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MS BENNETT: Commissioners, this morning we have an interesting panel discussion between Professor Cassandra Pybus and Professor Richard Eccleston. I'd now like to ask - Professor Eccleston is present in the room and Professor Pybus appears online, and I'd ask that they each be called and sworn.
<RICHARD GEORGE ECCLESTON, affirmed:
[10.17am]
<CASSANDRA JEAN PYBUS, affirmed:
<EXAMINATION BY MS BENNETT:
MS BENNETT: Q. Thank you, Professor Eccleston and Professor Pybus, I'm going to try and split my eye contact across the room this morning. I'll start, Professor Pybus, can you tell us your full name and your professional address or perhaps you might like to omit your address, just your full name?

PROF PYBUS: Well, my full name is Cassandra Pybus, I don't use my middle name, and I don't really have a professional address, I'm a writer, sorry, at home.

MS BENNETT: No, thank you. You've made a statement to assist this Commission. Have you read that statement recently and are its contents true?

PROF PYBUS: I have, yes.
MS BENNETT: And are its contents true?
PROF PYBUS: Well, truth is not a word that historians trade in, but I believe it's close enough to what I believe and what I understand from my research, yes.

MS BENNETT: Thank you, Professor. Professor Eccleston, could you tell the Commissioners your full name and your address.

PROF ECCLESTON: I'm Richard George Eccleston, I'm a Professor of Political Science at the University of Tasmania.

MS BENNETT: Professor Eccleston, you've also made a statement to assist this Commission. Have you read that statement recently?

PROF ECCLESTON: I have.
MS BENNETT: Is that statement true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief?

PROF ECCLESTON: To the best of my knowledge and belief it is true.

MS BENNETT: Thank you. Commissioners will have those statements provided to you. Professor Pybus, you've said that you're a creative fiction writer and an historian, is that right?

PROF PYBUS: Non-fiction writer.
MS BENNETT: I'm sorry.
PROF PYBUS: I'd hate to give you the impression that I was dealing in fiction.

MS BENNETT: I'm sorry, thank you. And you write historical biographical narratives, is that right?

PROF PYBUS: Many kinds of historical narratives. I've also written a number of what would be considered to be academic history books too, yes.

MS BENNETT: And you're historical research has included Tasmania's colonial past?

PROF PYBUS: It has included Tasmania's colonial past, it's also included Tasmania's 20th Century history as well.

MS BENNETT: You've lived in Tasmania until Year 11.
PROF PYBUS: That's right.
MS BENNETT: And you returned in 1985 and you've 1 ived in Tasmania since, is that right?

PROF PYBUS: More or less, yes, I've spent a lot of time in other places but, yes, this has been my home.

MS BENNETT: Yes, Tasmania is your home. Professor Eccleston, you're a Professor of Political Science at the University of Tasmania. You've published over 12 books and

100 articles on various aspects of comparative politics and economic policies, is that right?

PROF ECCLESTON: That's correct.
MS BENNETT: You're currently the Professor of Political Science and the Director of the Tasmanian Policy Exchange at the University of Tasmania, is that right?

PROF ECCLESTON: That is correct.
MS BENNETT: The Commissioners have the benefit of your CV and I won't read it in full. Are there any other posts or qualifications that we should specifically advert to for the purposes of this morning?

PROF ECCLESTON: I think just a brief note that beyond my academic research in economic policy which is comparative and international, I also coordinate a lot of work focused on contemporary Tasmanian policy and the economy, so a lot of the insights are drawn from that broader collaborative work.

MS BENNETT: Thank you. I'd like to speak to you both about what this Commission can learn about the history, culture, demographics of Tasmania from your various perspectives. I'd like to first just place this discussion in terms of Tasmania today and then I'd like to see how we can place it.

So, I'll start with you, Professor Eccleston, and by reference to, I think it's paragraphs 13 and 14 of your statement, can you tell us a little bit about Tasmania's current demography and how it might be considered, if not unique, then distinctive?

PROF ECCLESTON: I think there are clearly distinctive elements to Tasmania's demographic profile which have a number of implications, although I wouldn't say unique, as some of the characteristics of Tasmania are common to other remote communities, island communities and the like.

But in terms of an Australian state, clearly a small population, a little over just approaching 550,000, relatively low population growth over most of the 20th and early 21 st Century, but we've seen a relatively significant wave of migration over the last five or six years. I think
that's got many implications and one Counsel Assisting will most likely tease out, but one implication of that is Tasmania's demographic and population profile is relatively static, both in terms of growth and also in terms of mobility within the state.

I guess the other obvious point to note particularly relative to other Australian jurisdictions is that we're a relatively decentralised and regional community, with less than 50 per cent of the population living in Greater Hobart. Really only Queensland, albeit at a very different scale, is comparable in terms of the regionality of the community.

MS BENNETT: Can I ask you briefly to comment on Tasmania's present socio-economic profile, you've referred to this in about paragraph 14 or 15 of your statement?

PROF ECCLESTON: Clearly by a lot of traditional metrics Tasmania is less affluent than the rest of Australia, whether we're looking at household wealth, whether we're looking at wages; average weekly wages are around 12 per cent less than the national average. And, notwithstanding relatively strong growth in employment in recent years, participation in the labour market remains lower than the national average and particularly in the regions, and that translates to a situation where household's wealth's around 15 per cent below the national average.

So, that's a sort of an economic snapshot, but there's a flipside to that which I think is relevant to the Commission's deliberations. We've got many strengths in the community which are not captured in those basic economic metrics, with a strong sense of connectedness, community identity and resilience that really comes from our history and I think the nature of our community.

So, I don't want to paint a deficit picture of Tasmania, but certainly by traditional economic metrics not as prosperous as the rest of Australia.

MS BENNETT: Turning to you, Professor Pybus, I'd like to talk to you about how those demographic and socio-economic ideas echo the history of Tasmania, can you tell us how they land for you in reflecting on Tasmania's history?

PROF PYBUS: Well, I agree entirely with Richard's analysis of the demographics, although I would say I think there's a kind of, you know, dark side to the up side that he just pointed to about the nature of the community. But what marks Tasmania out for me in many ways is its powerful carceral past. It was established completely and utterly as a prison society and it was, thanks to the third governor, managed in extraordinary ways, the entire society, as a carceral society. Everybody was under scrutiny to a certain extent, and convicts and emancipated convicts who made up by far the great majority of the populations were under scrutiny all the time, as were any Aboriginal people who still managed to linger on.

Now that, and whilst there were a number of convict settlements in Australia, none were as big or lasted as long as in Tasmania, and there was this massive out-migration of free settlers in the 19 th Century, and so you have a situation where the make-up of the Tasmanian community, which as Richard points out has been remarkably stable with a lot of out-migration, not a great deal of in-migration, was dominated by people who have been through the convict system and had been tainted as children in ways that I can talk about a bit more later.

Also, merely by association they were sort of criminalised to a degree, and that that sense of trying to evade, repress, not have anything to do with the convicts staying is one of the things that's been picked up by social historians about Tasmania which is the very interesting fact that free settlers for generations managed never to marry into the convict class. So, they always married each other or went off to England to find partners, and so, that sense that there is the dominant group in the society is stigmatised and a source of shame, a shame for themselves and a stain on the wider community.

MS BENNETT: Can I pause you there for a moment because I want to test something with Professor Eccleston about that, because Professor Eccleston, you tell us in your statement at paragraph 15 that:

Research suggests that those residing in these socioeconomically disadvantaged areas are less mobile and unlikely to move around the state to seek employment or live in other communities.

You go on to say that:
It is common for families living in socioeconomically disadvantaged areas of Tasmania to have lived in the same communities for generations.

Now, you talk about that in terms of connectedness.
Does it also have an echo in what Professor Pybus is talking about around this sort of generational cultural connection or social mobility?

PROF ECCLESTON: There's a social mobility and I guess arguments about class and their historical origins. I guess, my approach would be to thinking about - to frame it in terms of the contemporary economic context, and in most developed countries there's a strong economic gradient to mobility: the more affluent you are, the more highly educated you are, the more mobile you'll be, both in terms of your means to pursue other lives, different lives in different places, but also perhaps in terms of an intent to do that.

And, clearly that is true in the data in Tasmania, where we're looking at the less advantaged, more disadvantaged rural and regional and remote communities, there is much less mobility. You know, the ABS has got good records of this in terms of asking that census question about where you resided five years previously and a lot of our regional communities are remarkably stable in terms of some of the core population. You know, some migration around that, but there are groups of families that have lived in communities literally for generations.

MS BENNETT: Returning to you, Professor Pybus, what do you see is the implications around that for social networks in Tasmania for people being connected to their area and region and how that might impact on, in a good way and a bad way, their willingness to go outside those networks?

PROF PYBUS: Well, it's a matter of who you're related to. When I moved back - just a little personal aside, when I moved back to Tasmania in 1985 I was taken aside by a political apparatchik I'd known in Canberra and told to be careful about who I spoke to and who I spoke about because I would be speaking to one of their relatives. He then
went on to make a very disparaging remark about a political - about a property developer and I said, "Oh yeah, that's my cousin Keith". Now, there you go. That's a big issue, that the kin networks in these very stable lower socio-economic groups that Richard has identified are very strong, as they are amongst the elites who have so proudly and firmly hung on to their elite status and their non-convict history, and so they're both of them, in my view, inclined to be very non-engaged in any self-reflection about their past; that's something that also marks Tasmanians, their refusal to do that, and I put that down to in both cases a matter of shame.

Shame is a very powerful, powerful social mechanism of suppression, and I think shame operates in Tasmania much more powerfully than it does almost anywhere else in Australia. The island state, the island that I most see similar kind of patterns is in fact the Republic of Ireland, or the whole island of Ireland and the way in which a kind of brutal and traumatic past and extraordinarily brutal treatment of women and children over generations has also had this kind of extraordinary suppression of reality really.

MS BENNETT: Let me just pause there because I want to explore the relationship with authority in a moment, but I wanted to return to you, Professor Eccleston, around those networks, because you say in your statement that you were surprised to learn in your research that Tasmanian employers rely more heavily on informal networks for recruitment. Can you tell the Commissioners a little bit about that?

PROF ECCLESTON: We're doing a large piece of work on the impact of COVID on regional labour markets generally and in Tasmania and really assembling the best kind of comparative data that we had, and one really distinctive feature of Tasmania relative to other states and other regional parts of Australia was this I think quite reliable time series by one of the commercial labour market companies that asked a question over 15 years or more, "How did you find out about the job that you're currently employed in?"

And, as you'd imagine, one of the big stories there is that nobody finds out about jobs in newspaper advertisements any more, it's all various online platforms, but nationally I think, and the figures are in my
statement, around 15 per cent of people still find their work through word-of-mouth and personal networks.

COMMISSIONER NEAVE: Here or everywhere?
PROF ECCLESTON: No, nationally. In Tasmania it is double that; it's around 30 per cent. And, thinking about it from a policy perspective, you know, we were thinking this highlights some of the barriers potentially to work and to fully utilise the skills of new arrivals and migrants, but it also says something to the kind of networked - to professional networks, how we interact, how we find employment as a community.

MS BENNETT: So, Professor, we've got there strong social connections, limited workforce mobility, and what does a combination of those two factors in your view give? Is there a hypothesis that you would advance around how those two matters might interact for dealing with problematic unethical or even criminal conduct? I'll draw your attention to paragraph 46 of your statement?

PROF ECCLESTON: The caveat is that I don't have expertise in terms of child sexual abuse and its causes and how it should be addressed, but I think a working hypothesis is, if you've got a small and connected professional community, perhaps fewer alternative sources of employment, and these strong community bonds, then you would imagine that the implications of reporting or disclosing misconduct or criminal activity would be higher in that community.

And, as I again tentatively outlined in my statement, there are other implications. In a very relatively tightly connected community, if you are aware of abuse, misconduct or illegal activities, perhaps you might be in denial. You know, I know this person's families, forebears, you know, so you may be less willing to disclose.

I guess on the flipside in terms of the consequences for the accused and reflecting on the presumption of innocence.

PRESIDENT NEAVE: I'm sorry to interrupt you. What about the consequences for the individual who does disclose? Do you have any speculations about that - sorry, who discloses misbehaviour on the part of another person?

PROF ECCLESTON: Well, I think the implications and the consequences could be greater all things being equal in that smaller community setting, so I think that's a working hypothesis which I'm sure that the Commission will explore.

COMMISSIONER BENJAMIN: Because what you're saying, isn't it, just so I understand, is that about a third of Tasmanians who get jobs get it because of their community or social contacts?

PROF ECCLESTON: That's correct.
COMMISSIONER BENJAMIN: So therefore your employment is dependent upon at some levels your position in society and how you're viewed by your family or those communities, is it not?

PROF ECCLESTON: That's right, that's part of the calculus, and also, your colleagues as well as being professional colleagues, are also part of your - often part of social networks and there are interactions there, so it's that challenging environment where we need to think about the governance and the policy response to these issues, but also be really mindful of the broader social and community context in which we're operating.

COMMISSIONER BENJAMIN: And if we go back to what you said earlier, Professor Eccleston, is that economic means gives rise to mobility. So, if you've done really well academically in Tasmania and you want to achieve economically, perhaps the Bass Strait is not a border you're looking for, you're looking for broader borders, whether that's in mainland Australia or overseas, and that must have some impact, or does it have impact probably is a better way to put it, on the community which is left behind? Because, I think even Professor Pybus, I think she went away and then came back, which is almost a common Tasmanian story, isn't it?

PROF ECCLESTON: I think it does, Commissioner, but it's also a story that's changing, in the sense that we're not having - in the last 10 years the big shift has been that net outflow of graduates and young professionals, and similarly we are seeing professional migration from interstate and beyond of younger professionals in their 20s and 30s, so that is changing, but the fact remains I think that, if you've got very strong - you've got a stable
workforce, relatively stable population, strong social connections, that the issues around disclosure are undoubtedly more challenging. The final --

MS BENNETT: In terms of - no, go on, please.
PROF ECCLESTON: The final, and again, this is just a hypothesis: that professional and community environment where you do have these very strong connections, I think there is a risk that, if there is misconduct and abuse, somehow it does become culturally normalised or to turn a blind eye, then there's probably increased risk of that kind of systematic and long-term abuse.

COMMISSIONER BENJAMIN: I note that Professor Pybus is nodding her head.

MS BENNETT: And I'd like to turn to Professor Pybus because one thing that struck me about each of your statements is you land in remarkably similar places through remarkably different means. Professor Pybus, can you tell us about how that analysis lands for you in your particular context?

PROF PYBUS: We11, what I was mostly nodding at has to do with, if this behaviour becomes normalised. Now, from a historical point of view I would put it, when was it not normalised?

MS BENNETT: What do you mean by that?
PROF PYBUS: Historically it has been normalised. We have in this short time, Europeans in this island, basically had an abusive administration, an abusive environment for children; I don't mean all children, but for a certain class of children or children who just happened to kind of fall between the cracks or whatever; children were criminalised from the moment - if they arrived with their parents, they were separated, they were used as slave labour, they were incarcerated, they were basically tainted in the same way that their convict parents were tainted, and that meant, as far as British administration was concerned, that punishment or brutalisation - and, let's face it, the convict system was very brutal - was par for the course.

I mean, it's very interesting to look at, for example,
the anti-slavery rhetoric at the same time as transportation which says that the slave, the black slave being taken from their kin and home in Africa and sent off to plantations in the Caribbean, that was shameful and immoral because they were innocent. But convicts who were taken from their home and their families and for the rest of their lives sent to the end of the earth, that was all fine and good because they had sinned.

So, of course, the mark of the sin, the mark of the criminal, is on the child and it travels down through the families too, and these children from the word go right into the 20th Century have been at the mercy of the state, the apparatus of the state, the kind of people who were employed by the state, and the people who basically owned them; you know, they were basically a slave labour force for a long time and so this is just rife for abuse.

MS BENNETT: Pausing there, I understand that's the historical perspective. That's a long time ago now since that --

PROF PYBUS: Except it isn't a long time ago, it's only a matter of a 100 years ago or more, and also, we've just heard about how little the population here has changed, apart from the out-migration of the people who might be better educated, for example, how concentrated it has been and that what has been normalised in the 19th Century into the 20th Century has continued on through the 20th Century and may - I mean, sexual abuse of children is commonplace across the world. So that, I'm not suggesting that there's anything really peculiar happening here; what's peculiar about it is that it becomes normalised, it has become normalised.

And so that, if you look at a place like Point Puer in the 19th Century and a place like the Ashley Boys Home in the 20th Century you'd say, what is the difference between these two places? To what extent is the same licence for abuse going to be operating in both of these places because of the mark of sin, the mark of being criminalised or being just basically an outsider without strong family connections to protect these children?

MS BENNETT: Let me turn now to another topic, I'm conscious of the time and I want to turn to a couple of matters concerning integrity oversight in Tasmania and the
relationship with authority. I want to start with Professor Eccleston around the Tasmanian State Service, and you make some observations around that at paragraphs 28 to 35 of your statement and you later refer to the recent Watts Review. Can you tell the Commissioners at a high level what you see the key issues are in the Tasmanian State Service arising from those matters?

PROF ECCLESTON: Yes, certainly, and this is really just summarising some of the regular reporting from the State Service annual reports but also Ian Watt's review of the Tasmanian State Service which was concluded last year and I guess in a sense mirroring the broader demographic profile.

The State Service is a very important source of employment as well as a key service provider in the State; 80 per cent of the members of the State Service are permanent employees, it is older and less diverse than other Australian jurisdictions, and also, the percentage of separations and the average length of service among members of the Tasmanian State Service, you know, is 20 or 30 per cent above the national average.

And again, there are two sides to this coin: there are real strengths in terms of having that institutional knowledge and building capability over time in an environment where many organisations are struggling to retain staff. But the flipside is that you do have that, you know, status and stability which means that a lot of employees have been in the service, and I think Ian Watt's observation is, have been in similar roles and similar agencies within the service, and there isn't - and that can be a barrier in terms of innovation and dynamism and potentially in terms of the issues that we're discussing today; again, you know, it would strengthen those professional and personal bonds.

And again, just an observation about the Tasmanian labour market and most regional labour markets particularly for professional roles within the State Service there aren't many alternatives, so you don't have that movement, community sector, private sector, government.

MS BENNETT: Is that connected to your comments at paragraph 49 and following wore you say:

There are strong social and professional

> connections among the population and among many employees of the Tasmanian State Service. These interdependencies make it particularly difficult to maintain integrity and a commitment to process and ethical conduct.

Can you expand on that for the Commissioners?
PROF ECCLESTON: One important qualification, I wouldn't say definitively that it does but I think clearly it's a risk factor. Cassandra made some really interesting points about kinship and history. I guess from my perspective and not being a historian, you know, that might be part of the story but it really is about those strong personal and professional networks.

People who have worked in a range of roles in Tasmania soon become quite socially connected so there aren't those degrees of separation, and in terms of providing really important services, health, social, educational services in regional communities, it's often the same. You have strong movement usually of younger employees through regions, but when people settle in regions they often stay, so you do have those strong bonds.

PRESIDENT NEAVE: I don't know whether you are able to answer this question or perhaps Professor Pybus would be, but do you think that - and I'm not quite sure how you test this hypothesis either - do you think that hierarchy and not challenging authority is a stronger motivation for people within the State Service, within the Tasmanian State Service than within other State Services? I mean, what you've described is a feature of all hierarchical organisations to an extent, but would you venture a comment on whether that is more so here than elsewhere?

PROF ECCLESTON: Professor Pybus?
PRESIDENT NEAVE: Professor Pybus?
PROF PYBUS: I'm not - Richard is a person who can speak to the nature of the public service. What I can say is that, it's basically ingrained in the social fabric of Tasmania a kind of hierarchical deference and a culture of silence that's self-protective and also driven by shame, and so, there's all kinds of reasons why you're not going
to call out something that might be getting you into trouble or bringing you into kind of problematic relationships with elites that have traditionally been, you know, the person to whom you might have been required to doff your hat.

And that, if you take the lower socio-economic group that Richard was talking about who have been here all along, you know, who have been here for generations, they've got historical memory of keeping shtum, they've got historical memory of this kind of abuse; they've got historical memories of being brutalised and spat upon and looked down on and talked about in terms of their inherent stain, their inherent stain on the value of the State, right.

MS BENNETT: Could I ask - sorry.
PROF PYBUS: People who come through that historical experience are not people who are going to be readily going off to the local police station or writing letters to the minister and saying, you know, "I've got concerns about what happened to my daughter or my son".

MS BENNETT: Let me ask you about that. Can I ask the operator to bring up a document, COM.0004.0001.2023. It's a newspaper article from a couple of years ago, and we've sent you a copy in case you can't see it. I wanted to ask you a question about this line that appears on the following page, and it's in the middle under the photograph and it reads:

> It is a relic of our convict past, this fear of speaking out. It is a straight line from "Don't upset the overseer" to "Don't trouble the Minister".

PROF PYBUS: A straight line.
MS BENNETT: Yes, is that part of what you're saying here?
PROF PYBUS: It is exactly what I'm saying. It is exactly what I'm saying. You know, in the convict past which isn't so long ago, and of course, after the convicts were gone the emancipated class were still a very exploited underclass if they remained in Tasmania, but whilst they were still under the penal system, making a complaint
against the person you were assigned to, or the equivalent of an overseer I suppose, would probably get you re-incarcerated or at least a good solid whipping.

MS BENNETT: Could I ask you, Professor Eccleston, from your political science perspective, how does that comment land with you? "A straight line from, don't upset the overseer to don't upset the Minister".

PROF ECCLESTON: I mean, there are multiple interpretations, because we don't want to discuss history although it's clearly relevant. Again, the other side of that is that, particularly with emancipated convicts, that Tasmania's got an anti-authoritarian streak and a disrespect for authority, but perhaps there is a difference between how you live your lives and also employment and economic relations. So, clearly I think in any small jurisdiction then there are sensitivities around disclosure and about criticising and disrupting perhaps the status quo.

MS BENNETT: You make some comments about accountability and governance and about the relationship between the way that departments and Ministers operate and interact with each other, can you tell the Commissioners a little bit about that?

PROF ECCLESTON: I can, and it is in the witness statement, I don't know how central it is to the Commission, but I guess that's for the Commissioners to decide.

My concerns about the machinery of government, the structural organisation of government and its relationship to the executive and Parliament in Tasmania is really about policy coordination and efficacy, but it is clear that we have developed a relatively complicated agency structure in Tasmania, and particularly the relationship to Ministers and the executive is complicated. Whether that's posing systematic accountability issues around issues that are our concern here, I'm not sure; I don't think there's strong evidence of that.

The other thing I should note is that this was identified in the Watt review and, you know, incremental reforms designed to improve coordination across State Service around complex issues have been proposed, including
heads of agencies taking collective responsibility for outcomes.

COMMISSIONER BENJAMIN: Can you give an example of what you mean by "the complicated agency structure"?

PROF ECCLESTON: So, for example - and I don't have the portfolio structures in front of me, but in a cabinet of eight Ministers I think - there have been a few reshuffles recently - you know, six or seven Ministers relied on the Department of State Growth for part of their portfolios, so there's not that clear relationship between ministerial portfolios and agency structures.

So, heads of agencies, and particularly those with broad portfolios, are grappling - are dealing with six and seven Ministers, whereas in a lot of smaller jurisdictions, and I cite briefly the ACT as an example but noting that's a city state where you've got a very simple and stable sort of six portfolio structure and agencies or directorates as they call them that sit below that.

Having said that and clearly of relevance to this Commission of Inquiry are some of the recent changes in terms of the machinery of government and departmental structures, and that is bringing education and child and youth wellbeing into one aligned portfolio, so in theory that should at the bureaucratic level help facilitate coordination and effective policy.

MS BENNETT: Another part arising from the Watt review in part concerned investigation discipline procedures like ED5, the Employment Direction 5 process which I think you say at 41 of your statement was considered to be overly prescriptive compared to similar arrangements. Can you talk to us about how that might impact upon some of the issues that we've been talking about?

PROF ECCLESTON: That element of my statement is drawn directly from the Watt review, it's not based on my research or expertise, but in terms of this broader pattern about lower turnover rate, longer periods of service, you know, Dr Watt did come to the conclusion that, relative to other jurisdictions, the number of public service employees terminated because of misconduct is proportionally lower in Tasmania, and that that is partly due to the complexity of the process. That doesn't really speak to the issue around
reporting and disclosure, but even where it seems that where there is a prima facie case of misconduct, not many State servants or relatively few State servants are terminated on that basis.

MS BENNETT: I think you say in your statement or reflect Dr Watt's view in your statement that the highly unionised nature of the workforce contributes to that in some way?

PROF ECCLESTON: Yes, although clearly - you know, we're talking about cultural and systemic cultural change, aren't we? And, I'm sure that, in terms of the important work that unions do in protecting and defending employee rights, that they too must be, and I'm sure are willing to be part of the solution in terms of dealing with some of these issues around conduct and criminal abuse.

MS BENNETT: Professor Pybus, I'd like to ask you about how we effect cultural change coming from where we are. Is that something that you feel that you can talk to the Commissioners about?

PROF PYBUS: We11, a little bit. I think this Commission is part of it, we're witnessing it, and Richard in his opening remarks made the point about how rapidly the demographics of Tasmania are changing in the 21st Century.

Now, I really do make a very strong distinction between what I've been talking about in the 19th and 20th Century and our current situation, and I feel very positive about this because I've been observing what happened in Ireland as if this closed, tight society that was based on secrecy and staying silent suddenly kind of burst open and did remarkable things very quickly because, you know, they suddenly had - you know, they always had known what it was that was going on, but there was a sense that joining the European Union, having all of those people from the European Union coming to Ireland just kind of blew the powder keg.

Now, I see the same thing happening here, that there's suddenly this realisation that the world is a different place, and we all feel it in Tasmania, we feel that Tasmania has changed decidedly in the last two decades, and that the amount of people coming here, the younger people coming here, the kind of people staying here and not going or, if they go, they come back again, the demographics are
changing dramatically and with it is coming a breakdown of the kind of traditional cultural relationships that have kept a sort of code of silence and a kind of - yeah, the things that I've been talking about which ...(Zoom connection drops out) ... until the end of the 20th Century as your Commission knows. I think that's very promising but that we do - and I think - or truth-telling to refer to something else that's going on at the moment is terribly important.

You know, we really have to make it clear that what we're dealing with here is not some kind of rare anomaly, this is something that's been going on in Tasmania from the time of its European history and that we have to set in place - we have to recognise that and set in place the processes that are going to make it, you know, shine the sun on it, make it clear that this is, (a) unacceptable and that it does happen and that we have to be prepared for ways of dealing with it, instead of just turning away and pretending it isn't happening or whatever.

Yeah, I mean, I'm very positive about where we're going in Tasmania, I'm thrilled about it, but at the same time I'm very aware on multiple levels of an unexamined dark past which of course relates to the Aboriginal experience, but it also relates to the experience of a lot of Tasmanians who have been here for generations as well.

MS BENNETT: Professor Eccleston, I'11 ask you the same question if you feel able to answer: how do you shift some of the culture or does the demographic changes bring with it inevitable cultural shift?

PROF ECCLESTON: I think the demographic changes are clearly part of it and I think Ireland is an interesting parallel in lots of ways, but I think this process, and Professor Pybus was talking about the really important truth-telling process, it is important in terms of our broader community consciousness and reflection, saying that there really is a problem and it's partly about trying to redress and support victims in the past, but you know, it really is about promoting the awareness.

So, look, I'm not a sociologist or a cultural historian, but $I$ do see it as being an important albeit a challenging part of the process, and look, there's a long history and literature about the importance of
truth-telling in terms of dark parts of the histories of all communities and nations.

MS BENNETT: Are there any other matters you'd specifically like to draw to the Commissioners' attention? I'm about to say, I'm conscious that Professor Eccleston has another commitment shortly and I'm about to conclude my questioning. Are there any other matters that you think the Commissioners need to know beyond what's in your statement?

PROF ECCLESTON: No, I just hope the statement and evidence was valuable and all the best for your ongoing work.

MS BENNETT: Commissioners, those are the matters, but I think Professor Eccleston has a couple of minutes if Commissioners have any questions.

COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: I actually do. I'11 try and be brief. I've sat here and been incredibly interested but also a little bit nervous because I don't want this Commission to be seen to be denigrating Tasmania or Tasmanian culture, and Professor Eccleston, I've noticed how carefully you've answered and been careful to point out the flipside, the positive side, to some of this close and connected culture.

I guess, I wonder if, again theorising and in the hypotheticals, are there things that we don't want to lose, things that this Commission should be careful not to erode in its recommendations, and happy for Professor Pybus to comment on this as well, are there then things that we can be doing to $I$ guess scaffold the negative flipside, the risks, whilst maintaining some of those strengths of Tasmanian culture and connectedness?

PROF ECCLESTON: Look, I think that's a really insightful analysis, and isn't that the challenge, is trying to address destructive and prevent destructive behaviour, support victims, but also retain what is strong about this community. And, you know, I don't like using the language of "disadvantaged communities"; working and spending time in these communities, there are real strengths there, and it's part of what is actually attracting migrants in terms of the lifestyle, the amenity, but also that strength in community. And this is one of our global challenges in the

21st Century living in this sort of digital secular age, you know, what makes us human: it's about the strength of those social connections and the strength of community.

I think your challenge is to make sure that, and the government's challenge in terms of responding to the Commission, is to be very mindful of the context that we're working in in terms of what the best strategy is, and obviously that's something for the Commission and for people with deep expertise around the appropriate legislative and regulatory and policy responses to child sexual abuse.

COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: Thank you. Professor Pybus, did you have any comment on that and whether perhaps truth-telling and enabling truth-telling is part of I guess scaffolding against the risk whilst not breaking down the fabric of connection?

PROF PYBUS: I couldn't have said it better than what Richard said. I probably would add that truth-telling is a very positive thing, it's something that we all need to engage in, all societies need to engage in. Other societies have engaged in it much better than Australians have, we've felt we like to tell ourselves folktales about ourselves instead. It's a very positive thing to examine an aspect of our past that has perhaps caused us to be, not scrutinised - not scrutinise organisations, not scrutinise things as well as we might because we avert our eyes basically.

I'd be the last person to want to denigrate Tasmania, I love Tasmania, and, you know, despite its problematic past, its past is no more problematic than other people's pasts, it's just that this one hasn't really been given a great deal of examination. I mean, it is very interesting that the whole convict issue was completely shut down in Tasmania until the late 20th Century: you know, you couldn't even get into the archives to look at the fantastic information that's in there about a lot of abused children, amongst other things, because, you know, that was the stain.

Now, we need to kind of talk about these things because we need to understand that this is something we have to kind of move beyond, you know, we have to reconcile ourselves to and move beyond into a more open society, a
more open society. And, I think that this can all be couched in very positive terms but I think truth-telling about the past is an important part of the whole business about moving forward and that we all should do it. I mean, that's as an Australian speaking, of course, you know.
"The past is never dead, it's not even past", as the great writer William Faulkner once said. And I think there's been a tendency in Australia generally and very pointedly in Tasmania to say, "Well, that's all in the past; sure, there's no Aborigines, they've all gone, but that was all in the past". But, of course, we now understand from the work that the Aboriginal community has done in Tasmania that that's not the past, that's the present, and we have to engage with it and I think the time has come to engage with some other aspects of our dark past as well and the way in which they may have contributed to the issue that you're engaged to look at.

COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: Thank you, that was really helpful.

COMMISSIONER BENJAMIN: Thank you.
PRESIDENT NEAVE: Thank you so much, this has been an absolutely fascinating session. Thank you both and I think the dialogue and the conversation worked beautifully, so thank you very much indeed and we'11 take a short break now.

## SHORT ADJOURNMENT

MS BENNETT: Commissioners, the next witness is the Auditor-General for the state of Tasmania, I'd ask him to come to be sworn in.
<RODNEY JAMES WHITEHEAD, sworn:
[11.34am]
<EXAMINATION BY MS BENNETT:
MS BENNETT: Q. Mr Whitehead, please tell the Commissioners your full name and professional address? A. Rodney James Whitehead, Leve1 8, 144 Macquarie Street in Hobart.
Q. You've provided some answers to questions to assist the Commission before today; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Have you reviewed those lately?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Are they true and correct?
A. Yes, they are.
Q. Commissioners, I might refer to those a little bit but for the most part they provide helpful background.
Mr Whitehead, you're the Tasmanian Auditor-General; is that right?
A. That is correct.
Q. And your powers are generally set out in the Audit

Act?
A. That's right.
Q. The Auditor-General is associated generally with the audit of the state's finances but it's a role that has some other parts to it, can you tell the Commissioners about that?
A. Yes, I can. So, under the Audit Act I have fairly broad powers to conduct examinations and investigations. Section 23 of the Audit Act sets out what those powers are, and there's a broad range of activities that I can undertake examining aspects of financial statements of State entities; I can undertake performance audits, I can undertake compliance audits, I can look at various activities of the employer's functions and activities, the employer being the Premier of the State of Tasmania as employer for Tasmanian state servants. And again, the wording of the Act is such that the investigations and examinations that I can do are quite broad.
Q. Your powers include examining the compliance of a state entity or subsidiary of a state entity; is that right?
A. Yes, that's right.
Q. Can you tell us what an example is of a subsidiary of state entities might be?
A. So a subsidiary of a state entity would be an entity that is wholly controlled or wholly-owned by another state entity. An example might be where there might be a government business that has companies set up underneath that government business to conduct other activities.
Q. Could you give us an example of one?
A. Look, I think the most common examples are Hydro Tasmania which has roughly 14 or more wholly-owned companies or other joint venture entities which conduct various activities that aren't incorporated into the main government business enterprise of Hydro Tasmania.
Q. So your powers actually include examining compliance of a state entity or a subsidiary entity with written 1 aws or its own internal policies. Can you tell us about what the scope of that involves?
A. Yeah, so it's quite broad because many state entities have to comply with various laws and regulations. In addition to that there might be various regulations or policies that apply across the entire Tasmanian State Service, and in addition to that entities have their own internal policies and procedures that they establish which they require employees within that agency to comply with.
Q. Where are the 1 ines around this? What if an organisation doesn't have a policy around something, would that be something that you could enquire into?
A. That would be something that we would enquire into. For example, if we were doing an audit looking at a particular area across a number of agencies and we felt that a policy should be in place to guide employees in how they might deal with a particular matter; if one agency had an absence of a policy or had a policy that we felt had deficiencies in it, then we would probably highiight that within the course of the audit.
Q. So it's like the policy space, and whether it's inhabited by a policy or not, you're able to review whether or not - or the way that organisation is operating?
A. Correct.
Q. What about compliance with laws, that obviousiy doesn't mean individuals complying with laws, does it? A. No, it's generally the agencies themselves and how they comply with the requirements that are imposed upon them.
Q. Can you give us some examples about the kinds of laws, the way you might examine a state entity's compliance with 1 aws?
A. Yes, one recent audit that we did as an example is we
looked at the recruitment of general managers within local government. The Local Government Act has certain requirements about how that recruitment process should be conducted by councils and we looked at whether or not the councils complied with those requirements.
Q. Are you restricted then to compliance with Tasmanian laws?
A. Broadly we look at compliance with Tasmanian laws, although we might look at what occurs in other jurisdictions within Australia or more broadly to get examples of what exists in other jurisdictions to help guide some of our recommendations that we might wish to make.
Q. For example, when you're thinking about employment practices, would you be thinking about whether or not an organisation is complying with the Fair Work Act or just Tasmania's discrimination act, a random example?
A. Probably a broad range of those matters, yes.
Q. How do you identify potential areas for investigation?
A. Okay. There is a requirement under the Audit Act for me to put an annual plan of work together as a draft which goes to the Parliamentary Standing Committee of Public Accounts. I need to do that each year by 31 March. They then have a couple of months to consider that plan of work and provide me with any comments that they might wish me to consider in finalising that plan of work, and then I need to finalise that plan of work by 30 June each year.

That plan of work under the Act has to set out the audits, examinations and investigations that I intend to undertake for the following 12-month period.
Q. What feeds into how you identify what's going into the plan for the 12 months?
A. Okay. We have a broad range of activities that we undertake to help formulate that particular plan. Part of it's informed by various meetings that I have with secretaries of agencies across state entities, also general managers of councils, Mayors of councils, I also meet with chairs of the boards of the government businesses and state-owned companies as well as the CEOs, so that informs my understanding of what's actually happening across the Tasmanian state entities.


#### Abstract

I also look at what's happening across other jurisdictions in terms of the work that other Auditors-General are looking at and that covers Australasia but also international jurisdictions. I also keep abreast of what's happening within media reports to ascertain whether or not there might be an examination or an investigation that might be warranted to be conducted in regard to matters that might be reported in broader media. Q. So, can media reporting of particular issues in effect arouse your interest enough to think that someone should look at that? A. Yes, they can, yes. And in some cases we also have a mechanism whereby members of the public can raise matters with my office which are then brought to my attention. For example, through the website there's an ability for people to make either anonymous or actually attribute their identity to matters that they want to raise with us and then we'll do an assessment about whether there's something that warrants investigation or examination.


Q. Let me see if I understand, there are basically three streams that flow into this creation of a workstream: we've got briefings by different government departments; they tell you what they're doing and you identify whether any of those things warrant investigation. Is that one of the ways that you --
A. That's correct.
Q. Another is through media and what's reported as matters of public interest and whether that identifies a few things that should be examined?
A. Correct.
Q. And the third is public engagement; people raising issues with you that might identify systemic issues to do with - that could fall within your role; is that right? A. Correct, and I probably wouldn't limit it to three, I think there are broader mechanisms as well and I suppose one of the other streams is that I have a mandate to undertake the financial audit of all state entities and in undertaking those financial audits also gives us an opportunity to have a look at the various activities of state entities, and that's another source of information that might inform our performance audit examination program.
Q. So if in the course of carrying out a financial audit you see - and this is entirely a made up hypothetical I hasten to add - you see significant payments made to a particular consultancy or you see lots of payments being made to settle lawsuits; you might say, "I wonder what's going on there, I'd like to have a further look". Is that right?
A. That's an illustrative example, yes.
Q. And I hasten to add it is only an example. Is it fair to say it's a mix of proactive and reactive operations?
A. Correct.
Q. In terms of your public engagement, I think you mentioned a website, is that right?
A. Yes, the Tasmanian Audit Office website.
Q. Are there proactive community engagement to tell people about the availability of that web website and that portal?
A. I wouldn't say there's public engagement to make them aware of that. We do with various parties that we might make presentations to about the work of the office and make them aware of the fact that there is that mechanism available but it's not something that we broadly advertise to the broader community.
Q. I'd like to come in now to the terms of this Commission. Now, if organisations had or did not have policies and procedures concerning the identification or response to child sexual abuse in Tasmania, that's something that you could examine within the terms of your Act?
A. It is something that I could examine within the terms of my Act.
Q. And, before you were to do that, and just to pause there, that's not something you've ever had cause to undertake?
A. No.
Q. If you were to consider such a review, would you think about whether there were other bodies better placed than you or more appropriately placed than you about to carry out such a review or enquiry?
A. Yes I would consider who is the most appropriate Tasmanian agency to undertake that type of work or
investigation or examination.
Q. Do you have a view about where responsibility for those kinds of reviews or examinations resides in Tasmania? A. Look, I do. Often when I talk to people about the role of the Tasmanian Audit Office and the role of the Auditor-General I often frame it in the context of the broader integrity framework that exists within Tasmania. There are a number of other integrity-type agencies. The role of my office, I tend to frame it in the context that, although our mandate is quite broad in terms of the things that we may examine or investigate, to a large extent people associate the role of my office as being more related to financial-related matters or management-related matters.

We also have the Integrity Commission in Tasmania, that is more concerned about misconduct. So, if someone asks me about a misconduct-related matter I would probably say that probably fits within the domain of the Integrity Commission.

You've also got situations where there might be concerns or complaints about administrative decisions made by Tasmanian Government entities and that potentially falls within the domain of the Ombudsman. There are also other events that might occur which are criminal-related matters which are probably more appropriately dealt with by the Tasmania Police
Q. So there's an ecosystem, if you like, of bodies capable of responding depending on the way the issue is raised and framed, is that a fair summary?
A. That is a fair summary.
Q. Is there any concern, Mr Whitehead, that that could lead to some confusion for people thinking about how they want to have these matters reviewed?
A. I think it can in some circumstances because people aren't necessarily clear about what the mandate or the powers or the functions of each of the particular integrity bodies might be. I think the way that people address that is that in some cases they'11 address their concern or their complaint to all integrity bodies, and in some cases even approach the Tasmania Police with their concerns.
Q. And so, assuming that each of the integrity bodies
receives the same letter, how do you communicate? Do you communicate about who should respond?
A. Look, we have on occasions done that. We do interact and I must say that my agency probably tends to interact more with the Integrity Commission more so than some of the other integrity bodies. We don't tend to interact with the Tasmania Police about some of the investigations that they might be doing, but if in the course of our work we came across something of a criminal nature we would certainly consider reporting that through to the police. But through some of the referrals that we have received in our office we have reached out to the other integrity bodies to ask the question whether they've received something similar, and on occasions we have all met to collectively discuss how we might respond to that.
Q. So, that's an ad hoc response but not a necessary response; is that fair?
A. Correct.
Q. I mean no criticism of you, Mr Whitehead, but is it possible that things could fall through the cracks when it's left to an ad hoc approach in that way?
A. I'm not sure that I'd say that things would fall through the cracks because I think for example in my case I've got discretion about what things I may investigate or not investigate. So, again, people might perceive that the fact that I don't investigate something is something falling through the cracks, but again, it just comes down to the fact that we have so much resources to do the work that we need to do.
Q. Let's talk about that. How much capacity does your office have to carry out investigations beyond your statutory obligations to audit the finances of the State? A. Sorry, if you reframe the question because I'm not quite sure whether you're talking about the scope of the work that we can do or the resources we have available to us.
Q. You're obliged to carry out an audit of the finances of the State of Tasmania as part of your work?
A. So the mandatory function that I have is to audit the financial statements of Tasmanian State entities and also the annual report of the Treasurer.
Q. So that's a set part of your work program each year
and takes a significant part of the resources allocated to your office, is that fair?
A. Yes, that is correct. And that work is funded by the agencies themselves that we audit so we actually charge them for the financial statement audits that we undertake.
Q. They have no option about whether that happens?
A. That happens, correct.
Q. So there's that category of work, and then what we've been talking about, the investigations into policies and procedures, are a separate bucket of work; is that right? A. That's right, a separate stream of work for which we are funded to undertake through an appropriation from the Parliament.
Q. What I'm trying to understand is, that's a finite amount of funding?
A. Yes.
Q. And you have a finite amount of resources?
A. Yes, so for the current financial year the funding was $\$ 2.17 \mathrm{~m}$, and that amount has to cover both the direct employees that are involved in performing those examinations and investigations and undertaking performance and compliance audits, but it also covers a proportion of the overhead of the office including administrative and support staff.
Q. And so, does that cause a limit on the extent to which your office can carry out investigations of this kind? A. Correct, yes.
Q. Can you tell us a little bit about how many full-time equivalent staff you have available to you?
A. Within the office as a whole, full-time equivalent staff is approximately 45 people. In terms of total head count there's slightly more because we have some people working on a part-time basis. Within that performance audit area we have approximately 10 or so people, and that equates to our ability to undertake around six or seven performance audits or compliance audits each year.
Q. Has it ever happened that there's an issue that you felt needed investigated but you've lacked the resources to do it?
A. Probably two parts to that question: one is the need
to do something, and I do have discretion to actually undertaking something if I feel there's a compulsion to actually undertake that investigation or examination. In terms of the resources, the Act does give me the ability to actually engage people outside of employees, so I can engage other experts, other audit service providers to undertake particular work.
Q. And would that be separately funded again or is that --
A. No, that would be within that appropriation amount.
Q. Is there a limit on the extent to which you can carry out your functions by reference to your funding?
A. There is a limit, but at the same time if there was something that I felt compelled to undertake it would be at the expense of another planned piece of work which would need to be deferred.
Q. I was going to ask, how solid is the plan? How much flexibility can there be in the plan if something arises in the year that you think needs to be responded to quickly? A. Look, there is the flexibility in the plan. Again, it's broadly at my discretion whether I modify the plan. In such circumstances I would normally engage with the chair of the Public Accounts Committee to have the discussion with them to inform them that I'm intending to modify the plan to undertake a particular piece of work.
Q. You're an independent statutory officer; is that right?
A. That is correct.
Q. Your reports are tabled in Parliament, is that fair?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. And you're ultimately accountable to Parliament?
A. Yes. Yes.

PRESIDENT NEAVE: Can I just ask a question there?
MS BENNETT: Yes.
PRESIDENT NEAVE: Going back to your process of putting your plan to the Parliamentary Committee; can a Parliamentary Committee say to you, "We don't think you should look at this area or we should elevate one
particular issue above another issue?" How does that work, how does that relationship work, or is it via pleasant conversation?
A. Yes, that's a very good question and in fact that does happen from time to time. A recent example was just when the COVID outbreak first arose back in January 2020. We'd just been preparing our annual plan of work and when I tabled the draft of that to the Public Accounts Committee for their review and comment it didn't have any COVID-related audits or examinations on that. By the time I received the response back from the Public Accounts Committee they suggested that I consider doing a program of work or some activity looking at the Tasmania government's response to COVID-19. Now, I took that request on board and I decided to actually include a series of COVID-related examinations and audits looking at various aspects of the Tasmania Government's response to COVID-19.
Q. You used the word "suggested"?
A. Correct.
Q. That is, the committee suggested. Let us assume that you had a situation where you did not agree with the suggestion; I assume that as an independent statutory officer you could nevertheless go ahead and do it. Is that right or not?
A. That is correct. Again, under the Act no-one can direct me in regards to the audit work that I undertake, although I have a very strong relationship with the Tasmania Public Accounts Committee.
Q. Yes, of course.
A. There's a specific provision within the Audit Act that says that I can undertake requests at the suggestion of the Treasurer from the Public Accounts Committee, from the Integrity Commission, from the Ombudsman, and I can also do audits in conjunction with other Auditors-General across Australia. So, there are these other avenues for me to actually get suggestions to undertake potential audits or examinations, but at the end of the day it's my discretion as to whether I undertake those.
Q. Subject, of course, to your funding and does that Parliamentary Committee - what power does it have to alter your funding? Let's assume you went feral and decided that you would investigate something that the Parliamentary Committee didn't agree with, how would that affect your
funding?
A. Yes, that's another very good question. I'm not sure that the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee would be inclined to take funding away from us, I think it's probably more the opposite, they're more inclined to assist us in securing more funding. The funding appropriation is really determined by the Cabinet Budget Committee, and we have been having discussions with the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee about how they might support my office in securing additional funding to undertake additional work.

PRESIDENT NEAVE: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER BENJAMIN: Q. Sorry, I'11 lean forward and speak up, I've been told, and rightly so. I think you said you had an appropriation of about $\$ 2.7 \mathrm{~m}$; is that right?
A. $\quad \$ 2.17 \mathrm{~m}$.
Q. You've got a staff of about 45?
A. Correct.
Q. That's a pretty tight budget --
A. The 45 , that includes the financial audit staff, so they are funded by us invoicing the entities.
Q. That was the question I was going to ask because I think you said earlier that each institution will pay you a fee or pay the Auditor-General a fee for undertaking the audit, so your $\$ 2.17$ is bolstered to a degree by income the Auditor-General will get from undertaking its statutory functions?
A. And that's around about $\$ 5.5 \mathrm{~m}$.
Q. So, your overall budget of your office is about eight or something like that or?
A. There's also a third element of funding as well which is reserved by law appropriation which covers my salary cost, travel cost on top of that.

COMMISSIONER BENJAMIN: Thank you.
MS BENNETT: Q. I'd like to continue with the theme of independence which I think is what the Commissioners are driving at. Can you tell us, are there any parts of your role that you find are difficult in terms of your independence?
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A. Look, at times it can be. I think in terms of making the decisions around which audits I undertake, look, there is a lot of thought and consideration that goes into that because we are again spending the public's money in terms of the work that we undertake. I'm very conscious that both the Parliament and members of the community have certain expectations around the types of activities of government that we should scrutinise or examine, so I'm very conscious of making sure that the work that we do actually does hold the government to account, does also look at examining activities of various state entities all with the objective of actually improving the operations and activities of the Tasmanian State Service and other state entities.
Q. Have you ever received, for example - has a minister ever called you and said, "I don't want you to investigate this"?
A. I've never had a call from a minister, I've had some robust discussions with heads of agencies about particular audits that we're looking to undertake. I've also had discussions with representatives from local government about some of the audits that we propose to undertake.
Q. How do you see those as walking the line between respecting your independence and informing you about your function?
A. Look, I think it comes down to the relationship that we have with the parties that we're working with to undertake those audit activities. Look, if there are legitimate reasons as to why I should defer the commencement of an audit, then I certainly take those circumstances into account in determining the timing of when we might commence an audit. If there are reasons that someone put forward as to why we should not undertake an audit that I had originally planned to undertake, I would again assess the merits of those arguments before making a decision whether I continue to undertake that audit or not.
Q. Do you ever feel anyone's tried to inappropriately pressure your office?
A. I wouldn't say "inappropriately pressure". Again, we've had some robust discussions about some of the work we've undertaken and I think an example would be the decision to undertake a series of COVID-related examinations and investigations at a time when the government was heavily involved in responding and
recovering from the impacts of COVID-19. That did cause some concern amongst some of the leaders within government about whether we would be a disruption to some of those response and recovery activities.
Q. I'm interested in developing the elements of your independence. From your point of view what are the key elements of your independence? Can I suggest so far you've got a set budget and you've got the protection of your Act? A. Correct.
Q. And you've got a direct line to the Parliament. Are there other matters that you see as critical to your independence?
A. Look, I think it's enshrined that no-one can actually direct me in terms of what audits we may undertake or in regard to the conduct of an audit. So, again, every decision that we make in respect of an audit comes down to my discretion.
Q. Where do you get your legal advice from?
A. The Office of the Solicitor-General.
Q. Are you required to get your legal advice from the Office of the Solicitor-General?
A. Technically the way that the office is structured we are a government department, so I think in the first point of call for us in terms of seeking legal advice would be to go to the Office of the Solicitor-General, much as other government departments and other certain State entities do do. So, yes, that would - my answer to the question would be, yes, I feel that I should go to the Office of the Solicitor-General in the first instance.
Q. Now, the Office of the Solicitor-General of course is the main legal advisor to the State of Tasmania. If you had a concern that you couldn't get independent advice because of that role, what would you do?
A. Look, it's a discussion I'd probably need to have with that office as to whether there's the ability for me to go and seek external legal advice.
Q. And, has that ever come up?
A. Not during my tenure as Auditor-General.
Q. I just want to go back a little bit to the funding from the cabinet budget committee just to clarify one
point. Does that mean that your funding is in the hands of the government of the day?
A. Correct.
Q. Is there a risk that, if you displease the government of the day, you might find that reflected in your future budgetary allocation?
A. That is certainly a risk.
Q. That's a risk to the independence of your office, isn't it?
A. Some - yes, it would be a risk to independence.
Q. And that requires that - that's not fatal to your independence plainly, it's just a factor that you take into account; is that fair?
A. That's correct. It really is a question of the breadth of work that we can undertake; it doesn't impact on the type of work that we undertake.
Q. I'd like to talk about some of the work that you've undertaken to date, if we can understand some of your insights based on your role into the approach of the Tasmanian State Service, for example, but I'd like to start at a high level and just to understand, have you heard concerns around reprisals for people who might speak up to integrity bodies? Has that been something that's been said to you at any stage, people are concerned to speak up to you because they're worried about the effect on their career or similar?
A. No, I've never heard any direct suggestions along those lines.
Q. You've undertaken some investigations into - I'm going to go to a couple of them: in 2018 you did a report into rostering specialists in major hospitals; is that right? A. Correct.
Q. Now, that was tabled in Parliament; that was mainly concerned with rostering of specialists rather than nurse level staff; is that right?
A. That is correct.
Q. I want to ask you about some of your findings there. You found suggestions around the concentration of power in leadership roles. Can you tell the Commissioners what you found around that?
A. Yes, what we found, when we undertook that particular audit it was in response to a matter that had been referred to us from a party that was - made particular allegations about the way in which rostering occurred of specialists within a particular government department. We decided to have a look at the matter, but rather than focus on an individual department we selected a number of departments to have a look at across the major hospitals in Tasmania to understand how medical specialists were rostered to work within those departments.

What came out of that particular audit was the way in which heads of departments were actually appointed and the sorts of training and support that those heads of departments receive in undertaking those managerial responsibilities.

So, the observation that we found is that there was they didn't necessarily always go through a proper recruitment process to become a heads of department. In some cases it was a question of who expressed interest in taking on that particular role, and what we also found was because they were also specialists themselves there was often a conflict between their role as a specialist and their administrative and managerial responsibilities that they were taking on as the head of that particular department. In some cases there wasn't necessarily specific training provided by the hospitals to support those heads of departments in taking on those additional responsibilities. And in fact some of the personal development that those specialists undertook tend to be more related to their specialisation, medical specialisation, as opposed to being necessarily directed towards managerial-type training.
Q. To paraphrase that report, I think you said that a significant portion of the managers didn't believe that under-performance by staff was effectively understood or managed in the Tasmanian State Service. Can you tell the Commissioners what led to that observation, was that an accurate observation?
A. Yes, that is an accurate observation, so this relates to another piece of work that we did that looked at the management of under-performance within the Tasmanian State Service. What was reported was that both managers and staff within the Tasmanian State Service, a high proportion of them, felt that there wasn't a common understanding
around what under-performance looked like, nor a common understanding as to how that was actually - or whether it was effectively managed across the Tasmanian State Service for the agencies that we looked at within the scope of that audit.
Q. And that was a review that took place before the Watts review?
A. Correct.
Q. That review also I think identified a low level of trust in management and a culture where under-performance might be considered too difficult. Can you tell the Commissioners about that?
A. Yes. Part of the finding there related to the way in which managers were supported to actually deal with under-performance. I think during the course of the audit we did hear about one situation where one manager had up to 16 direct reports, so when you've got that type of ratio between a manager and the people that they're responsible for, it probably does call into question their ability to actually manage the performance of all those individuals as well as their other duties and responsibilities that they may have. But what became evident through the course of the audit was there was some concerns expressed by managers in particular about the level of support and training that they had received to actually properly manage employees that they were responsible for. And also particularly employees where under-performance was a particular issue.
Q. That could undermine, could it not, the faith that employees have in the consistency of a response to the issues that they raise; is that a fair --
A. That's correct, because the way in which under-performance is managed fundamentally comes down to the capability capacity and experience of the individual manager in terms of managing under-performance.
Q. Is there any reason to think under-performance would be radically different to discipline or misconduct?
A. I think you can draw an analogy between the way in which under-performance might be managed and the way in which other more difficult human relations matters might be managed within agencies.
Q. Can the Commissioners take it that that raises a concern that it has some relevance for the variability in
response to, for example, boundary violations or disciplinary breaches which could be precursors to inappropriate contact with children? I don't expect you to comment about the contact with children point, but what I'm trying to get at is whether or not there's an analogy to be drawn between the variability of management response in under-performance and whether or not it responds in a similar way to breaches of codes of conduct?
A. Yes, I think you could draw that association. I think in the context of some managers or even staff being unaware about how under-performance is managed could be equally the situation where you're dealing with cases of misconduct.
Q. Your office also completed a report concerning special care packages for Out-of-Home Care; is that right?
A. Yes, we did.
Q. That was about 2018?
A. That is correct.
Q. You talk about an alarming situation for young people in Out-of-Home Care. Can you tell us what you mean by that?
A. Look, that particular audit arose from a Four Corners programme that was aired called "Broken Homes". It actually focused on a provider of Out-of-Home Care services to children here in Tasmania. We received a request from the Public Accounts Committee to actually have a look at the allegations raised within that programme, and in deciding to undertake that examination we met with the then Department of Health and Human Services to understand the circumstances around the particular provider referred to within that program, but more broadly looking at how children in Out-of-Home Care, particularly those on specialised care packages were actually being managed and monitored by the department.
Q. Broadly speaking, can you tell us about what you found?
A. Look, what we found is that the department at that particular point in time had already undertaken its own examination into how children in Out-of-Home Care, and particularly those on special care packages were being provided for or managed. They had instigated some of their own reforms in response to some of the matters that they found from their own internal investigation. On top of that there was a broader strategy being revised in respect
of how Child Safety Services was being managed, and our overall conclusion coming out of that particular audit was that we felt that the department was adequately responding to the allegations that were referred to within the Four Corners programme, but we felt that the department needed more time to actually implement the other reforms it was looking to undertake before we'd do a broader investigation into how those children were being managed in that Out-of-Home Care environment.
Q. And then it's a matter for the department to implement after your audit, is that right, recommendations arising? A. Correct.
Q. Do you have any insight into how consistently your recommendations get implemented?
A. We do because a lot of our recommendations arising from our reports are either monitored by the agencies themselves internally, they often report through to committees, for example audit and risk committees, about the status of implementations and recommendations that we might raise within both our financial audit work and our performance audit work. In addition to that the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee also follows up recommendations that are made within our reports and they actually seek information from the agencies to confirm that they're actually implementing our recommendations, and in addition to that we undertake our own follow-up reviews for agencies to assess whether or not they're actually implementing our recommendations.
Q. That was going to be my question. So, do you have the power to step in and ask about the progress of implementations?
A. Yes, we do.
Q. Is that effectively a new review? Are you then looking into whether or not the agency is complying with the policies and procedures insofar as they comply with the recommendations they've undertaken to implement?
A. Yes. Yes, we do.
Q. Is that your common practice, to carry out reviews of that kind?
A. It is, although there are again budgetary constraints as to which ones we will follow up. I think in an ideal world we will follow up either between ourselves or the

Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee, we will follow up all the recommendations coming out of all of our, particularly performance audit reports, but in reality they select which ones they wish to follow up; we'll select some that we wish to follow up and inevitably there are some audits where simply because of resources we don't have the ability to follow up the recommendations.
Q. Just to be clear, no department is required to accept your recommendations; is that right?
A. That is correct.
Q. So, if they elect to adopt them, how do they tell you that?
A. Normally we have discussions with them in terms of framing our recommendations to understand that there is a degree of agreement around the recommendation. I think for us to make recommendations that an agency has no intent to implement would not actually derive any benefit, so throughout the audit process there is a degree of discussion about the recommendations, and I suppose it's beneficial for us to understand that the recommendations are implementable.
Q. So, before you finalise recommendations is it your practice to provide draft or tentative views about --
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And you receive response from a department?
A. We do, we go through an informal response process where we might get or seek comment on the findings of an audit and examination, and that happens at the completion of our fieldwork. We will then draft a report and also go through a process to seek their comment on the findings at that particular stage, and once our report's finalised we then send it to the agencies involved in the audit but also the Ministers for a formal response on the report.
Q. Do you find agencies are open to criticism?
A. I'm not quite sure that you'd always call it criticism, but opportunities for improvement might be another way of framing it as well. But look, certainly some agencies are very accepting of the fact that they can do things better in certain circumstances; on other occasions there are discussions around what we might be saying and in some cases it might be a misinterpretation of information that we might have received and there's often a
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discussion around that, but broadly most agencies accept the fact that there are sometimes room for improvement or if they had their time again they might have done things differently. The nature of our work is that we've always got the benefit of hindsight in terms of examining the performance and activities of state entities.
Q. In that informal response process, is that confidential, that informal exchange of potential recommendations, is that a confidential --
A. We say it is because we don't want that information being leaked to the media or leaked to anyone prior to us tabling a report in Parliament on that subject matter.
Q. And that's because you might have recommendations in mind to which there is a barrier that you're not aware of at the time? Or why does that need to be confidential, let me put it that way?
A. Look, I think it's more to protect us in terms of Parliamentary privilege which applies once we've tabled our report within Parliament.
Q. So the statutory protections for your office attach to the final report; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. You've got a general, if I remember your Act, you've got a general immunity in your Act for your role and those carrying out functions connected with their role in your office; is that right?
A. Yes, that is correct.
Q. And that doesn't depend upon the tabling of the report?
A. No. But there are certain other provision within the Act that relate to confidentiality, so we need to be mindful of those as well.
Q. What are the restrictions on you sharing information obtained in the course of your investigations before you've tabled to Parliament?
A. There are certain provisions and I haven't got the exact provisions directly in front of me, I think it's section 46 of the Audit Act I think from memory, but essentially information gathered by employees of the Tasmanian Audit Office or other audit providers that we've engaged to assist in undertaking an audit, they have to
respect the confidentiality of that particular material and only use it in connection with the performance of the audit. There are provisions within that confidentiality clause that do give me the ability to share information where I determine it's in the public interest to do so.
Q. I wanted to ask you about information sharing. So, if you're finding something in the course of your audits which is systems focused; is that a fair summary, it's a systems focused audit?
A. Yes, but not always systems focused audits, yes.
Q. If you find something that you feel needs to go police, how does that work?
A. Look, if I found something that related to a criminal matter then I certainly would go to the police and raise it with them, and an example would be in the conduct of a financial audit, if we found instances of where a fraud might have been committed then certainly we would refer that matter to the Tasmanian Police.
Q. And that's not something you need a memorandum of understanding about, it's simply part of your role?
A. Correct.
Q. Would the same be true of your communications with other integrity bodies?
A. Look, yes, if we found something relating to serious misconduct for example, that would be something we would raise with the Integrity Commission and they would make then an assessment whether that's something that they would investigate.
Q. What about in the context of the Department of Education, or would you share information with the Teachers Registration Board?
A. Probably haven't been any circumstances where we've needed to do that in the context of the audits that we've undertaken.
Q. Are there any barriers to you doing that?
A. Look, again, there is that provision within the clause that if I felt it was appropriate to make information available to someone, then I've got that ability to do that.
Q. A number of broad discretions in that Act?
A. Yes, correct.
Q. The same would then go for other regulators that you felt were appropriate to receive that information?
A. Correct.
Q. That would include the Working With Vulnerable People Check units?
A. It would be. If we were doing an audit that involved children, for example, and we had concerns about the safety of children, then there would be that ability to refer something through to the advice Advice \& Referral Line, for example.
Q. I'm interested that you mentioned the Advice \& Referral Line. Now, that's an area that you're undertaking an audit about presently; is that right? A. That is correct.
Q. Commissioners, we won't interfere with the Auditor-General's work in that respect, I just note it. Mr Whitehead, we'd like to extend the invitation to discuss with us your findings when you've completed that audit. Is that something you'd be open to?
A. Yes, I'd be very happy to do that.
Q. Thank you. I wanted to ask you about, go back to your hospitals report from 2018/19 and that's the performance of Tasmania's four major hospitals in the delivery of emergency department services; I want to take a moment to read an extract from that report. Now, it's an extract of an extract.

So, in that report you extracted some words from a 2014 report by The Commission on Delivery of Health Services in Tasmania and it says, and it's quoted here:
"The influence of local political interests on health system decisions has been a consistent source of frustration. Reforms, particularly with regard to overarching issues of governance, cannot be enacted where opportunistic political interference can intrude into the reform process.

Healthcare is a political issue but political concerns must not interfere with
the implementation of reforms once those reforms have been accepted at a government 7eve7.

There can be no effective governance and therefore no genuine and sustainable reform if clinicians or administrators believe that they can circumvent or redirect reform by making use of political connections and short-term political tactics. Such tactics are a product of a culture in which too many decisions are made on the basis of what is politically convenient and one where self-interest is placed before the interests of patients".

Now, does that reflect, to the extent that your work has covered areas that intersect with those observations, can you tell the Commissioners your reflections on them? A. Look, that particular extract there was in reference to a review that had been undertaken in respect of the Tasmanian Health Service. I think we raised or included that excerpt within the report in the context of the way in which the Tasmanian Health Services had implemented recommendations arising from previous reports, but also it touches on the culture within the Tasmanian Health Service in terms of its ability to effectively implement recommendations and reform more broadly within the hospital system.
Q. Is that something that's come up for you in your work? A. It certainly did in the context of that particular audit because it was evident to us that there had been a number of reviews, specifically - and the scope of that audit was looking at emergency departments within the Tasmanian major hospitals - there'd been a number of previous reviews raising a number of recommendations for implementation and it was evident to us that a lot of those recommendations had not been implemented.
Q. Do you agree with the proposition that political interference is going to be harmful to the development of a positive culture of compliance and integrity?
A. Look, the extract there did make reference to "political interference", I don't think our report actually makes a statement along those lines, but obviously the Minister does have responsibility for decisions relating to
the health service. Again, we make no comment within that particular report about decisions made by the Minister --
Q. Sorry I've misspoke, I meant to your office, to your role; it requires independence to carry out properly, doesn't it?
A. Yes, it does, yes.
Q. And as I understand your evidence, you consider you have that independence?
A. Yes, I certain1y do, yes.

MS BENNETT: Thank you. Commissioners, those are the matters that I wanted to cover with the Auditor-General today.

PRESIDENT NEAVE: Thank you, Ms Bennett.
COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: Q. Mr Whitehead, thank you for your evidence today. I just wanted to bring you back to the report you did on the special care packages in Out-of-Home Care. This Commission this week has heard evidence from Professor Donald Palmer about total institutions; other witnesses have also told us about total or closed institutions.

I note that that evidence that we heard wasn't new evidence, it was also heard by the National Royal Commission which was drawing to its end of five years in 2017 when you were looking at the special care packages.

I just was wondering, when you were looking at the policies around Out-of-Home Care oversight, whether there was consideration about the additional risks of closed institutions and what monitoring might be required? A. Okay. Perhaps for my clarification, the definition of "closed institutions"?
Q. A closed institution refers to an intuition where it is closed to public scrutiny, so there's limited community incidental engagement with that institution; in the past those institutions were often isolated geographically or physically in terms of walls, or by policy. So, for example, Youth Detention centres where you have to have special permission to access the site, people can't just walk into the site; those are kind of some of the key features, there's some cultural features as well in terms
of the relationship between the people running the institution and the people in it, for example, carers and children, that they are in some way going to be changing or transforming those residents of the institution.
A. Okay. I think in the context of our audit that we looked at or examination at that particular point of time the Out-of-Home Care special care packages were being administered by non-government organisations, so there's probably questions there about the level of scrutiny that applies and even questions about my ability to actually scrutinise those types of entities who are delivering services on behalf of the government.

Now, my interpretation is that my Act does give me that ability to actually scrutinise entities that are delivering performing services on behalf of the government, so we do have the ability to actually look at the activities of those particular organisations.

But the question also comes down to the - any that's engaging those types of organisations, the way in which they engage them, the way in which they monitor the performance of those particular entities and the nature of the relationship in terms of how they've engaged them.

I think in the community services space there was a view in some cases where grants were provided that, as long as they met the conditions of the grant agreement or the acquittal arrangements then that was sufficient, as opposed to a contract for service where there's perhaps more intensive monitoring of what that organisation is doing on behalf of the government department or agency.

COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: Thank you.
PRESIDENT NEAVE: Sorry, can I just clarify that? So, in the context of grant - do you take the view that your role enables you to look at provision of grants to a non-government organisation to provide a service as opposed to a contractual relationship?
A. Probably both. So, we believe that we've got the ability to look at how public money and public property is being used not only by state entities but entities that have been provided with public money and property to provide services on behalf of the government.
Q. So that might include, for example, scrutinising the
terms of a contract entered into between a government department and a provider of services?
A. It certainly would include that type of arrangement, yes.
Q. And if it's a grant then your view is that your Act doesn't allow you --
A. No, we can look at the grant but I'm talking about the actual activities of the third party entity itself.

PRESIDENT NEAVE: Thank you, I understand, thank you. Thank you very much, that was very helpful.

MS BENNETT: If this witness could be excused, the next witness will be taken by Ms Darcey and I'11 accede the lectern to her. Thank you.

PRESIDENT NEAVE: Thank you, Ms Darcey.
MS DARCEY: Yes, our next session today is a panel of two members from the Tasmanian Council of Social Services Inc, or TasCOSS for short, and I believe the witnesses are Dr Charlie Burton and Ms Adrienne Picone are in the witness room, if they can be called, thank you. Both witnesses will take an affirmation.
<ADRIENNE ELIZABETH PICONE, affirmed:
[12.27pm]
<CHARLIE ARTHUR BURTON, affirmed and examined:
<EXAMINATION BY MS DARCEY:
MS DARCEY: Q. Thank you very much. If I could start with you, Ms Picone, could you tell the Commissioners please your full name.

MS PICONE: Yep, my name's Adrienne Elizabeth Picone.
MS DARCEY: And your current occupation.
MS PICONE: I'm currently employed as the CEO of the Tasmanian Council of Social Service, TasCOSS.

MS DARCEY: Is it the case that you provided a statement dated 12 April 2022 for the assistance of the Commission?

MS PICONE: That's correct.

MS DARCEY: That can be found at tab 15 of your hearing bundle, index C, Part 2. Do you have a copy of that statement in front of you?

MS PICONE: I do, yes.
MS DARCEY: Are you satisfied that the contents of that document is true and correct?

MS PICONE: Yes, I am.
MS DARCEY: In that statement at paragraphs 5 to 7 you outline your qualifications and professional background. Would you please provide us with some detail?

MS PICONE: Sure. Yes, I trained as an early childhood teacher and, from that, I became involved and worked in a number of early intervention programs, so working with families and young children, and then from there moved to Volunteering Tasmania where I was the State Services Manager and then later the CEO, so I was with that organisation about nine years. And then, from that, I moved to Canberra as the CEO of Volunteering Australia for three and a half years and then moved back to Hobart in the beginning of 2020 to take up the position of CEO of TasCOSS.

MS DARCEY: Thank you. Dr Burton, would you please tell the Commissioners your full name?

DR BURTON: Charlie Arthur Burton.
MS DARCEY: Thank you. And your current occupation?
DR BURTON: I'm the policy manager at TasCOSS.
MS DARCEY: Dr Burton, you've made a statement also dated
12 April 2022 to assist the work of the Commission, is that correct?

DR BURTON: Yes.
MS DARCEY: You have a copy of that statement with you?
DR BURTON: I do.

MS DARCEY: I understand that there are two small amendments to be made to the statement at paragraphs, firstly, 21, if we could deal with that first.

So, paragraph 21, at the top of page 5, after the words "and evaluate" could we insert a further sentence which says:
... up until the Tasmanian Government's
Fourth Annual Progress Report insufficient details were provided to assess the
Government's responses against the National
Royal Commission recommendations.
And the balance of that paragraph can be deleted.
PRESIDENT NEAVE: I'm sorry, what was deleted, Ms Darcey?
MS DARCEY: So, after the word "and evaluate" as the paragraph currently reads, everything after that point can be deleted.

PRESIDENT NEAVE: Thank you.
MS DARCEY: This statement was created prior to the fourth annual report and action plan becoming available.

PRESIDENT NEAVE: Thank you.
MS DARCEY: A related amendment also to paragraph 23.
That paragraph currently reads:
In TasCOSS's submission to this Commission we recommended that the government's reporting on progress on the National Royal Commission's recommendation ...

And after that point we can delete sub-paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) and insert the words:
... continue with the level of detail
provided in the fourth progress report.
Again, simply reflecting the content of the most recent government report.

With those amendments made, are you satisfied,

Dr Burton, that the contents of your statement is true and correct?

DR BURTON: I am.
MS DARCEY: Thank you. Dr Burton, as part of your statement you attach as Exhibit 2 a copy of your curriculum vitae which, Commissioners, is found at Part 2.2 of your hearing bundle. Are you able, please, just to briefly outline to the Commission your qualifications and background?

DR BURTON: Yes. I have been at TasCOSS for almost five years now, initially starting as a policy officer and for the last four years in the role of manager of policy. Prior to that, going way back, a degree, undergraduate degree in politics and a PhD in politics and international relations, and since that time over the last 20 years or so I've been employed in research and policy roles mainly, including in the research service in Canberra on social policy work and other roles in Sydney and Tasmania.

MS DARCEY: Thank you. Ms Picone, in your statement you adopt the content of relevant paragraphs of Dr Burton's statement; is that correct?

MS PICONE: That's correct, yes.
MS DARCEY: Ms Picone, in Dr Burton's statement he provides some background with respect to TasCOSS; would you be able to expand on that, please, for the Commission?

MS PICONE: Yes. TasCOSS is a not-for-profit organisation, it was established in 1961. Our role is to change and challenge the systems and attitudes that create poverty, disadvantage and exclusion, and we work in sort of two key ways: the first one is that we represent community service organisations, but we also work very much with individuals and represent the needs and the issues that pertain to poverty, disadvantage and exclusion.

So, we don't do direct service delivery within the community services industry but what we do do is policy development, advocacy, we work with the media to raise the issues around poverty and some of the solutions. We also do community services development, so we work a lot with
the community services industry, developing resources, we provide workshops and webinars to actually increase the skills and the resources within the industry.

We are very much a member-based organisation, so we have 241 members across Tasmania; of that, 73 are individuals with particular interests in social justice, and 168 are organisational members, and those members cut across, right across the community services industry, so within disability, aged care, family support, housing and homelessness, mental health et cetera, and of course we have a number of members who work in the family violence and child abuse space.

MS DARCEY: Thank you. So, would it be true to say that your members are in the business of providing a whole range of services to children and young people and, as such, they have a significant interest in the recommendations of the National Royal Commission that were made back in December 2017 and also the Tasmanian State Government's response to those recommendations?

MS PICONE: Yes, that would be true to say.
MS DARCEY: Thank you. Can you please tell us a little bit about the Tasmanian context in which TasCOSS operates and the National Royal Commission recommendations that are to be considered within?

MS PICONE: Yes, I think we didn't high1ight this as much in our submission, but we really would like to focus a little bit on the context that we find ourselves here in Tasmania. We really have got entrenched intergenerational poverty here in Tasmania and we really, in terms of risk factors we don't - we have some very low factors in that area, so we're talking about social economic disadvantage, housing stress, neighbourhood disadvantage, physical and mental health issues and poverty for example.

So we thought we'd give you a bit of an idea about some of the issues that Tasmanians are facing, particularly those who are really experiencing disadvantage and poverty. So, in Tasmania the number of Tasmanians that are living in poverty, it's estimated to be around 66,500 Tasmanians that are estimated to be living in poverty. The number of Tasmanians living on an inadequate income, so that's around 117,000 Tasmanians, so we have a significant number of

Tasmanians that are really struggling.
Our unemployment rate - or as we know nationally our unemployment rate is sitting at around 4 per cent but here in Tasmania we have higher levels of unemployment than the rest of the country, so it's around 4.5 per cent. Also our incomes are the lowest in the country as well and that's traditionally been the case. That has been, you know, offset historically here in Tasmania because we've actually also had low cost of living and low house prices, but as I'm sure the Commissioners are aware, our house prices have risen exponentially over the last sort of two or three years to the point where it's really pricing many Tasmanians out of the market, so people are really struggling just to put a roof over their heads.

The rental affordability index, and that's something that we often don't talk as much about is rental, but again, it is very difficult for people to find a rental property, and so what the recent rental affordability index found was that, of the 714 properties listed for rent statewide in Tasmania in March, only two were affordable for a single person on JobSeeker and only four were affordable for a family with both parents on JobSeeker, so it's really extreme. We also have about four and a half thousand Tasmanians on the social housing waiting list and they're waiting in excess of a year just to get a home, and what that of course means is that people then get forced to live in untenable situations, big families get squeezed into a two bedroom home, they live in tents or live in cars just to be able to put something over their heads.

So, I guess it's really important for us to understand the levels of disadvantage that we're experiencing, of course that's offset by a number of opportunities that we have here in Tasmania as well, but we also do have a lot of challenges and I think that really does compound in terms of some of the risk factors.

COMMISSIONER BENJAMIN: Q. So, just so it's clear to me, you're saying about 66,500 Tasmanians live in poverty?

MS PICONE: Yes.
Q. About 117,000 live in strained financial circumstances, and that represents about 45 per cent of the population; is that about right?

MS PICONE: That's correct, yes. Yes.
COMMISSIONER BENJAMIN: Thank you.
MS DARCEY: Yes, thank you. Dr Burton, as part of your statement you attach as a first exhibit a copy of submissions made to this inquiry by TasCOSS in July 2021; is that correct?

DR BURTON: That's right.
MS DARCEY: Thank you, and Ms Picone, you signed off on those submissions in your capacity as CEO of TasCOSS, but is it fair to say that both you and Dr Burton and other members of the team have contributed to the production of those submissions?

MS PICONE: That's correct, yes.
MS DARCEY: Thank you. Dr Burton, there are seven recommendations that have been made in those submissions which the Commissioners will be able to read and consider as part of your statement. It's apparent that as part of your role you've been reviewing and keeping up with the Tasmanian Government's annual progress reports and action plans as they've been released. Have you been able to glean from the government's fourth action plan, or from any other place for that matter, whether there's any implementation plan or timing for the development and introduction of the Child Youth Safe Organisations framework?

DR BURTON: One of the issues that we have and that our members are raising with us regularly, is the lack of implementation timeframes and targets, if you like, around when some of the recommendations and Tasmanian Government commitments will be introduced by.

One example is standards for Out-of-Home Care which the Tasmanian Government has been promising essentially to be introduced. I think the latest annual progress report says that it aims to have those released in early 2022. So, I think that's just under two months to go before it becomes the second half of 2022 , so there is concern amongst our members around the timeliness of the government's responses in many areas.

MS DARCEY: Thank you. Would you agree that one of the planks of the Child Youth Safe organisation framework is the proposed Child Safe Organisation legislation, and in particular the draft bill, the Child Safe Organisations Bill?

DR BURTON: Yes.
MS DARCEY: Thank you. As part of your statement you attach as Exhibit 3 a copy of submissions made to the Tasmanian Government during the consultation phase of the Child Safe Organisation Bill by TasCOSS?

DR BURTON: (Nods.)
MS DARCEY: Thank you, and again, Ms Picone, you signed off on that document that it was a team effort?

MS PICONE: Correct, yes.
MS DARCEY: Dr Burton, as far as you know, what is the status of that legislation? Has there been any progress that you are aware of since TasCOSS made its submissions in February 2021?

DR BURTON: There's no official status on where that draft bill now is. The government has acknowledged receiving a number of submissions and TasCOSS as well as many of our other members who made submissions on that draft bill are looking forward to seeing the amended version and are hoping that many of the shared concerns will be adopted by the government.

And, if I may just explain one core concern with that bill? The Child Safe Organisations Bill included standards, child safe standards for organisations. As you no doubt - or as you are aware, the Royal Commission, there are national Child Safe Standards that have been drafted entirely to ensure that there are nationally consistent standards on this. For reasons that are not clear to us the government included standards in its Child Safe Organisations Bill that were quite different to the National Standards: there were five instead of ten, some were re-worded, some were merged, and a couple of them went into the implementation issue, including talking about codes of conduct, rather than sticking to principles.

So, no-one's entirely sure why that occurred and, you know, speculation, it's either possibly incompetence in drafting or some other reason why the government did not want to hold itself to the National Standards.

PRESIDENT NEAVE: I have a question about that. Presumably in that process of consultation there would have been some discussion about what the government was intending to do or not proposing to do; did that give you any insights into why some of those issues were not going to be pursued in the Tasmanian legislation?

DR BURTON: No.
PRESIDENT NEAVE: So, the draft appeared, you were consulted, nothing else has happened since then?

DR BURTON: That's right.
PRESIDENT NEAVE: Thank you.
MS DARCEY: Dr Burton, are you able to explain the consultation process? Was it simply a matter of written submissions or was there any direct face-to-face consultation that occurred?

DR BURTON: As part of the responses to the Royal Commission as well as the ongoing Strong Families, Safe Kids redesign there have been ongoing consultations really between the government and our sector and other interested stakeholders. So, it's not always easy to differentiate while there was a formal consultation on the bill that involved written submissions, but at various roundtables and other consultation opportunities on Royal Commission responses and the Strong Family Safe Kids redesign we have - TasCOSS and our members have had many opportunities to advance to the government what we believe should be part of a framework around keeping children safe.

COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: Just to be clear, what you put forward was that that framework should be based on the 10 National Principles?

DR BURTON: That's right.
COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: Thank you.

MS DARCEY: In relation to Recommendation 4 of TasCOSS's submissions in relation to the Child Safe Organisation Bill, that was a recommendation that either the bill or a separate piece of legislation provided for the establishment of a properly resourced independent oversight body. Are you able to expand on that point and provide the Commissioners with an understanding of what you think the creation of such a body might look like?

DR BURTON: Sure, thanks, well, in terms of what the body should look like I'm absolutely taking the lead from the Royal Commission itself, and that's in Recommendation 6.11 and there are five elements to a robust oversight body that the Royal Commission recommended.

Going from the latest information that the government has provided through its Fourth Annual Progress Report, it doesn't look like it intends to adopt the robust approach that the Royal Commission recommends. So, obviously we'11 give the benefit of the doubt, we haven't yet seen any draft bill or had discussions around what an oversight body would look like yet, but I suppose this does go to an issue that our members have been concerned about, not only with the timeliness of the government's responses, but whether the government is approaching some of the recommendations with a tick box exercise, if you like, rather than fully complying with the intent of the Royal Commission.

MS DARCEY: Yes, thank you. And, Dr Burton, apart from this focus in relation to the overarching Child Youth Safe organisation framework which we've been discussing, I understand that TasCOSS also has some particular concerns that are being filtered up from the membership about the implementation of certain Child Safety system initiatives. And I note that was the subject of TasCOSS's submission to this inquiry also.

Just a couple of questions in relation to that. Well, really, what are the concerns that your members are bringing to you?

DR BURTON: Our members, including those who work in the Out-of-Home Care sector, have regular interaction with Child Safety and the department that oversees the Child Safety workers and workforce, and there are two main concerns there: one is workload, so Child Safety workers
being very overloaded and over-stretched, and so, their responses to issues of concern are maybe not always as timely as they should be.

And also, workforce issues around training, staff turnover, recruitment and retention. And I do note that it's not just our members, there was a 2020 Coroner's report into six infant deaths and one child death that made these points as well.

Our members observe, and again, this is reiterated in the Coroner's report and in the 2021 Department of Education report into responses to child sexual abuse, that a combination of lack of staff training and high workloads means that there's a very high threshold for reporting and responding to abuse.

A researcher who until recently worked at Social Action Research Centre at Anglicare has done a lot of work in the area of responses to unaccompanied homeless children, Dr Catherine Robinson; her observation is that the threshold for action or removal is being raped by a parent.

PRESIDENT NEAVE: Sorry, I just didn't catch what you said then?

DR BURTON: Threshold for action or removal of a child is that child being raped by a parent. That most of - we would all agree that that threshold is just too high.

MS DARCEY: Dr Burton, given what you've just said, how ready to you think your member organisations are to implement Child Safe Standards and perhaps participate in a Reportable Conduct Scheme?

DR BURTON: They're more than ready, many of them have already introduced, they have their own codes of conduct, Out-of-Home Care providers have drafted - or are working to their own standards of care. They're begging the government to give them more guidance on this and to have consistency across the system.

They also are very willing and keen to work under a broad framework that includes a Reportable Conduct Scheme. There are concerns around the costs of compliance. Accreditation, for example, for Out-of-Home Care is
expensive, so introducing a robust scheme like this will involve costs and those costs will need to largely be borne by the government, but I think in terms of the other costs that we know that cascade through the system when children and families are not being supported, it should pale in comparison.

MS DARCEY: Thank you. Are there any other specific actions that you think might be pursued in relation to Child Protection and in the Out-of-Home Care space? I'm looking particularly at paragraph 42 of your statement.

DR BURTON: Yeah, so we've already mentioned the need for standards for Out-of-Home Care, accreditation for Out-of-Home Care providers, and also a carer's register that isn't simply a list of names but there is some oversight and training and accountabilities involved.

MS DARCEY: Thank you. I might direct this question to you, Ms Picone, and I am referencing paragraphs 45 to 47 of Dr Burton's statement here. In terms of primary prevention strategies, are any of your members undertaking work in that space?

MS PICONE: Yeah, I think this is really important to highlight, that there's actually some really excellent programs out there that have been tried and tested and are really working and are being developed in consultation with service users and organisations, and there's a couple that I would just like to highlight: one is a program that's run by the Sexual Assault Support Service that's run in schools, and that's specifically for children but also for carers, for parents and for guardians and also school staff. And really, it's about addressing harmful behaviours and attitudes, but also promoting healthy and respectful ways of interacting, so it's really highlighting some of the factors.

Then there's another program called Consent Sex and Respect that's run by Laurel House and that's in the north and northwest and that's targeting high school students and talks about consent, respectful relationships and the law but also healthy and unhealthy relationships, violence and online safety. There's also another program that's run with Women's Legal and Laurel House in partnership.

MS DARCEY: Yes, thank you. I just have one final
question, $I$ 'm not sure who might like to answer it. There was a review undertaken by Dr Ian Watt in July 2021 of the State Service. Recommendation 5 is that the government task some or all heads of agency collectively with addressing a small number of whole-of-government or across-government priorities that require a collaborative approach to facilitate better delivery of outcomes.

Do you think that this is something - or a model that would be appropriate to deal with the issue of child sexual abuse in the Tasmanian context?

MS PICONE: I think this recommendation goes to the heart of this issue. You know, I think really we need to see child safety and wellbeing being, not just the government's priorities but all of our priorities and, if children aren't our priority, then who are? You know, we're the adults here that should be the ones that are making sure that children are safe.

I think we need to acknowledge that, you know, no one program or service, no one piece of legislation is going to fix all the problems, but each of us really I think can make a contribution towards this and it's incumbent on all of us that we build a better system for the children that have been let down in many ways by the systems and the adults that should be supporting them.

MS DARCEY: Dr Burton, do you have anything to add?
DR BURTON: No, fully agree with that.
MS DARCEY: That's great, I'11 leave you in the hands of the Commissioners if there are any further questions.

COMMISSIONER BENJAMIN: Just one question, or a couple of questions, sorry. I've read somewhere that Tasmania's functional illiteracy rate runs between 40 and 50 per cent. Is that something you understood, Dr Burton?

DR BURTON: Yeah, that's based on - it's almost a decade old now, but that's based on international research, and the figure was about 48 per cent, so one in two Tasmanians.

COMMISSIONER BENJAMIN: And that collates roughly with the levels of poverty and financial stress that you told me about or told us about, Ms Picone, earlier on. Those
combinations must create significant or substantial challenges, just not to government, but to non-government organisations as well?

MS PICONE: Absolutely, because you've got people experiencing multiple vulnerabilities needing to access a range of services, yeah.

COMMISSIONER BENJAMIN: Thank you.
DR BURTON: And I'd just add to that as well, it's becoming exacerbated with high levels of digital exclusion in Tasmania, so it's not just literacy around language and numbers, but digital literacy involving access to the internet and digital skills with so many government and other services going online, many Tasmanians struggle to get the help that they need.

COMMISSIONER BENJAMIN: So, is what you're saying, that with those high levels and the switch by government and non-government agencies to online access, it creates a whole new level of lack of information for significant parts of the Tasmanian community?

DR BURTON: Correct.
MS PICONE: Yes, lack of information but also lack of access. So, what we say is that 65,000 Tasmanians are not able to access services on1ine. What we saw during COVID of course, and these things could happen again, was that many service providers delivered their service online. So, not only were people not able to pay their bills, but they weren't able to, you know, see their counsellor or see their service provider.

COMMISSIONER BENJAMIN: And I guess then those people with limited resources don't have mobile telephones with their vaccination status or any of those aspects which many of us use on a daily basis?

MS PICONE: Correct, yes.
PRESIDENT NEAVE: Did you say 65,000?
MS PICONE: 65,000.
COMMISSIONER BENJAMIN: I think it was 65,500 , you said
live in poverty; is that right?
MS PICONE: That's correct.
COMMISSIONER BENJAMIN: And 177,000-117,000.
COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: 66,500 and 117,000 .
COMMISSIONER BENJAMIN: And that totals 243,500.
DR BURTON: I will just clarify that. The poverty figures that we use are based on, we define living in poverty as being on 50 per cent - the threshold of 50 per cent the median household income; living on an inadequate income is 60 per cent of the median household disposal income, so combined it's almost 120,000 people living in poverty or on an inadequate income.

COMMISSIONER BENJAMIN: So, my mathematics are incorrect in that I've added the two together, but the 117 is a cumulative figure?

DR BURTON: Correct.
COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: That's a very helpful clarification, thank you. Was that your questions?

I wanted to come back to your comment that, while the community service sector were kind of ready and willing to implement the National Standards for Child Safety and a Reportable Conduct Scheme, you had some concerns about the cost of compliance. I wondered if you had any views about what would help with compliance?

DR BURTON: So, going back to the Royal Commission recommendations around the oversight body, for example, and we know this is being implemented really quite successfully in Victoria; that the oversight body also has a role in educating and capacity building amongst the organisations that fall under the Child Safe Standards, so that's very well resourced and that's been operating for a little while now, long enough for Tasmania to be able to look to Victoria, learn some useful lessons around where the resourcing is needed and where the gaps are and, yeah, we'd really encourage the Tasmanian Government to be looking to that model and not re-inventing the wheel.

COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: Thank you, and just a second question, I just got a little bit confused. Is there currently an Out-of-Home Care accreditation process? You mentioned it's costly?

DR BURTON: Some Out-of-Home Care providers undertake off their own bat, if you like, accreditation, but it's not mandated by the government.

COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: And that is accreditation for Child Safe Organisations, not accreditation as an Out-of-Home Care provider then?

DR BURTON: No, as an Out-of-Home Care provider, whether or not Child Safe Standards are included in those - as an aspect of that accreditation, I can't say.

COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: Is it your view that Out-of-Home Care accreditation is something that should be in place across all providers?

DR BURTON: Our members would like that, they know then that they have clear standards, clear expectations, and consistently cross the jurisdiction they're being held to the same account.

COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: Following on from that then, if there were Out-of-Home Care accreditation standards and Child Safe Organisation accreditation standards, I assume that your members would be better to line up the accreditation process for both to avoid duplication of administration?

DR BURTON: Yes.
COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: That's all my questions, thank you.

PRESIDENT NEAVE: Thank you very much indeed, that's been very helpful, and we will now take a break.

## LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT

MS BENNETT: Commissioners, this afternoon we're going to hear more of the integrity ecosystem that started with this morning's Auditor-General session. Before I call the three witnesses who will form this afternoon's panel, I'd just
like to put in context the purpose of this panel. It is to complete the picture of this ecosystem and to understand the structure, purpose and effect of the integrity system in Tasmania.

As has been the case with other witnesses that the Commissioners have heard from, we expect that in subsequent weeks we will speak to some or all of the individuals now called about specific examples or specific issues about which this Commission hears. Today, however, is more about those high level matters and, to the extent that we need to go into anything more detailed, it will do so most likely into future weeks.

With that brief overview, Commissioners, I'd like to ask that Commissioner McLean; the Ombudsman, Mr Connock; and Mr Easton of the Integrity Commission to come to be sworn in.
<MICHAEL DAVID EASTON, affirmed:
[1.53pm]
<RICHARD ANTHONY CONNOCK, affirmed:
<LEANNE DELANY MCLEAN, affirmed:
MS BENNETT: Thank you all for attending to give evidence today. I'd like to start by just identifying who each of you are and what your roles are. So I'll start first with you, Commissioner. That's Commissioner McLean, can you tell the Commissioners what your role is?

MS McLEAN: I am the Commissioner for Children and Young People in Tasmania.

MS BENNETT: Thank you. And, how long have you held that role?

MS McLEAN: Since November 2018.
MS BENNETT: What were your previous roles?
MS McLEAN: Prior to being Commissioner I had a range of advisory and chief of staff roles in the Tasmanian Government. Prior to that I had quite a long career in policy in the Department of Education originating working with children and young people who are at risk in the community.

MS BENNETT: Thank you. Mr Ombudsman, I call you Mr Ombudsman but you in fact have a number of positions. Can you tell us what they are?

MR CONNOCK: Yes, I'm the Parliamentary Ombudsman as it's known, which is the oversight agency for the administrative actions of public authorities. I'm also the Health Complaints Commissioner and can take complaints about the provision of health services in both the private and public sector. I have functions under the Energy Ombudsman Act. There's not in fact in the entity known as the energy ombudsman, but as Ombudsman I have functions under that Act.

I am the de facto Information Commissioner under the Right to Information Act. My office is final external review on decisions on right to information. And I'm also the custodial inspector. I also have various other little functions here and there of inspecting and auditing documentation and so forth, listening at devices and that sort of thing.

MS BENNETT: Thank you. And how long have you held well, when did you start to hold any of those roles?

MR CONNOCK: I commenced as Ombudsman in July 2014. I had acted in the role a couple of times prior to that for a number of months while the position was vacant. I am a fixed term of five years, and that was extended again in 2019. So I'm in the office until July 2024 now.

MS BENNETT: What were your previous roles, broadly?
MR CONNOCK: Prior to that, I was the director of the office of the Ombudsman, which is sort of like a de facto deputy. There isn't currently a Deputy Ombudsman in this State, although we're about to get one, thankfully. Prior to that I was - well, I was initially a lawyer in private practice in Melbourne, I practised as a solicitor and a barrister, moved to Tasmania in 2000 and took up more consultancy work doing investigations and mediations and that sort of thing for various government agencies.

MS BENNETT: Before I move to you Mr Easton, Commissioner, can I just return to you. The Ombudsman noted that he's in a fixed position. Are you in the same boat?

MS McLEAN: Yes.
MS BENNETT: When does your fixed position expire?
MS McLEAN: November 2023.
MS BENNETT: And that's your first appointment?
MS McLEAN: Yes.
MS BENNETT: Mr Easton can you tell the Commissioners your role?

MR EASTON: I'm the Chief Executive Officer of the Tasmanian Integrity Commission.

MS BENNETT: How long have you held that role?
MR EASTON: Most recently for two years, so I was appointed for a five-year term in April 2020, but I was actually acting CEO for 20 months between 2015 and 2017.

MS BENNETT: I'11 start with you, to just identify some of your core functions or the core functions of your office, because there is a statutory office holder in your office, isn't there?

MR EASTON: Yes.
MS BENNETT: And that's not you? Or tell me about your statutory function, let me put it.

MR EASTON: I am a statutory officer. So, my statutory function is, from a management perspective, to manage the entity that is the Integrity Commission, of course, but in a more specific sense it's to deal with misconduct and to bring the public sector to a point where somewhere down the road we all agree that all public sector officials and entities are behaving with propriety and ethically.

MS BENNETT: Can you tell us about how the Integrity Commission, the Office of the Integrity Commission, goes about doing that? What are its specific powers or methods?

MR EASTON: Most people automatically assume it's the investigative side that I might start with, but I would
actually start with our education and prevention side; it's a very fundamental part of what we do, because if we're not preventing misconduct then we're never gonna get to that point down the road.

So we have a very strong emphasis on education and engagement with public sector entities and individuals, but we're trying to work with the entities as a whole; we want to build their capacity to deal with misconduct and to educate their employees about misconduct and misconduct risks.

So, that's the educative side, and then we have our operational side where we deal with complaints about misconduct. There's a range of statutory processes built into the Act for how we do that. It's a very prescriptive act, that being the Integrity Commission Act. And on top of dealing with complaints, we also receive notifications and information reports from public sector entities or individuals or even sometimes from our own staff about misconduct risks and potential misconduct areas, and we will deal with those as well. And, when I say "deal", I guess there's a range of ways we might address a matter. Some are prescribed; some we have worked out for ourselves as to how we might address a report of misconduct.

MS BENNETT: And your office can develop standards and codes of conduct for public offices; is that right?

MR EASTON: That's right. So, under section 8 of the Act it outlines our functions and powers. And you will find that that section begins with the educative and preventive side, and one of the key areas for us is exactly that, preparing and monitoring/reviewing codes of conduct. We can't do that for everyone, of course, but, for example, we had a very strong role in the development of the ministerial code of conduct for State Government MPs and then also for State Government MPs themselves. And that finally got endorsed a couple of years ago. So we have that role as well.

MS BENNETT: All right. So just to check - sorry to interrupt. And I just wanted to clarify that you can also conduct enquiries into complaints that you receive; is that right?

MR EASTON: That's right. That's the end point of how we
might deal with a complaint or even an own motion investigation; we can - yeah, it's Part 7 of the Act and we can carry out tribunals. Probably wouldn't look unlike this.

MS BENNETT: So you can develop standards and codes of conduct. And are public authorities/public sector officers required to comply with those standards and codes of conduct?

MR EASTON: Well, we hold them accountable to it, so of course as a State Service employee the public sector are required to, yeah, conform with that code of conduct, and then we might get a complaint where we will hold them accountable against that code of conduct.

MS BENNETT: You educate the public and you educate members of the state public service; is that right?

MR EASTON: Yes.
MS BENNETT: You receive and assess complaints and you conduct enquiries, is that about a reasonable summary?

MR EASTON: Yes.
MS BENNETT: Mr Ombudsman, I won't go through all of your powers, but I'd like to identify at a high level your role as Ombudsman is really responsive to administrative actions by public authorities; is that fair?

MR CONNOCK: That's fair.
MS BENNETT: And you can carry out your own motion investigation or investigations based on complaints?

MR CONNOCK: Yes.
MS BENNETT: But they're tethered to administrative action by public authority?

MR CONNOCK: That's right.
MS BENNETT: And you carry out investigations generally in private; is that right?

MR CONNOCK: Generally, yes.

MS BENNETT: At what point do you publish anything publicly?

MR CONNOCK: Once an investigation, a formal investigation that is, is concluded, we will prepare it. And particularly if we are making recommendations, we will prepare a report of the investigation and the recommendations and publish that.

MS BENNETT: So the limitations that you have, you can't investigate a minister's decision or a court decision; is that right?

MR CONNOCK: No, lawmakers are all excluded. So officers like the Solicitor-General, the Director of Public Prosecution and the courts are excluded from our jurisdiction.

MS BENNETT: So it's really the administrative decisions and public servants are open to you?

MR CONNOCK: Not individual public servants. We can only look at public authorities. So, if somebody has a problem with a public servant, we look at how the authority has managed that problem or its role in it, if it has one.

MS BENNETT: That would include those operating the Out-of-Home Care scheme?

MR CONNOCK: It would, but again it would only be the administrative actions of that. If it's a public authority. I mean, there are some private providers that --

MS BENNETT: Private providers publicly funded would not fall within your scope?

MR CONNOCK: It depends upon the relationship between the private entity and the government. We can look at a lot of Housing Tasmania stock is now owned by private companies, but our jurisdiction extends to those providers. That's because of the relationship between government and then.

MS BENNETT: And administrative decisions of the Department of Education would fall within your scope?

MR CONNOCK: Would fall within my scope.
MS BENNETT: And so, decisions whether or not to initiate, for example, ED5 investigations, would that fall within your scope? Or no?

MR CONNOCK: Not really. We're not involved in the ED5 process. That's the State Services management office is in charge of that. If we had - there is a provision in our Act that if we are of the view that there has been something that might warrant that, we can refer it. But we wouldn't actually - we're not involved in the ED5 process.

MS BENNETT: Is it not an administrative decision by the agency to conduct such an investigation?

MR CONNOCK: Could be, could be, yes, but that's - yeah, it's not something that we would ordinarily - it's a bit yeah, I can take that on notice if you like and review that. We've not been had to do it, but we don't play a part in the ED5 thing. And that's usually an internal thing within whichever agencies employs the person.

MS BENNETT: Commissioner McLean, I should have said earlier you made a statement for the assistance of the Commission; is that right?

MS McLEAN: Yes, I did.
MS BENNETT: Have you read your statement recently?
MS McLEAN: Yes, I have.
MS BENNETT: And is that statement true and correct?
MS McLEAN: Yes, it is.
MS BENNETT: Thank you, Commissioner. Now, Commissioner, your general functions include advocating for all children and young people in the state generally; is that fair?

MS McLEAN: Yes, that's right.
MS BENNETT: You're particularly directed to being an advocate for a detainee under the Youth Justice Act; is that right?

MS McLEAN: Yes, to clarify, my advocacy function broadly is for children and young people generally as a group. I don't undertake any individual advocacy unless it is for a child or young person detained under the Youth Justice Act.

MS BENNETT: I see, so generally speaking when you're talking about general advocacy functions, it's for all children in Tasmania? It could be in whatever context?

MS McLEAN: That's right, under 18.
MS BENNETT: Under 18. For children in custody, they are considered a "vulnerable child" under section 4 ?

MS McLEAN: They are. But there is also a specific section of the Act, section 10, that describes my role as the individual advocate for young people detained under the Youth Justice Act.

MS BENNETT: And that involves, I think you explain in your statement, that that's where you can involve yourself with the specific circumstances of a child in particular?

MS McLEAN: Yes, that's right.
MS BENNETT: How does that differ to how you might advocate more broadly in the community?

MS McLEAN: So I cannot advocate on an individual matter. So, for example, if somebody were to come to me with an issue in relation to their care or their protection, I cannot advocate for them specifically; I can advocate on systemic matters for children generally as a group, just as I cannot undertake an individual - assess an individual decision.

MS BENNETT: I'd just like to explore a little bit about how that interacts with Out-of-Home Care. So, Out-of-Home Care is a system which provides care and shelter for children; is that fair?

MS McLEAN: That's right, yes.
MS BENNETT: Can you tell the Commissioners about your oversight role in relation to that system?

MS McLEAN: Yes. So, in 2016 in response to
recommendations made by a previous Commissioner, the government provided additional funding to the Commissioner for Children and Young People to undertake an independent systemic monitoring program of the Out-of-Home Care system in Tasmania. There are no specific functions in the Commissioner for Children and Young Peoples Act in relation to that Out-of-Home Care monitoring function; it is achieved through the existing general functions of the Act and is very systemic in nature. So, I am not able to investigate an individual decision. It is my view that I am unable perhaps to investigate an individual organisation who is providing a particular type of care, and I am unable to investigate organisations who may be providing care to Tasmanian children outside of Tasmania.

MS BENNETT: I just want to go back to - you can't investigation an organisation providing services to children?

MS McLEAN: Arguably, if it is a particular matter in relation to a particular organisation. The word "general" features in the Act, which I think - you know, my view is that would benefit from specificity and clarification as to how I undertake Out-of-Home Care monitoring for Tasmania.

MS BENNETT: But just so I understand, sometimes - I think we've heard some evidence this week that sometimes one issue can be an indicator of larger systemic issues; would you accept that?

MS McLEAN: Yes, it can.
MS BENNETT: And so, sometimes in the Out-of-Home Care context an issue with one child might indicate a systemic problem with that provider; would you accept that?

MS McLEAN: Yes.
MS BENNETT: Would you then have the power to make enquiries about what that provider is doing around that issue?

MS McLEAN: As a part of the system, yes. I can undertake a systemic enquiry that could be informed by an individual matter; could come to my attention through an individual matter.

MS BENNETT: What is the ambiguity with which you're concerned? When you said earlier that it's unclear but you understand it to be the case that there's a limitation there; what is it?

MS McLEAN: It's probably best demonstrated by giving a hypothetical example.

MS BENNETT: Yes.
MS McLEAN: We are a small jurisdiction, so there are cases where particular types of care - for example, therapeutic residential care, which is a large part of the system in itself - are delivered by a single organisation. So, I think the question remains how I frame any questions or requirements for information about a particular organisation in that scenario has to be in a systemic way. And you can very quickly tie yourself up in knots; it would be much easier if my role in relation to Out-of-Home Care monitoring was much clearer, I think.

MS BENNETT: With respect, do you think that's causing a barrier to you doing your job as you would like?

MS McLEAN: I think it makes it more complicated than it needs to be.

MS BENNETT: Returning then to your statutory basis, you've got the power to undertake an investigation if you're requested to do that by the Minister. In what other circumstances can you carry out an investigation?

MS McLEAN: So I can investigate, based on my own motion, systemic issues. Outside of my jurisdiction, which is outlined in the Act, the Minister can ask me to investigate individual matters or individual decisions.

MS BENNETT: And you can compel the provision of information, can't you, to your office?

MS McLEAN: Yes, I can.
MS BENNETT: Is that from state providers only, from state entities only?

MS McLEAN: Yes.

MS BENNETT: Mr Easton, is that the same for you? You were talking before about having inquiries much like this one. Can you call for documents?

MR EASTON: What, sorry?
MS BENNETT: Call for documents?
MR EASTON: Yes, absolutely.
MS BENNETT: And you can require people to give evidence on oath?

MR EASTON: Yes.
MS BENNETT: Mr Ombudsman, are you in the same position? Can you call for documents?

MR CONNOCK: If I'm doing a formal investigation, yes. The Act confers on the powers of a commission of inquiry when I'm conducting a formal investigation.

MS BENNETT: Are there any limitations to your powers that are a matter of concern to you?

MR CONNOCK: Not really. I mean, the models have been the same always. The one thing about an Ombudsman and a Health Complaints Commissioner is the office is not designed to have coercive powers. It's a recommendatory thing. So, if we come to a conclusion, we tend to - well, when formulating our recommendations we negotiate with the agency concerned to make sure that they can comply. But no, in general the jurisdictions that we administer are fairly well-established and operate pretty well.

MS BENNETT: As custodial inspector you have responsibility for custodial inspections?

MR CONNOCK: Yes.
MS BENNETT: And reporting the matters in the public interest?

MR CONNOCK: Yes.
MS BENNETT: You can visit any custodial centre at any time you see fir and you can obtain access to any documents
when you do; is that right?
MR CONNOCK: Yes.
MS BENNETT: Does that include Ashley Youth Detention?
MR CONNOCK: It does.
MS BENNETT: And any custody facility in the state?
MR CONNOCK: That's right.
MS BENNETT: As Health Complaints Commissioner, you have the role of reviewing issues arising out of complaints and suggest ways of improving health services and preserving and increases health rights. Is that a reasonable summary?

MR CONNOCK: That's a reasonable summary. We also try to resolve health complaints without the need for them to progress it to a higher level of formality than they might need. So a lot of our focus is on conciliation when we're dealing with those. But yeah, it's like an Ombudsman; we're look at improving the system of government. In health, we're also looking to improve the provision of healthcare services.

MS BENNETT: All right. So let me see if I understand where everyone sits. Commissioner, all children in Tasmania broadly fall within your remit and if there is a systemic concern in relation to their welfare, you are able to call for documents, carry out an enquiry, make a report; is that a fair summary?

MS McLEAN: Yes.
MS BENNETT: And you have particular responsibility for children incarcerated; is that right?

MS McLEAN: Yes.
MS BENNETT: And that includes visiting and advocating for those children?

MS McLEAN: Yes.
MS BENNETT: And that's the exception to the rule that you will generally only act systemically?

MS McLEAN: That's right. That's my understanding.
MS BENNETT: Thank you. Mr Ombudsman, as custodial inspector, you have some overlap with the Children's Commissioner because you have some responsibility in relation to the children at Ashley Youth Detention as well; is that right?

MR CONNOCK: That's right.
MS BENNETT: And that's because you can access that centre at any time, can't you?

MR CONNOCK: Yes.
MS BENNETT: And you can enquire into any matter at that centre as well?

MR CONNOCK: Yes.
MS BENNETT: So the key difference between you might be and I'11 ask you first, Mr Ombudsman, and then you, Commissioner - that your role is one of oversight of administrative decisions of those who are operating Ashley; is that fair?

MR CONNOCK: Yeah. As Ombudsman, yes.
MS BENNETT: And as custodial inspector? Sorry, as custodial inspector. Tell me about that?

MR CONNOCK: As custodial inspector, I inspect prison facilities and the Youth Detention centre against an established set of standards. So it's not complaint-driven, it's not looking at individual cases. It's looking at how compliant a centre is with those established standards, which are published on our website.

MS BENNETT: And are you looking at those established standards as well to see if they comply with a particular standard?

MR CONNOCK: No, we have developed those. When the custodial inspector was established four or five years ago, we worked with the first independent custodial inspector, which is the one in Western Australia. And we had some
assistance from the deputy inspector over there, who was also at the same time working with New South Wales, which was trying to establish an inspectorate. So we all worked together on these standards, trying to get as much uniformity between the various jurisdiction as we could, but we could only achieve that at a very high level. I mean, Western Australia is a vastly different landscape in terms of prisons than we are. We --

MS BENNETT: I won't ask you further about that.
MR CONNOCK: No, okay.
PRESIDENT NEAVE: Can I have a follow-up on that? When you say "standards", obviously there would be standards about the building and all of those sorts of things?

MR CONNOCK: And security, yeah. We cover just about everything.

PRESIDENT NEAVE: But what about practices? So, for instance, let's assume that in certain situations children are secluded and there are standards about how long they can be secluded for.

MR CONNOCK: We'd look at those, yes.
PRESIDENT NEAVE: You would invest - you --
MR CONNOCK: Report on that. If we do an inspection and we find non-compliance, for example - compliance or non-compliance, at the end of an inspection we will prepare a report which we then send to the responsible department for comment. Once they have done that, we forward it to the Minister who then can retain that for 30 days and make comment on the report but can't change it. And then the report must be tabled. So, if we find non-compliance, sooner or later that will get into the public sphere through our reporting.

MS BENNETT: So, you develop those standards?
MR CONNOCK: Yes.
MS BENNETT: And then you examine the practices to see if they comply with the standards?

MR CONNOCK: Practices, infrastructure, all aspects of the prison or Youth Detention centre.

MS BENNETT: Would I be right to call them "systems"?
MR CONNOCK: Yes, usually systems. Yes.
MS BENNETT: So in the context of Ashley Youth Detention, in that context it's the custodial inspector that looks to the systems and the propriety of the systems, and the Children's Commissioner who looks to the individual welfare? Is that a fair summary?

MS McLEAN: I also have an advocacy role in relation to Youth Justice. So I'm very interested and constantly advocating for the reform of Youth Justice generally in Tasmania, but also have a role as the individual advocate for detainees.

MS BENNETT: And you can investigate individual matters as they concern Youth Justice?

MS McLEAN: No. That is not my understanding.
MS BENNETT: But coming back to your youth advocacy role, you can advocate for individual detainees, young people?

MS McLEAN: Yes.
MS BENNETT: They're vulnerable people within your Act?
MS McLEAN: That is right.
MS BENNETT: Can you not investigate how they are being treated?

MS McLEAN: I can, but I cannot investigate a decision made about them. So, I can facilitate or help them to make a complaint to the Ombudsman about a decision that has been made about their care while they are in Youth Justice detention or their treatment. I cannot investigate that decision myself; that is my understanding.

MS BENNETT: What if that were to disclose, let's use the President's example of the use of seclusion. A young person in the course of you carrying out your advocacy function says to you, "I'm secluded each day for an hour
for no reason". That's a hypothetical. You hear that from the young person and you say, "There's a problem with the use of seclusion at Ashley", for example.

MS McLEAN: That's right, yes.
MS BENNETT: Now, can you do anything about the use of seclusion, having had that report from an individual child?

MS McLEAN: Yes, I can raise that as advocacy matter with the management of the facility, I can raise it with the heads of the department, I can raise it with the Minister. So I am an advocate, so it's my job to beat that drum. But in terms of a review of those decisions, I would support that young person to make a complaint to the Ombudsman about their treatment.

MS BENNETT: But can you investigate the use of seclusion at the centre?

MS McLEAN: I think I can look into the records around seclusion generally, but in relation to an individual, the decisions made about an individual, $I$ don't think I could investigate those individual decisions.

MS BENNETT: I'm perhaps not being clear, because I'm not interested in - I'm not investigating whether or not Mr Smith was properly secluded or not. Having had the report from Mr Smith, the child, that he has been improperly secluded or potentially improperly secluded, can't you then enquire into the use of seclusion at Ashley?

MS McLEAN: Yes, I can.
MS BENNETT: And you can compel information about that?
MS McLEAN: I think compelling information about an individual in my --

MS BENNETT: Again I'm not asking about the child any more, I'm asking about the use of seclusion in the facility.

MS McLEAN: If prompted, I can ask about the use of seclusion in the facility.

MS BENNETT: You can investigate that?

MS McLEAN: Yes, I think so. But if the child is making a complaint about having been secluded in the facility, I do not take that complaint. I don't have a complaint handling role.

MS BENNETT: I see.
MS McLEAN: That rests with the Ombudsman.
MS BENNETT: And you facilitate that complaint?
MS McLEAN: That's right.
MS BENNETT: And then, Mr Easton, you might be called upon if somebody says there's somebody, let's continue the Ashley who's inappropriately secluding a child, that constitutes misconduct; does that fall within your scope as well?

MR EASTON: It does fall within our scope. Would we deal with it if we got a complaint? I guess if we got a complaint, we would deal with the complaint on its face. But I was just look at our principles, and one of our principles is that we not - well, I'll read it:

> Not duplicate or interfere with work that
> the Commission considers has been undertaken or is being undertaken appropriately by a public authority.

Which could be potentially either of these two authorities, so we don't duplicate work. So, theoretically yes, but practically we would look at whether it's being dealt with and whether another authority has the capacity to deal with it. We would look at the seniority of the people involved and the seriousness of what's being alleged, and decide then whether we need to be further involved or whether we refer it out to an appropriate agency or person.

MS BENNETT: And to continue with my single hypothetical example of the rogue prison officer, let's say that somebody made a public interest disclosure about the inappropriate use of seclusion. That would then go back to you, Mr Ombudsman, wouldn't it?

MR CONNOCK: Could do, yes. That's the only time we can look at individual conduct.

MS BENNETT: Tell the Commission about that.
MR CONNOCK: We're one of the reporting entities under the Public Interest Disclosures Act, as is the Integrity Commission, and we can investigate disclosures about public officers under that Act. That's the only time we can look at individual conduct.

PRESIDENT NEAVE: Can I just continue on? I'm the mother of a child that's in Ashley and I'm very concerned about this child's mental health. The child has told me that they've been secluded. What guidance do they get about where do I go?

MR CONNOCK: I was thinking when Leanne was talking. My office, for example, can take complaints about the individual and how they're being treated. And what we will do also on occasions is we will look at that individual complaint and see how that has transpired and what's going on there. But if it indicates systemic issues, as
Ombudsman I can also investigate those, and whether I choose to tie that to the complaint or do it on my own motion so I can expand the net.

PRESIDENT NEAVE: Yes, I understand that.
MR CONNOCK: I can do that. And that's different to the custodial inspector.

MS BENNETT: I see. And you need to tell yourself which hat you're wearing?

MR CONNOCK: Which hat you're wearing. But it's comparatively easy with custodial because that is just inspecting against standards. If there is an individual complaint, that might inform an inspection, but it's not something that we would resolve as custodial inspector. The office can do that under its other guises. Our biggest cohort of complainants, for example, in Ombudsman and Health are prisoners, so we do a lot of work with them. Mostly adult, I should say.

MS BENNETT: To come back to Commissioner Neave's question, can the mother of the child complain to you and
is there some guidance for her?
MR CONNOCK: Well, we would try to provide whatever guidance we could which would be dependant on the particular circumstances. Our Act requires that the person who complains must be personally aggrieved by the action they're complaining of, so that is taken on a case-by-case basis, we would have to look at the circumstances. And ordinarily we would say, well, if the young person wants to make the complaint, and they have capacity, it should probably come from the young person, but we would treat everything on a case-by-case as it came on.

COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: Would the mother then complain to the Integrity Commission?

MR EASTON: Yes, there's no limitation on who can complain to us; it can be anonymous, it can be from anybody.

Just while Richard was talking I was thinking about the PID Act again. The difficulty there is that you have to be a public officer to make a public disclosure. A person can be deemed as a contractor under the Act, that's getting into the complexities, whereas the difference with our Act is, it can be anybody who can complain to us.

MS McLEAN: And if I can just add to that, that the mother or indeed the family member may have been directed to the complaining role of the Ombudsman through original interaction with me as the advocate. So, we do receive, you know, calls from family members in our office and they often dovetail with our regular interaction with detainees, and if there are systemic issues that arise through that we can look into them, but if it is a complaint we will help guide them towards the Ombudsman.

MS BENNETT: Okay, let's see if I've got this right. For children, all children will be advocated for by you, Commissioner?

MS McLEAN: Yes.
MS BENNETT: In the youth detention context they will be specifically advocating for. You can launch some investigations into systemic matters; those systemic investigations can be triggered by individual circumstances but not investigate those individual circumstances per se.

MS McLEAN: Yes.
MS BENNETT: I've gone too fast for the stenographer and I apologise.

Next, Mr Ombudsman, a person could come to you with a complaint about individual decisions. As custodial inspector could ask you to look into the standards in the facility?

MR CONNOCK: No, we inspect independently. We have an obligation to inspect all facilities every three years, so we do that as of course.

MS BENNETT: And, Mr Easton, your office will look at individual allegations of misconduct or serious misconduct?

MR EASTON: That's true, but we can also just look at policies, practices and procedures if we choose to as well.

MS BENNETT: Is that responsive to complaints or individual complaints?

MR EASTON: Can be; complaints are a source of information. I would say most of our work in policies, practices and procedures are based on a range of sources of information and our review of the relative risks of those issues and then we will look at what is driving those issues if it becomes systemic, I guess, as opposed to individual.

MS BENNETT: But you will keep hold of it at that point, you don't --

MR EASTON: If we think we're the best agency to deal with it. There's a lot behind - this is maybe going to your question, Commissioner. If somebody came in through our door, it may be almost instantly that we might be talking to Richard's office, the Ombudsman's Office, to find out what the intersection with the issue is with his office I have not had the opportunity to talk to the Commissioner's Office on that basis - but we would be engaging at that informal level to find out who is the best entity to deal with this, and we may refer it onto the Ombudsman or somebody else or deal with it ourselves.

MS BENNETT: I'd like to come back and unpack that process because I think it's significant. Would you each agree with me that this is a complex system, Commissioner?

MS McLEAN: Yes.
MS BENNETT: Ombudsman?
MR CONNOCK: Yes.
MS BENNETT: Mr Easton?
MR EASTON: Yes.
MS BENNETT: Is it a difficult system for lay people to navigate, Commissioner?

MS McLEAN: In my experience, yes, people are often confused about my role.

MS BENNETT: Mr Ombudsman?
MR CONNOCK: It can be, yes.
MS BENNETT: Mr Easton?
MR EASTON: I think it's difficult for people to understand the complexities, but they know - my sense is the layperson would know they can come to us about misconduct. They would not understand what I was just talking about in terms of what we might do with it, but they would at least know that they can come to us and that's our job is to deal with it.

MS BENNETT: Between the three of you, and I'11 start with Mr Easton and move down the line, do you have a protocol, a formal protocol about who is best placed to use their powers in response to any particular issue: Mr Easton?

MR EASTON: "Formal protocol". We have letters of understanding and have memoranda of understanding with different entities. I don't have one with the Ombudsman's Office, we haven't needed it, but I have one with police and I have one with the Auditor-General. And, I guess, we then deal with the matters on a case basis as to who we think would be the appropriate entity, and the Act is actually worded that way, we can refer it to an
"appropriate person", so that necessarily envisages that it may vary, so we don't have that fixed in that sense. Some pick themselves. So, child sexual assault, it is always going to be police, whereas other matters, it just depends on what's being alleged.

MS BENNETT: Mr Ombudsman, how do you identify who is best placed to deal with something that comes to you?

MR CONNOCK: It depends on the complaint. I mean, if it does raise individual conduct rather than systems issues, I would probably refer it to Michael. And he and I meet on a regular basis, as I do with the Commissioner, to talk about arising issues and things that we are facing. So, while there's no protocol or memorandum of understanding, we all have a high level of understanding of our various functions. So we have a good idea, having been doing it for a while, where things should go. And there is actually an exception to my secrecy provisions under the Ombudsman Act; I can refer things to the Integrity Commission and exchange information. So as the two complaint handlers we can between us, as amongst ourselves, work out where the best place to go is. As the Commissioner has said, she doesn't have the individual complaint handling thing, but our two offices have a really good relationship, I think, and a good understanding, and we will take the complaint if it's within our jurisdiction.

MS BENNETT: Commissioner, when a matter arises for you from a child in your advocacy role, you will refer the child on to one of - or what will you do to enable investigation in identifying the proper integrity body?

MS McLEAN: So, if the child wants to make a complaint, I will assist them to make that complaint to the Ombudsman, which often includes me working with them to write their complaint down, sign their complaint, and I will often pass it on for them. And there have been times when I have been unclear as to whether it would constitute a complaint that the Ombudsman could look into. And it's those good relations that we have with Richard and his office that clear that up. I largely agree with what Richard has said in that regard; there are no formal arrangements. There may have been under previous Commissioners, but there certainly aren't that I'm aware of.

MS BENNETT: And is there, Commissioner, a system for the
recording of complaints or concerns that you might receive and refer on?

MS McLEAN: So, I keep information in my office that I collect in that role. So, if I, for example, am the conduit of the complaint, I will keep a record of that complaint.

MS BENNETT: And are there safeguards in place to make sure that it's taken into the next system appropriately?

MS McLEAN: What do you mean by safeguards?
MS BENNETT: Well, you might refer the child to the Ombudsman and they don't follow up. Is there a diary note, is there something in the system that says you must check in to make sure that that complaint has reached an officer who can do something with it?

MS McLEAN: So, the Ombudsman's Office can and do follow up with my office on the receipt of a complaint. A young person in detention may consent to their advocate providing information directly to the people investigating the complaint, and that has certainly happened.

MS BENNETT: At your office are there systems to catch anything that might otherwise not get referred?

MS McLEAN: So, we don't have a formal record-keeping system in that regard, but we do check in with young people very regularly, including whether or not they have heard about the progress of their complaint.

MS BENNETT: Does that make it difficult to monitor the levels of complaints that you might be receiving?

MS McLEAN: Not necessarily, but you need to remember I only know about the complaints that I know about. Young people can go direct to the Ombudsman, and they can and they do, so I wouldn't necessarily know about those complaints.

MS BENNETT: I meant complaints received by your office because you're the Children's Commissioner and children might come to you because they think, "Here's an advocate for me", and that you refer on. I'm trying to get a sense of if there is a record of how many children come through
that pathway?
MS McLEAN: No formal record. We keep copies of the complaints.

MS BENNETT: Mr Easton, does your office keep records of all complaints received?

MR EASTON: Yes.
MS BENNETT: And then how disposed of?
MR EASTON: Yes.
MS BENNETT: Mr Ombudsman, would that be the same for you?
MR CONNOCK: The same for us. Yes.
COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: Can I ask just two small clarifying questions, just while it's still present in my mind?

MS BENNETT: Yes.
COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: Commissioner McLean, in the Ashley example that we're working with, if the young person raised something with you and decide they didn't want to raise it themselves as a complaint, they were perhaps fearful of reprisal while they're still in detention, if you were concerned about it as an integrity issue, could you refer it or make a complaint to the Integrity Commission?

MS McLEAN: Yes, I believe I could.
COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: Thank you. And then, Mr Easton, in relation to the Integrity Commission, you said that you - I understood about the referring it to the Ombudsman, but then you mentioned that you can refer it on to somebody else and that seemed a fairly - that there's some flexibility within that. Is it conceivable then that somebody else you could refer it to might be, in the Ashley example, for example, back to the Department of Communities or to the Ashley Youth Detention Centre to investigate?

MR EASTON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: Thank you. That's very helpful.
MS McLEAN: I would just like to add, I can also refer matters to the custodial inspector. Sorry to clutter things even more, but I can.

COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: Thank you. I'm trying to draw an arrow chart in my mind, and it's not working for me.

MS BENNETT: Mine's colour-coded, and it's a rainbow at this point.

Okay, I'd like to turn to child sexual abuse. And I'd like to talk first of all - well, sorry. Before I go there, I'd like to just identify levels of reporting that you're aware of each in your roles of child sexual abuse. And I'm just trying to get an indication, do you consider those levels to be high or low? Commissioner, do you have a sense of the extent to which your office receives - does it receive complaints concerning child sexual abuse?

MS McLEAN: So our office, despite not having a complaint handling function, regularly receives contact from the public - we call it public inquiry - and in response to that, we have a protocol in our office on how to deal with it, which includes referring the people to the appropriate places to raise it. And also I take a decision in relation to the safety and wellbeing of a child as to how I act in relation to that, particularly if something like child sex abuse is raised.

MS BENNETT: If something like child sex abuse is raised, do you have any systems that can cause a red flag to arise with multiple reports pinning the same institution?

MS McLEAN: We don't have a system that analyses all
public enquiries to flag risk, no. It would be an anecdotal or a - it would not be a forensic system.

MS BENNETT: And Mr Ombudsman, do you have levels of reporting of child sexual abuse or child sexual abuse-related matters?

MR CONNOCK: We get very few, if any.
MS BENNETT: Mr Easton?

MR EASTON: I would agree we get very few. We've had a couple in the 12 years we've been open in terms of complaints, but we also get notifications and we get far more of those. But there haven't been many notifications about child sexual abuse itself apart from recently where there's been a fillip because of this inquiry and suddenty all these things are being reported to us.

MS BENNETT: Do you see that as being because there's been an increase in child sexual abuse or an increase in awareness?

MR EASTON: Well, I'd say the latter. I'm not informed enough to say about the former, but it's clear - I've got some stats here - since 2017 we've received one or two notifications per year involving some form of child sexual abuse, including grooming. But in 2020, suddenty it's nine and then 2021 it's 24 . So it can only be that the Commission of Inquiry is in existence and suddenly we're getting those notifications.

MS BENNETT: Mr Ombudsman, does it concern you that your levels of report around these issues are low?

MR CONNOCK: If that abuse is happening, yes, it does concern me.

MS BENNETT: I think it probably could be taken as read that the abuse is happening, couldn't it?

MR CONNOCK: Yes, I think so.
MS BENNETT: And so, low levels of report might indicate barriers to reporting; is that fair?

MR CONNOCK: I don't think I can really answer that. I was listening to Michael before. I think most people know about my office. I don't know why we're not receiving complaints about it, because we're not getting them. So nobody is saying, you know, "I was reluctant to bring this forward because", or whatever, so it's difficult to answer that question.

MS BENNETT: In your general role as an Ombudsman, standing aside for a moment from child sexual abuse, do you encounter a reluctance from members of the public service or the Tasmanian State Service to whistleblowing or calling
out potential misconduct?
MR CONNOCK: The numbers have been historically low, yes.
MS BENNETT: What do you ascribe that to, Mr Ombudsman?
MR CONNOCK: Difficult to explain. We did used to think that it was the definition of misconduct in the Act, which was a very high bar. The conduct either had to be criminal or a sackable offence. We changed the definition; we adopted the Griffith University model in its definition of misconduct, and still we got very few. We're now getting more, but still not a lot. I think I think it may be an awareness thing. But again, that's difficult to answer. We produce a lot of information in relation to public interest disclosures. We produce guidelines and so forth. We go around all the agencies, and we've done this fairly recently, updating their guidelines. We've produced fact sheets and guides and all that sort of stuff. I don't know whether it's a lack of awareness in agencies, because the thing is it's not for the person who's making a public interest disclosure to declare it so; it's for the person receiving to determine whether or not this fits the definition of a public interest disclosure. A lot of the time a discloser won't know what those requirements are. They just want to get this.

MS BENNETT: What I'm getting to though is, in your experience and your long experience in integrity in Tasmania, we've heard some evidence this morning about potentially a cultural reluctance to call out misbehaviour in some circumstances; is that consistent with your observation or experience? I'm interested in your comment about that.

MR CONNOCK: We11, again, that's difficult to answer; if it doesn't come to us, I don't know what's going on out there. We haven't had a lot of sort of high-level misconduct type complaints and things, and the whistleblowing that we do get is not related to substantial matters in a lot of cases. So, again, it's really difficult to answer. I don't know why things are not happening if they're not happening.

MS BENNETT: I'd like to just speak - I'm conscious of the time, but I'd like to ask you about your independence. So, Commissioner, are you independent?

MS McLEAN: Yes.
MS BENNETT: Can you tell us where that independence is enshrined?

MS McLEAN: In the Commissioner for Children and Young People Act I'm independent and impartial, and act in the public interest.

MS BENNETT: And so you can't be directed by any minister or public servant as to what you might look into?

MS McLEAN: No. A minister can ask me to investigate an individual matter, and that's also set out in the Act, but largely no. I provide the Minister with responsibility for the administration of the Commissioner for Children and Young People Act, with a work plan each year - I'm required to do that by 31 March - and I report annually to the Parliament.

MS BENNETT: And, have you ever been - has a minister ever contacted you to ask you not to undertake an investigation?

MS McLEAN: No.
MS BENNETT: Has any senior public servant ever contacted you and asked you not to undertake an investigation?

MS McLEAN: No.
MS BENNETT: Mr Ombudsman, the same questions for you. Are you independent? And how is your independence protected?

MR CONNOCK: Protected by the legislation that we work under. I am also a separate appropriation when it comes to budget, so I am in control of my own budget, which is helpful.

MS BENNETT: I should ask the Commissioner the same question. How is your budget determined and controlled?

MS McLEAN: My budget flows through the Department of Communities Tasmania; I don't have my own separate area of the budget like Richard.

MS BENNETT: So there's a public servant who allocates funding to you from their general allocation?

MS McLEAN: You could put it that way. Yes, it is allocated. It is an output item from the Department of Communities budget.

PRESIDENT NEAVE: And I might be using incorrect language for Tasmania, but you make a budget bid presumably?

MS McLEAN: Yes, I can.
PRESIDENT NEAVE: So you make a budget bid and then a decision is made? A bureaucratic --

MS McLEAN: My budget bids flows through the Department of Communities Tasmania as well, so my understanding is that they are prioritised with the budget bids of the department.

PRESIDENT NEAVE: And so they then go up to the body that deals with all budget bids?

MS McLEAN: That's right.
PRESIDENT NEAVE: Okay, I understand, thank you.
COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: While we're interrupting.
Commissioner McLean, the question that Ms Bennett asked
about whether you'd been contacted by a minister or an
Executive Member of Government about investigations, I just note that you're not really an investigatory body. I
wonder if you've ever been contacted by a minister or a member of the - a senior Executive Member of Government expressing any kind of displeasure in relation to your advocacy?

MS McLEAN: No.
COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: Thank you.
MS BENNETT: Mr Ombudsman, could I perhaps phrase it more broadly in keeping with Commissioner Bromfield's formulation. Have you received any call from Ministers expressing displeasure with the functions of your office?

MR CONNOCK: No.

MS BENNETT: Any senior public servant contacted you or Executive Member of a relevant department, or any department, has contacted you to express displeasure in the way you exercise your functions or propose to exercise your functions.

MR CONNOCK: We have disagreements occasionally but they don't try and stop me from exercising those functions.

MS BENNETT: Mr Easton, I ask you the same question. Has any Minister or senior public servant called you to seek to influence the exercise of your statutory powers?

MR EASTON: I'd have to answer, no, but as you can imagine with our work not everyone's happy with what we're doing, particularly when they're the subject of it. So, I was trying to formulate an answer in my head. I think I've certainly had expressions of displeasure from people who are Ministers of the government when they've found out that they're being investigated about something. So, they haven't called me in advance to stop me doing my work or the Commission doing its work, but when they're the respondent in a matter they've certainly expressed some displeasure that we're doing anything, because I guess they're expressing their innocence to us, there's nothing to see here, so I'd have to say no, but there is that scenario. Doesn't stop, we've already done what we're going to do by that point.

MS BENNETT: And in your view is that a legitimate part of the integrity process?

MR EASTON: Well, it's part of our procedural fairness process so I'd have to say, yes. It's not always enjoyable, but yes.

MS BENNETT: Commissioner, you mention in your statement that you receive advice from the Solicitor-General. Are you required to seek advice from the Solicitor-General?

MS McLEAN: No, I don't believe I am and I'm not receiving advice from the Solicitor-General in relation to this Commission of Inquiry, for example.

MS BENNETT: And so, Mr Ombudsman, what about you, do you receive advice from the Solicitor-General's office?

MR CONNOCK: Only when I ask for it, but unlike other agencies I'm not bound to comply with that advice.

MS BENNETT: And you're free to go to any lawyer for your advice?

MR CONNOCK: Yes, I think so.
MS BENNETT: Mr Easton, are you required to seek advice from the Solicitor-General's office?

MR EASTON: I can seek advice, and I do. I don't have that ability to not conform or comply with the advice; I believe we're beholden to that advice, but actually, we can't go and actively seek external advice without the approval of - it may be the Premier or it may be the Attorney-General.

MS BENNETT: Is that the case even when you're considering the scope of your power to investigate members of the government?

MR EASTON: Yes.
MS BENNETT: And the primary legal adviser of the government is the Solicitor-General?

MR EASTON: Yes.
MS BENNETT: Does that cause concern for you?
MR EASTON: Has done.
MS BENNETT: Commissioner McLean, are you bound by Solicitor-General advice?

MS McLEAN: I don't believe that I am. The staff in my office are public servants, so they are, so it's murky as to how that advice applies to me or applies to them. I'm not a state servant, and reflecting on my previous answer where I am - the Solicitor-General is not providing legal advice for this Commission of Inquiry, I did liaise with the Solicitor-General about that and legal advice that I have obtained was arranged through that liaison with the Solicitor-General, so it could be said that it is still through the Solicitor-General's office that that advice is
facilitated.
MS BENNETT: What I'm interested in is whether the advice about regulating the state is coming from the State's own lawyer; is that your experience to date in your role; that's where it's coming from?

MS McLEAN: Yes.
MS BENNETT: And that's your experience, Mr Easton?
MR EASTON: It is and it has concerned us concern at times in various matters.

MS BENNETT: Can you tell us about that concern please?
MR EASTON: Well, exactly, I think what you're talking about, that there's a potential conflict there if we're investigating a government representative and they're seeking advice from their lawyer, which is the Solicitor-General, and we're required to get advice from that source as well or get - and I think, thinking through it now, I think it's the Solicitor-General who can give me approval to get external advice. But he or she may say no.

MS BENNETT: So, which integrity body do you go to to talk about your concern? If you've got a concern that there might be a conflict, which integrity body is there - who guards the guards, Mr Easton? Who can you go to?

MR EASTON: Well, the Integrity Commission Act establishes the Joint Standing Committee on integrity so that is an option for us to raise it through them. To be honest, I've had these discussions with the former Solicitor-General himself and he recognises the issue, and he has in one matter given us approval where we asked for it to have an external legal representative, and that occurred and we were provided funding because that all becomes an issue for us as well, we have to pay for it.

MS BENNETT: I've just got one final line of questioning, before I accede the lectern to Ms Norton and that concerns the next panel which concerns the media and journalists.

Starting with you, Mr Easton, does your office have a relationship with the media?

MR EASTON: We11, yes.
MS BENNETT: Do you find that to be a cooperative or difficult relationship?

MR EASTON: We're very cautious about that relationship. Our approach is, when we speak we have something to say and otherwise we wouldn't be speaking. As we know, once you speak publicly or in the media you've lost control of it, so we're very aware of that. But equally, one of our key objectives under our Act is to enhance public confidence that misconduct is being dealt with, and how else do we do that but by speaking publicly and producing reports.

So, it's a necessary relationship, but there's been times where I guess I've realised they might want a comment from us more than we need to put a comment out, and so we won't.

MS BENNETT: Mr Ombudsman, do you have any comments about your office's relationship with the media?

MR CONNOCK: Similar to what Michael was saying. I think in the past we were overly cautious and didn't engage a lot at all. I tend to much the same view that our publications and our reports speak for themselves and that's the conclusion that we have reached and there's nothing really to add to that. But what we've started doing in recent years is, when we publish reports putting out press releases, because we used to find in the past that the media would cherry pick little things out of the reports and some of the important stuff was not being addressed, so we've now started putting out at press release every time we publish a report, and that's been very positive from our point of view.

MS BENNETT: If your office was the subject of media coverage, would you engage with a journalist about it?

MR CONNOCK: I have a media representative that liaises with the journalists.

MS BENNETT: But you personally wouldn't?
MR CONNOCK: Not as a general proposition, no.
MS BENNETT: Have you?

MR CONNOCK: No.
MS BENNETT: Commissioner McLean, what's your view of the media's role in oversight in the state?

MS McLEAN: It's a very powerful role. My relationship with the media is different than the two previously described; I'm an advocate first and foremost, so the relationship with the media for me is very important and largely proactive I've got to say. The media are quite receptive to many of the opportunities we provide them.

MS BENNETT: And so, would you engage directly with the media?

MS McLEAN: I hire, I contract media services who engage directly with the media on my behalf, and if we take a decision to do a press conference or provide an interview, that is arranged through that contractual arrangement.

MS BENNETT: Is media a legitimate avenue for whistleblowers in your view?

MS McLEAN: Oh, that's a very interesting question. I think it has been in Tasmania. I'm not sure if "legitimate" is the right word, I think "effective" would be another word.

MS BENNETT: Have you directly engaged with journalists about their coverage of child-related reporting in Tasmania?

MS McLEAN: I have responded to their requests for my opinion on matters.

MS BENNETT: Have you ever proactively called a journalist to talk about their coverage of child-related issues?

MS McLEAN: I have interacted with an editor of a local paper about their coverage of some child-related matters.

MS BENNETT: Was that to express concern about the nature of the coverage?

MS McLEAN: The concern - and I have published statements on this as well - the concern that I have about the
coverage of highly vulnerable children is the concern for them and for their families. So, if I could expand, in relation to Ashley Youth Detention Centre, for example, as the individual advocate of the children who reside there I have witnessed that it is often very, very difficult for them to see a place that for much of their life may have been their home portrayed sometimes in the way it is portrayed, even though it is so important that we bring these issues to light, we have to find a balance. We have an obligation to the safety and wellbeing of individual children and their families and we must do everything we can to make this system better, more accountable, but we must also think about them. That is where my primary concern comes from when I'm talking to the media.

MS BENNETT: And so, your concern, in this instance you're referring to was to make sure that coverage was appropriately protective of children; is that right?

MS McLEAN: That's right.
MS BENNETT: And it was limited to that?
MS McLEAN: I would ask that people think about children in their media coverage.

MS BENNETT: My question was, was it limited to that?
MS McLEAN: I have had a further conversation with an editor of a local paper in relation to their commentary about my involvement as the Commissioner or the role of the Commissioner for Children and Young People; I was fairly cranky during that conversation, I'm happy to share with the Commissioners. I always am very concerned when an independent statutory office is thrown into the middle of a political or media fray for the reasons that it was at that time. I didn't think that was fair, I didn't think that it was productive and I made those views clear at the time.

MS BENNETT: Please the Commission, those are the questions $I$ have for this panel.

PRESIDENT NEAVE: Thank you, any questions?
COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: I have one question and really, Mr Easton, I've been contemplating your answer about potentially referring matters back to the organisation for
investigation, and your other comment that might not be evident to the public. While they may be clear that they can come to the Integrity Commission and make a complaint, that they might not necessarily know that you'd refer it on. Do you think that could be problematic at any point in time, that a person might be concerned if the complaint they made about an organisation was referred back to that organisation?

MR EASTON: Yeah, I would say, yes, people are regularly concerned about that but it's a reality that we work with. One of our roles is to build capacity of agencies to deal with misconduct and prevent misconduct, we cannot do it all by ourselves and we want strong public institutions to do that.

As a complainant, yeah, I would say in the first instance they don't understand that we might but, when we do, we tell them so they know that we're doing it and we explain why; doesn't always make it any more palatable for the complainant, but at least we've put that forward as to why we're doing it and that we can then - or we will then follow up with the agency where we refer it out. So, our complaint management system will flag that, we have processes in place for doing that, and we will always follow up with those agencies as to how they've dealt with that matter and we can audit that and pick it up again if we choose to.

COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: Would you refer that back to an organisation to investigate if the individual expressed any fear of reprisal?

MR EASTON: It would be a factor for us, but that fear of reprisal at that point could be real, it could have already happened, or could be speculative, and there's protections in place under our Act, not very good ones I must say for protections against reprisal. If it's a public interest disclosure then there's protections under that Act: they're not that great either. So, it's a real factor, but what we'd be looking at really is the seniority of the people involved, the seriousness of it, and whether it's systemic, and, can the agency deal with it if we do refer it to them, because we're not just going to do it knowingly that they can't deal with it.

I should say that that ability to refer matters can
happen at a number of stages along the path of our dealing with complaints; it's not just at one point, it can happen at various points

COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: Ms Bennett put the idea that could confusion or lack of information contribute to lack of reporting, but could fear under those - what you've said as some weak protections there for people lead to lack of report?

MR EASTON: Absolutely. Yeah, I didn't get asked that question. I'd probably be a lot firmer, I don't have the evidence. It's my observations and we've put this in our submission in September. Yeah, it's our view based on our experience that people will not report things for fear of retribution or for fear of ostracisation as a
whistleblower, kind of thing. But equally people won't
report things because they don't understand the process
within their agency of reporting things, or they won't report things because they don't think they have to. So, there's some mandatory reporting requirements under other legislation, but it is not a requirement of a public official to report a criminal offence even. There's some people that have to, but not everyone. It's not even a requirement for public authorities to report to the police, so they're barriers, they're blockages.

COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: If we think about protecting children as something that needs a safety net, from what you're saying it sounds like we have the inverse of that, that we've actually got holes at multiple levels that may be contributing to a lack of reporting.

MR EASTON: Maybe. I'm speaking, I'm giving my opinion, I guess, I don't know enough about all of those potential holes, it's just our experience through not just our complaint work, but we engage regularly with agencies, we educate and people come and talk to us and tell us things, so I guess we're working at that informal level as well.

COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: And I was only making that conclusion from the things that you identified, the lack of understanding, the complicated systems, the fear, so you actually identified several different, I guess, potential missed opportunities there for people to understand how to report.

MR EASTON: That's right, and I would add to that or reinforce the lack of a requirement particularly in relation to criminal offences.

COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: Thank you, that's all my questions.

PRESIDENT NEAVE: I have one last question. You have power to hold public inquiries, and I don't think the Integrity Commission has ever done so; is that correct?

MR EASTON: That's correct. So, the inquiries themselves are not public.

PRESIDENT NEAVE: Yes.
MR EASTON: It's if the inquiry or the Integrity Tribunal who runs an inquiry, they may hold hearings and the hearings are public unless it's decided not to. But, you're right, we haven't held an inquiry to this point.

PRESIDENT NEAVE: Is there a reason for that?
MR EASTON: There is, the board of the Commission who make that decision have criteria in place for determining whether they will consider an inquiry and they've decided at this point that none of the investigations that we've completed have required us to take that next step into an inquiry, and there's a lot of positives and negatives from having not just inquiries but public hearings. One of the criteria essentially has been have we got sufficiently to the bottom of the matter through our investigation to be able to refer it back to an appropriate person to deal with, and I guess the response to the board would be, they've been satisfied that they have with all the matters to date.

PRESIDENT NEAVE: Thank you for that.
COMMISSIONER BENJAMIN: It's a two-step process, isn't it? First of all your first one is to determine whether you should make an enquiry at all or whether it goes back to the department or institution from whence it came; is that the process?

MR EASTON: So, I'11 try and simplify it. At the end of an investigation the board has to make a decision, they can
dismiss a matter, they can refer a matter back to an agency but it may not have come from that agency.

COMMISSIONER BENJAMIN: It may have come from somebody else about that agency, yes.

MR EASTON: That's right, or it can make a decision to hold an integrity tribuna1. It can also send it back to us to investigate it further, but that's the point, it makes the decision, is it going to hold a tribunal. If it does, or hold an inquiry; if it does then an integrity tribunal will run that inquiry.

COMMISSIONER BENJAMIN: So, what are the three options? (1) have an integrity inquiry; (2) refer it back to the instrumentality or refer it to the instrumentality, or (3) get you to do more work in relation to it? Are they the three options essentially?

MR EASTON: No, it's actually more than that; I'm sorry, but it's in section 58. Essentially at 58 the board can dismiss it. The board can refer it and then there's five six different types of entities that it could refer it to, so it's not just the agency, we could refer it to the police, we could refer it to the DPP, we could refer it to the responsible minister or a person who the board considers appropriate. On top of that the board can recommend that a commission of inquiry be established if it so chooses: that hasn't happened. It can require further investigation or it can determine that an integrity tribunal inquiry occur through the Commission, as in, the Integrity Commission.

COMMISSIONER BENJAMIN: And how long has the Commission been in place?

MR EASTON: Twelve years.
COMMISSIONER BENJAMIN: And there's not been one referral for an inquiry, has there, in that 12 years?

MR EASTON: That's right.
PRESIDENT NEAVE: Thank you.
MS BENNETT: We might adjourn for a break before convening the next panel.

PRESIDENT NEAVE: Yes, thank you.

## SHORT ADJOURNMENT

PRESIDENT NEAVE: Ms Norton.
MS NORTON: Good afternoon, this afternoon we have two journalists to speak to the Commission and I ask that they come up, Ms Camille Bianchi and Ms Emily Baker.
<CAMILLE SYDNEY BIANCHI, affirmed:
[3.24pm]
<EMILY JANE BAKER, affirmed and examined:
<EXAMINATION BY MS NORTON:
MS NORTON: Ms Bianchi, can I just ask you again to state your full name please?

MS BIANCHI: Camille Sydney Bianchi.
MS NORTON: And your occupation?
MS BIANCHI: Journalist.
MS NORTON: And is it the case that you're a freelance journalist?

MS BIANCHI: Yes.
MS NORTON: And so, you don't have a professional address as such?

MS BIANCHI: Not for this purpose, no.
MS NORTON: And, Ms Baker, your full name please?
MS BAKER: Emily Jane Baker.
MS BENNETT: And your occupation and professional address?
MS BAKER: Journalist at 1-7 Liverpool Street in Hobart.
MS NORTON: Commissioners, Ms Baker and Ms Bianchi have not prepared statements. You might have seen an outline that they've prepared; they're going to speak to you today
about their personal experiences of reporting on child sexual abuse in Tasmania.

Ms Bianchi, can I start by asking you just to outline for the Commissioners and the people here today your professional background in journalism?

MS BIANCHI: It's quite varied and most of my background has been in broadcast and that can be - I mean as Emily knows, that can be anything, so you sort of show up and it runs the gamut from court reporting to state politics if it was in a regional setting, et cetera, et cetera, so it's and then later on was real estate and finance, which is the closest I would say I have to a specialty.

MS NORTON: And you've been a journalist for 12 years or thereabouts?

MS BIANCHI: Yes.
MS NORTON: During that time, your background as a journalist includes a stint reporting for Southern Cross TV in Launceston?

MS BIANCHI: Yes.
MS NORTON: Was that in about 2012/13?
MS BIANCHI: Yeah, it was a short one, it was just shy of a year in that time.

MS NORTON: You've also worked as a journalist in Queensland and New South Wales?

MS BIANCHI: Yes.
MS NORTON: And I think as you said, to the extent you have an area of specialty it's in daily news, finance, those areas?

MS BIANCHI: Yes.
MS NORTON: Ms Baker, can you tell us about your professional background?

MS BAKER: So, I was lucky enough when I was 19, I got a cadetship in my hometown newspaper, The Examiner, in

Launceston. I was at The Examiner for about three years and then moved to The Canberra Times where I covered education, then moved back to Tasmania to work at The Mercury where I was the state political reporter for about a year and I've been at the $A B C$ for the past almost three years.

MS NORTON: As part of your role at the ABC you've been reporting on child sexual abuse for the past two years or thereabouts?

MS BAKER: Yeah I'd say that's roughly correct.
MS NORTON: You referenced getting a cadetship at your hometown newspaper. Is it the case that you grew up in Launceston?

MS BAKER: That's right, so I grew up in Launceston, my whole family's in Launceston, I spent my whole life until I was 23 in Launceston and still spend a lot of time there.

MS NORTON: Thank you. Ms Bianchi, I'd like to talk about The Nurse podcast. You're the journalist behind that podcast, which I think was first released in 2020 and ran for two seasons; is that correct?

MS BIANCHI: Yeah, so October 2020 and season one, I think there were eight episodes which I put out weekly and then season two was about six months later and that was much more ad hoc in terms of the publication, and then that last episode was I think 1 July 2021.

MS NORTON: The podcast, it takes its name "the Nurse", it's a reference to a former paediatric nurse at Launceston General Hospital, James Griffin. The podcast doesn't just concern the Launceston General Hospital; are you table to talk to the Commissioners in general terms about the topics that you've looked at in the podcast.

MS BIANCHI: Yes, and I'm not sure how clear I've made this within the making of it, but it all sort of became bigger and bigger and it certainly wasn't the case that I sort of came in with a wide lens but it became so by the end of that period.

So, I just got more and more information that sort of traversed different state departments, different
victim-survivors and different alleged perpetrators and the scope increased naturally from there.

MS NORTON: Given your background as a daily news and finance reporter based in Sydney, how was it that you came to prepare a podcast about sexual abuse in a Tasmanian hospital and Tasmanian institutions?

MS BIANCHI: I still don't know. No, I got a tip and then what quickly became apparent was that, or at least it seemed so at the time, that the only avenue in which victim-survivors, including Keelie McMahon who was wonderfully courageous and came to me would have the chance to do so publicly, was through media. They wanted to tell their stories because the Griffin matter wouldn't proceed to court because he had died and that stymied all sorts of different processes, and so, began, yeah, a good seven, eight, nine months of trying to work out how to tell that story and even if I could, yeah.

MS NORTON: Were you the first port of call for your sources or had your sources attempted to tell these stories or to raise their concerns elsewhere before they came to you?

MS BIANCHI: I think $I$ was the last port of call, and I certainly wouldn't have imagined, as I said, it wasn't on my radar personally in 2020 early when I first got that call. Yeah, the feeling that I got was that there was well, at least the perception was that there was no other outlet, and I'm aware that other journalists - I mean, I've been told other journalists were told, and I know that the journalists who originally broke the story, without naming Griffin, Sarah Aquilina of the Examiner at the time, it was a matter of limited resources et cetera, et cetera, an incredibly complex case to cover legally, and it sort of disappeared into the ether, so no, I was not the first.

MS NORTON: I'd like to come back to the question of local reporting, but just to give the Commissioners and those here present today a sense of the exposure that your podcast got; as I understand it, it was a self-funded podcast; is that right?

MS BIANCHI: Entirely, yes.
MS NORTON: Do you have a sense of how many times it's
been down1oaded?
MS BIANCHI: No, I have exact numbers. I say that and now I don't know. I think as of today it would be just shy of 1.3 million, but yeah.

MS NORTON: Do you know where the downloads take place?
MS BIANCHI: Yeah, so, I mean that's really, really slowed in the last nine months, but almost all from Sydney and Melbourne, and the US, and then in different degrees different states of Australia, but they give you a breakdown of cities around the world.

MS NORTON: And what about in Tasmania?
MS BIANCHI: It was picked up a little later, but also, I mean podcasts, it's sort of a certain generation, so I mean, 80 per cent of the listener breakdown of mine are women true crime enthusiasts around 40 to 50 years old, but then I was told by Acast who I produced it through that Tasmania doesn't have a huge podcast audience and not for true crime, anyway in 2020 that was the case. So, it was a comparatively small audience, but also population-wise it's quite difficult to compare, yeah.

MS NORTON: Can I throw a question open to both of you. You referred then, Ms Bianchi, to a journalist at the examiner who had originally broken the Griffin story, and I'm conscious, Ms Baker, that you had also along with other local reporters been reporting about the Griffin story and other concerns about institutional child sexual abuse in Tasmania prior to the podcast. That reporting doesn't seem to have got the same traction as the podcast. Do either of you or both of you have a view about why that might have been the case?

MS BAKER: I'm not sure, just to correct you, I'm not sure that I had reported on Griffin before The Nurse podcast so that was actually the first time it came to my attention except for a conversation with a friend in Launceston who wondered why the media wasn't covering it, that he had been walked out of the LGH. This was after The Examiner had covered it and after he had died.

In terms of why it didn't get traction, I would probably agree with what Camille has said, I think about a
newspaper like The Examiner which faced tremendous cuts while I was there and, and has been cut and cut and cut since, it is a legally complex story and as I'm sure we'11 hear, took Camille months and months and months to get the information that she needed to proceed with the story. I would say that at a place like The Examiner when you're reporting on daily events as they happen and you're basically treading water, they don't have the time to do that frankly. I've said that I heard about this in a conversation with a friend, I believe that was actually after the nurse came out because she said, "I can't believe you guys didn't report it", "you guys" being the ABC. I don't know a single person at the ABC who was aware of it, which may be a reflection on us or it may be a reflection on the distrust I think of local media that some of the community feel.

MS NORTON: Do you have a sense of why there's a level of mistrust for local media?

MS BAKER: I think there's a few reasons, maybe as a primary one is, I mean, there's distrust in journalists generally which we see around the world. And I think it's particularly prominent in Tasmania, maybe the culture of secrecy that you've been talking about today is part of that, but I have the sense, when I talk to people they are trying to figure out who I know in Launceston, whether they might be connected to, say, the LGH, whether I have relatives working there or for a particular department or whatever it may be, and I've had that question directly asked of me before, and "will you tell anyone", you know, "Your certain relative works here, will you tell them what I've told you?" I think that's a really big factor, how small Tasmania is and a concern - you know, maybe a misunderstanding of how journalists treat sources or good journalists treat their sources and what we might do with that information.

MS NORTON: Can you offer any reflections on local perceptions about the role of the media when reporting on Tasmania?

MS BAKER: I get the sense, and I mean this is backed up by trusty Facebook, for example, that there's a belief that feels particularly pronounced in Tasmania that the role of the media is to champion Tasmania, and that's a view expressed by the community often and that's a view
expressed by the government often. Stories that talk down Tasmania are likely to attract negative criticism and often quite negative commentary.

MS NORTON: You said in your answer just then that this idea that the role of the media is to champion, not denigrate Tasmania and that that's a view expressed by the government. Can you expand for the Commissioners and the people here today how that view is expressed by government?

MS BAKER: I think a pretty clear example is the only recently former Premier Peter Gutwein often at a press conference will say, "Well, you might want to talk down Tasmania but I don't", and you might be asking a basic question about funding to something or whatever it may be, a really basic question, you're interrogating an announcement, you're wondering where money is going to come from for this big thing that we're planning on building, and the response will be, "You might want to talk down Tasmania but I don't", and that's the end of story.

MS BENNETT: No, please.
MS BAKER: No, I've lost the stream on that.
MS NORTON: Well, can I throw this out there and ask for your comment on it, I've certainly heard it myself and I'd be interested in your view, the slogan, "Ashley's good for jobs". Do those sorts of attitudes affect your reporting on Ashley Youth Detention Centre?

MS BAKER: Particularly, Tasmania's fiercely parochial and that affects the state $I$ think in all sorts of ways, we're talking about a disjointed health system, tension between the north and south, we have a Federal election happening right now where funding gets concentrated in areas where it's easier - an unfair thing to say - where people would like to win seats and you play up, you know, we're here for the north, we're good for Bass, we're good for Braden, whatever it is. Working for something like The Examiner certainly - and I haven't worked there for a long time but certainly the sense was, we're here to champion the north, we're here to talk up the north, we'll tell good stories about the north and I do think that's an important role that a local newspaper plays, you're part of the community's identity and you should be of course telling the good stories that come with that.

Sometimes there are not good stories though, and if we think about something like the Ashley Detention Centre, and again, I would say no-one at The Examiner was aware of the extent of the abuse that's been alleged at Ashley Youth Detention Centre, but the way Ashley was framed was that it's good for jobs in Deloraine. It is a jobs hub in Deloraine and it was seen as political poison to talk about closing Ashley. Indeed the 2016 Noetic report which recommended the closure of Ashley, you know, replacement with the two purpose-built centres which now seems to be happening, that became this political football of, well, labor wants to shut down Ashley, loses local jobs; not what is the best outcome for the children in this situation.

MS NORTON: Are you aware of any attitudes within the Tasmanian community about newspapers reporting on child sexual abuse?

MS BAKER: It's still - I know one particular publication did not report on child sexual abuse for some time because it was a topic that readers don't like and, of course they don't like it, we don't like talking about it either. There is a sense I think in Launceston still that these are private matters and, when we talk about the Griffin matter in particular, that this is a private matter and it's wrong, it's wrong for the media to keep talking about it.

MS NORTON: Ms Bianchi, can I invite you to comment on the reflections that Ms Baker's just offered?

MS BIANCHI: Yeah, that holds true. So, certainly, I mean, the feedback I had from many Tasmanians, especially probably fair to say older Tasmanians would be a little bit like, "Okay, this is done now, why are you still talking about it?" Or almost as if you're glorying in it and it's like Emily said, it's the hardest thing to report on, I mean, even just logistically, legally, every element of it, emotionally, it has an incredible burden that you place on everyone you speak with, which you have to be conscious of to be a decent human being as well as a journalist, but it was definitely a sense of, "This isn't nice, this isn't productive, this isn't helpful", and all you're doing is, I mean, I had this said directly and indirectly was, "You're doing harm", was basically it.

MS NORTON: And the people who came forward to you, they
obviously took a different attitude, and no doubt were very disturbed about the matters that they were coming forward with and would have preferred not to have felt like they needed to come forward. What motivated them to come and speak with you?

MS BIANCHI: It was different for a different one. So, for victim-survivors a couple of whom came forward and I don't want to name one and forget someone - anyway, they're such outstanding courage I'll never be able to even fathom that. But, they didn't - they all said the same thing predominantly, which was, "This can't happen to anyone else, and we're not certain these people who were in state-run institutions, we're not certain that enough has changed since in the years since this happened to me that it won't happen to someone else". That was the predominant thing, and then the other reason that people gave was a sense of justice not done and they felt stuck in their lives. There was this hurdle that they couldn't overcome and, "I hope, I hope speaking helped".

MS NORTON: In your experience, was coming forward an easy or a straightforward thing for those people or was that a difficult thing for your sources to do?

MS BIANCHI: Again, it's so different. So, for people that I dealt with that hadn't gone to media before it was incredibly - I mean, I can't speak for them, but my sense was that they were comfortable with speaking with me, but they had a lot of fear around what would happen - I mean, as you'd expect - what would happen reputationally; you know, it depended on how much time had passed really and how much they had sort of come to terms with what had happened, I suppose, depending on how they felt.

MS NORTON: Can I ask you about that fear and I'11 invite you to comment as well, Ms Baker, because I know in the last month or two you've published an article where you talk about being not the first port of call for sources. Can you share with the Commissioners your reflections on the fears that sources have coming forward?

MS BAKER: I think in a small place like Tasmania there's a fear about personal repercussions, professional repercussions, what the broader community might think of them, that they won't be believed, you know that that thing will be reinforced that they won't be believed, that
nothing will change. And, as Camille said, it's a huge thing to talk to a journalist, it's completely outside the realm of what most people every day have to even think about doing. To think about going on television, talking about the most traumatic event of your life is a huge decision to make.

You know, I've done stories with people where they don't leave the house for a week, they're too scared, they're worried people on the street will recognise them and know them as this person that this terrible thing has happened to. But often there's immense strength and courage in the people who decide to do that and the people who don't. You know, we talked to people who - I'm assuming, I certainly talked to people who get partway through wanting to tell their story and decide that's not for them and I respect that as well and their bravery and making the right choice for them.

MS NORTON: Can I ask you about your process. When a source comes forward with a story they'd like to share with you, what sort of discussions do you have with them about the process that you're about to engage in?

MS BAKER: I always try to be very honest and up-front with people who come to me, and of course empathetic as well, that goes hopefully without saying. We need to be able to - we need evidence of - that the allegations are true, and that can be really difficult if we're talking about historical child sexual abuse, and it might be as simple as talking to another family member, a person's friend from the time, that sort of thing. But it is, it's a really rigorous process. So, you know, I can't speak to Camille's process, but it's asking for paperwork, any documentation, did you keep a diary at the time, would you sign a statutory declaration, would you appear with me in court if I'm sued for publishing this story, who can back up your story? Then, you know, I tell them, these are the things we have to go through and it might be that we can't tell the story if you can't produce those things. It's a really rigorous and difficult process.

MS NORTON: Ms Bianchi, is your process similar to that described by Ms Baker?

MS BIANCHI: It is, and I had my own lawyer, I mean, she has excellent judgment in that and it was always, there
were thresholds that she wouldn't accept in terms of evidence that I would present to her with my scripts and things that she checked, so numbers of sources. Paperwork is very helpful, all that stuff. And also with the court, sort of the caveat that if this goes ahead will you testify in court?

MS NORTON: You said earlier on in the session that you began looking at events surrounding James Griffin at Launceston General Hospital but the scope increased as more information came to you. Applying the sort of thresholds that you've just described, have you told in the two series of the podcast all or most of the accounts that have come to you, or is there material that's unpublished?

MS BIANCHI: A very small portion has been able to be published. So, I am - I'm loath to put a percentage on it because it wouldn't be accurate, I can't sort of really. I mean, I know at least half but it's more than half of what I've had, probably much more than half I can't report on, for very many reasons, including sources disappearing, et cetera, et cetera, but mostly it's because of evidence thresholds.

MS NORTON: You've both talked about the fears that sources have in coming forward, fears related among others things to professional consequences. Currently, and distinct from some other jurisdictions whistleblower legislation in Tasmania doesn't provide protections to whistleblowers who come to professional journalists. Do you have any views on whether those sorts of protections are a good idea and might make the process of coming forward easier for your sources?

MS BAKER: I think those fears would remain and, at the risk of doing myself out of a job or whatever, my personal preference would be the existing systems actually work, that they're strengthened and - I mean, of course, I would love people to be protected if they talked to a journalist but I recognise that that's not necessarily an ideal scenario, but we're not living in an ideal scenario right now, so I think that, yes, adding journalists to that level of protection would be a wonderful thing but there are so many things before that I think that need to happen before that as a matter of priority.

MS NORTON: Can you speak to the Commissioners about what
those things are?
MS BAKER: We11, I'm sure you would have read so much evidence of people trying to make change within institutions, they go through the right channels, they go through the right channels again, they try a different office, they try an integrity office. Wouldn't it be wonderful if someone alerts someone in their workplace to serious misconduct, and we're talking about the worst kind of misconduct, and that's acted upon.

MS NORTON: So, you're referring to processes within institutions rather than processes that involve the media?

MS BAKER: I am, yeah, I'm talking about, I would love for these institutions to work.

MS NORTON: Do you have anything you'd like to add to Ms Baker's comments, Ms Bianchi?

MS BIANCHI: Yeah, I 100 per cent agree, I mean, I can only speak for myself, but I don't think people should have to go to media. I don't think it's an easy or even a great outcome. Like, I worry every day that people will regret coming forward. Like, you know, because every time I speak with someone I'm exposing them to all the things that come with it. I mean, good for me, I get to tell a story, but for them, wouldn't it be better if they could go safely within their workplace and not feel as though there would be some sort of punitive outcome if they were to report things higher? And also, a little bit more transparency and clarity around where they can go. I mean, so many of my sources, and at times I don't know what the appropriate course is in terms of which Commission, which Ombudsman, integrity, whichever, whichever; I can't imagine how confusing it must be.

MS BAKER: Could I just add something, sorry, if we talk about something like - I mean there are times I will talk people out of doing a story with me because I am too conscious of the potential repercussions for them, and they may be, you know, if they want to do it, obviously people are consenting adults and that's fine, but there are times where I'll say "I think this is too risky and I'll talk them out of it.

What I actually meant to say was - I then might try to
refer them to, well, again, like Camille, I'd struggle to know where someone should go, so often I would suggest the Ombudsman, for example. But I know, or it appears, that that office is chronically under-resourced and therefore limited in the actions it can take in a timely manner.

MS NORTON: It sounds like you both feel a real responsibility when people come forward to share their stories with you; both a responsibility that is squarely within your professional realm, but one that strays beyond it as well. Is that a fair characterisation?

MS BAKER: Oh, absolutely, I take it incredibly seriously. You know, it's a great responsibility to tell these stories and any story, for someone to trust you with often very sensitive and personal information and not just with this, but in many other topics that I've covered should be treated like it's the huge responsibility it is.

MS NORTON: We've been talking about your interactions with sources, I'd now like to ask you about your interactions or dealings with Tasmanian institutions. Can I ask you, and perhaps I'll start with you, Ms Baker, as the local journalist, to talk to the Commissioners about your experience of dealing with government departments and other agencies when you're making enquiries as a journalist.

MS BAKER: It's an experience that's changed over time. So, I think, as I said at the beginning, I started - I didn't go to university, so I came straight out of Launceston College, I'm working at The Examiner, I was 19, and at that time I was not treated well, I think it would be fair to say by government media officers, and there was a short period where Labor was in government and then Liberals came into government.

What has been a common theme - I'm treated with more respect now, I would say, and I don't know whether that's because we've had several different Premiers since then and things keep changing and whatever that may be, cultural change I don't know, or whether I'm just more experienced so people don't bother. But what hasn't changed is, I think, a general hostility towards the media. Obstruction of even the most basic requests, crazy hurdles thrown in your way for no reason or completely ignored.

MS NORTON: Can I just ask you there, can you give an example of what you mean by basic requests?

MS BAKER: I wrote these down because I knew my mind would go blank. It's outside the scope of --

MS NORTON: Sure.
MS BAKER: So, I'm talking really basic requests. For example, when we started having the quarantine hotels, so who's the contractor? Apparently it wasn't our business. It wasn't a whole story in itself even, it was meant to be a line in a TV story. We've got quarantine hotels popping up in Tasmania, I wasn't allowed to know who the contractor was. I've asked how many children in Ashley are the subject of Out-of-Home Care orders; I can't quite remember the right phrasing there. I ended up doing an RTI, I don't think I got that back either. I remember asking a question on when Minister Jaensch was alerted to specific allegations within Ashley: didn't receive a response; talk about incidents happening at the LGH when I was at The Examiner: no response. I could do this all day.

MS NORTON: Thank you, you've answered my question , thank you. Can you contrast that experience of dealing with local institutions with your experience when you were at the ACT of dealing with government institutions there?

MS BAKER: It was really shocking. I mean, moving from Launceston to Canberra was a cultural shock in a lot of ways. But every time you make a request for information here, and again I'm talking about from the most basic request to ones that I would acknowledge are more potentially hairy for a government: it is why do you need that information, what are you doing with it, what are you writing, what's your angle, argue, argue, argue, it's 5 o'clock, it's too late, sorry, everyone's gone home.

When I moved to the ACT I was shocked, happily shocked, that I could ask for, say, I said I was an education reporter. What are the school attendance figures? Oh, here you go. It's like, oh now what? I have to write a story on it, you know. It was a very different attitude, and it doesn't mean that it wasn't combative sometimes or they would try to prevent you from getting information or it was this beautiful utopia that everything I wanted I received, absolutely not, but the attitude was
very different
MS NORTON: Ms Bianchi, would you like to comment on your experience dealing with Tasmanian institutions?

MS BIANCHI: Yeah, so I'll put RTI stuff to the side for a moment.

MS NORTON: We'11 ask you about that shortly.
MS BIANCHI: But just in terms of my perception in general, and I have a lot of doubt in this because I have a really shallow pool of experience in Tasmania and it's such a narrow sort of scope of experience and I am asking really troubling questions of departments. I mean, the biggest thing that I kept sort of coming back to was just non-replies and baffling lapses in time that were
attributed to things like, you know, COVID or this or that, and then I had time, so I was okay. And then I'd come back and then just, it would just be like, "Oh, you know, thanks for your enquiry but no, we won't be answering it". It was like, this is really serious, I would have thought, you know, in different jurisdictions I've dealt with there'd be a call that was sort of, you know, a formal call and then trying to get the scope of what you're saying and how it can be responded to and an answer quite swiftly. And I was dealing with a Regional Queensland hospital about six months ago for something; I mean on the level with this seriousness, it wasn't child sexual abuse but it was really serious, and it was dealt with in a way that I expected. They weren't thrilled and they certainly didn't hand me over a bunch of information straight away but it felt professional and it didn't feel like a game.

I came away from a lot of this reporting with a sense that it was - like I was going crazy and it was this sort of back and forth that got more and more bizarre and more and more time passing and then all these nos, and yeah, you do, you sort of - almost fatigue, and I wonder, yeah, if it's that hard for us, I wonder how it is for other people, members of the public.

MS NORTON: I'd like to come back to that because I'd like to explore that further in the context of RTI applications, but I'd also like to invite you, both of you, to comment if you'd like to about particular government departments that you find particularly difficult or particularly good to
deal with.
MS BAKER: Health and communities have long been particularly difficult to deal with, and I'm not blaming any individuals for that, it feels cultural. Education, I have found easier to deal with in a Tasmanian context. Yeah, I would say they're the kind of three - DPIPWE has become, or whatever it's called now, has become better, but I would say certainly health and communities are the standout most difficult.

MS NORTON: You're nodding, Ms Bianchi?
MS BIANCHI: I mean, I haven't dealt with all the institutions, but they were kind of my first foray into really sort of seriously dealing with any media enquiries in Tassie, and I was astounded by how combative it felt, and again, you kind of wonder, I'm coming in as an outsider and it's this sort of brief experience that I'm having, but it's been vindicated and validated by people like Em and yeah.

MS BAKER: Yeah, there are times particularly when I was younger that I'd be left crying after an interaction with someone from a particular department, and that happened to a colleague of mine last week, she was left crying after an interaction because you were so attacked, and to the point of a former employer had made a complaint about this, but who do you complain to? It's working for them, right?

MS NORTON: Would either of you like to comment about the role of political advisors, Ministers, the extent to which in your experience they seek to influence the media narrative and, if they do, the ways in which they seek to do so?

MS BIANCHI: The only thing I can really think of that's a concrete example is, prior to my first episode on Ashley, I was getting - I got a weekend call from a media rep who - I mean, to be fair to them it wasn't like they were being nasty or anything but it was baffling, and it was ostensibly trying to see if they could preview the episode because they were concerned that I didn't understand the legalities. And, you know, I had a lawyer of my own and she assured them, no, she understands as do I, and the inference was that I would be harming children in custody, and look it's very difficult when you hear that enough not
to think that that's just how they approach any of these inquiries as though they're malicious. I can say they're not, they're not malicious on my end, but that's certainly the tone with which media enquiries are met, I would say, in the departments we mentioned. It's sort of, "What are you doing this for, you're going to do harm?", is the - I mean, it's not even covert, sometimes it's said directly to you.

MS NORTON: Ms Baker, have you had similar experiences where representatives of government institutions have contacted you directly in response to your reporting on child abuse?

MS BAKER: Kind of separate to that, and I'11 get to that obviously, but building on what Camille has said, there have been several occasions where I've been told, like several occasions, that I'm going to cause someone to take their own life, my reporting will lead to that dreadful outcome, and it is, I'm loath to say weaponised because I don't want to make light of it myself, but it can feel that that is often used. That is often used.

MS BIANCHI: It's been said to me too.
MS BAKER: Yeah, so I received - I guess the most blatant example of what you're talking about would be a phone call from a very senior public servant who - this was obviously in relation to a particular report, I think it was on some staff stand downs - implying that I was, I may cause a staff - I may cause serious mental harm to the staff involved, that I was unnecessarily scaring Northern Tasmania, which is an amazing power of mine, and that I was upsetting the victims of abuse particularly at Ashley Youth Detention Centre, which was a dreadful, horrible phone call to receive; particularly, I was talking to the people that were affected by that abuse.

MS NORTON: You both referred on a number of occasions to suggestions that you're doing harm or seeking to do harm through you're your reporting. Is that the case?

MS BAKER: No.
MS BIANCHI: No.
MS BAKER: No.

MS NORTON: What's your reaction to those suggestions?
MS BIANCHI: Um, it's very heartbreaking, because if you if you do report in this area, and I think you would hope anyone working in this area, it's impossible to - and I suppose - it's really bad faith to come at it that way because I don't really understand what we would get from that; like, there's no kind of kudos.

MS BAKER: No, and that's not to downplay, the media has a really serious role, we can cause harm, I'm so cognisant of that as I'm sure Camille is.

MS BIANCHI: Yeah.
MS BAKER: That's a balancing act every day when we're talking about these issues, it's at the forefront of our mind, but $I$ would refuse to be another institution that says sorry I'm not reporting on that because I might hurt a worker's feelings. No.

MS NORTON: Can I ask you this question: I believe you were both in the media room during the previous panel, and you would have heard the evidence given by the Commissioner for Children and Young People about conversations that she had had on occasion with the media stemming from a concern that reporting, for example, in relation to Ashley Youth Detention Centre was - and she didn't use this word but my paraphrasing, that it might be irresponsible and that when she has those conversations with the media it's because she wants the media to think about the children. What's your reaction? I guess the implicit message there is that you're not thinking about the children when you report on Ashley Youth Detention Centre. What's your reaction to that?

MS BIANCHI: I mean, it's an explicit message in my mind. The reaction again is, why would we do it? I don't - I mean, it's not the area that editors want you to report on, it's not going to kind of get you a Netflix series, I mean, it's not fun for anyone.

MS BAKER: No, I feel like I - yeah --
MS NORTON: What motivates you to do it?

MS BAKER: Um, sorry, I'm getting emotional.
MS NORTON: Take a minute.
MS BAKER: I just think we can do so much better, and, frankly, to hear the Commissioner say that, I almost cried at the time. Like, I feel like I was so - and, you know, we're not the victims here, you know, I know that. But, you know, having a new - what felt like new disclosures of child sexual abuse made to us most days of the week, 24-hours a day, dealing with the barriers that we've dealt with, you know, I would love - I'd love to never report on this again, I'd love for it not to be a problem, but that's the point: I would love for it not to be a problem. I think we can do better, I think vulnerable children deserve so much better and that they don't have that.

MS NORTON: Thank you, Ms Baker. Can I just go back to the previous example that you gave about receiving a phone call from a senior government - a senior public servant. You, of course, can't speak to the state of mind of that senior public servant, but being on the receiving end of that call, what was the message that you took away from that call?

MS BAKER: The message was, "Don't talk about this stuff, we're dealing with it, leave us to deal with it, you are hurting people every time you report on that."

MS NORTON: I'd like to talk about - I'm conscious of the time - I'd like to talk about the RTI process, and perhaps I'll start with you, Ms Bianchi, and I know, Ms Baker, you've had considerable experience with RTI requests.

But there's a particularly prominent example in your case, Ms Bianchi, where you made an RTI application to the Department of Health; would you like to just briefly outline to the Commissioners what you were seeking in that application and when you made it?

MS BIANCHI: Yeah. So, I made it on 1 April 2020, and that was seeking records of complaints against James Griffin in his capacity as a paediatric nurse, I think it was transfer records and also ward notes, emails, it was anything pertaining to that inquiry, and also I think within that was whether he had an eligible Working With Children's card, but I can't recall if that was a different
application. So, I made it on April 1st 2020, yes.
MS NORTON: And, what response did you receive to your request?

MS BIANCHI: I mean, the first were really helpful because I had filed it incorrectly, so that was the same day, actually I had made it as an FOI and that wasn't appropriate in this jurisdiction. Then it was, I suppose, back and forth of housekeeping around how I needed to send it; I needed to pay for it because I wasn't recognised as a journalist, which I accepted because this was an enquiry made as an independent who works outside of Tassie. So, I think I paid $\$ 44$ for it? I can't remember whether I even eventually waived that fee or not, and then it had to be posted, so it became a bit of back and forth yeah.

MS NORTON: A bit of back and forth initially, and then, did you receive a response within the statutory timeframe?

MS BIANCHI: No. So, I think about six weeks, and then I followed up, and then the answer was that due to COVID that there was time delay, which I accepted, even though there were zero cases in Tassie at the time from memory, or maybe there was - I think there was a handful. And then a couple of months later I followed back up and then asked again, and it was due to COVID, and then I got a bit arky and then was kind of just, like, well, there's so few cases in the state, how could it be a COVID delay?"

Then the eventual response, I started to talk about it. I didn't have it by the time I started publishing in October 2020, so six months later, and then I made reference to it quite a few times, so I was annoyed. And then I was - I did hear back once I started sort of broadcasting about it; I remember hearing just a "no", so it wasn't in the public interest to fulfil that request.

And then I referred it to the Ombudsman's Office - I can't actually remember the exact timeline of this, I think it was all within that six, seven, eight months, and then the Ombudsman - so, that was for an appeal, so you can appeal. And then the Ombudsman accepted it but said it would take up to three years, and they were really helpful but they - a couple of calls back and forth, like, it was just gonna take a very long time.

I tried to fast-track it and then that was rejected, that application to fast-track it, so that was another month down the line I think; and then I just let it be. And then, in this time this Commission had been announced and things, and then sometime later I got a call from the Ombudsman's Office saying it had self sort of elected to fast-track it and I would be getting that soon, and then a number of more months passed and then I think it was November, the beginning of November in 2021.

MS NORTON: Yes. So, you appealed the decision of the and, just to assist the Commissioners, the Ombudsman's decision is in the hearing bundle, it's before the Commission, but just for context. The request was made, I believe, tell me if this is wrong: the Department of Health responded - told you that there were documents responsive to the request but refused to provide them on the ground that they were each captured by exceptions to the obligation to provide materials, and it was that decision that you appealed to the Ombudsman; is that correct?

MS BIANCHI: Yes, that's correct.
MS NORTON: And the Ombudsman handed down a decision at the beginning of November 2021; that's a detailed decision and I don't want to oversimplify it, but would you agree that, in general terms, the Ombudsman found that some of the exemptions were not made out at all; others were made out in part, and that there certainly were documents that weren't covered by an exemption and that ought be provided to you?

MS BIANCHI: Yes.
MS NORTON: So, that's at the beginning of November 2021. Were the documents provided to you at that time?

MS BIANCHI: No.
MS NORTON: And, Ms Baker, I think I'm right in saying that about a month later, in December, I think it's around 10 December last year, you and others started to report on the Ombudsman's decision. Can you explain why it was that you started reporting on that decision a month after it had been handed down?

MS BAKER: So, there are a couple of things. I think, to be frank, I'm not on the Ombudsman's website very often. I had a source alert me to this decision and they basically had to hold my hand to walk through this complicated web on the website of where exactly this decision was hiding. It was under a subheading on a subheading, you know, on a page buried deep on the Ombudsman's website, so it took that source alerting me to this, and the fact that this page even existed, before I realised it was there.

MS NORTON: And, Ms Bianchi, what happened when the media started reporting on the Ombudsman's decision?

MS BIANCHI: So, that was on October 10. So, journos, including Em, were talking. I think that was sort of - the flavour of the reporting was the fact that the Ombudsman had made some commentary around the justifications that Tasmania Health had used to not provide the documents. So, anyway, that basically triggered - well, I don't know, I can only say it's coincidental - that, about half an hour after Channe1 7's story, I got all the documents 22 months after I filed RTI.

MS NORTON: So, just to make sure I've got this right: you made a request and documents were not provided by the Department of Health in response to that request; they also were not provided following a decision from the Ombudsman saying that at least some of those documents ought it to have been provided to you; is that correct?

MS BIANCHI: Yes.
MS NORTON: And it was media reporting on the issue that finally prompted, in the end, quite a rapid response?

MS BIANCHI: Yeah, very rapidly.
MS NORTON: Or rapid provision?
MS BIANCHI: Yeah.
MS NORTON: What does that tell you about the importance of robust reporting in this state?

MS BIANCHI: Well, I want to ask Emily, because I remember - because I didn't tell the other journos that it wasn't being filled or anything, and it all felt too inside
base fill and like no-one would care, and I feel like I should have sort of, I guess, thought more about that, but I mean, I was really surprised that it was covered and so extensively at the time. And, I'm grateful, but it all just - like, it's sort of what we were talking about before, it frustrates me because that's not what the media is for.

Like, if you're a member of the public filing an RTI, if you're a victim-survivor, if you're a politician, if you're someone else, it's for you, it's not just for us, and it's not necessarily most important that journalists get these documents, it's for everybody.

MS BAKER: And I think it's an unfortunate reality, and not just in the RTI space, that sometimes it can take going public, and I guess this is what we've already touched on, for things to change. You know, again outside the scope of this inquiry, but it might be a person who's on a public housing waitlist and in an extremely dire situation desperately comes to the media and, what do you know, there's a house available for them.

I can think of many examples of things like that: someone on an elective surgery waitlist suddenly has access to the surgery. I'd say it's the same situation here, without knowing the ins and outs, of course, but it is a wonderful coincidence that, half an hour after airing on the most viewed news in Tasmania Camille Bianchi gets the documents she'd applied for 22 months earlier.

MS NORTON: And, the sort of process that we've just gone through, Ms Bianchi's experience may be an extreme example or maybe you'll tell me it's not; to what extent has your own experience with RTI applications been consistent with Ms Bianchi's experience?

MS BAKER: Oh, it's completely consistent. It seems, frankly, a waste of time, and it doesn't mean we don't still file them, we do, but it is absolutely an issue of last resort, you're gearing up for a fight. I have had to prove I'm a journalist using an ABC email address. Cassy O'Connor, the Greens Leader, has had to prove she's a Parliamentarian. It's always difficult, it's always an argument.

This, I think, is changing. I actually would note
that this is changing, but there is certainly a sense that the cuts to the media again, journalists are time-poor, probably not across the legislation maybe as we should be, that those things are all taken advantage of; we're fobbed around, rebuffed, it goes away.

MS NORTON: Can I call up onto the screen a document, COM.0004.0001.2023 and COM.0004.0001.2024. This is an opinion piece that was published around the same time as this Commission of Inquiry was called as around the same time that you received your documents, Ms Bianchi.

You will see there, it's an opinion piece by David Killick who is the political editor at The Mercury and it's titled, "No More Secrets". There's a quote there at the end of the first paragraph, I'm just going to read out these quotes and then invite you to comment.

The quote is:
... Tasmania's culture of secrecy is a cancer on our democracy.

He goes on to talk about Launceston General Hospital and Ashley, and then over the page, at 2024, he continues:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Keeping bad news - or any news - from } \\
& \text { reaching the public isn't some sort of } \\
& \text { aberration. It is the defining } \\
& \text { characteristics of this state's political } \\
& \text { culture. } \\
& \text { It infects almost every public institution. } \\
& \text { It is endemic in the health and education } \\
& \text { departments and reflected in the unchecked } \\
& \text { nepotism of the state's prison system. }
\end{aligned}
$$

Now, they're strong words, and it's important to stress that that's an opinion being expressed by Mr Killick, but I'd like to invite you each, to the extent you'd like to, to comment on the extent to which you agree or disagree with his opinions.

MS BIANCHI: 100 per cent agree, and he's articulated it so well, I remember when this came out and feeling so validated because he knows his stuff, he's been around a long time, and yeah, he goes on to describe everything in
perfect detail, I would say.
MS NORTON: Ms Baker?
MS BAKER: I would agree, yes. Yes, agree. I think the approach has changed over time where there's not the aggression, I think, that we once experienced from different levels of, whether it's government or institutions, but I would agree that the default is that information is not released; that the media is not to be trusted; that, you know, we know best, you are just being a pain, you know, yep.

MS NORTON: Can I ask you both just for some closing reflections; I'll start with you, Ms Baker. It's quite apparent from the evidence you've given that you work in circumstances that are often very challenging, and the personal toll that the reporting that you do has on you is also evident through the evidence that you've given today.

You're a skilled journalist with a national media outlet, I'm sure you have job opportunities that you could pursue elsewhere; why is it that you choose to do the work that you do in this place?

MS BAKER: Tasmania is my home, I think about returning from Canberra, driving off the Spirit of Tasmania and this sense of, like, this full-bodied relief that I was back, you know. The past two years though, frankly, have made me question how long I can stay here doing this job. I would like to, I would like to contribute to a better Tasmania, whatever that may look like, and everyone will have different ideas of what that might look like. I would like to, you know, if I'm lucky enough one day to have children to raise them here, this is where I'm from, this is where my family's from.

But, and thank you for your kind words, but it's something that I fairly lately have been grappling with; you know, this is it a pretty hard job to do in a small State. Yeah, I might leave that open-ended.

MS NORTON: Things would need to change, and you may well have addressed all the things that need to change already, but do you want to summarise for the Commissioners what would need to change for you to continue to do the important work you do here?

MS BAKER: I'm really bad at maths, so if I've had two years away, I've been working roughly seven years in Tasmania. I've been writing similar stories throughout those seven years. Our health system is lagging, our education system is lagging, we're talking about abuse in these institutions, we think about a government being dragged kicking and screaming to the only logical conclusion which is to close Ashley Detention Centre.

I need to believe there's a will in Tasmania, in the community, within the government, within the institutions, that we can do better, we can be better and this will be a better place. I acknowledge that there are some really complex challenges in this state, and we're talking about demographics, history, but why should we accept that we are the bottom of the ladder? Why aren't we throwing everything we can into fixing these systems, supporting the vulnerable families that end up within these systems and being trapped in these systems and taken advantage of or lost?

I just, at the risk of sounding a bit twee, like, I just need to believe that we can get to a better place, and that has been seriously tested in the past couple of years.

MS NORTON: Ms Bianchi, I'll similarly invite you to offer any closing reflections you have about the importance of the media's working upholding integrity in public institutions and perhaps how your experience of reporting on child sexual abuse here might have changed your view of Tasmanian institutions.

MS BIANCHI: Yeah, so I mean, the first and most important thing I want to say is, I was getting emotional earlier describing sort of the toll of reporting, and I would feel so awful if that was interpreted by any of the incredible whistleblower sources and victim-survivors who came to me as not acknowledging that it has been such a privilege, and it is, and it is the job we want to be doing as hard as it is. Like, we know that it's - and this is why we get upset and why we get frustrated is, we know the toll it takes on the people we're talking to.

And, speaking of harm, of course I've done harm, I know I have against every instinct and, of course, against what you want; like, it's something you kind of always
guard against, and that's why it's so complicated and so difficult, this area.

But, yeah, I just wanted to really high1ight that it is, it's the privilege of my life and certainly my career. But also, in terms of acknowledging the media, I think I've had a disproportionate amount of, I suppose, acknowledgment from some of the reporting from The Nurse when it has been happening for years.

The first stories, and especially in 2020 from Amber Wilson into education; I mean, extraordinary stories that, if they were being told, I would think anywhere else in Australia, you know, presses would stop. And, I kept reading, and I know I regurgitated a lot of old press when I was doing episodes, especially on Ashley, and reporters have been fearless and they continue to be, and it's hard to continue to ask what we ask of people when we don't see change, and that's the hardest thing and it's the reason you burn out; it's the reason you stop is because you think, how can I ask that? I can't promise anything, I mean, we shouldn't promise anyway, but how can you possibly say things will get better and that this just won't be an extraordinary risk to whoever you're speaking with.

MS NORTON: Thank you both for your time this afternoon and for the work you do. Commissioners, are there any questions you have for the witnesses?

COMMISSIONER BENJAMIN: Not from me, just thank you for your efforts and your evidence.

MS BAKER: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER BROMFIELD: And I echo that, thank you.
PRESIDENT NEAVE: Yes, we thank you so much for your commitment to improving the situation for children in Tasmania and for the enormous contribution you've made to that at some personal cost; of course, the cost is largely borne by the victims of child sexual abuse, but your work will help to improve things, I'm sure. So, thank you so much.

MS BAKER: Thank you very much.

MS BIANCHI: Thank you.
AT 4.45PM THE COMMISSION ADJOURNED TO FRIDAY, 6 MAY 2022 AT 9.45AM
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