is but a victim of the whole culture that exists within the Police Service and that, along with many others, he is resistant to change. We need a new broom - major change. The Minister will not achieve that by going softly-softly on the police and matey-matey and so on. It will only come through this exposure process that I would certainly

Page 743

advocate. I want a Police Service where excellence, honesty and being a good cop is rewarded - but it is not at the moment.

Mr Cochran: It is.

Dr MACDONALD: It is not. A really good cop, one who is prepared to speak out, one who criticises cronyism and cover-ups, runs a real risk of being victimised. It does happen, but it is not acceptable. There are subtle ways of dealing with this matter. In the Independent Commission Against Corruption report prepared by Mr Temby there were a number of specific issues where policemen were victimised and held back. Those were obvious examples, but there are subtle ways where it could work against the honest cop. I do not want to get a handful of Ministers' scalps. I do not want to be part of any political opportunism, but I do want a comprehensive, independent, public exposure of the Police Service. In my view the Premier absolutely failed the last police Minister, who had identified many of the problems.

I appeal to the Premier and to the Minister to establish a royal commission. That is something all honourable members should work comprehensively towards. I am happy to work on additional evidence. I know the honourable member for South Coast is happy to do that as well. Tonight this debate has shown a lack of substance from the ALP, a lack of suggestion in terms of long-term solutions, a total inability over many years for the ALP to come to grips with taking on what they claim the Minister should have taken on. That has been a useful lesson tonight. Let us get to the core of it, to the heart of it, and get the system changed. That is why I want a royal commission.

Mr BECK (Murwillumbah) [11.6]: Tonight I join with my colleagues on this side of the House and give support to the Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services. I condemn the Opposition, especially the Leader of the Opposition, for bringing forward such a motion. It is a scurrilous motion that does not deserve the time that has been devoted to it tonight. I suppose it has been brought forward in an attempt to prop up the ailing Leader of the Opposition, the 24 per cent leader of the Opposition. But more so it has been brought on to try to prop up a former Minister for Police in the Wran-Unsworth Government, the honourable member for Liverpool. The honourable member has only about a fortnight to go and we all know he will lose his endorsement and will not be around. The honourable member for Liverpool is trying to get a few brownie points to see whether he can come forward and beat those left-wing members who are trying to roll him in Liverpool. The honourable member's track record is not good. He lost the seat of Penrith in 1988.

Mr Nagle: What does that have to do with this motion?

Mr BECK: It has a lot to do with this motion. The honourable member lost the seat of Penrith in 1988 and is now trying desperately to hold on to Liverpool, an electorate he does not even live in, and he will go.

Mr Nagle: On a point of order: there is a very clear motion of a very serious nature of censure relating to the Minister for Police. The honourable member should come back to the issue of supporting the Minister as to why he should not be censured and, as a result of that censure, why he should not

resign or be sacked by the Premier.

Mr Hazzard: On the point of order: the honourable member for Auburn deserves some response. Mr Acting-Speaker, you would be aware that I was in the chair this evening for an hour. The Opposition has extended this debate beyond any possible realm. Tonight we have listened to a succession of private members' statements of extraordinary length. For the honourable member for Auburn to try to limit the debate is farcical, ludicrous and entirely consistent with the crazy debate put on by the Opposition tonight.

Mr Beck: On the point of order: I was addressing matters raised by the Leader of the Opposition, the honourable member for Liverpool and other members. I needed to canvass those issues before returning to the motion, which I intend to do.

Mr ACTING-SPEAKER (Mr Rixon): Order! I have heard sufficient on the point of order. This wide-ranging debate has covered a number of issues relating to the administration of the Police Service. Although the honourable member for Murwillumbah may have started to stray from the subject of the debate, I am sure he is about to return to it.

Mr BECK: I support the Minister and condemn the Opposition for moving a motion that has taken so long to debate. The motion is an attempt to condemn a Minister with a fine record. Let me look at that record. He is a former major in the army. He has been a leader of men. He has been a chief executive officer in the scouting association. Where would one find anyone in this House with such qualifications to lead the Police Service, which is so important in the State of New South Wales? I do not want to canvass issues relating to the honourable member for Liverpool or the 24 per cent Leader of the Opposition. The Minister has an excellent track record. The previous speaker, the honourable member for Manly, mentioned that he was pleased with the way the police were looking after him and his electorate. I should like to mention some of the things that are happening in the electorate of Manly and explain why the honourable member for Manly must be happy.

The Manly police station has been upgraded at a cost of about \$400,000. That is an example of the great thinking of the caring Minister. I support the Minister against the scurrilous and shocking motion that has been moved by the Leader of the Opposition, supported by members on the other side of the House. The Minister has looked after the Police Service in this State, and I am confident that he will continue to do so for some considerable time to come. I should like to mention also the achievements of the Minister in my electorate and in the electorate of Lismore. Six additional police are on the beat in Lismore. The

Page 744

electorate of Murwillumbah has one additional sergeant and six extra police. That demonstrates how caring the Minister is. It is a matter of grave concern that the Leader of the Opposition should seek to condemn such a successful Minister. I have great pleasure in supporting the Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services. I will continue to give him my support.

Mr NAGLE (Auburn) [11.15]: This is a very important motion. It is a censure motion based on an allegation of the mismanagement and incompetence of the Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services in the performance of his duty. The motion does not seek to censure the Minister for his ideas, political thoughts or concepts. The motion does not contain allegations of corruption, misdeeds or the Minister's failure to take particular action. The motion relates to the Minister's malfeasance in the performance of his duty. I did not think the debate would be so wide-ranging. I thought it would be a censure debate and would be dealt with in the same way other censure motions have been dealt with. However, when the Premier of New South Wales, the Minister for Transport and Minister for Roads and other senior members of the Government defended the Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services in this House, one realised that perhaps there was something more to this debate that honourable members do not know about.

Why should all these heavies from the Liberal Party-National Party Government have defended this Minister? He can look after himself. He has given yes, yes, no answers, but he has not answered the questions. I thought that perhaps the reason the Minister was so strongly defended was related to corruption. I listened to the debate and realised that it had nothing to do with corruption. There is no allegation that the Minister is corrupt. I thought that perhaps the Government was defending the Minister because of his incompetent performance of his duty. Where does one ascertain whether the Minister has performed well? One judges him by what he has said, the way he has said it and what he has done. The only way to judge the Minister's performance is through the media. I asked the Parliamentary Library to obtain a few press clippings about the Minister's mishaps and incompetence.

I hold up the press clippings about the mishaps of the Minister. The library could give me very little about what he has achieved. Many members have spoken about the micro aspects of the Police Service. I could refer to an incident at Eastwood police station when a policeman, the former Liberal candidate for Wyong, set up a young man on an allegation of urinating in the street and dragged him off to court. Eventually the young fellow received a section 556A recognisance from the magistrate. However, that was not enough for his counsel and he appealed. The whole matter was thrown out of court and costs were awarded against that police officer, the former Liberal candidate for Wyong in the last State election. We could look at matters such as that, but instead let us look at the macro aspect of the debate, the administration of the police portfolio. Perhaps the solution is to be found in what the honourable member for Murwillumbah had to say. He talked about the Minister's fine record and said that he was a leader of men.

Mr Beck: He has a better record than you will ever have.

Mr NAGLE: So be it, but let us have a look at his record and we will see how good it is. The issue boils down to the Minister's decision to reform the culture of the Police Service. The essence of the history of the Minister and his incompetence is to be found in his own statements. Let me examine a few of these press clippings. Many of them relate to the Minister's press releases to the media. I will go back to 14 January 1993. An article in the *Sydney Morning Herald* by Mark Coultan, who is accepted by this Parliament as a competent journalist, was headed "Govt tightens control over police". The article read in part:

Under plans put forward by the new Minister for Police, Mr Griffiths, the departmental head of the new police ministry will be a member of the Police Board, giving the minister a much greater say in its proceedings.

Honourable members know that never came about, but let me read on:

Senior members of the Government believe that the Police Board did not back Mr Pickering in his clash with the Police Commissioner, Mr Lauer, who is a member of the board.

Let us forget about Mr Lauer and the Hon. Ted Pickering, a member of another place, and the conflicts that arose. Terry Griffiths was right in the middle of it, backing the Commissioner of Police against the former Minister for Police, the Hon. Ted Pickering. I then come to an article by Sue Quinn in the *Sunday Telegraph* of 17 June 1993 under the headline "New police battle plan delayed by probes", which says:

Late last year new Police Minister Terry Griffiths ordered a prominent sign be posted outside the Avery Building in College Street to make it clear beyond doubt where the State's Police Headquarters is located.

That was one of the finer decisions that the Minister made: he wanted to let everyone know where the police headquarters were in New South Wales. That was a wonderful decision, and not in controversy. The article proceeded:

Much of Mr Griffiths' time in the job has been spent getting to know Tony Lauer, the Police Commissioner with whom his predecessor Ted Pickering had such a spectacular falling-out.

By that stage the only good thing the Minister had achieved was to put up a sign. On 21 January the *Sydney Morning Herald* carried a headline "Minister: I'll shake up NSW police".

Mr ACTING-SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Auburn has the call. Members wishing to converse should do so outside the Chamber.

Page 745

Mr NAGLE: That article referred to the Egyptian solution for police. I quote from the article, which is by Mark Riley:

Mr Griffiths said he wanted to introduce a three-tiered management structure, which he described as a trio of pyramids sitting on top of each other.

That is the Minister's Egyptian solution for the running of the Police Service in New South Wales. That article is the basis upon which the Minister set out to shake up the New South Wales Police Service. In it Mark Riley said:

The Minister for Police, Mr Griffiths, foreshadowed "revolutionary" changes to the structure of the New South Wales Police Service -

To a conservative such as the Minister for Police the word revolutionary must have the worst Marxist connotations. The article continued:

- yesterday in anticipation of damaging reports on police administration from the New South Wales Ombudsman and a parliamentary committee.

Later the article stated:

Mr Griffiths's blueprint for the changes in police administration is believed to be contained in a submission to be considered by the parliamentary inquiry next month.

The article proceeds with these immortal words of Mr Griffiths:

If there is any senior officer who is incapable of doing the job or being retrained or has difficulty in moving forward with the vision I have, then I would like to look at assisting him with an alternative career . . .

That is what this debate is all about. We are assisting the Minister with an alternative career in this debate by asking him not to put the Parliament to the embarrassment of having to pass this censure motion. He should resign as Minister and put that portfolio in the hands of a capable member. The honourable member for Burrinjuck would make an excellent Minister for police in 1933 in another country. On 17 February 1993 the *Daily Telegraph Mirror* carried the headline "Police in a state of chaos". Then on 6 March 1993 that newspaper had a headline "'Failed' police unit may be axed". It was not axed, it was simply reorganised. In the *Sydney Morning Herald* of 6 April 1993 under the headline "Advice ignored in police shake-up" again Mark Riley wrote:

A recommendation by the Inspector-General of Police, Mr Donald Wilson, to ensure the accountability of senior police in the internal investigation process has been overlooked by the Minister for Police, Mr Griffiths, in the second round of his five-phase reform package.

He went from having a three-tiered pyramid to having a five-phase package. The story continued. On 6 April 1993, "Now for real police reform" was the heading of the *Sydney Morning Herald* editorial. That reform never eventuated. Michael Wilkins wrote an article in the *Sunday Telegraph* with a heading "Crunch time for boys in blue" again referring to Terry Griffiths and saying -

Mr Hazzard: The honourable member only reads the big print.

Mr NAGLE: I shall read the small print for the honourable member for Wakehurst. The article stated:

Police Minister Terry Griffiths might be right when he says only a small percentage of the State's 16,000 officers have breached that trust - but with a body as sensitive as the police, any number is too high.

And Mr Griffiths admits that while this is the only instance he is aware of, there may be others. Any transgression by an individual police officer reflects on the force as a whole, and that is where the problem lies.

The transgressions of the Minister for Police affect the operations of the New South Wales Police Service. That is a major problem and that is the reason the Minister should save us embarrassment by writing his resignation here and now. He should get out and obviate the need for us to carry a censure motion against him and request him to resign. This motion is not based on what the Minister thinks but on his performance in the exercise of his duties. The censure motion has not been moved against the Minister for the Environment or any other Minister. The motion of censure has been moved against the Minister for Police. On 5 April 1993 the *Australian* said "Command shake-up threatens top police". In the small print at the end the article stated:

The NSW police are also facing four other separate allegations of corruption.

The *Sydney Morning Herald* of 3 April 1993 referred to another of the great press releases from the Minister. The article by Mark Coultan is headed "A blood transfusion for police"; the *Daily Telegraph Mirror* of 18 May 1993 headline is "Operation bungle" and the article is about the whole of the Fahey Government. It stated:

A row broke out today between police and other emergency services -

Mr Hazzard: On a point of order: it is obvious that the honourable member for Auburn has a special deal for buying the *Sydney Morning Herald* and the *Daily Telegraph Mirror*. Could he let the House know exactly what the arrangement is?

Mr ACTING-SPEAKER (Mr Rixon): Order! No point of order is involved.

Mr NAGLE: In this House the Minister said he would put his reputation against what the media said about him. I shall go through all of that and examine what the Minister said to the media and what the media said about him. On 3 June 1993 the *Sydney Morning Herald* editorial under the heading "ICAC and the powerful" dealt with the serious matters of concern about the Ombudsman as follows:

Once the Police Minister, Mr Griffiths, had chosen last month to make public a policeman's complaint - now found by Mr Temby to be unsubstantiated - against Mr Landa alleging a conflict of interest in an Ombudsman's Office investigation, the ICAC inquiry was inevitable. Mr Temby has cleared the air quickly by exonerating Mr Landa. But Mr Landa is entitled to feel badly treated by Mr Griffiths, who forced the ICAC inquiry on what must always have been obviously a flimsy allegation.

How can we have a Minister who makes a scurrilous allegation against the State Ombudsman, a public servant who cannot defend himself in this Chamber, but has to be cleared by the ICAC? How can he remain as the Minister for Police? The history of this matter goes on and on: "Police minister 'set up' ombudsman", was the headline in the *Australian* of 2 June 1993. Then there is a small item in the *Australian* of 7 June 1993 which said:

Police ordered to shred documents.

The NSW police service has been ordered to shred or incinerate sensitive documents no longer of use, after the embarrassing discovery of confidential police papers at a tip on the NSW central coast.

What did Mr Griffiths, the Minister for Police, say? According to the article:

The Minister for Police, Mr Griffiths, said he regretted what had happened and that Mr Lauer had issued a directive that all such documents be shredded in future.

The headlines go on and on: "ICAC slams Minister"; "Police in crisis"; in August 1993 "The man who would clean up the police force". This is all a joke. In the *Sydney Morning Herald* of 28 August 1993 we have the headline "Detention law move attacked". Then one comes to the infamous helicopter incident in which Inspector Gadget, as he was called by the honourable member for Smithfield - the future minister for police - said that he had taken a helicopter to go to a John Marsden party. I am sure honourable members would like to use a State Emergency Service helicopter to attend a John Marsden party. That was an absolute disgrace! The Minister for the Environment, who travels around the State looking at environmental matters, never uses helicopters. He always does the right thing by the community. He does not have a censure motion against him.

In October 1993, the *Australian* published an article headed "Back away from Lauer, Fahey tells minister". That is absolutely terrible. Other headlines included those in the *Australian* of 21 October 1993, "Minister questioned on car siren, lights", and "Inspector Gadget" in the *Daily Telegraph Mirror* of 21 October 1993. The things the man does for the people of New South Wales are beyond description. He is a Minister in a responsible government that operates under the Westminster system. A Minister must have some responsibility. This is not an attack upon his thoughts or his political ideas; it is about his performance.

In the Parliament one knows when one starts to get the back up of this mob opposite - when one's comments cut to the bone - because they start interrupting and carry on talking. The Minister for Police described the honourable member for Wakehurst as the biggest mistake sitting on the Staysafe committee and said, "The sooner we get rid of him, the better". But I would welcome him on the ICAC committee. Further headlines included "Minister's high profile blunder", the *Daily Telegraph Mirror* of 16 October 1993; "Chopper used for private purpose", the *Sydney Morning Herald* of 15 October 1993; "Minister 'just a messenger'", the *Daily Telegraph Mirror* of 27 October 1993, and it goes on and on. There are articles everywhere. Let us take the final part of it and see what today's newspapers said. Look at the very smarmy expression on the face of the Minister for the Environment. Look at his face. Would you buy a used car from him? Yes, but look at his face!

Mr ACTING-SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Auburn has the call.

Mr NAGLE: He is so despondent about this resolution because he knows it is right and he knows the Government is in trouble. Let us look at today's *Daily Telegraph Mirror*, Tuesday, 15 March, the Ides of March. The Minister for the Environment talked about the Ides of March during a discussion we had.

Mr Hartcher: On a point of order: the honourable member for Auburn may not be aware of it, but honourable members are debating a motion of no confidence in the Minister for Police. His

conversations, alleged to have taken place with the Minister for the Environment, are completely irrelevant to the process. Further, it is against the standing orders of the House to read from newspapers in the House.

Mr ACTING-SPEAKER: Order! I am sure that the honourable member was making only passing reference to both the conversation and the newspapers. He may proceed.

Mr NAGLE: I will not go into the conversation, but it is not a breach of standing orders to read extracts in such an important debate dealing with the historical development as to what brought the Minister before us today and showing what newspapers have to say about him. I quote what was said today:

It was the third time in three months one of his ministerial decisions had been scrapped by Mr Fahey. But the Premier backed the Minister today, saying: "Mr Griffiths has had a very difficult time during these past 20 months and has shown a remarkable amount of resilience and great strength at times."

The Premier did not say that the Minister was competent, he did not say that he was efficient, he did not say that he knew his portfolio; he just said that the Minister showed that he had resilience. The article then goes back to talking about the Minister:

But Mr Griffiths strongly defended his backdown and said Mr Fahey had his "respect and loyalty".

The Minister is not saying that the Premier is strong, that he has brilliance and that he can work it out: all he is saying is, "the Premier has my respect and my loyalty". He does not say anything else about the Premier. The headline reads, "Premier supports minister", and that is reflected in the debate today. I think the final comment has to go to the editorial in today's *Daily Telegraph Mirror*. I will not read the whole of it, but an extract only. It states:

Yesterday, Mr Griffiths was forced to abandon his free-thinking approach to car stealing after Premier Fahey expressed his concerns.

Page 747

In a similar way, the Police Minister was obliged a fortnight ago to abandon his hard-line approach to police officers charged with corruption, just as he was required to explain his Prince Charles remarks.

The Cabinet is an important component in the system of checks and balances by which our method of government operates. It provides Ministers with an opportunity to discuss policy, to weigh up the consequences of their decisions.

Why did this Minister for Police not discuss all these matters with his leader and his Premier? It is an important portfolio. It is probably one of the most senior portfolios in government, next to transport and health, yet this was not discussed with the Premier. The Minister for Police is an incompetent, bungling fool - an Inspector Gadget. He should be removed from his position forthwith. He should not embarrass this House by a censure motion; he should resign. [*Time expired.*]

Mr FRASER (Coffs Harbour) [11.35]: I am saddened this evening that I had to come into the New South Wales Parliament to listen to drivel from the Opposition and to defend an exceptional Minister. The job he has done has been attested to by almost every speaker this evening. The Independents have attested to the fact that the Minister has listened and has been prepared to put his ideas on the public table, yet when public opinion shows that his ideas are not necessarily sanctioned by all, he is prepared to say, "I will change policy and I will listen to what the people of New South Wales want". That

is a responsible Minister responding to the electorate. That is what responsible government is all about.

But to have responsible government, one must have a responsible Opposition. This debate has gone on for a number of weeks, with the Opposition flagging very clearly that it was out to get the police Minister. Why? Because the Minister is doing a good job, which the Opposition does not like. He is finding in the bowels of the organisation the maladministration of the Labor Government when it was in office. He is taking notice of what was said in the police committee, of what the commissioner for the ICAC has said, and he is acting on that advice. He is acting on the results of various studies into the police force.

Today in the House the Minister and the Premier mentioned that 64 charges will be laid as a result of the ICAC report into the Police Service. But we have a Leader of the Opposition whose leadership is suspect. For the past two or three weeks we have seen him in the dining room, buying beer for the cronies, because his leadership may be under challenge. But all of a sudden this evening he was not there, because his main leadership rivals will not get preselection, or it does not appear that they will. The Leader of the Opposition puts on a show for the press gallery and the public gallery and shores up his flagging support - Mr Twenty-two Per Cent. His leadership is a joke.

Censure is the most serious motion that can be moved against any Minister in any government, yet the Leader of the Opposition is prepared to come in here with smiles from ear to ear and make a joke of the whole business. The honourable member for Manly and the honourable member for Bligh have indicated clearly tonight that the Opposition's motion is not worthy of their support. They believe that they cannot support the motion because the Opposition has effectively failed to prove maladministration in any way shape or form. The motion refers to continued maladministration of the police portfolio. It is utter rot and nonsense.

The police force and the emergency services in my electorate have absolute confidence in the Minister. In the past two or three days they have come to me, after the Labor Party flagged what it intended to do, and said, "Go in there and support the Minister. He has our support and we would like you to reflect that support within the Parliament". I support the Minister today. He has recognised the needs in the Coffs Harbour electorate. He will visit the electorate on 7 April to open the new police station in Woolgoolga. In the past couple of months he has given us two extra beat police, the volunteer policing trial, which is working exceptionally well, and new engines for the fire brigade, and he has supported the State Emergency Service every step of the way. He is well respected and supported by the electorate at large. The Labor Party is playing politics.

The honourable member for Auburn did nothing but prove to the House that his wife, a journalist, is good at research and has a very good cutting service. She gave him cuttings that had been highlighted so that he could read them. Instead of looking at the pictures, as he normally does, he had to practise tonight and read what was in the articles.

The honourable member for Liverpool said that he believes a person is innocent until proved guilty. If he wants to treat the Parliament as a court, he must admit that the Opposition has not put forward any case that would prove maladministration by the police Minister. All that the motion has achieved is to give Labor Party candidates for the next State election an opportunity to practise their preselection speeches and to jockey for positions on the frontbench when the honourable member for Liverpool and the honourable member for Ashfield go. The honourable member for Smithfield spoke about reckless incompetence, but did he prove it?

Mr Humpherson: He epitomises that.

Mr Kerr: He epitomises reckless incompetence.

Mr FRASER: As the honourable member for Davidson and the honourable member for Cronulla

said, he epitomises reckless incompetence. He proved to the Parliament tonight that he is reckless and incompetent, but he did not prove any maladministration on the part of the police Minister. He spoke about the Minister in derogatory terms and called him Inspector Gadget; he loves his lurks and perks of office. I hope the honourable member for Smithfield is lurking in his office and listening. Come down Carl. I want to tell the House about the phone

Page 748

call that I, as chairman of the Committee on the Ombudsman, had with the honourable member for Smithfield about 10 days ago when he rang me and said, "I would like to talk to you about a letter you are sending to Mr Temby". I said, "Fine", and we agreed on the content of the letter. It took about a minute to discuss it.

I will paraphrase what the honourable member said to me, although it will be almost exact - and I think I have written it in my day book so I can probably prove it. He said, "I want to talk you about snouts in the trough". I said, "What are you talking about, Carl? What do you mean, snouts in the trough?" I thought he was referring to the previous police administration in the days of the Labor Government in this State, but he was not. He said, "As a member of the Ombudsman committee I have been given the nod by the Labor boys to take a trip and I would like to visit Canada and go to England and I would like to propose that I put up a trip to Canada and England for the Ombudsman committee: one member of the Labor Party, one Independent and yourself". I had already knocked off one trip that he put up to the previous chairman and then to me, because the cost to the taxpayers of this State was about \$100,000.

The honourable member for Smithfield will put this suggestion to the meeting tomorrow: it will cost only \$52,000. Talk about maladministration and using the lurks and perks of office! The honourable member for Smithfield wants to travel to England and to Canada because he feels he deserves it. Maybe he is a bit worried that he will not win the seat in the 1995 election and will never get another opportunity to go on a trip. That hypocrite stands in this House and accuses a Minister of the Crown, who is doing a tremendous job as police Minister and has proved it to this House, of lurks and perks and yet no less than a week before rings me up and, in his own words, talks about snouts in the trough. He ought to be ashamed and should apologise to the Minister and to the public of this State.

I put the honourable member on notice that while I am chairman of the Ombudsman committee that trip will not go ahead, because I will not put up with that clown trying to waste taxpayers' money on a junket. I would not be surprised if he wanted to come back via Singapore, as he did on the previous trip, so he could visit his relations. That man is despicable, to say the least. He comes into the House and accuses the Minister of corruption or maladministration. The honourable member for Smithfield now enters the Chamber with his leader - for the time being.

I wish to refer to the points raised by the honourable member for South Coast. The honourable member for South Coast has pursued zealously the Commissioner of Police, Mr Lauer. He has been very enthusiastic in his pursuit and I believe he has lost sight of what has actually gone on. He said that he is not prepared to condemn the Minister or to vote on maladministration or do much at all, apart from make a noise about what happened in the police committee. His attitude was zealous but he gave no substance to the debate. He is taking the coward's way out and is going to abstain because he knows there is no maladministration of the portfolio by the Minister. The honourable member for South Coast states that a royal commission should be held. That is supported by the honourable member for Manly. I draw to the attention of the House an article in the *Bulletin* of 2 April 1991 entitled "Private Trial to Public Conscience", in which Mr Hatton is quoted as follows:

Once you get on the gravy train of a royal commission, you are on a couple of thousand dollars a day while ever that royal commission sits and for weeks and weeks you may not need to do a damn thing.

He said previously \$2,000 a day for however long it takes and maybe no result comes out of it. The honourable member for South Coast seeks to set up a royal commission to give himself a profile in the

press and to waste taxpayers' money. It is not acceptable. In the *Sydney Morning Herald* of 9 November and 24 April 1991, the *Illawarra Mercury* of 23 and 24 April 1991 and the *Daily Telegraph Mirror* of 24 April 1991 the headline was "Hatton, a perjurer". But did anyone condemn him? It was part of the evidence given at the Winchester inquiry. Does that headline prove that the honourable member for South Coast perjured himself? It does not. The Director of Public Prosecutions did not follow through.

The Leader of the Opposition had a smirk on his face when he made the allegation of maladministration, stating that this was a debate when he knows that it is not, and beating up votes for his leadership contest in case the honourable member for Heffron or other honourable members give him a belting. But the honourable member for South Coast is saying that because the allegation has been made, the case must be proved and he will abstain. That is not good enough. The commitment must be made in this House and it must be put to a vote. He should not stand outside the door and do nothing; he should put his money where his mouth is. He knows, as all members on the Government and Opposition benches know, that no case of maladministration has been proved here today.

The Minister for Police deserves the support of the electorate; he has earned it. The people of the Coffs Harbour electorate will stand by him because they know he has done a tremendous job for the electorate and the people of New South Wales. He has acted openly and above board. That hurts the Opposition because it has a history of Ministers who have been proved to be corrupt and it will do anything to try to taint this Government and a good Minister. It saddens me to have to defend a Minister with such a reputation, but I will defend him in the House, in the street, anywhere, against allegations made by honourable members opposite.

Mr Scully: I wish to make a personal explanation.

Mr ACTING-SPEAKER (Mr Tink): Order! I am advised by the Clerk that if the honourable member for Smithfield wishes to make a personal explanation, he should seek leave to do so at the conclusion of this debate.

Page 749

Mr GIBSON (Londonderry) [11.50]: I rise to speak on this very serious motion. As all honourable members know, a no confidence motion is the most serious motion that can be brought against any member of Parliament. There is something we should get straight from the start: Government members have implied that we on this side do not have a legitimate right to bring such a motion before this House. That is absolute rubbish. We are the Opposition, the alternative government. It is our job as Opposition members to keep the Government honest. If we see government maladministration we are entitled to speak out about it and we are entitled to take whatever action we should to rectify it.

I will not be attacking the Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services on a personal basis - I do not believe that any person in this Chamber should do that. However, I am terribly concerned about the administration of the Minister's portfolio. To be concerned is a healthy situation. The Minister has said in this Chamber many times that we have one of the best police forces in the world; that corruption is under control; and that the Government, through the Independent Commission Against Corruption, has made a wonderful impact on wiping out corruption. There are 66 officers before the ICAC at the moment and 56 officers have been forced to resign in the last 17 months. If that is getting corruption under control, I would hate to see it raging ahead at a fast rate.

The days of corruption in this State are not over - they are far from over. I believe that the Government does not realise that there is a major problem in New South Wales in corruption, particularly in police corruption. That in itself is a dangerous situation. If someone does not believe they have a problem, it is very hard to rectify it. The Government does not think there is a problem. I assure the Government, through personal experiences, that there are major problems with corruption in this State. The Minister has been condemned in this Chamber tonight by members of the Opposition on three main

points on which he has changed his mind, and at a fairly fast rate.

Mr Griffiths: Is that a crime?

Mr GIBSON: No, it is not a crime. But I suggest to the Minister that if he is on top of his portfolio, and if he makes out that he is on top of the portfolio, he should not change his mind because of public opinion. I suggest to the Minister that he should know what public opinion is before he formulates his policies. Or is this a popularity contest? Is this government by popularity? If the people do not like it out there, we do not do it. The Minister must have thought that it was the best policy to bring into this Chamber and the best policy to pursue, but because of public opinion he changed his mind. I put to the Minister that he should know what public opinion is before he formulates policy.

As the honourable member for Liverpool said, the Minister has done three backflips in this Chamber. He has done backflips on police pay, juvenile cautioning and quotas. The honourable member for Liverpool took my thunder a little: I was going to speak for some time about the fact that policemen are judged guilty before their guilt is proved. One of the main principles of a democratic society is that a person is innocent until proved guilty. Colleagues from both sides of the Chamber have been under suspicion and under threat many times, but at no time has their pay been taken from them until they have been proved guilty and either forced to resign from this Chamber or have resigned on their own account.

The Government talks about hypocrisy - that is hypocrisy. The Minister who represents the police says that charged police should be stood down, without pay, before they are judged. I do not know who in his department gives the Minister advice. Imagine being the Commissioner for Police. He might get a fax in the morning with a directive from the Minister. The Minister has told him that he is going to pursue juvenile cautioning, quotas or whatever. In the afternoon the commissioner receives another fax and has to get the troops back and say, "Look, I am sorry. We are not going to do what I told you about this morning. The Minister has had a change of mind because public opinion is not with him". I do not think it is good enough for the Minister to change his mind because of public opinion.

If the Minister honestly believes that a certain course is the right path to pursue he should not change his mind because of public opinion. If it was not the best way to go he would not have made the decision in the first place. As I said, the Minister talked about quotas. The quota system is a little worse than we believed it to be. A highway patrol officer visited me on Friday. If the officer wants me to, I will give the Minister his name. He tells me that it goes a little bit further than the quota system.

The police admit that they are not on a quota system as such, but they also admit that if they do not arrest a certain number of people they either get moved sideways or they are treated like an insurance salesman - if they do not make contacts, if they do not make sales, they do not have a job. This highway patrol officer told me that if a parking policeman puts a ticket on the window of a car and it is still there in a few hours' time the highway patrol police will pull up, take the ticket off, rip it up and put their own ticket on the car so that they get the credit for it.

Mr Griffiths: Give me the evidence.

Mr GIBSON: I will give the Minister the evidence as soon as I speak to the officer, on the condition that there will be no ramifications for that officer.

Mr Griffiths: Given. Total protection.

Mr GIBSON: Right, the Minister is on. I have seen the enterprise agreement which has been referred to in this Chamber. It refers to 10 tickets per officer per shift. But quotas are informal; we all know that. Everybody in New South Wales knows that. Justice

does not only have to be done in this State; it has to be seen to be done. The public will change the

Minister's mind, and it will change its mind. If the public changes its mind it will throw the Minister out because of it, and the Minister knows that as well as I do. I often wonder about the departmental heads. The Minister has everybody done up in uniform today. It is a little bit like the Hitler youth days or Dad's Army. All the departmental heads have uniforms with braids all over them. What sort of a department is the Minister running? Have we gone back to the military? That is exactly right.

The honourable member for Manly is in the Chamber tonight. He said that the Minister is too militarised, and there is no doubt that that is right. The Minister has a major problem, inasmuch as he is too close to the police. If I were the police Minister I would administer the service in a different way to the Minister, which does not mean that I would be right or that the Minister is right. The Minister should take a step back from the police force -

Mr ACTING-SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Broken Hill to order. I call the honourable member for Broken Hill to order for the second time.

Mr GIBSON: The Minister is not the Minister for Police; he is the Minister for the public, representing the public of New South Wales. That is something he has to think about. One charge that I bring against the Minister - and I said at the time that it was probably the most gutless and cowardly act - was his attack on the Ombudsman. In many cases the Ombudsman is the last avenue that a lot of people have to get some justice in this State. When the ICAC found that there was no case to be brought against the Ombudsman I would have given the Minister credit if he had had the guts to apologise. But no apology was forthcoming.

As the Ombudsman said at the time, under the Police Service Act 30 per cent of the complaints would never have been investigated. That cannot be good administration on behalf of this police Minister. In 1990 in this Chamber I brought charges and named certain police in New South Wales as being corrupt and as acting in a very corrupt way. I did not do that lightly. It takes a lot of thought and a lot of decisions to do that. This place is a coward's castle; there is no risk about that. But all members realise that if anyone is named in this Chamber they have families and friends and all the rest of it. So you have to make a decision before naming anyone in this Chamber and you have to be sure of your facts. Three years ago I named some police officers in this Chamber. The ICAC inquiry has proved that situation to be spot on. As Gary Sturgess was reported in the *Sunday Telegraph* to have said a few months ago, I take pride that part of my action led to the ICAC investigation into police over the past 12 months.

During that time I brought to the attention of the House the case of Louie Bayeh. We have been told in this Chamber that Louie Bayeh is the so-called Mr Big of crime. I am not too concerned about whether he is the Mr Big or not, with regard to the facts that I brought before this House. Mr Louie Bayeh has had one charge against him. I think he was charged when he was 16 years of age for fighting in the street or something like that. If he is as big a crim as Government members and the Minister believe he is, I ask this question: if we have a police force that is not corrupt, how come he has not been charged before this time with anything serious? How come this man, who has been in this country for many years, has not been charged? It is because - and he is prepared to tell you himself - he has been buying police off in this State for many years, and it has happened for 14 years with different squads of the New South Wales police.

At the time we needed some evidence to put forward. You cannot come into this Chamber and just say that police are corrupt. So, a meeting was arranged with eight senior detectives at La Fontana Restaurant at Leichhardt. Of course, at that meeting there were some Federal police and also members of the Independent Commission Against Corruption. That is on record. At that meeting Bayeh left the dinner to go across the road and withdraw \$12,000 out of his account. He brought that money back into the restaurant. ICAC officials who were there stated that Bayeh and a certain detective went into the toilet. They noticed that Bayeh had bulges in his pockets. When he came out of the toilet a few minutes later, Bayeh did not have bulges in his pockets but the detective did.

No movement was made by ICAC or other senior police who were at that dinner to even arrest anyone. The question has been on many people's minds for three years: why were they not arrested? In addition, the \$12,000 was supposedly given to a detective - and the detective has been named - but there has never been an investigation of that detective. He has never been questioned by the New South Wales police. I, too, want to know why. That has been going on for the past three years, and for some of that time the Minister has been in his portfolio.

On 12 July 1993 there was a shooting attack at Bayeh's house. Two men were charged in relation to the shooting, namely Mr Assef Dib and Mr Norman Jamil Korbage. Both those people are contract killers who were hired and brought into this country to wipe out Bayeh and or Bayeh's family. Both accused were no-billed by the Director of Public Prosecutions on about 17 February 1994. On contacting the police in charge of the matter I was informed that the day after the no-bill, namely on about 18 February 1994, Mr Dib was to be deported from the country as he was an illegal alien. I have now been advised that Mr Dib is still in the country, has in fact been released from custody, and is now at large in Sydney. Bayeh was told by certain members of the New South Wales police that there was strong suspicion from the circumstances surrounding this matter that these two offenders were never to go to trial. What has happened so far suggests that those suspicions are correct.

Page 751

In addition, what concerns me in relation to the investigation is that within a day or so of the offence having been committed at Bayeh's family house - it was well reported at the time that bullets were fired and the whole front of the house was splattered with high-powered gunshot - Bayeh supplied the police with the identity of the motor vehicle which was involved in the shooting. Notwithstanding, apparently that information was not processed by the New South Wales police; nor was it on the police computer. Therefore, no bulletin was given by the police to ascertain the location of the car. I understand also that an inquiry on the police computer would have revealed the owners of that motor vehicle through its registration number, notwithstanding the fact that no attempt was made to recover the vehicle until some days later.

The question has to be asked: why? In addition, I have been informed that the police were also given the names of offenders and of people who could prove the shooting. But no one has ever been called in and questioned about that. In addition, I understand that when interviewed by the police the two offenders indicated that at the time the incident occurred they were very drunk and had taken heroin, and when they were in the car they had fallen asleep. Based partly on this, the Director of Public Prosecutions made his decision not to proceed. Mr Acting-Speaker, I put it to you and to the Minister that if this were true, that the offenders admitted they were using heroin, why were charges not brought against them for using heroin? No charges have ever been brought against them.

In the case that I mentioned in this Chamber about three years ago, Bayeh was charged with possessing heroin by the police at Kings Cross. On 24 June 1993 that case finally came before the courts. The magistrate in his summation said that the evidence had been fabricated against Bayeh by the New South Wales police; he was loaded up by the New South Wales police. That is exactly what I told this Chamber in 1990. But no member of the New South Wales police force has ever been called in since that verdict was brought down. No police Minister - and they are still out there doing their normal job - has ever been questioned about the loading up of Bayeh. I am not sticking up for Bayeh. If he is a crim, arrest him, put him in gaol or do whatever you like; but no one has been questioned about that. It has cost the taxpayers so far. The Government so far has paid out to Louie Bayeh - who is supposed to be the so-called Mr Big - \$55,000 in court costs. The police had to pay court costs for Bayeh because of the fabricated case that was brought against him. There is more compensation to go Bayeh's way, and that could be anything up to \$250,000. The whole thing is a joke.

The two people supposedly responsible for the shooting of Bayeh, the two so-called gunmen, Dib

and Korbage, who were brought into this country, were arrested. The person in charge of that arrest happened to be Detective Reid from Parramatta. I understand that some days after the shooting a Mr Robert Daher, a person who frequents the Kings Cross area, contacted either Detective Mal Biggs from Kings Cross or Detective Trevor Haken and indicated that he could arrange for Dib and Korbage to surrender to police. That was done. They turned up at a police station at Bankstown. Instead of Detective Reid, the person responsible for the case, Detective Biggs and Detective Haken from Kings Cross came over and usurped the authority of Detective Reid and took over the case. They went to court the next day and appealed for these people to be let out on bail. I ask: why? I say that corruption is alive and well in New South Wales. I ask the Minister to look at the detectives I have named in the Chamber tonight, because if the extent of corruption in New South Wales is such that hired gunmen can be brought into this country to knock anyone off, it is a sad state of affairs. That comes under the present Minister's administration.

Mr COCHRAN (Monaro) [12.10 a.m.]: The motion is nothing more than a despicable attempt at character assassination in order to shore up support in the preselection contest of the honourable member for Liverpool. I assure the House that the people of the Monaro electorate have absolute confidence in Terry Griffiths as the Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services. The firemen I have spoken to in the stations in my electorate and the bush fire brigades have the highest respect for him. The State Emergency Service personnel and the police have unequivocally stated to me their support for and confidence in Terry Griffiths. I can proudly say that in the Monaro electorate Terry Griffiths is held in high regard not only among those over whom he has portfolio jurisdiction, but also those within the political spectrum on both sides.

In opening the debate the Leader of the Opposition said that the issue revolves around the question: is the Minister up to the job? Terry Griffiths is recognised within his departments as the leader. He has the unequivocal support of his subordinates. That was demonstrated today by a letter from the Police Association. From my experience, which is vast in terms of leadership and the understanding of the responsibilities of leaders, leaders are created and not born. The reason Terry Griffiths commands the sort of respect he does within his portfolio from those who work with him, not for him, is that he has been trained to be a leader. He spent 20 years in the army, attended the Australian Institute of Management and was a manager in business. These qualifications provide him with tangible knowledge of how to manage his portfolio. He is far better equipped in management experience than any previous police Minister. He has had on-the-ground management experience in paramilitary situations. And make no mistake about it: the services within his portfolio are paramilitary organisations.

We need to look at his background to establish why this Parliament, the Police Service, emergency services, the people of New South Wales and all members on this side of the House who have spoken

Page 752

tonight - and I dare say some on the Opposition side of the House - have confidence in Terry Griffiths as the Minister. I suggest members go through the *Parliamentary Year Book* to look at his curriculum vitae or background. He has had experience on the Public Accounts Committee. As I said, he has had experience as an army officer. He served in South Vietnam. He was a senior personnel staff officer with the Australian Embassy and liaison officer to the Pentagon in Washington. He is a graduate of the officer cadet school at Portsea - I will speak more of that in a moment - and the school of military engineering. Terry Griffiths is qualified and trained to be a Minister. He has demonstrated outstanding leadership qualities in two portfolios. I mentioned that Terry Griffiths was a graduate of Portsea. I want to explain why this person has outstanding qualities as a leader and the reason for it. On entry to the officer cadet school he would have been issued with a leadership aide memoire, as I was issued with one. I have carried my copy of this small brochure for 20-odd years. There is good advice in it for young leaders, and good advice for old leaders. Leadership is described as:

... the art of influencing and directing men to achieve an assigned goal in such a way as to obtain their obedience, confidence, respect and loyal co-operation.

This is what Terry Griffiths is able to achieve within his portfolio and that is why, members of the Opposition, he is able to obtain the sort of respect that you dream of. I quote again:

LEADERSHIP characteristics are those qualities of personality which are of greatest assistance in obtaining obedience, confidence, respect and loyal co-operation.

This small document is the doctrine of young leaders in the services. It is the leadership bible, the code of ethical behaviour for young leaders. It has a great impact on the life of people involved in the hard training of the 12-months' officer cadet course. It describes some of the essential leadership characteristics of a person such as Terry Griffiths, a graduate of the course. Loyalty is described as "Faithfulness to country, corps, unit and to your seniors and subordinates". That is an apt description of Terry Griffiths as the Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services. The document continues:

SENSE OF HONOUR (INTEGRITY) - Uprightness of character, soundness of moral principle, absolute truthfulness and honesty; fairness and impartiality in exercising command.

That is Terry Griffiths. The document goes on:

SENSE OF RESPONSIBILITY - Constant endeavour to discharge the responsibilities accepted as an officer.

He has a sense of responsibility and he has acquired the knowledge of his portfolio. He has studied it. He understands it. He can stand in this House and speak without notes on any matter within his jurisdiction. I quote further:

COURAGE - A mental quality that recognises fear of danger or criticism, but enables a man to proceed in the face of it which comes with calmness and firmness.

We have seen that demonstrated here today. Under a barrage of abuse from the Opposition benches the Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services sat calmly in his chair, assessed the situation and dealt with it in such a way as to leave egg on the faces of Opposition members. Initiative is something totally lacking on the Opposition benches. It is described as "Seeing what has to be done, and commencing a course of action, even in the absence of orders". The Minister did that in the past few days. He had the common sense, the courage and the initiative to understand that a decision that had been made did not have the support of the public. He took the initiative in the absence of orders and made a correct decision. That should be commended. I quote further:

DECISIVENESS - Ability to reach decisions promptly and to announce them in a clear, forceful manner.

That is Terry Griffiths. That is the person who holds the portfolio of Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services. And Opposition members dare to suggest that he is in any way incompetent! The document also states:

DEPENDABILITY - The certainty of the proper performance of duty.

That again describes the man to the nth degree. I quote again:

ENDURANCE - The mental and physical stamina measured by the ability to stand pain, fatigue, distress and hardship.

He works an 18 to 20 hour day every day, seven days a week. I suggest that Opposition members try to stick with him for a day. They would learn that he works damned hard. I quote further:

ENTHUSIASM - The display of sincere interest and exuberance in the performance of duty.

If any Opposition members have seen the Minister take anything but a positive approach to his job, I would be surprised. The document continues:

UNSELFISHNESS - Avoidance of providing for one's comfort and personal advancement at the expense of others.

The first thing the Minister asks at the police stations he visits is about the comfort and well-being of his subordinates. He inquires about their families and is concerned about their welfare. It is the style of a true leader. Opposition members should not dare to tell me that this man is in any way incompetent. He carries himself with a sense of bearing and presence that Opposition members could only dream of. I should like to have the time to compare the current Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services with the former Labor Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services, Peter Anderson. Peter Anderson has a record of failure - yes, Peter Anderson has a record. He was the Minister for Police and Emergency Services when there were record robberies, record drug abuse, and record road deaths. He was Minister for Corrective Services when there were record escapes, record bashings, and record skulduggery and thuggery. He was known as the minister for revolving doors.

Page 753

Instead of setting off on this wild goose chase he would be better off assisting the honourable member for Cabramatta, who has a genuine problem in his electorate. But not once have we seen the shadow minister rise in this House on that issue. It is to his discredit that he fails to support his own members. He is a failed member. He was whipped in Penrith by the former member, Guy Matheson, in 1988. He just fell over the line in 1991 with his new electorate of Liverpool, and now as he struggles for political survival, looking frantically for votes for his preselection, he is prepared to forsake all ethics and all principles in the hope that he will stumble over the line once again in his preselection. He has stumbled into the gutter and there he will stay. Terry Griffiths is an honest, capable and qualified Minister, as I have demonstrated tonight. The Parliament, police and emergency services officers, and residents of New South Wales have absolute confidence in the Minister, and I urge all honourable members to reject this contemptible motion.

Mr SCHULTZ (Burrinjuck) [12.21 a.m.]: I welcome the opportunity to speak against this motion for urgent consideration against the Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services. I came to this House in 1988. I am not about to comment about people of whom I did not have a great deal of knowledge before I became a member of Parliament in 1988. Prior to my election I spent considerable time talking to police officers and people from emergency services in the electorate of Burrinjuck, when that electorate was held by the Australian Labor Party. The message I received loud and clear from the police force in particular - which was completely demoralised under the previous administration in this State - was that it had absolutely no confidence in the ALP; it had absolutely no confidence in the way in which members of the police force were treated by the ALP.

They told me they were understaffed and had been asking for additional manpower in the patrol at Tumut since 1973. That is an indication of the way in which the Opposition treated the police force in this State. Since then, through the previous Minister, Ted Pickering, a number of initiatives were undertaken by this Government to upgrade police stations, bring them up to strength and give them the equipment they sadly and badly needed. During that time - the first two or three years that I was in this House, and more particularly when the current Minister for Police was made Minister for Corrective Services - I had the privilege of serving as chairman of his advisory committee.

Everywhere I went in the prison system, prison officers told me that the one thing they were happy about so far as Terry Griffiths was concerned was that they only had to telephone him with a problem and he would speak to them about it, and within 24 hours the problem was addressed. Sometimes the

problem was addressed immediately. That is an indication of the type of person we have as Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services in New South Wales. Like my parliamentary colleague, the honourable member for Monaro, I have received an enormous amount of comment from police in the Burrinjuck electorate about the way in which the Minister has looked after police officers. He has always been available to talk to them.

When he visited my electorate, I took him to police stations throughout the Burrinjuck electorate to talk to police officers at all levels, and I have to say in all honesty and sincerity that on every occasion during his visit and since I have heard nothing but praise for the Minister from those police officers. Similarly, I have had an enormous amount of praise for the Minister from the State Emergency Service, voluntary rescue operations, volunteer firefighters and members of the bush fire brigades. That praise has centred around the availability of the Minister and the ability of the Minister to listen to their concerns about matters which, in many instances, would probably appear to some people to be trivia, but they are not trivia to volunteer bush fire fighters, who go into the public arena to raise money to buy badly needed equipment.

Recently in Batlow I handed over, through the Minister, a new International 180-class fire truck, which replaced an old Dennis D600 Jaguar fire engine that had been given to the Batlow Fire Brigade in the mid-1970s. The Batlow Volunteer Rescue Association was given \$2,000 to refurbish its existing headquarters. The Binalong Rescue Squad was given \$1,200 for a rescue wrap stretcher to assist in removing people from caves. Boorowa, Crookwell and Yass fire brigades were given hydraulic power rams at a cost of \$3,500 each. Cootamundra and Young fire stations had new trucks given to them. That is an indication of the type of person we have as police Minister in this State today. I condemn the Opposition for the cheap political exercise which it has carried out this afternoon and this evening. This motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition has been a complete waste of the time of this House, because I have absolutely no doubt that the motion will be defeated.

Mr HAZZARD (Wakehurst) [12.28 a.m.]: It was not my intention to contribute to this debate, but I wish to put on record - though briefly - that I believe this has been a gross exercise in political opportunism. The Minister for Police has been very supportive of my electorate and also of the Staysafe committee. Together with all Government members I add my support for the Minister. I should like to have spoken at length, as I am sure other Government supporters would, but I intend to respect the arrangements that have been made between both sides and I shall not speak any longer.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Georges River - Minister for Police, and Minister for Emergency Services) [12.29 a.m.]: I must confess that I have been humbled tonight by the tremendous show of support, particularly by the Premier, who has demonstrated why he is such a popular Premier, why he is receiving 65 per cent in the polls. He has shown outstanding leadership, loyalty and dedication, and his

Page 754

entire team has come out tonight to support me. I am humbled by that show of support, but I am deeply appreciative of it. The Opposition motion is clearly nothing but fluff and nonsense. The question must now be asked: why did the Leader of the Opposition take the lead in this debate? The answer is obvious. The split between the Leader of the Opposition and the honourable member for Liverpool has widened even during the past few hours.

This evening the "7.30 Report" revealed that the honourable member for Liverpool opposed bringing this motion, obviously because he knew it was absolute rubbish. The Leader of the Opposition has misjudged the public yet again and insisted on throwing his colleague's credibility on the pyre for a quick headline. How sad. We all now understand why the Leader of the Opposition could not trust his shadow spokesman to lead this debate, even though he had foreshadowed it. Instead, we had to listen to the unconvincing theatrics of a threatened and desperate leader that contained no substance at all. The shadow minister then treated us to the worst performance I have ever seen.

It only confirms that today is the last futile throw of the dice by a desperate man. What has the

Opposition produced to support this motion? Absolutely nothing. As is patently obvious to every single member of this House, the Opposition motion is completely without substance. The record conclusively shows that I did not mislead this House at any time on quotas. The record shows also that the honourable member for Liverpool has indulged in one of the most shameful pieces of hypocrisy ever seen in this place for many a year. He attempted to condemn me for allowing revenue raising. He is now accused of inventing and encouraging the practice when he was Minister.

What does this extraordinary waste of the Parliament's time tell the people of New South Wales? The answer: the Opposition cannot resist bringing its internal factional fights to the floor of the Parliament and is prepared to corrupt the democratic process for its own political ends. It makes a mockery of parliamentary accountability and shows once and for all that the Opposition will sacrifice principle on the altar of expediency. In spite of all this the Leader of the Opposition dared to lecture me on the Westminster system of government. I listen to the people and act when they speak. He obviously finds it difficult to hear the people of New South Wales from the cafes of Venice.

I trust that the Independent members have thought long and hard before joining the Opposition in this blatant abuse of the public trust invested in the Parliament. I congratulate and applaud the Independent members of this Parliament for the totally responsible approach and the decisions they have taken throughout this debate. It is no more than a sleazy piece of politicising designed to conceal the complete lack of Opposition policy on anything related to the police and emergency services portfolio.

If I am guilty of anything, it is that I have been innovative and committed to better outcomes from the huge investment the people of New South Wales make each year in the portfolios for which I am responsible. There is no question that I took some hard decisions. My critics opposite do not have any policies or anything of importance because they are too lazy and too timid to even develop them. That is a poor substitute for putting in the hard work required for genuine policymaking. The Opposition displays a complete lack of the courage that is necessary to advocate genuine alternatives.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much interjection in the Chamber.

Mr GRIFFITHS: That is not just my judgment. The honourable member for Liverpool's own party colleagues are similarly dismayed by his lack of performance and are set to withdraw Labor Party endorsement. Let us not forget that this is also the man who presided over the most disgraceful period ever in the history of the New South Wales police administration. During his time as Minister for Police and when he was a senior Minister in other portfolios, corruption was rampant in the Police Service. This was the heyday of Roger Rogerson and other corrupt elements of the criminal investigation bureau. The failure of the Labor Government to act decisively left an incredible mess for the coalition Government to clean up after the 1988 election. The whingeing and whining, the knitted brows and frowns which are the honourable member for Liverpool's substitute for sensible debate, fool no one. His pious and hypocritical comments about me are as convincing as Jack the Ripper complaining about unsafe streets.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Londonderry to order. I ask honourable members at this late stage of the evening to exercise decorum and to allow this matter to continue to its conclusion in a satisfactory manner.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I have explained comprehensively just how pointless this motion is.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the Minister for the Environment to order. I call the honourable member for Baulkham Hills to order.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I rely happily and confidently on my record, but I know the facts will not change the predetermined attitude of members opposite. The Government has clearly shown in this motion that the Opposition is a disgrace and that the Leader of the Opposition is desperate.

Mr CARR (Maroubra - Leader of the Opposition) [12.36 a.m.], in reply: Two conclusions emerge from this debate. The first is the seriousness of problems in policing. The honourable member for South Coast gave more detail than other members in expressing that view. All members are agreed on the difficulty of the policing task. All are agreed, I would hope, on the persistence of the challenges in this portfolio. The second conclusion is the sheer inadequacy of this Minister to deal with these problems.

Page 755

Mr SPEAKER: Order! If members of the Government benches particularly cannot maintain decorum, I may have to direct them to leave the Chamber. I ask them to co-operate by allowing the remainder of the debate to proceed in silence.

Mr CARR: The Premier's intervention in this debate did nothing to rescue the Government from its embarrassment and predicament with this Minister, or to save this Minister from his own plight. The Premier did not have to intervene in this debate. On half a dozen occasions he is on the record as overturning the policy initiatives of this Minister. Nothing like that has ever occurred in any previous government - a Minister in an important portfolio announcing policy and having his leader overturn it. The Premier can intervene all he likes in debates in defence of this Minister but the record shows what the Premier had to do whenever this Minister announced a new policy. The latest example was juvenile cautioning: one policy at 8.55 a.m., another at 9.15 a.m.

Mr Griffiths: Another Labor lie.

Mr CARR: Another Labor lie? It is on the record. Get the tape from 2BL. When it comes to tapes, need anything be said on the question of the existence or otherwise of police quotas than what was said by this Minister in his famous interview with Jennifer Byrne, which has been quoted in this debate? Jennifer Byrne said, "But with all respect Terry Griffiths it just doesn't read like that to a normal person". I underline "normal". Jennifer Byrne then quoted what he had said.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Broken Hill to order for the third time.

Mr CARR: The Minister responds, "Well Jennifer, you're an intelligent woman. If you read it that way then I need to clarify it". Later on in the interview she said, "Finally Mr Griffiths I mean I appreciate you coming on the show and fronting up but I suppose I just find it quite hard to understand how you can read these words and see them so differently?". In conclusion she said, "Mr Griffiths would you concede that any normal reading of this document would be that if a parking officer doesn't get 10 parking infringement notices per shift he or she could be moved?" The Minister concludes, "Well, the fact that you believe it, Jennifer, I will go and read it again. I have read it about ten times. I don't draw that conclusion from it. Maybe I am too close to the problem".

I think on that we rest the case about quotas. The fact is the Minister is not entitled to express dismay at this debate. His exercises in public policymaking - for that is what the Minister is involved in - have been farcical, overruled at all points as they have been by the Premier. But all this comes on top of more serious problems and the Minister's policy backflips. They come on top of his fight with the Ombudsman. Where was his defence today for that unnecessary and cruel assault on the Ombudsman and his weakening of the Police Board He and all New South Wales will live with the consequences of that. Distil from all this the fundamental problem of the Minister and we come to his mentality, we come to his cast of mind, we come, if we wish to dignify it further, to his philosophy and his ministerial responsibilities. The fact is that this debate, his recent record, and his record since becoming Minister, have demonstrated his inadequacy to fulfil the great responsibilities that he must have in this task. He will not tackle the great problems of policing in New South Wales. As long as he remains in this portfolio it will be marred by maladministration.

Question - That the motion be agreed to - put.

The House divided.

Ayes, 45

Ms Allan	Mr Markham
Mr Amery	Mr Martin
Mr Anderson	Mr Mills
Mr A. S. Aquilina	Mr Moss
Mr J. J. Aquilina	Mr J. H. Murray
Mr Bowman	Mr Nagle
Mr Carr	Mr Neilly
Mr Clough	Mr Newman
Mr Crittenden	Ms Nori
Mr Doyle	Mr E. T. Page
Mr Face	Mr Price
Mr Gaudry	Dr Refshauge
Mr Gibson	Mr Rogan
Mr Harrison	Mr Rumble
Mr Hunter	Mr Scully
Mr Iemma	Mr Shedden
Mr Irwin	Mr Sullivan
Mr Knight	Mr Thompson
Mr Knowles	Mr Whelan
Mr Langton	Mr Yeadon
Mrs Lo Po'	<i>Tellers,</i>
Mr McBride	Mr Beckroge
Mr McManus	Mr Davoren

Noes, 47

Mr Armstrong	Ms Moore
Mr Baird	Mr Morris
Mr Beck	Mr W. T. J. Murray
Mr Blackmore	Mr O'Doherty
Mr Causley	Mr D. L. Page
Mr Chappell	Mr Peacocke
Mrs Chikarovski	Mr Petch
Mr Cochran	Mr Photios
Mrs Cohen	Mr Richardson
Mr Collins	Mr Rixon
Mr Cruickshank	Mr Schipp
Mr Downy	Mr Schultz
Mr Fahey	Mrs Skinner
Mr Fraser	Mr Small
Mr Glachan	Mr Smith
Mr Griffiths	Mr Souris
Mr Hartcher	Mr Tink
Mr Hazzard	Mr Turner
Mr Humpherson	Mr West
Dr Kernohan	Mr Yabsley
Mr Kinross	Mr Zammit
Mr Longley	<i>Tellers,</i>

Dr Macdonald
Mr Merton

Mr Jeffery
Mr Kerr

Page 756

Pairs

Mrs Grusovin
Mr Ziolkowski

Ms Machin
Mr Phillips

Question so resolved in the negative.

Motion negatived.

COMMITTEE ON THE OFFICE OF THE OMBUDSMAN

Personal Explanation

Mr Scully: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr Scully: This evening the honourable member for Coffs Harbour, in the course of debate on the want of confidence motion, made a totally unfair, inaccurate and spurious attack on me, by purporting to refer to a private conversation which was alleged to have taken place in the context of a committee upon which we both serve. I am disappointed and appalled that the honourable member would make a personal attack on me which amounts to an entirely inaccurate account of an alleged conversation. Any conversations I have had with the honourable member concerning the Committee on the Office of the Ombudsman have been entirely proper, and have been reflective of my view that the committees of this Parliament should be respected, and that their activities - if and when that involves a visit overseas - should be undertaken financially responsibly and respecting the important role of committees in inquiring into substantive facts.

The alleged conversation, and its misrepresentation, both in manner and context, reflects very poorly on the honourable member for Coffs Harbour. I assure the House that it was not an accurate record of the conversation between me and the honourable member. I reject the notion that committee travel is improper or wrong, or a lurk or perk which reflects on honourable members undertaking it.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I advise the honourable member for Smithfield that he cannot debate the matter. He should confine his remarks to the manner in which he alleges his character has been impugned.

Mr Scully: I am loath to advise the House that the honourable member for Coffs Harbour complained that a suggested itinerary did not include Scotland, where he wanted to play golf. He is the lurks and perks man, not I.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Smithfield is beginning to debate the matter. The House is well aware that he has contended that his character has been impugned. He should confine his remarks to that, and I would suggest that he has probably completed his personal explanation.

Mr Scully: The honourable member for Coffs Harbour sought to misrepresent a private conversation and I do not believe he can be trusted following that. I certainly will not deal with him in future, except in the presence of a witness. I could not care less -

Mr SPEAKER: Order! If the member for Smithfield is not going to continue with his personal explanation he should resume his seat.

Mr Scully: At the next committee hearing I propose to move that no trip be taken by any -

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Smithfield will resume his seat.

House adjourned at 12.52 a.m. Wednesday
