

**ADDRESS-IN-REPLY**

*Motion*

Resumed from 18 September.

**HON DERRICK TOMLINSON** (East Metropolitan) [11.56 am]: I take great pleasure in supporting the motion by Hon Sue Ellery expressing loyalty to our Most Gracious Sovereign and thanking His Excellency for the speech he was pleased to deliver. I note in supporting that motion, in particular Hon Sue Ellery's expression of loyalty to our Most Gracious Sovereign, that the Queen's representative in Western Australia is a Western Australian-born man. He conducts himself with considerable dignity and is a credit to the job that he has. He was preceded by another Western Australian-born former military officer, Major General Michael Jeffery who, like Lieutenant General Sanderson, has enhanced the role as Governor and enhanced the people of Western Australia.

There is something to be said about bush boys. Both Major General Jeffery and Lieutenant General John Sanderson were bush kids; one was born in Bunbury and the other in Wiluna. Major General Jeffery had the added advantage of subsequently moving to Kelmscott, and in the East Metropolitan Region acquired some of the polish that the East Metropolitan Region is known for.

I am sure His Excellency saw and enjoyed a movie that was very popular in Western Australia in the early seventies. The movie was *Serpico*. It starred Al Pacino - a much younger Al Pacino than the one who is now gracing the movie screens in Western Australia. It is a story of what is called a whistleblower. I do not think it is quite correct to call Frank Serpico a whistleblower. It is more appropriate to call Frank Serpico an honest cop. He was a police officer who pursued and prosecuted criminality with a proper conscience. I suppose the movie could be called a "factional" account of police corruption in New York and the work of Frank Serpico in exposing that corruption and causing the appointment of the Knapp Commission of inquiry into the New York Police Department. I never saw the movie.

Hon Frank Hough: It was good.

Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON: I am sure it was a brilliant movie. I could not afford to go to the movies in those days; I was just a poor schoolteacher. I read the book instead.

Hon Barbara Scott: You borrowed it from the library.

Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON: No, I did not borrow it from the library. The book was republished in the United States in 1997 by Harper Paperbacks. My wife was in the United States at the time.

Hon Frank Hough: You still could not afford to see the movie but you could afford to go to the United States.

Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON: No; my wife was there. I am an impecunious member of Parliament. I am even more impecunious than when I was a schoolteacher. I asked my wife to purchase the book, which cost \$US5.99. My wife could afford the book, so she bought it for me and posted it home. The cover of the book says that three million copies have been sold. I am sure it is a very popular book. The blurb describes it as a "raw and moving portrait", and reads -

It is the late sixties, a time of intense social and generational upheaval. Into this maelstrom came a man who broke the mold. A working class, Brooklyn-born Italian cop with long hair, a beard, and a taste for opera and ballet. Most of all, Frank Serpico was a man who couldn't be silenced - or bought.

In some respects, the sensational cover does not do justice to the story that is told in the book. I do not regard it as the most gripping piece of literature ever written or that I have ever read. However, the story is very instructive. Serpico included an afterword in the 1997 edition, which was released 25 years after the conclusion of the Knapp Commission. Immediately after the commission had completed its work, Serpico was shot in the face. At that time, alarm was expressed within the Police Department - New York's finest - that one of its officers might have done it. Frank Serpico was not a popular cop in New York because he was an honest cop and he exposed corrupt cops. He made a lot of enemies. As it turned out, a petty hoodlum was arrested and charged with the shooting of Frank Serpico. However, at the time, there was genuine concern among the New York police that one of their own had shot him as payback. Serpico writes in his afterword that he had witnessed a burglary while he had been in Holland, and that some time after he returned to New York -

... I was guest on a New York radio program. A New York City police officer called in to say, "You know, Frank, the day you testified before the Knapp Commission was a dark day for every cop in New York City. When I went home that night, I couldn't face my wife and kids." "Why?" I inquired, "What did you do wrong?" "Nuttin'," he replied. "Then why didn't you come out and back me up?" I asked. Without hesitation he shot back, "What! And be an outcast like you?" A very sad attitude, one

that I believe reflects that of most honest officers. It is my opinion that there have never been any real department incentives for cops to be honest, from the police academy up through the ranks to the police commissioner.

An excuse often proffered by police officers for their corruption is that seeing such enormous sums of money, on their salary, is too much temptation. If this form of logic held true, bank tellers would be taking money home by the bagful. Unfortunately, the real culprits of my story were never brought to task. They went on to become judges, politicians, commissioners, and university professors. Men of base character are elected to the highest offices of the land. In the final analysis, the people get the police they deserve.

One must accept that in popular “faction”, there is some degree of sensationalism and an emphasis on the emotive to maintain interest in the story, and one reads *Serpico* with that awareness. However, if one turns to the reports of the commission, one realises that the sensationalism of the “faction” - or the fiction, or the factual fiction, or the fictional fact - is understated. The Knapp Commission found endemic corruption in New York. It was a corruption of a type that would now be regarded as being of a low order. It was a corruption of kickbacks. A cop on the beat in New York would expect free meals in restaurants, financial backhanders from prostitutes, and to walk into a laneway and be given a brown paper bag of notes by a gambler. However, the cops did not touch drug dealers. It transpired during the Knapp Commission that the cops regarded drug money as dirty money.

Hon Frank Hough interjected.

Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON: No, not quite like the Queensland police. I will get to that. I am talking about mere tips for not prosecuting; for not doing a job. This was mere payment for not pursuing, arresting and prosecuting gamblers or prostitutes. That is low-level corruption. The Knapp Commission called such corrupt officers grass eaters. The Knapp Commission identified two types of corrupt officers. One type was the grass eaters who graze upon their precincts. In contrast with those were the corrupt officers who were operating at a different level of corruption and were the meat eaters, the carnivores, who were engaging in criminal activity, some 20 years after police officers had been prosecuted and imprisoned as a result of the findings of the Knapp Commission, and 20 years after procedures had been put in place to ensure that this sort of corruption would never recur in the New York Police Department. “The City of New York Commission to Investigate Allegations of Police Corruption and the Anti-Corruption Procedures of the Police Department Commission Report” by Milton Mollen, Chair, of 7 July 1994, reads -

The new nature of police corruption this Commission observed shatters many of the traditional, and more comforting, notions of police corruption that existed at the time our investigation began. When former police officer Michael Dowd was arrested in May 1992, the Department maintained that he was an aberration and that corruption was limited to a few “rogue cops.” Police corruption was said to be a matter of isolated and sporadic opportunities, rather than planned or organized group efforts. It was said to be motivated solely by greed, nothing more. The Commission found that these notions of police corruption were wrong and vastly underestimate the serious nature of present-day corruption.

Today’s corruption is far more criminal, violent and premeditated than traditional notions of police corruption suggest and far more invidious than corruption of a generation ago. Testimony and field investigations demonstrated that its most salient forms include groups of officers protecting and assisting drug traffickers for often sizable profits - stealing drugs, guns and money - and often selling the stolen drugs and guns to or through criminal associates; committing burglary and robbery; conducting unlawful searches of apartments, cars and people; committing perjury and falsifying statements; and sometimes using excessive force, often in connection with corruption. Greed is the primary motive behind these activities, but a complex array of other powerful motives and conditions also spur corruption.

Whereas in 1975 the Knapp Commission characterised the endemic corruption in the New York Police Department as corruption of grass eaters, the 1994 corruption was the corruption of meat eaters. The Knapp Commission found that even corrupt cops regarded drug money as dirty money. They would certainly take money from prostitutes and petty thieves and to protect gamblers; however, they would not protect drug dealers. They were grass eaters, not grass smokers. In 1994 they not only took the money but also the drugs, which they sold and then used the proceeds for their own criminal purposes. That is the 20-year change in the New York Police Department.

Michael Armstrong, who was chief counsel for the Knapp Commission, testified before the Mollen commission on 7 October 1993. He said this -

“The crooks, however, that you have uncovered, the criminals seem to be a different breed of criminals [than twenty-years ago], . . . the guys you’re digging up, these guys are walking around with lead-lined gloves and riding shotgun for organized crime people, it seems to me they have changed the nature of being a ‘meat eater’ in the Department. Instead of taking money to look the other way while someone else commits a street crime, they’re out there competing with the criminals to commit street crimes themselves, and it seems to me that is a very big difference.”

It is a little like the 1914-18 war, which was the war to end all wars. The 1919 Treaty of Versailles and the subsequent efforts to prevent war led 20 years later to the outbreak of World War II. The Knapp Commission set in place procedures to prevent corruption, but 20 years later there was much more invidious and pervasive corruption in the New York Police Department.

Hon Kim Chance: The difference in the analogy of the Treaty of Versailles is that it caused World War II; I am sure that the commission did not cause the corruption.

Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON: If the Leader of the House looks at the police commission in New York, it could also be argued that it contributed to the sort of corruption that the Mollen commission identified. Arguing by analogy is always dangerous because one can extend the analogy as far as one likes.

The Mollen commission found something else, and something that has bothered me for the past almost 10 years now. The proposition is this: corruption exists because honest people allow it to go unchecked; corruption exists because honest people allow it to exist; corruption exists because honest people refuse or avoid exposing it, and they avoid exposing it in a variety of ways. One way is to say that there is a rotten apple in the bunch; that it is not endemic, but belongs to a few corrupt individuals. In any society, we will find one per cent who are criminals. Of course, in the Police Service and the medical profession and among politicians, we will find at least one per cent representative of the community, but the rest are honest and doing their job - that is one excuse. The second thing people say is that they do not want to get involved because it represents a threat to their comfort and security zone. The third thing is to say that it is somebody else’s job. However, the worst thing is to say that it does not exist, that people do not want to know about it and that they live in a wholesome world. The Mollen commission found this in the police service in New York -

What we found is that the problem of police corruption extends far beyond the corrupt cop. It is a multi-faceted problem that has flourished in parts of our City not only because of opportunity and greed, but because of a police culture that exalts loyalty over integrity; because of the silence of honest officers who fear the consequences of “ratting” on another cop no matter how grave the crime; because of wilfully blind supervisors who fear the consequences of a corruption scandal more than corruption itself; because of the demise of the principle of accountability that makes all commanders responsible for fighting corruption in their commands; because of a hostility and alienation between the police and community in certain precincts which breeds an “Us” versus “Them” mentality; and because for years the New York City Police Department abandoned its responsibility to insure the integrity of its members.

I return to *Serpico*. It states at page 400 -

A very sad attitude, one that I believe reflects that of most honest officers. It is my opinion that there have never been any real department incentives for cops to be honest, from the police academy up through the ranks to the police commissioner.

It would be nice to be able to say well, that is New York. I have just been handed a note from my colleague Hon Barbara Scott that refers to a quote from St Thomas More, namely evil prevails when good men stay silent. In his afterword, Frank Serpico uses a quote from T.S. Eliot -

Only a fool, fixed in his folly, thinks that he can turn the wheel whereon he turns.

He also quotes from Fredrich Nietzsche -

Perhaps nobody yet has been truthful enough about what ‘truthfulness’ is.

It is very easy to dismiss the sensationalism of *Serpico* and the findings of the Mollen commission in New York and say we all know that New York is a corrupt place and that the corruption in New York exists because the New York finest is a corrupt institution. If it were Chicago or San Francisco, we would say the same thing, and we might even say the same thing about Moscow, but not here in Western Australia!

Hon Paddy Embry: Never!

Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON: No, never!

The Queensland Commission of Inquiry into Possible Illegal Activities and Associated Police Misconduct ended up with the then Commissioner of Police going to prison and the then Minister for Police, Russ Hinze, coming under considerable suspicion. I do not think he was ever charged with anything. It also contributed to the bringing down of the then Bjelke-Petersen Government. It was endemic corruption, but not quite the measure of corruption that was found by the Mollen commission. The chairman of the Queensland inquiry, G.E. Fitzgerald, refers in the "Report of a Commission of Inquiry Pursuant to Orders in Council" to the known police misbehaviours of verballing; manufacturing or falsifying evidence; interfering with evidence and other material, including loss and destruction of records; intimidating witnesses; obtaining admissions by threats or inducements; and obstructing investigations. Those misbehaviours are familiar. I think we will have a test of that sort of corruption in the Court of Criminal Appeal next Friday when Lewandowski's testimony is heard in the Mickelberg case. That is the sort of corruption that we accept, regrettably, as a day-to-day common feature of police work. It is noble-cause corruption. The role of police officers is not to uphold truth, justice and the American way but to get the scum off the streets; and if they cannot get the evidence to convict the scum, they will manufacture the evidence. In other words, the end justifies the means. That is the most insidious form of corruption - or perhaps not.

The Fitzgerald report states at page 207 -

The other major type of police misconduct which is protected by the police code involves much more diverse behaviour and degrees of culpability as police take advantage of opportunities which arise in the course of their duties to obtain personal benefits. Opportunities so afforded include:

- (i) theft of seized or forfeited property, evidence, or funds intended to be used to pay for assistance rendered to police;
- (ii) acquisition of seized or forfeited property at an undervalue upon its official disposal;
- (iii) use of informants and other criminal associates to dispose of illegally acquired property; and
- (iv) acceptance of money, property and sexual favours in connection with the benefits which police are able to provide such as information and warnings in relation to law enforcement activities, information in relation to criminal opportunities, and licences and the like for which police have responsibility (in false names where appropriate), the prosecution and falsification of evidence against rivals of protected criminals, and the favourable exercise of the wide discretions which, in practice, arise at various stages of the criminal process: for example, in relation to charging (both in whether a charge is laid and, if so, what charge, which is relevant not only to the likely success or failure of the charge brought and potential punishment if the charge proceeds but also to whether a conviction can be avoided by forfeiture of bail and to whether forfeiture of property can be avoided), charging "nominees" to avoid the consequences for those in fact responsible, applications for bail, modification of charges, and prosecution.

The sort of criminality that Fitzgerald refers to is a next level of the grass eaters of corruption; for example, making use of one's position of authority for personal benefit, and issuing licences under false names. A group of police officers in Western Australia, who I think operated out of the Lancelin Police Station, were found guilty of issuing licences in false names. One of those licences was later found to be in the possession of one of the known criminals in the drug scene in Western Australia. We can ask ourselves how far did that level of corruption extend into organised crime in Western Australia. However, on the face of it, it is a simple misuse of authority. Another example is manipulating charges in return for some favour so that the offender will face a lesser penalty. Our prostitution policy, the so-called tolerance policy, under which brothels were illegal but were tolerated -

Hon Kim Chance: The containment policy.

Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON: Yes. There were brothels that operated outside the containment policy. The reason that those brothels could operate - because only the illegal brothels that were approved by the Police Service could operate - is quite simply that the police officers who were supposed to contain prostitution contained themselves on the girls! That is the sort of corruption that Fitzgerald found. Fitzgerald found also, like Mollen, that the reason that corruption was able to exist and prosper in Queensland is that honest officers refused to expose it. The reason is the code of silence - the blue wall of silence, as it is sometimes called - that police officers do not rat on their mates and do not expose the criminality of their colleagues. There is a sense of loyalty within the Police Service. Members of the Police Service stick together because they are a band of brothers. There is camaraderie in the Police Service. Policemen depend on their fellow officers when they are out on the street because they are under threat. They deal with the low-life of society who have no respect for the law, for other people and certainly not for cops. When police are out on the streets, they depend upon their

colleagues for their own safety; they must trust each other. Therefore, if a colleague does something wrong, the other officers turn a blind eye. Furthermore, if a colleague is investigated, the others do not cooperate with the investigation or turn evidence against him; they protect him. At worst, they destroy and discredit evidence that is brought against that colleague.

I refer to the Eucla case in which police officers were charged with perjury. The charge hung upon the evidence of one probationary constable, Paula Johnson, from the Esperance Police Station. Paula Johnson was a whistleblower and an honest cop; she was State's evidence. The counsel for the charged officers, John Quigley, did his very best to break down her evidence by making personal attacks on her. He did not attack what she said, but who she was. Her fellow officers collaborated by making available confidential health records from Police Department files. They did everything in their power not to discredit dishonest cops, but to discredit the police officer who stood for honour and integrity. After those officers were found guilty and convicted of perjury and conspiracy to pervert the course of justice and were imprisoned for terms of three or four years, Paula Johnson was stationed at Carnarvon Police Station where she was treated as a pariah by her colleagues. Eventually, she took stress leave and resigned from the Police Service. The code of silence is very cruel when it is used in that way.

That is the code that Fitzgerald found existed Queensland and the Wood Royal Commission found in New South Wales. Justice Wood found that, just as in New York, corruption moved from the grass eaters to the meat eaters; that is, from the protection of those who were engaged in petty criminality to the protection of those who were actively engaged in criminal behaviour by people who were appointed as the protectors of society against criminal activity. Justice Wood found the meat eater variety of corruption, which it is believed went to the extent of murder to protect the reputation of the police and to protect police officers from prosecution.

Another characteristic of the Wood Royal Commission was that from the beginning, the Commissioner of Police in New South Wales said that if there was corruption in his police force, it certainly was not endemic. He said that there might be a few rotten apples. Roger Rogerson, one of the most revered police officers in New South Wales, was sent to prison for 20 years. He was regarded as a top cop. His arrest and conviction record was second to none. He was regarded as one of the State's top investigators. His record was second to none because he dealt with his own opposition within the criminal sector. He was just as criminal as the criminals he prosecuted. He had inside information and could get convictions so of course he was a successful cop. When looking for corruption in the Police Service, the arrest records of police officers must be examined. Those who have the most successful arrest record must be scrutinised very closely. Their bank accounts, associates, houses, property, vehicles and recreational activities must be scrutinised. Unfortunately, some of the best cops are exposed as the most corrupt. They are best in the sense that they have the most effective arrest and prosecution rate.

Just as Mollen and Knapp in New York and Fitzgerald in Queensland found a code of silence that allowed corruption to exist, so too did Wood in New South Wales. The code of silence was based upon wholesome principles of the police protecting their mates because they had to rely on their mates for their own safety. They considered that the integrity and reputation of the Police Service must be protected because without a reputation for integrity, a Police Service is worth nothing. People who rely on the Police Service for their own safety and protection must have confidence in its officers. Therefore, everything must be done to protect that reputation. The senior officers in management positions in the ranks of the Police Service considered that they had to do what was necessary to protect the reputation of the Police Service. If that meant not exposing corruption within their own ranks, they did not do it.

What is the worst form of corruption? Is it the meat eaters or those who protect the meat eaters? Is it the meat eaters who use their position of authority to engage in criminal behaviour for personal gain or is it those who allow them to engage in criminal behaviour for personal gain for the altruistic purpose of maintaining the reputation of the Police Service? I am not sure which is worse.

Currently in Western Australia a royal commission is being conducted into the Police Service. I was sickened - I use the term advisedly - to read a special editorial on page 5 of the August 2002 edition of the *WA Police News* headed "Inside Royal Commission - laboured progress during early hearings". The by-line reads -

Nearly two months into public hearings of the Kennedy Royal Commission into allegations of police corruption and criminality, there has not been much revealed to stun or astonish the Western Australian public.

The editorial opens with the following -

The pedestrian-paced progress since public hearings began on Monday 1 July has probably been a disappointment to those commentators who were looking for the revelations in the style of a Trevor

Haken (key “roll over” copy for the NSW Wood Royal Commission) or the video of a “Chook” Fowler from the same Commission receiving bribe money in the front seat of a car.

The editorial concludes -

Undoubtedly, the Royal Commission will in due course hit its straps but if it were a football game the team’s coaching staff would probably be looking to change the game plan.

I am not sure what the author of that special editorial - a fellow by the name of Winston McNamara - expects will move the Western Australian public. However, I have collected from the parliamentary library the press cuttings of the Royal Commission Into Whether There Has Been Any Corrupt or Criminal Conduct by Western Australian Police Officers. I have also called up the royal commission web site and read the evidence presented verbatim - not the journalist’s selective reporting - which is available to every Western Australian on the Internet. I found allegations that the so-called Kalgoorlie six stole and sold morphine and engaged in criminal activity, not merely grass-eating corruption but meat-eating corruption. Of course, those allegations were denied. I then found the Kalgoorlie six transformed into the Brentwood four. What were the Brentwood four up to, according to the evidence given to the royal commission? They were engaged in the same activities: stealing and selling drugs.

When one reads this, one wonders what is necessary for Mr Winston McNamara to accept that the Western Australian public will be stunned or astonished. I will tell Winston McNamara what will stun the Western Australian public, but I will not tell him now. I shall wait for the next stage of the royal commission and I will wait for the next six matters to be dealt with by the royal commission. I will then tell Mr Winston McNamara what sickens the Western Australian public about those police officers who engage in that sort of criminality. We will find the very same sort of corruption that was characterised in the findings of the Wood and Fitzgerald royal commissions and the Mollen commission in New York. Perhaps we will not be stunned and perhaps we will not be astonished. We might not even be surprised because we have grown used to it. Perhaps the Western Australia public is inured against it and just accept it as part of policing; I do not.

Hon John Fischer: Do the parameters of the royal commission enable the same sort of results and inquiries of, for example, the Fitzgerald inquiry?

Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON: The features of the Fitzgerald and Wood royal commissions that are yet to be tested in the Kennedy royal commission are these: both the Fitzgerald and the Wood royal commissions were able to expose the corruption that they did because they had hand-picked teams of investigators who did all of the background work to present the evidence to the royal commissions. The hearings of the commissions were simply the public inquisitions which examined the truth; the truth had been found in the investigation. The members of the team that was put together in the Wood royal commission were drawn from all over Australia, headed by an officer from the Australian Federal Police, whom Hon Nick Griffiths and I met at one stage in our work with the Joint Standing Committee on the Anti-Corruption Commission. He was a man of considerable investigative skill and considerable administrative talent. That is the first thing that will be tested. The second thing that contributed to the success of both the Fitzgerald and Wood inquiries was that eventually one police officer turned State’s evidence. Until one police officer turns State’s evidence, the success of the royal commission will be limited. The Knapp commission succeeded because Frank Serpico turned State’s evidence. The Mollen commission succeeded because one of New York’s finest turned State’s evidence. The Fitzgerald royal commission succeeded because one of the corrupt officers turned State’s evidence. The Wood royal commission succeeded because one of the corrupt officers turned State’s evidence. There was then a domino effect. One led to the other which led to the other and there was therefore a roll over of police officers. They exposed their own corruption. Why? It was to protect their own tails. What a better way to protect one’s own tail than to turn on one’s mates. They were true carnivores; they were true meat eaters. Their loyalty to one another extends thus far; thus far is to the point at which they must protect themselves. The Kennedy royal commission will succeed only if and when one of those officers turns State’s evidence. I am confident that one of them will.

I am going to the Court of Criminal Appeal next Friday to watch with considerable interest the cross-examination of Tony Lewandowski who in 1983, he says, lied about Peter Mickelberg’s confession. He says that in 1984, 1985 and 1988 he lied to the Court of Criminal Appeal. Now he is turning State’s evidence. It is defence evidence because the State has now abandoned him as a prosecution witness; he is now a defence witness. I will be watching that very closely because, like other royal commissions, once one cop rolls over there is a continuing effect because the cop who told the lie was part of a team. This is one of the characteristics of corruption. People can be corrupt only if other people allow them to be corrupt. Corruption exists because other people support it, not by being themselves criminal, but by protecting the criminal. Each lie exposed, exposes another lie and another liar. Every police officer who gave testimony supporting the lie is exposed as a liar. I will be watching very closely the evidence of Tony Lewandowski because, if his evidence is sustained, it

will expose the lies of other police officers who gave evidence, not necessarily only officers who gave evidence in the original 1983 trial and the 1984-85 Court of Criminal Appeal, but the detective sergeant in charge of the Belmont detectives who gave evidence in support of Tony Lewandowski in the 1997 Court of Criminal Appeal also runs the risk of being exposed as a perjurer. That sort of corruption is unacceptable corruption.

Let me return to my original proposition that corruption exists because it is allowed to exist. Corruption exists because honest people fail in their duty to report it. Corruption exists because ordinary citizens are prepared to turn the other way. Corruption exists because senior executives, whether they be in the Police Service or any public sector, put the reputation of their department ahead of the preservation of integrity. The code of silence that exists in the Western Australia Police Service is not unique to the Western Australia Police Service, neither is it unique to police services elsewhere. How many times have we heard complaints made against this or the other government department, sometimes of a petty nature or a seemingly petty nature, being denied by the officers who are the accused. Those officers are then supported by their superiors up to and including the chief executives, not because they are corrupt or dishonest but because they believe the reputation of their department is more important than integrity.

I hope that the Police Union rethinks its position on this royal commission. I hope that the contempt that is shown in the editorial to which I referred in the *Police News* changes to support for integrity, not support for corruption. For as long as the Police Union and other elements of the Police Service function to support those who engage in criminal activities, they themselves are criminal. For as long as honest people collude to protect the corrupt, they themselves are corrupt. If we want integrity, we have to behave with integrity. If we want an honest community, we have to be honest to that community. If the Kennedy royal commission succeeds that far, it will all have been worthwhile. I support the motion moved by Hon Sue Ellery.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon Alan Cadby.