

**THE PARLIAMENTARY JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICAL CONDUCT  
MET IN COMMITTEE ROOM 2, PARLIAMENT HOUSE, HOBART, ON  
WEDNESDAY 10 SEPTEMBER 2008.**

---

**Mr WAYNE CRAWFORD** WAS CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION  
AND WAS EXAMINED.

**CHAIR** (Mr Wilkinson) - Wayne, thanks for coming along.

**Mr CRAWFORD** - Thanks for the invitation.

**CHAIR** - There is no need for me to tell you the ropes. You know the ropes. I will leave it to you as to how you want to prosecute your submission

**Mr CRAWFORD** - I figured that after 40 years of writing columns, giving unsolicited advice on what you should be doing, I could hardly pass up the opportunity to come and do it in person. Thanks for the invitation. I don't know that I really have a lot to add to my written submission, although some of it has obviously been overtaken a bit by subsequent events, even today with the Treasurer finding himself in a spot of bother. I think, with great respect to the Treasurer, that he has caught himself in exactly the same situation that the former Premier was tending to find himself in.

The former Premier, in my view, was never able to face up to the fact that perceptions are, as much as anything else, important in politics and the perception that he might not have been doing the right thing by having dinner with the same company that he was negotiating with is just as important as the fact. I think Mike Aird has probably run into the same problem now.

I don't suggest that there's anything necessarily improper in what, for example, he has done, but certainly the perception could be held that it seems that he may be open to giving preferential treatment to people who were paying him \$2 000 to have lunch with him. I don't think, just hearing part of his interview this morning, that he has actually acknowledged that even to himself, and it was the same with the former Premier. He had the same problem, I thought.

**CHAIR** - As we were finishing with some questions to both Wynne and Marian, it all becomes part of this ethical issue and education issue, and there's no better place to start than at home, I think. When you look at your continuing professional development, that might be a way of always bringing these things to the notice not only of backbenchers, independent members of the upper House, but also government members.

**Mr CRAWFORD** - I agree but I would also add that you do not need to be Einstein, you do not need to have gone through an ethics education process, surely, to realise that it does not look too flash when the Treasurer of the day or the Premier of the day puts himself in that sort of position. I would have thought that most people should have been able to see it for themselves. I accept that yes, there is a need for ethics training. I think Mr S. Donnelly would probably be an excellent point to start.

**Mr BEST** - It is interesting, is it not, because it is about perceptions, as you say, and some other submissions say, and I am not sure but I think I may have read it in yours as well, that Tasmania is a small place so there is that contact, is there not?

**Mr CRAWFORD** - Of course.

**Mr BEST** - It is almost unavoidable in a sense and it is what is appropriate for that to -

**Mr CRAWFORD** - It would be unthinkable that the Treasurer, surely, in a small State like Tasmania would be unable to make himself available to the business leaders. He should not need a \$2 000 lunch to be able to do that. Whether he is available to them is another matter but if it does take a \$2 000 lunch to make him available then it is not only a perception but it is, in my view, bad.

**Mr BEST** - Just looking at your submission, you draw upon Sir Max Bingham and Professor Malpas and in the last bit of it you talk about proactive and educative, which I suppose is teaching and imbuing ethical standards in State and local government; influencing and mentoring.

**Mr CRAWFORD** - With what the Chairman said a minute ago, talking about personal development, was it?

**CHAIR** - Yes, continuing professional development.

**Mr CRAWFORD** - I think that the media could benefit from that as much as anybody else because I do not believe that we - and by 'we' I am talking about the media - should be free from examination of our motives and our actions any more than politicians. I am not suggesting that a parliamentary committee would be dictating to the media how it writes its stories but I should think that there would certainly be an opening there for the media to be able to learn from the same experiences that MPs are learning from.

**Mr BEST** - Do you think that some of the reporting, in recent times because obviously you have been there through quite a number of episodes of parliament, is becoming, not necessarily on these subjects but in a general sense, more spin and less fact or getting the truth out?

**Mr CRAWFORD** - Well, it goes through phases. Even some of my own colleagues would say that we are guilty of spin as much as anybody else. We just have different motives for it, I suppose. In my experience, I would not say that but we do have our own faults and our own failings and I think it is healthy that we be held to account for them.

**Mr BEST** - Sure. You would be interested to see this panel or whatever it might be probably encompass more broadly, obviously parliamentarians but maybe the media -

**Mr CRAWFORD** - It would probably have to be fairly informal, I think.

**Mr BEST** - Yes, in-house.

**Mr CRAWFORD** - But I think the media could certainly benefit from it.

**Mr BEST** - The politicising of the public service, I wondered what your thoughts were on that?

**Mr CRAWFORD** - I think that has been a major problem. There has been a greater change there. The fearless and frank advice that came from the traditional Sir Humphrey Appleby-type of public servants that I recall back in the 1960s is totally different to the politicised spin that comes out now from not so much the public service but advisers who are telling ministers and telling the public what they hope and expect the minister wants them to say, rather than what they believe is best for the State of Tasmania.

**Mr McKIM** - You have said that you think a critical and open culture has been lost with the politicisation of the public service. I wanted to ask you whether you thought placing senior executives in the public service on short-term contracts had any impact on the quality of advice that they give rather than what was traditionally the situation in which senior public servants, such as secretaries of departments, were given lengthy tenure?

**Mr CRAWFORD** - From my experience, yes, the culture of frank and fearless advice tends to go hand in hand more with long-term contracts rather than short-term contracts where people are in fear of possibly losing their position. Humphrey Appleby was there for the duration and saw many ministers come and go.

**Mr McKIM** - You have spoken about Sir Max Bingham and Professor Malpas's proposal for an ethics commission. Sir Max has said that Tasmania Police could allocate personnel, as needed, to pursue any investigations. Then you have gone on to suggest that such a body could also call on the resources of beefed-up existing offices like the Auditor-General, the Ombudsman and the DPP. We have recently had a situation where Tasmania Police officers have investigated the commissioner, who stood aside at a particular point of that investigation. If the committee were to recommend the establishment of any such body, do you think it would also be wise to explore whether the Federal Police or other Australian police agencies might consider seconding staff down here in the event that allegations are made against Tasmanian police officers?

**Mr CRAWFORD** - Yes, it is something that I have given a bit of thought to over the past few days as a result of developments, not only with police but also with the committee itself. I see no reason why an ethics committee might not be able to call on federal resources to help do its job. As much as I admire Jack Johnston, I think to be investigated by his own people put him in an invidious position. If police from interstate had been called in to have a look then it would have been a lot more transparent. I think the same could be said for other problems and investigations - such as politicians themselves. It is a small community and to have me investigating you when we are just as likely to be having a cup of coffee tomorrow morning is a difficulty. I think to bring in resources from interstate would be quite useful.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - You mentioned the roles in the ACT of an ethics advisor and the Parliamentary Commissioner for Standards in the UK. Would it be necessary to have a similar role as well as the ethics commission or do you think it could be incorporated within an ethics commission body?

**Mr CRAWFORD** - I think it would go further than the ACT and the House of Commons have gone. I am no expert on either the ACT or the House of Commons system but from my reading of what they are doing I do not really know that they are getting to the root of any problems. With the ACT, about the best that you can hope for is that, if you are put in a position where you are not sure if you can use your frequent flyer points amassed during parliamentary service, you ring the 1300 number and they give you some advice on it. I do not think that takes it anywhere near far enough.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - I notice also in your submission you advocated for MPs procuring interests to be on internet, with which I do not disagree. When an MP is seeking advice on a particular matter to do with a pecuniary interest register or whatever, would an ethics commission be an appropriate body to go to seek that advice?

**Mr CRAWFORD** - I would think so, yes.

**Mr MARTIN** - The very fact that we are talking about politicians having to be taught ethics - it almost beggars belief that we are even talking about it. You gave the example of the Treasurer and I think you said words along the lines that it would be rocket science to think that what he did was not a good judgement call.

**Mr CRAWFORD** - You quote me correctly.

**Mr MARTIN** - In your submission you give one example after another of the Tasmanian Government's series of bad judgement calls in the last two years. In 30-40 years of commentating on Tasmanian politics have you ever seen a period that has matched this?

**Mr CRAWFORD** - Not such an intense period where so many have happened. I do not quite know the reason for it.

**Mr MARTIN** - Do you think it is a cultural thing?

**Mr CRAWFORD** - It is a cultural thing but I do not know why the culture has been allowed to develop.

**Mr MARTIN** - Culture of an organisation is normally set by the leader of the organisation.

**Mr CRAWFORD** - True enough, but I would not have thought that such a culture would have been allowed to exist under the leadership of, for example, Max Bingham or even someone like Eric Reece. Much as he had his failings he certainly had very strong views also on things like ethical behaviour. If he believed that something was not ethical then he would certainly say something about it. I just think it has been a shame to see the culture develop because I do not even know that it has been a deliberate thing and that may be putting the best possible spin on it and I am not here to defend those who can defend themselves.

Putting best spin on it, I just do not know that the former Premier, for example, would necessarily have deliberately set out to develop a culture of favourable treatment for mates, it is just a culture which has developed and no-one has done anything about stopping it from developing.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - In terms of that cultural development, as you say, how much emphasis - and I know you mentioned it a bit in your submission - do you put on the executive having more power as a result of the smaller number of members of parliament?

**Mr CRAWFORD** - I think that is an important aspect of it. The smaller the Parliament, the more powerful the executive becomes. The culture just sort of creeps through and it seeps through the system but I think largely that you have probably hit the nail on the head there, that that is one of the very reasons that it is happening.

**Mr McKIM** - Just on that, how would you describe the 1998 decision to cut the numbers of MPs in the Tasmanian Parliament?

**Mr CRAWFORD** - Wrong. I just think for a whole heap of reasons it should not have happened. To tell a story against myself, Ray Groom reminded me of this some time ago, that when I was a young green if enthusiastic reporter probably back in the 1960s -

**Mr McKIM** - A small 'g' - the Greens

*Laughter.*

**Mr CRAWFORD** - Thanks for that, Nick.

**Mr McKIM** - That is okay.

**Mr CRAWFORD** - I once said that Tasmania, with a population of what then would have been about 450 000, it could probably adequately be run by a local council and indeed I did say that, as Ray reminded me, but when I became hopefully a little bit wiser and certainly a bit more informed about the way things worked I now acknowledge that this is not so, that under the system that we are trying to replicate, the Westminster system, there are all sorts of checks and balances that come into it and to allow a State to be run by a local council would simply not allow for those checks and balances to operate, apart from anything else. What was the question?

**Mr McKIM** - I was inviting you to give us your view on the cutting of numbers in the House.

**Mr CRAWFORD** - I just think it was a bad decision.

**Mr McKIM** - I agree.

**Mr CRAWFORD** - I am not taking your side on this or anybody else's side on it but I acknowledge or I would say that one of the central reasons was to try to elbow you guys out of the system -

**Mr McKIM** - It nearly worked, too, in the short term.

**Mr CRAWFORD** - But it didn't and I think it's probably testimony to the - I don't know quite what it's testimony to but the fact that it didn't work is maybe more luck than good management.

**CHAIR** - With the fact, Wayne, that it was never really going to work when you investigated, and in hindsight's 20-20 vision.

**Mr CRAWFORD** - Yes. Hindsight is useful.

**CHAIR** - Can I just go down a couple of areas, Wayne. Some could argue - and I realise probably time has taken over a bit now - that Parliament has a number of systems in there at present. There is the Privileges Committee, there are the GBEs and the Estimates committees. There is the Auditor-General, there are a number of investigative-type committees if needs be for a check and balance on the excesses of members of parliament and parliamentary processes.

**Mr CRAWFORD** - A lot of those are parliamentarians looking at themselves from nowhere.

**CHAIR** - There's the Ombudsman's office -

**Mr CRAWFORD** - Yes. The Ombudsman's office, in my view, is not sufficiently resourced, neither I think is the Solicitor-General or the Auditor-General.

**CHAIR** - So therefore you're saying, as I understand it, there needs to be a body; you're saying there needs to be a person who is full-time, and a couple of part-time people if needs be. Do they have a separate secretariat?

**Mr CRAWFORD** - I would think so, yes. The way I'd see it would be almost as an independent body reporting to the legislature about the legislature, and making use of the existing resources that are available through the Auditor-General and the Solicitor-General and the Ombudsman, and so on. The Government's argument initially was that because we already have these bodies, we don't need another one, but I think we do. One to incorporate the other bodies, and bring them maybe into one organisation overarching.

**CHAIR** - With the secretariat that we have, have you thought of the framework for that, whether you have a person who is legally trained, politically trained, journalistically trained - I don't know what. Do you have -

**Mr CRAWFORD** - I haven't really gone into that detail in thinking about it, but I would have thought that, firstly, you'd need some legal training and a background in politics and in parliamentary-type government. I think the important thing would be to have someone whose view of parliamentary government is a positive one, someone who takes seriously the objects of parliamentary government. Not necessarily someone who is going to be over-critical, but someone who takes it seriously to the point that they want to see it work.

**CHAIR** - If I make a complaint to this body what happens?

**Mr CRAWFORD** - I think the body needs to be independent and be able to not only take on board your inquiry but even initiate its own inquiries. It would be partly a policing body, partly an educative body and I think it would work in the same way as any other investigative committee or body, even this one, by taking evidence.

One of the things that I am a bit concerned about is that ICAC-style bodies in the Australian experience, tend to have a size and a scope which allows them almost to become laws unto themselves. It is a concentration of power, especially secret powers, as with the West Australian and Queensland models, which I think is potentially very dangerous. So there needs to be a balance struck. Certainly they need to have powers and possibly even some secret powers or some ability to secretly investigate. But I think we need to be pretty careful about how far we allow them to go because, once they get out of control, I think it has been shown in the West Australian experience how many reputations can be damaged just at the inquiry stage.

**CHAIR** - So they should be confidential, those inquiries? That is really what we are saying is it?

**Mr CRAWFORD** - Yes, generally speaking.

**CHAIR** - To flesh out that, if I might. So, the complaint has been made and the person has said, yes, there is a legitimate investigation that should take place. Do they have people in the body, themselves, who are ready to take that on or do they then go to the Federal Police, as Nick was saying, or the State Police, to second people onto the investigation or should those people already be seconded there for this perception of what we are talking about?

**Mr CRAWFORD** - I think it depends on the case. I think with some of them you could draw on the powers and authority of the Federal Police or one of the Federal authorities to look into it. With others, I think it could be done more in-house.

**CHAIR** - Then, for example, the investigative body has said, yes, the person who is sitting, the retired judge or whoever it might be, on top of it, says, yes, I believe there is a case to answer and I believe it is criminal. That person then transfers it to the DPP with the evidence they have for the DPP to look at and then if -

**Mr CRAWFORD** - It goes to the next level.

**CHAIR** - What happens if it is not quite criminal, but it is certainly negligent, immoral and unethical? What happens to it then?

**Mr CRAWFORD** - You at least shine a light on it and expose it for what it is.

**CHAIR** - Who does that?

**Mr CRAWFORD** - I think the media and Parliament itself and the ethics body, whatever. There would be no shortage of people lining up to do that.

**CHAIR** - So it would be a name-and-shame type of punishment more than anything else?

**Mr CRAWFORD** - Yes, as much as anything else.

**Mr BEST** - On the matter of the public service, do you feel that the Public Service Commissioner may have a role to play in the public service or even on a panel to talk about how fearless advice should be provided?

**Mr CRAWFORD** - I have not specifically given any thought to that but my inclination would be to say, yes

**Mr BEST** - Would that be the same also, maybe, when you were talking about the issues of proper process, that you would think about the Auditor-General?

**Mr CRAWFORD** - Yes.

**Mr BEST** - Would there be a role there?

**Mr CRAWFORD** - The Auditor-General has an independent authority to report to the Parliament and not to the Government and, again, frank and fearless advice. I think we are lucky to still have somebody, some organisations and positions that do continue to offer this frank and fearless advice. I think the Auditor-General and the Ombudsman are among them and the Solicitor-General, I think. The authority and powers that be are the people that should be used and should be called on. I think it would be silly to be doubling up all the way down the line.

**Mr BEST** - I am interested in your views about lobbying. Sometimes you might get a community group that might be lobbying for a health service or a dental clinic or more buses or something like that, and I am just thinking where this ends up in the sense that you do want to be transparent but what happens then -

**Mr CRAWFORD** - That is the thing, that if it is transparent, if it is open and if it is accountable I do not think there is a problem. Whenever you can shine a light on whatever is happening then there is no problem but as soon as you start to try to hush things up, whether it be expensive luncheons or jumping the fence at the races or whatever -

**Mr BEST** - Those sorts of things, I suppose, are for the domain of Parliament itself to be debated but where someone may be a professional lobbyist maybe there is something that needs to be thought about in the context of that.

**Mr CRAWFORD** - I would be inclined towards the sort of thing that the present Premier has spoken about. I think he is talking about registration of lobbyists and I think that is probably one way to make it open. The more open and accountable it is the more likely it is to be above board.

**Mr MARTIN** - Wayne, there are some different points of view, especially from some key people, on whether a body, if we recommend such, should have retrospective powers. Do you have a view on that?

**Mr CRAWFORD** - Yes. I believe that it should. I do not think you can just draw a line in the sand as we have been saying over the past couple of weeks and forget about everything that has happened before. I just do not see that as an ethical way to deal with it. If you are going to take this matter on it has to be taken on seriously and, in all seriousness, a lot of the problems hark back to previous actions by governments and members of governments who need to be held to account for these things, even if they did happen two years ago.



**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Should there be a limited time frame?

**Mr CRAWFORD** - I have not really applied my mind to that. I do not know.

**Mr BEST** - Just on that, there would be a sorting of the wheat from the chaff as to what, otherwise everybody -

**Mr CRAWFORD** - Of course.

**Mr BEST** - You would have to have some sort of trigger as to what was fair and reasonable to be -

**Mr CRAWFORD** - Yes, and I suppose you would need to have some sort of time limit. But then again you get into difficulties where something that happened six months ago is still liable to be investigated but something that happened seven months ago is not. A modicum of common sense needs to be applied to that.

**Mr MARTIN** - One of the other issues that we will have to decide is whether this body has the powers to investigate police. Have you any view on that?

**Mr CRAWFORD** - It has to have those powers. If you limit it by saying you cannot investigate the police then you are limiting it from investigating an area which, although it has not been a problem so much in Tasmania, has been one of the central problems in some other States. I do not think you could avoid having it investigate the police. I do not think they should be out of bounds.

**Mr McKIM** - You raised the issue of the Treasurer's dinner, which has come to light in the last 24 hours or so.

**Mr CRAWFORD** - I do not want to be picking on the Treasurer.

**Mr McKIM** - No, no, absolutely, and I was not going to ask you specifically about that; it was merely to establish a context. I wanted to ask whether you thought there was a case for State-based donation disclosure laws in Tasmania and what you think about the capacity in Tasmania for people to purchase media space, particularly during election campaigns, without disclosing who they are or the source of their funds.

**Mr CRAWFORD** - I do think that is an issue. Political donations as much as anything else need to be brought into this. I do not see this as a one-dimensional problem. It has to be considered in conjunction with all sorts of things, such as restoring the size of the parliament to a more realistic size. Whistleblower legislation, political donations and freedom of information law reform have to be considered. I was quite impressed with the Premier's 10-point plan. I agreed with most of that. I do not necessarily think that it covered everything but it went a long way to covering most of the issues.

**Mr McKIM** - It did not cover donations disclosure.

**Mr CRAWFORD** - No.

**Mr McKIM** - Just to be clear, have you just indicated that you think there is a case for State-based donations disclosures?

**Mr CRAWFORD** - Yes, most definitely.

**Mr McKIM** - Secondly, I will invite you to make a comment about whether you think it is appropriate that people can advertise, particularly during election campaigns, without disclosing who they are or what the source of their funds is.

**Mr CRAWFORD** - No; we are entitled to know who is saying what and on whose behalf. Without that context we cannot know what to believe.

**CHAIR** - It raises an interesting point. In an election campaign people ring up the ABC and they use that as a forum. I am Bill Bloggs and so and so was doing this or not doing that and then somebody else rings up. You know where it is coming from so should they also have to -

**Mr CRAWFORD** - I think under the Electoral Act as it stands you're supposed to identify yourself anyway.

**CHAIR** - Yes, but there are plenty of times where people ring up and say 'I am Jim Wilkinson' even though I might be John White. It just seems to happen around election time, and as soon as it finishes, bingo, it's gone. So it's obvious it comes from your opponents.

**Mr CRAWFORD** - I don't know how you control that because if you believe in freedom of speech, as I am sure you all do, you can't just pull the shutters down on it. There needs to be some effort to control it.

**Mr McKIM** - I guess my response to that would be that paying for media is a little bit different from an individual ringing up talkback radio. You're talking about hundreds of thousands of dollars going to a paid media campaign.

**CHAIR** - Where does it finish; that's the issue.

**Mr CRAWFORD** - There's not a great deal of difference, though, really. Obviously you've had the experience in the last election where hundreds of thousands of dollars I suppose were spent trying to bag the Greens. On the other hand I am sure that a number of supporters of the Greens were ringing Tim Cox stating the opposite view.

**Mr McKIM** - A number of supporters of all political parties were ringing Tim Cox stating all kinds of views.

**Mr CRAWFORD** - I don't know how you control that and I don't even know whether 'control' is the right word for those of us who want to see freedom of discourse.

**CHAIR** - Nick was talking about State donations but it would be more than that; it would be interstate donations as well.

**Mr McKIM** - I was actually referring to State legislation and a State-based system which we don't have currently in Tasmania. I think we're the only State that doesn't have a State-based donations disclosure system. I certainly would include money that comes from outside Tasmania to Tasmanian candidates or political parties.

**Mr CRAWFORD** - You've got the curious position at the moment, for example, in that for Bob Brown as a Federal senator there is some control over his spending through Federal legislation but no control through State legislation. So whatever control there is in the State is by virtue only of the Federal act, which doesn't specifically apply to the Tasmanian situation.

**Mr McKIM** - Would you support the concept of public funding for political parties at a State level? Currently only Tasmania and South Australia don't provide State public funding of political parties and candidates for elections. If public funding was linked to a ban or a cap on donations to political parties do you think that might improve the quality of the democracy?

**Mr CRAWFORD** - I am quite in favour of public funding, but public funding without limiting in some way the amount of funding that comes from commercial organisations in particular has no point. My understanding is that that was what it was supposed to replace.

**Mr McKIM** - Yes, that's why I've linked it to a cap or a ban on donations.

**Mr CRAWFORD** - Yes. Public funding federally, as I recall, came in during the Hawke era. The argument was that if you've got public funding then politicians can't be bought off with donations from Gunns or whatever. But as it happens they are now double-dipping in that they are getting funds from the Federal coffers and are still able to get funds from commercial organisations who were wishing to influence their decisions.

**Mr BEST** - I am interested in your thoughts about false allegations which, I believe, happens quite a lot. Do you feel that is part of the parliamentary process?

**Mr CRAWFORD** - It should not be.

**Mr BEST** - I think allegations should be put. If people in Parliament believe something needs to be debated or they want to put that forward, I believe that is democracy that you do that. But when sometimes you see the continuation of false accusations, should that remain in Parliament and continue on? Is that ethical or do you think that there should be a forum where that be dealt with? One that comes to mind is the donations where a series of allegations were made and that went on for some time.

**Mr CRAWFORD** - Allegations about?

**Mr BEST** - About individuals getting finance from Gunns - those things - when that was not the case. How do you clear that up or does it just stay part of the public process and people make up their own minds? Would you refer something?

**Mr CRAWFORD** - I do not know how you would sort that one out. But at present, I suppose, you have parliamentary privilege, which allows things to be said that sometimes are not true.

**Mr BEST** - I accept that happens at times. But I am wondering whether there is a view maybe that when it -

**Mr CRAWFORD** - I do not think that we should accept that is just happens and should happen.

**Mr BEST** - Maybe if it is put to debate and it cannot be resolved or something like or is that then politicising this panel? How do we get to that point where we restore trust? We put these things in place, I guess is what I am saying, but it does not remove the politics that can be unethically played out.

**Mr CRAWFORD** - I would say that the media, for example, has a responsibility to correct its errors when it discovers it has made errors. Newspapers and radio and television have become far better at honouring those things in recent years. I can remember back in the 1960s when it was unthinkable that a newspaper would acknowledge that it had made a mistake and now we have, whether it be the *Age* or the *Mercury* or whatever, we were wrong. The complaint is often made that the 'we were wrong' paragraph does not get the same amount of space as the original allegation, but that is a difficult problem that probably cannot be overcome. So I think we have made progress in that area. But I think it is just a matter of keeping at it.

**CHAIR** - Any other questions for Wayne? Wayne, thank you very much for coming along and giving us your time and providing the submission as well, it was most helpful.

**Mr CRAWFORD** - Thank you.

**CHAIR** - As to when we are going to report, I do not know. We will be speaking about extending the time from where it is at present to sometime next year. That has to get the blessing of both Houses first. So it is up to both Houses to vote on that.

**Mr CRAWFORD** - Could I just clarify one thing, I sort of half-heard I think an ABC news item today which I think quoted - who was it -

**CHAIR** - The DPP.

**Mr CRAWFORD** - the DPP, it might have been, saying that he was disappointed that he was unable to repeat his evidence or make his evidence available outside the committee. I am just wondering how that applies to me if, for example, I wanted to write a column based on the sort of things that we have talked about and not necessarily quoting what has been said here today but just really talking about things that I have spoken about in columns in the past.

**CHAIR** - Please correct if I am wrong, but what Tim was saying is that he would have liked, because of what has been coming out in the press in relation to another issue, to have given to the Press his submission that he made to the committee. He rang and asked and I said, 'You can't do that. Standing Orders say it is the property of the committees. The

only way that could occur is if at the conclusion of the committee's reports or with an interim report'. He then said, 'What about if I changed a couple of words and it wasn't exactly the same?' That was up to him whether he did that, I told him, so that shows the difficulties that we have. My belief is that if you were asked or if you were printing things you could print what was said and what you believed because it is part of the evidence that -

**Mr CRAWFORD** - I do not want to break any confidences from the committee -

**Mr McKIM** - This is an open hearing.

**Mr CRAWFORD** - That is what I was about to say, I would not have thought that there would have been confidences to be broken.

**Mr BEST** - It is not in camera.

**CHAIR** - It would be good to read your conclusions. You could save us some work.

**Mr CRAWFORD** - Yes, that is right. Someone asked me this morning what I was doing down here and I said I was making a submission to the committee and then I was going to write a column about it. If there are no objections to that, thank you.

**CHAIR** - Thank you for coming along.

**THE WITNESS WITHDREW.**