



COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA

Official Committee Hansard

**HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES**

STANDING COMMITTEE ON LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL
AFFAIRS

Reference: Crime in the community

TUESDAY, 19 NOVEMBER 2002

PERTH

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

INTERNET

The Proof and Official Hansard transcripts of Senate committee hearings, some House of Representatives committee hearings and some joint committee hearings are available on the Internet. Some House of Representatives committees and some joint committees make available only Official Hansard transcripts.

The Internet address is: **<http://www.aph.gov.au/hansard>**

To search the parliamentary database, go to: **<http://search.aph.gov.au>**

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
STANDING COMMITTEE ON LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS

Tuesday, 19 November 2002

Members: Mrs Bronwyn Bishop (*Chair*), Mr Murphy (*Deputy Chair*), Ms Julie Bishop, Mr Cadman, Mr Kerr, Mr Melham, Ms Panopoulos, Mr Sciacca, Mr Secker and Dr Washer

Members in attendance: Mrs Bronwyn Bishop, Mr Kerr, Mr Murphy and Dr Washer

Terms of reference for the inquiry:

To inquire into and report on:

The extent and impact of crime and fear of crime within the Australian community and effective measures for the Commonwealth in countering and preventing crime. The Committee's inquiry shall consider but not be limited to:

- a) the types of crimes committed against Australians
- b) perpetrators of crime and motives
- c) fear of crime in the community
- d) the impact of being a victim of crime and fear of crime
- e) strategies to support victims and reduce crime
- f) apprehension rates
- g) effectiveness of sentencing
- h) community safety and policing

WITNESSES

BARICH, Mr John Robert, Convenor, Family Council of Western Australia..... 531

GOULDING, Dr Dorothy Helen, Board Member, Institute for Restorative Justice and Penal Reform..... 521

HUDSON MILLER, Ms Rosemary, Executive Secretary, Institute of Restorative Justice and Penal Reform..... 521

MORAN, Mr Kevin James, Executive Member, Family Council of Western Australia..... 531

Committee met at 8.10 a.m.

GOULDING, Dr Dorothy Helen, Board Member, Institute for Restorative Justice and Penal Reform

HUDSON MILLER, Ms Rosemary, Executive Secretary, Institute of Restorative Justice and Penal Reform

CHAIR—I declare open this Perth public hearing of the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs inquiry into crime in the community, victims, offenders and fear of crime. Yesterday, the committee was in Geraldton and heard much interesting evidence about crime in regional areas. This morning, we will hear from the Institute for Restorative Justice and Penal Reform as well as the Family Council of Western Australia. I welcome witnesses. We have received a submission from you and it has been authorised for publication. Would you both like to make an opening statement before we ask some questions?

Dr Goulding—One of the things that concerns me in terms of crime in the community is the rhetoric of law and order politics and the law on crime type of language, which I feel exaggerates the level of crime in our community and instils fear in the community. Fear of crime is perhaps more pertinent here. Basically, we are here to talk about the concept of restorative justice, which looks at crime as a breakdown in relationships rather than as anything else. We are talking about restoring harmony in the community, changing offending lifestyles and looking at having a more healing approach rather than the punitive approach we currently have.

Ms Hudson Miller—The reason for the institute coming into being has a fairly long history. About 10 or 11 years ago, we had a conference in Western Australia—*Prison: the Last Option*—and there were repeats of this conference across Australia. Nine years after that, we held another conference, *Prison—the Last Option: New Directions for the Millennium*. It was held in March 2000 in Western Australia. We were invited to put it together by the Association of Heads of Churches in Western Australia, and we invited other people—some sociologists, some lawyers and so on—to participate along with us. The seeds of working towards a more holistic approach to prison in Western Australia were sown, and the institute was formed earlier this year. We have a really wide community representation on it, including lawyers, judges, members of the church communities, academics and some of the lobby groups who work towards seeing justice happen.

This is our first foray into making a presentation at this level to you. It comes from a very broad base in Western Australia, so we are very pleased about that. Members of the Department of Justice are also part of the institute, as well as some serving officers of the police, so we are feeling really hopeful about the coalition that we have formed in the institute. Everyone has the aim of looking to find better ways of addressing crime in the community and the damage that it does.

CHAIR—Thank you very much. Dr Goulding, when you are thinking of the perpetrators of crime, I suppose, like many other sections of our community, they come in varying degrees of offenders, don't they?

Dr Goulding—Yes, they do.

CHAIR—It could be somebody on a drink-drive offence, somebody who has been guilty of an assault or somebody who has been guilty of what we might call a heinous crime. When you are working through your thoughts about how you deal with criminals, do you have different ways of treating different types of criminals?

Dr Goulding—We go further than that: we have ways of dealing with individuals. We look at the crimes they have committed and we look at the impact on victims. Restorative justice brings victims very clearly into the equation and gives them a say in what occurs. We use a restorative and transformative justice model. We believe that, if we look at individual cases, we look at the underlying issues of crime, not just the crime itself. We deal with offenders to try to transform their behaviour, and once we have worked with them for a while, we bring them together with the victims, if the victim is willing to do so. We work with a community group conference and we try to come to some agreement about what should be done. Then this goes back to the court for the offenders to be sentenced. We feel that that restores some harmony. It gives victims a say in what should occur. Whether or not they particularly like the outcome, they are generally very pleased with the process, because the current adversarial system negates the inclusion of victims. Apart from the odd victim impact statement, victims very rarely get to tell how it has been for them, how their lives might have been harmed, shattered or whatever. They also get to see the offender as a human being and the offender cannot then depersonalise the crime. We have just completed a two-year research project in the Court of Petty Sessions here, in court 37, and we have dealt with some quite serious crimes—some that have gone up to the District Court level. We have had very good results in terms of victim satisfaction. We are still analysing the results in terms of offenders, but we have had improvements in behaviour.

CHAIR—Are you dealing with one-off offenders or serial offenders?

Dr Goulding—No, we were dealing mostly with repeat offenders, but we did have some first-time offenders on fairly serious charges which could have led to imprisonment.

CHAIR—Do you have case studies?

Dr Goulding—We do, but the project is being analysed. We finished the project only about four weeks ago and the data is currently being analysed at Murdoch University. It should be available within six weeks.

CHAIR—We might make a note to get that.

Ms Hudson Miller—It will be published.

Mr MURPHY—Dr Goulding, I would like you to expand on your observations about law and order politics and the levels of crime in the community being exaggerated. Could you make some comments on that? We always find, particularly at election times, that there is a crime wave. It does not matter which side of politics it is; it is always a dominant issue, particularly in the states. Federal elections tend to be dominated by health and education, but what seems to separate state elections is law and order. Would you like to make some comments on that?

Dr Goulding—I feel that we live in a very unjust society. I think that before we can start thinking about reducing crime levels, we will have to transform our society to be a bit more

equal. Law and order politics are brought up just before elections simply to win votes, and I think that is quite immoral.

Mr MURPHY—Quite immoral?

Dr Goulding—Yes, I do.

Mr MURPHY—Can I just ask you about your institute's model of therapeutic jurisprudence. Yesterday we listened to Dr Michael King, who is a stipendiary magistrate in Geraldton. He is very strong in this area and he has had this initiative going for a bit more than 12 months. I would like to hear your experience.

Dr Goulding—I do not know much about Dr King's therapeutic jurisprudence project but I know that what he has been doing has been quite successful. Our model started 2½ years ago. We call it a communitarian model of restorative and transformative justice. What we do is we go to court. Because it is not something that is readily known in the community, we basically had to sneak into the court, sit there and wait for cases to come to us. The magistrates were very good. We had the chief stipendiary magistrate, Stephen Heath, and his deputy, Libby Woods, supporting the project. They gave us most of our cases. If someone had pleaded guilty to a specific crime and if the magistrate thought they were worthy of coming to the restorative and transformative justice team, he would remand for 21 days. We would then engage with the offender, give them information and ascertain their willingness to meet with the victim, and we would begin to work with them. We would then approach the victim. If the victim was not willing but if we thought the offender was willing to change his or her lifestyle we would work with them on the transformative component, which meant that we brought the offender together with a support network. We would not work with them in isolation. We would go out to their homes and work with their mothers, fathers, brothers, sisters or friends. We felt that would cut out the bull factor. We would have a very good insight into the position they were in with their lives. We felt that if we were to invite them into an office we could have the wool pulled over our eyes so to speak.

That is how we would work. We would look at the underlying issues, whether it was drugs or sometimes just plain poverty or gambling. Sometimes gambling was a very serious issue. We would work with them with the hope of bringing them to see the victim. If the victim had at this point said, 'No, I don't want to participate,' we still would write a report for the court and say that for this person these are the underlying issues and this is what this person is doing to address the situation. Where the victim was willing, we would work with the victim, give them some information on what to expect and then bring the victim, the offender and the support networks together at a place and time of the victim's choice. We would have a chance to speak. We only had two ground rules: everyone must speak truthfully—there was no reason for the offender not to, since they had already pleaded guilty—and the victim would be able to quite clearly state the harm that was caused. That is, if it was a burglary, for example, they would be able to state how they felt violated and unsafe in their own home. They may have felt, for example, that they had been stalked and that someone had been watching them for a while. It may be possible to ascertain that it was an opportunistic crime and so start to instil feelings of safety in the victim. We would try to come to some mutual agreement, and a report on the agreement would be written up for the court. That would include what the victim and the offender thought should happen at sentencing. Then it was up to the magistrate whether or not to use the mitigation when sentencing.

Mr MURPHY—Yesterday in Geraldton there was considerable evidence given from the witnesses about fear of crime. In your opening statement to this committee this morning, you also observed that fear of crime was very pertinent. Would you like to elaborate on that a little bit?

Dr Goulding—I think when you live in fear—and I quite clearly blame the media to some degree here; they do sensationalise crime, and I think they should have clearer guidelines about how these things—

CHAIR—That sounds remarkably like censorship to me. I would be opposed to that.

Dr Goulding—I believe they sensationalise crime and I think that instilling fear in people is counterproductive. Old people are afraid to leave their homes on occasions. We constantly see the same negative images. The images that we generally see are of old people being bashed, whereas, really, the majority of crimes are perpetrated against young men and by young men.

Mr MURPHY—Yes, I think you are right.

Dr Goulding—The point I am trying to make is that the fear of crime is a concern for me.

Mr MURPHY—I think you are right. The media sensationalise crime, but they sensationalise everything—

Dr Goulding—Yes, they do, I agree absolutely.

Mr MURPHY—You have to accept that they are all about keeping an audience and keeping the advertising revenue coming in. In your submission you also talked about the support services for the victims of crime. I am interested in that, because we have had submissions from people who have been victims of crime. You said that the organisations needed the support but not the control by government. Is it your experience that the government are interfering too much and the NGOs are not being allowed to manage?

Dr Goulding—When an NGO is dependent on government for the majority of its funding, it is very well controlled by government. We have a Victim Support Service here which is government run and comes under the auspices of the Department of Justice. I think it would probably work better if it were funded by the Department of Justice and other government agencies but not so tightly controlled. Effectively, it helps victims of assault but it does not help victims who, for example, have had one of their employees steal \$20,000 from them. It helps some victims and not others.

Mr MURPHY—Do you think there is sufficient government funding for the victims of crime?

Dr Goulding—No, I do not.

Mr MURPHY—What type of safeguards do you think would be necessary to prevent the misuse of DNA information?

Dr Goulding—I am not quite sure. I do not know much about DNA. I did not write the submission. Brian Steels, who has gone to the UK, wrote that part; he had a specific interest in it. I feel that if DNA testing of prisoners—especially remand prisoners who have not really been found guilty of any crime—is going to be done, it would be better if the entire community were—

CHAIR—I think that is outrageous, I have to say.

Dr Goulding—You might, but we all have our opinions. I confess that I do not know a great deal about DNA so I am a bit concerned about making too many comments.

Mr MURPHY—Thank you for your evidence.

Dr WASHER—Dr Goulding, how do the victims of severe assault generally take being confronted by the people who have assaulted them?

Dr Goulding—We have done two cases that were family violence situations where the victims chose to try to get some solutions through restorative processes. It is very traumatic for victims and for offenders; it is also traumatic for the people who are running it. However, for the two we have dealt with, we have had very good outcomes. As we wrote in the submission, in the area of domestic violence in particular, a perpetrator of domestic violence can come before the court as a first offender when, in actual fact, this person may have been perpetrating acts of domestic violence over a period of 20 or 30 years in different relationships. We had some concerns from domestic violence groups about using this process. Our argument was that, if a victim chose to participate in this, we could not say, ‘No, you cannot.’ We put in lots of safeguards; we had the presence of domestic violence groups and help in having different processes in place—for example, a 48-hour cooling-off clause if a victim felt disempowered in the presence of the perpetrator. We felt that there should be a 48-hour cooling-off clause where they could change their mind. But, as I said, for the two that we did that involved very serious assaults we had very good results. But it is not for everyone, and victims cannot be coerced to participate in any way.

Dr WASHER—When you say you had good results, did you get a quicker recovery phase? Did you feel the post-traumatic recovery phase was shortened by this procedure?

Dr Goulding—I am not qualified to say that, but what I can say is that we had victims who were very pleased with the process who have continued to contact us and tell us how things are going on. One of them I actually met by accident in a shopping centre a few weeks ago. Her son was the perpetrator and she was the victim. She said that because he had undergone treatment for his anger management and for his alcoholism the family has healed. In fact, he does not live at home any more, the family has healed and they socialise together—they feel like they are a family again.

CHAIR—Was this domestic violence?

Dr Goulding—This one was domestic violence.

CHAIR—What about where it is not domestic violence?

Dr Goulding—We had a serious assault against a taxi driver. The taxi driver started off by wanting to participate and then changed his mind. In that case we had a surrogate victim. He asked for someone from the taxi drivers board to represent him. We did come to some mutual agreement, but it was fairly recent so I cannot tell you whether this offender has offended again. It has only been six months.

Dr WASHER—How does this then influence a magistrate's decision? Is this information given back to a magistrate to influence sentencing? Does the information about the attitude of the victim and the way the person who perpetrated the crime addressed the issue have an influence?

Dr Goulding—I guess the magistrate takes into consideration all of these things. We cannot say what the magistrate does. The information is given to the magistrate so that the magistrate can then disseminate it, make an informed decision and see the crime within a context.

Dr WASHER—If I could ask that a slightly different way: if I were to perpetrate a crime, would there be a benefit for me to participate in this procedure to influence sentencing? In other words, would there be some reward perhaps, if I were cooperative, that I may get a lesser sentence?

Dr Goulding—That is a possibility, but it is down to the magistrate and I could not comment on that. Our job is not to influence the magistrate; our job is to give the statements from the victims and the offenders statement and to say what we have done with them. It is then down to the magistrate; it is not down to us.

Ms Hudson Miller—Sometimes magistrates are more able to direct people to particular treatments or particular courses and so on. It might mean that somebody who has had a life influenced by drugs, gambling or alcohol has a treatment that is directed at the causative issues. So it actually informs the magistrate about what things may be contributing factors to this recidivism.

Dr Goulding—Those programs would be court ordered, so the offender would be required to actually complete them.

Dr WASHER—You have mentioned gambling a number of times, and I know that West Australia prides itself on being one of the toughest states in regard to gambling laws. I guess gambling is a fair problem; it has come up in your conversation quite a few times. Can you flesh that out a little bit?

Dr Goulding—There are a quite a few women sitting now in Bandyup and Nyandi prisons. The main crime associated with gambling would be stealing as a servant. We had several people go through the process with us who had gambling as a major underlying issue, two of whom served custodial sentences. One was released on Friday.

Ms Hudson Miller—Even though it is a small opportunity in Western Australia, as a percentage of the imprisoned population, it is quite high, so it is a good reason to keep it out of the remainder of Western Australia.

Dr WASHER—Do you feel that our strict laws have, to some degree, worked? Other states are much more liberal—perhaps that is the wrong word—much more flexible in their gambling.

Mr MURPHY—Much more Labor!

Dr WASHER—Labor—whichever way you want to look at it. Certainly, they are far more tolerant of gambling than we are here. Do you think it works? Obviously, we still have a major problem.

Ms Hudson Miller—It is a proportional problem. The number of women imprisoned is low, but a significant proportion of them have gambling as a contributing factor. A significant proportion also have drugs and alcohol as contributing factors. We are very pleased that it is not as widespread as it is in other places. If we did some further research, we might be able to back that up in a much tighter statistical way.

Dr Goulding—Stealing as a servant is at the very serious end of the stealing scale and it often attracts a custodial sentence for a first offence.

CHAIR—I would like to ask a question on the gambling issue. We have had evidence before that, in the overall breakdown of crime, it is largely young men, 17 to 25, both as perpetrators and victims. But with the growth in areas of fraud, there is a different demographic coming out which is older and includes women showing up in the figures more significantly—and gambling does seem to be a cause in the fraud area. Have you looked at any programs for identifying people who might go that way, how they can be helped and how they can be kept out of the system?

Dr Goulding—No, at this stage we have not. There are very few programs to help gamblers—there is Gamblers Anonymous, which does not suit everyone, and there is a program run by Centrecare called BreakEven, but it is not very well funded—given the quite high number of women who commit fraud and steal as a servant because of gambling issues. But I do not think it has been readily identified, and not much has been done about it, and I think that is something we could look at for research.

CHAIR—Was there any evidence given when casinos were to be built? Did anybody put in any submissions that said what the costs would be? Is there any old research around?

Ms Hudson Miller—We certainly did look at this as a subcommittee of the Association of Heads of Churches in Western Australia and when we formed Coalition Against Pokies in Western Australia. That is a coalition that reactivates itself every now and again when the issue rolls around or when somebody thinks that it is a good idea to reintroduce it. We may have old research, but I cannot immediately bring it to mind.

CHAIR—I would also be interested to see whether casinos, per se, had increased the problem, because New South Wales has had poker machines forever and yet the incidence of fraud is on the rise. So you cannot say that it is poker machines in New South Wales, because they have been ever present and available. What is new is casinos.

Dr Goulding—That has given us food for thought for some research.

CHAIR—Is there anything you might like to add?

Ms Hudson Miller—I would like to say something about the political discourse that happens around crime. I think this is a significant problem and it is something that leads the media to continue to up the ante: it gives the media more issues to take hold of. Just recently in Western Australia—I know this is not a federal issue but I raise it as an instance—some people who, in the normal course of events, would have been allowed parole for serious crimes have spent serious amounts of time in prison. We have had leading political figures commenting on specific cases and asking whether we should allow people to pursue the ordinary processes that we have in place for everybody else, processes which actually are bound in regulation and legislation. When the political discourse comes in to talk about it because we worry about what the community are going to think about crime it makes it very difficult to have a rational discussion about the issues.

One of the issues that is problematic for us is that as a society we do not actually understand that removal from society is the punishment. Rather, we think in prison you should continue to be punished. Whether we believe that there can be some kind of restoring of people in a way so that they can be reintegrated into society is also significant because, while ever we are trying to put resources into dealing with people at this end because we want to do some restorative justice here, states seem to me to be taking resources away from what they do with people inside prisons, and so there is another aspect of this as well.

It is a very complicated story. What would be good is if we ever saw some leadership from political movers and shakers about how we can discuss crime in a rational way and how we will not respond to the anxiety and so that happens, or that we will respond in a way that hears what victims are saying but actually leads the community to be more thoughtful about it—instead of saying, ‘Lock ‘em up and chuck away the key,’ let us think about what the causative things are.

Mr KERR—I come from broadly the same side as you do, but isn’t this essentially a lament that could have been made from the time of early prison reformers, from Connecky right through? I read a book about Papua New Guinea called *Not A White Woman Safe*. In Papua New Guinea there was a huge fear of crime after a couple of fairly minor instances in the 1940s. Don’t we always have this terrible dilemma where we do not entirely have a rational response—

Ms Hudson Miller—That is right.

Mr KERR—to acts of disorder within our community and fear overpowers the rational response very often? It is one thing to attack politicians and the media, and I do not think that they are at all blameless, but in many ways this is not a new phenomenon; this is a very old phenomenon. I do not know how you can do other than you are doing: that is, to persistently argue an alternative view. We have moved away from the flogging triangles and the model prisons where total silence was imposed. We have actually in many ways come quite a distance in terms of our thinking about restorative justice or what have you. Yet there are many who want to bring back the death penalty, many who see that our society is falling apart, many who think that if you lock people up for longer that is a solution. I do not know what you can do other than to continue to make the case.

Dr Goulding—I would like to make a comment. I have recently finished a four-year study called *Recapturing Freedom* and it deals with issues related to the release of long-term prisoners

into the community. I spent quite a great deal of time in prisons talking to long-term prisoners and in actual fact my ex-partner spent six years in prison. I know that prison is very harmful. It does not heal. It does not make better people. I think that we should be mindful that imprisonment should be the tool of last resort. Where an offender can be treated in the community, where the offender is of no great risk to the community, the costs, the economics of it—apart from the social costs—mean that it is much better to have treatment in the community. That is my point. Imprisonment is very counterproductive. It reproduces criminality.

CHAIR—I think that the problem with some of those things is that there is no way in the world that anyone was going to let Myra Hindley out of jail, nor should she have been released. There are other people in our jails here, in Australia, who would be, in my mind, in a similar category. I personally oppose capital punishment, for a whole variety of reasons. However, I do think that there are some people who should stay in jail forever. I think that the statistics are starting to show that perhaps jail is a last resort. We have 21,900 people in jail, 83 per cent of whom have been sentenced. The others are on remand. We have 59,000 people who are in non-custodial sentencing. Then we have another group of people who, as first offenders, have been let off by the various states' equivalent of the 'first offender conviction will not be registered provisions' and so on. We do actually have a whole level of things, but what I want to know, and what we are still searching for, is the effectiveness of those alternative methods. We have no figures on recidivism for the 59,000 in non-custodial sentences. We do have them for people who are actually in jails. Sixty per cent of them have been there before. It is a matter of finding all of that information; I do not know if it is available.

Ms Hudson Miller—One of the research projects that we are just about to do is for young frequent offenders and recidivism. One of the really huge problems is that the Department of Justice here have not kept adequate statistics.

CHAIR—We are finding that to be a problem.

Ms Hudson Miller—It may be that somewhere there are these statistics that can actually be collated—in the Department of Justice's archives or somewhere. We do not have access to those, they are not published in an annual report, and perhaps that is something that we might be able to—

Dr Goulding—I do not think that they are collected. They do not collect enough statistical information. Recently the Attorney-General here did collect information—he had a profile of women in prison, which was a good start—but it is a drop in the ocean. We need much more information.

CHAIR—I think we would all agree that we could really do some work on that.

Mr KERR—One of the things that strikes me about this debate that is different from our past is that we have an ageing population. We also have a much more immediate media. The two things are intersecting. Firstly, as people age they become less confident in their own abilities and more fearful—whether it has got anything to do with the actual threat is a different point. I even feel it as I become older. I feel less certain with my ability to deal with any threat. Secondly, in my household I turn on the television and I see pictorial instances—I pick up a newspaper and I see pictures—of a much more immediate and vivid portrayal of events even if they are not immediately on our doorsteps. They may be in another city or another country. It

brings a threat into our lounge rooms. We have an ageing population with a much more dramatic presentation of events. I am just wondering how you can deal with this. Echoing what the chair says, it is difficult to see how you could censor these things. I would caution the media about its presentation and try to find balance. I think that it is totally unbalanced. One of our witnesses said that you hear all these things where things go wrong and very little accounting of instances where police are effective, where communities respond well or where people are living quietly and comfortably without threat. There needs to be more balance, but how do you do that without essentially denying the right of media and journalists to present those things which are most dramatic in our lives? Now they do it from all around the world. If you are picking out the most dramatic events from all around the world, then you are picking out quite terrible incidences from time to time—almost every day. Something horrible will be happening in a population of billions every day to present to the community as if it is happening in their own lounge rooms.

Dr Goulding—I have no idea what the answer to that question is. If I did, I would be rich.

CHAIR—We might just have to leave that one out of the conversation, because we are running out of time. I thank you very much for your submissions and for the evidence you have given today. It once again highlights the fact that we need better record keeping so that we can really see what we are dealing with. Thank you both very much.

[8.51 a.m.]

BARICH, Mr John Robert, Convenor, Family Council of Western Australia

MORAN, Mr Kevin James, Executive Member, Family Council of Western Australia

CHAIR—Welcome. Do you have anything to add about the capacity in which you are appearing today?

Mr Moran—I am a retired police superintendent with 35 years experience as a police officer. I am a committee member of various organisations relating to crime and the family. I am a member of the Family Council, an organisation comprised of many organisations both religious and secular. I have a concern about crime because I have nine grandchildren now and I am also a victim of crime, which has not yet been resolved.

Mr Barich—I am the convenor of the Family Council of Western Australia. Of the 27 organisations represented, probably more than half have a vital interest in this area, especially the consequences of dysfunction in family life. That is what I will be focusing on.

CHAIR—We have received a document from Mr Moran, ‘Presentation by Kevin Moran 8.45am Tuesday 19th November 2002 at Perth to House of Representatives Parliamentary Committee on Constitution and Legal Matters’. There being no objection, the committee will receive that document as a supplementary submission. I invite you to make an opening statement.

Mr Barich—I will be very quick. There are two things I want to focus on. One is crime statistics. We are not very happy that some criminologists tell us that we have never had it so good, that we should not be concerned just because we are getting older and that society is no more dangerous today than it was X years ago. We are not impressed with their work; instead, we are very taken with the work that the Centre for Independent Studies, which you are probably aware of, have done on crime and justice. Their work shows quite clearly—graphically, in fact—that every kind of crime has gone up in the last 100 years, some of it quite horribly. Rapes, murders, crimes against property—you name it, it is all there. I really cannot understand why we pay big dollars. We have got a centre here, and there is a federal centre, and these people constantly come out in the press and say that we are making it up, that it is media hype and that it is stupid oldies like us.

CHAIR—To put your mind at rest, Mr Barich, evidence has been given to the committee which shows quite definitively that crime in Australia is rising, whereas in the United States, the United Kingdom, New Zealand and Canada it is dropping. One of the things we are looking at is why.

Mr Barich—The second thing I want to focus on comes mainly from the social worker group. I worked with them for years, so I know all about them and how they think. They try to tell you that the crime is all due to poverty. Of course, that is a nonsense; in the Depression—again, you see it in these graphs—crime was almost non-existent. In the Depression, crime had dropped from the bad days before the turn of the century. So I think there are other factors

operating. It is not so much about poverty; that is an element of it but it is not the dominant element that these people seem to be trying to tell us it is. I suppose that is because the answer is simple then: increase taxes, give out more welfare and it will all be solved.

The council and the Australian Family Association, who have been looking at these things for over 20 years, put to you that the more basic reason for crime is what is going on in the family. The key factor we have identified there—unfortunately, it is not politically correct to say it—is the absence of fathers. That is the key factor causing crime, especially juvenile crime and crime by young boys. That is nothing new. Again there is a funny thing here. We went to see Chief Justice Malcolm recently on another matter—on a drug matter, because he is very concerned about the increase in drug use in this state—and he told us that in 1930 there were six armed robberies in this state. Kevin, I think, was on the armed escort; they were all cases of people trying to rob banks. In 1974, the then chief justice, Chief Justice Burt, screamed out that we had a crisis in WA: armed robberies were going through the roof. There were 30 in 1974. Chief Justice Malcolm said that last year we had over 200 in this state. So crime is on the increase; there is no doubt about it.

I return to the point I started to make earlier about the absence of fathers. Chief Justice Malcolm gave the Fremantle Family Lecture here in Perth on 2 November 1998—your staff can get a copy of that for you if you wish—and in that lecture he documented his discovery that there was a royal commission here in 1943. Australian society wanted to know why there was so much juvenile delinquency, hooliganism. Of course, everybody knew what the answer was, but the royal commission had to document it, and it did. The answer was the absence of fathers; the fathers were all at the war. They were not there to take the kids out or give them a clip across the ear and do the usual stuff that fathers do. So there is evidence from the forties. But we have overwhelming evidence from all over the world. We are in touch with a group in America called the Fatherhood Initiative. It was started by a man called Horn and it is run by him and a man called Blake. Horn is now one of George Bush's top advisers; he is an under secretary in the welfare administration. We have British data from the Institute for the Study of Civil Society and two of its academics, Norman Dennis and George Erdos. Those academics are both left-wing, so it is not a right-wing conspiracy; it is not Thatcher saying that it is all the fault of family breakdown. The fact that the fathers are not there is all documented there.

The Sydney group, the Centre for Independent Studies, have done a correlation study. While correlation does not necessarily show causation, it gives you a fairly good idea of where to look. They got a perfect correlation between single mothers—and an almost perfect correlation between single mothers due to divorce—and crime. The issue about women choosing to have a child on their own—by IVF or whatever method—is causing society a lot of problems, and I think future data will show that. That is all documented here and in the work of Lucy Sullivan. Jennifer Buckingham, also from that centre, has done more: *Boy Troubles: Understanding Rising Suicide, Rising Crime and Educational Failure*. She said the same thing, which supports Lucy Sullivan's work. There is another American text, *The War Against Boys: How Misguided Feminism is Harming our Young Men*. Figures are coming out now about boys not really feeling at home at school, not being wanted at school, not having a male role model. Something like 87 or 90 per cent of primary school teachers are women, and you can imagine that those who do not have a father at home would see a male only very rarely.

Even in the last week, I got another document from England, *Family Bulletin*, from the FYC, and another book, *Experiments in Living: The Fatherless Family*. This issue is all over the

Western world. I think the committee could do worse than be briefed by a group like the Institute of Family Studies, who do not hold to this view, and ask them to explain why they do not accept this thesis that has been documented in America, in Britain and in this country. They seem to be going for other things, such as the quality of care, and suggesting that six people can look after the child or that the village looks after the child and so on, when those are not proven facts; they are things derived from their ideology. The suggestion is that the absence of fathers is pretty key in the upbringing of boys, especially, and that, if you fail, the consequences to society ought to be looked at very closely.

Mr Moran—I will take a tack a little bit different from John's. I try to express my observations rather than seek out the information from academics and other writings. I have given you a submission. I would have made it larger, except my computer packed up and I had only yesterday to do it. It is fairly long, and I do not intend to raise all of it now. I simply want to explain why I feel that society has deteriorated in the way it has.

I start off with the origins, at page 2, relating to when the social justice industry started to become highly promoted after the war. Social workers, who had come out of the community, all of a sudden became young people with a degree rather than people with experience. I could tell you what happened in various incidents when it started to be implemented in Western Australia. From that, the child rights movement has become very strong. I refer to the child rights manifesto that is at the back of my submission. You will see that most of what they decided in 1981 has come to pass. They have their sexual freedom; the right to use drugs is being pushed very much; they have the right of free expression; and it goes on.

The issue of free expression is what got me into trouble just a while back and, as I say, the case is still going. It is foul-mouthing under the claim of free expression. The most disgusting, ugly and vulgar words are used, mainly by youths in public places, and they have to do with excretory and sexual functions. It distresses many in our community, including me—not because of what the words purport, but because of the actual sound. People will say it is freedom of expression and it is no longer offensive, but to counter the argument that such language is acceptable—made particularly by those in the arts, academia and the legal profession—I provide the origins of why these words are very offensive. Although they relate to sexual and excretory matters, that is not the reason they came to be offensive; it is because the sounds of these words are so harsh. They are known to have been used in Chaucer's time to insult and offend. They sounded offensive to the ear then and they sound offensive now. I would suggest that you try saying some of those words that I claim are offensive, and then use some other terminology. You will find that the other terminology gives no offence. Why would a word meaning the same as a word that did not give any offence still offend? It is because of what it sounds like.

The child rights movement has been very successful and I would request that the committee have a close look at its successes. There has been political correctness, and I make observation of it in feminism, Aboriginal cultural deconstruction, historical revisionism and multiculturalism, together with a multitude of other social justice issues. Feminism has had a detrimental effect, already spoken about by Mr Barich, on girls' education, and the use of foul language by young women has increased enormously. That is because they believe that using foul language indicates that they have overcome the low esteem in which they were held by males. They think that if they can swear like males they are as good as males. That does not work.

Regarding Aboriginal cultural deconstruction, I feel very sorry for young Aboriginal men or children who go to school and are told about an Aboriginal culture that is false and, when they go home and see their mums, dads, cousins and uncles fighting, swearing and cursing, they wonder why they could not be like the good people of the past. They need to be told and advised how their culture developed and where they are now, and they may then have some understanding and appreciation of their progress. At the moment, they believe they are going backwards. In fact, the Aboriginal has developed quite rapidly, particularly since the 1960s, but there are people in the Aboriginal community and academia who, for various reasons, have deconstructed their culture to provide a 'Disneyfied' version, not a true version. I could give examples if required.

The history revisionists are the ones that I feel very strongly about. I have found Australian writing since the mid-1970s different from the previous historical writing. Our pioneers were changed from being decent folk battling against the odds to being a reprehensible, cowardly and cruel people. This was the beginning of the denigration of our past by those academics who sold the truth for a fistful of dollars, in the way of grants, to write politically correct lies. In many cases, historical research and writing has become a corruption of the truth and a contempt of our nation. Those historians who failed to conform to this 'newthink' were sidelined, and the politically correct proliferated. Through profitable literature, film, theatre and TV grants these self-indulgent lecturers offer particular beliefs and, in doing so, then falsely claim the title of 'historian'.

Those people are not historians; they are propagandists and apologists. They are treacherous citizens who have stolen a nation's pride. All you need to do is read writings since the mid-1970s and compare them with the ones before and you will find that, for some reason, we have been denigrated since. The reason is that they have been given a fistful of dollars and have sold their integrity. Multiculturalism has failed; everybody knows it has failed. There are letters, there are complaints, and it goes on and on. Why has it failed? Why would young men or children of citizens who come to this country want to become Australians when we denigrate ourselves so badly? It needs to be looked at very seriously. I believe multiculturalism should be dismantled. It may be used in a different manner but it must not be the division it is in this society.

CHAIR—Perhaps you could tell us how this relates to crime.

Mr Moran—What I am trying to say is that our society has put together all these different elements in it which are against the good order of a community, and when that happens—when people have no pride in their community because we have denigrated it ourselves, when we have no feeling of belonging because of multiculturalism and people feel that they belong to another culture and not to an Australian culture—we have an understandable alienation of Australian society, particularly amongst the young. Sociologists and psychologists often deflect blame for errant behaviour to a child's perceived lack of belonging. It seems contradictory that a society whose prime purpose is to educate children for their future happiness and the nation's wellbeing would deny them adequate and truthful knowledge of their past, and thus add to their problems of feeling they do not belong to the community. There rests, particularly in the Aboriginal community and ethnic communities—and it has transferred itself to our young folk in the rest of the community—the reason for feeling that they really are not belonging to a good culture.

Academics tell us that we do not even know who are, that we are still looking. I suggest that we have a strong culture and we should push it to bring our youth to have pride in the place where they live so they will not want to spoil and bash and rob. The other problem we are having is that police officers, or the police, are slowly having their rights removed in fulfilling their duties. I give two examples on page 7 of two officers who were not on duty and, as a result, were denied the powers that were rightfully theirs sometime ago.

CHAIR—I wonder if we could pause a moment. Mr Barich, did you say you had to leave at 20 past?

Mr Barich—Yes.

CHAIR—Then perhaps we ought to pause there. People might have questions to ask of you in that five minutes, and then we can perhaps go back to Mr Moran. I would be most interested to see that CIS publication that you were dealing with and I have asked the secretary if we could get copies of that particular publication.

Mr MURPHY—Could I ask Mr Barich a question in the very short time he is available, because we can read the information he has put before us. What recommendations would you put to this committee with a view to reducing crime in our society?

Mr Barich—To follow up on the absence of fathers, and to back Kevin there, we know that in the Aboriginal communities something like 70 per cent of families are fatherless. Fiona Stanley is doing a survey at the moment, and the results will come out in 12 months time. We already know, as she herself said just recently in Fremantle, that they only prove what society already knows. I will give two little examples. The first is this debate we have been having about IVF. Everyone is very relaxed about IVF. Everyone is entitled to have a baby, and do it themselves—buy \$25 worth of sperm and do it themselves. That ought to be stopped. Society ought to say, ‘You can’t, because of the consequences.’

Mr MURPHY—What are the consequences?

Mr Barich—I just gave you an example—fatherless children being brought up. All the evidence points to the fact that that does not work.

Mr MURPHY—I understood that in some instances IVF has provided children to childless couples.

Mr Barich—I am talking about single mothers. I am not talking about married couples. We have the law in three states.

CHAIR—Statistically they are a very small percentage of the population. Our figures show that the largest group of perpetrators are young men aged 17 to 25, and they did not all come from single mothers.

Mr Barich—No, true.

CHAIR—We have to get a bit of balance here.

Mr Barich—True, I agree. I know it is not going to solve it; that was just one factor. The other one is the ease with which we talk of divorce. I have Chief Justice Nicholson saying in writing that divorce is a good thing. The Attorney-General, a mate who used to be my member, Daryl Williams, issued a press statement 12 months ago saying that if you are over 65 you can now get a divorce for free—and he thought he was doing us a service.

Mr MURPHY—Mr Barich, with respect, should people be expected to stay together when there has been an irretrievable breakdown in marriage?

Mr Barich—Yes.

Mr MURPHY—I personally believe in the sacrament of marriage, but I do not personally believe that, if a marriage, in the view of husband and wife, has got to the stage where there is irretrievable breakdown, they should be forced to stay together.

Mr Barich—You cannot force anybody. But the law is there to educate. You have to remember that in the 1974 legislation that Murphy introduced this key clause was passed by one vote. There is not this overwhelming support in the community. I would think there is even less support now because all the evidence is there. For 20 years we have been saying that if mother and father are fighting it is better they break up. Wallestein now has the evidence, after a longitudinal study of 30 or 40 years, that that is not true. It is better that people try to make a go of it because it is going to be good for them and good for the children. The old doctrine was that if you are bickering it is bad for the children. The new thinking is that it is not. You can do something about divorce. This is what these people are saying.

CHAIR—Are you saying that all crime is caused by divorce or single mothers?

Mr Barich—Please, do not put words in my mouth. I am not saying that at all. I am drawing your attention to this: Lucy Sullivan of the Centre for Independent Studies has done a correlation study between single motherhood at two levels—one where it is self-inflicted or self-selected and one where it is caused by divorce. There is perfect correlation in one instance and almost perfect correlation in the other. I am not saying any more than that.

CHAIR—Statistically, 50 per cent of marriages are going to break down. How do you segregate those whose crime tendencies were caused by the breakdown from those that were caused by some other factor?

Mr Barich—We have made it easier for them. That is our association's point of view.

CHAIR—You cannot say that 50 per cent of the population are potential criminals.

Mr Barich—No, we are not saying that. All we are saying is that we are enlarging the pool, and the pool has to be shrunk; otherwise you are going to keep getting an increase in crime. There it is there—the graphs. This one goes through the roof.

CHAIR—I have no doubt at all—we have had evidence—that crime in Australia is still growing. But in countries like the United Kingdom, the United States, Canada and New Zealand

it is dropping. They have exactly the same sorts of laws that we have relating to divorce and relating to the numbers of single parents, so why the difference?

Mr Barich—No, the Americans are much tougher on divorce.

CHAIR—Their figures are the same as ours.

Mr Barich—The figures are the same but they are tougher. In fact, they are now going for covenant marriage in three states, where you will not be able to get a divorce unless you prove some sort of fault.

CHAIR—That is in the future. We are talking historically. Their crime rates have come down. Their figures on divorce are like ours but our crime rates are on the rise. Why?

Mr Barich—I am not a criminologist; I am a member of the public. I am telling you what I have read. If you do not want to take what I am saying, that is your business. I am telling you that the absence of fatherhood is an element in crime, and all these experts document it. If you do not think it is an element, that is okay by me—it will not worry me.

CHAIR—I am not saying it is not an element, Mr Barich.

Mr Barich—You are trying to minimise it all.

CHAIR—But you are trying to make it the sole cause.

Mr Barich—I didn't. I am just giving, in five minutes, evidence in one area. Kevin can give you evidence about all the other things, including the regime of punishment and the other things the ladies were saying before when we came in—'Let more criminals out and it will be good for us.' In home punishment, kids are given 26 weeks punishment, they do not even turn up and no-one chases them. The police do not have time to chase them.

CHAIR—We are certainly looking at those things.

Mr MURPHY—Mr Barich, do you think there is any circumstance in which a divorce should be granted or there should be an annulment by the church? For example, a most conservative organisation, the Catholic Church, has a marriage tribunal which allows annulments on the basis that the marriage was never—

CHAIR—Let us not go there, John.

Mr Barich—I am not a crusader against divorce; I am just saying we made it too easy. When the Attorney-General says that he is doing a good thing by giving us free divorce if we are over 65 years of age, that to me is ludicrous.

Dr WASHER—I guess what you are saying in summary is that family dysfunction, where we have just one member, and social dysfunction, which Kevin has mentioned, certainly have an influence, but where you have levelled that influence mainly is at young males, at boys

particularly—not so much girls; girls were not mentioned. Is there any speculation in the writings you have read as to why it should affect boys more dramatically than girls?

Mr Barich—Yes. That is what I was trying to say. One thing is the companionship which the father provides—taking him fishing, just listening to him. In fact, the latest data from the church, which Mr Murphy seems to be interested in, concerns churchgoing in Switzerland. For 2,000 years we thought mothers were the dominant factor in churchgoing by boys; this Swiss data shows the opposite, that it is the father. If the father does not go to church, the boy follows the father. He is the leader and he does not go to church. In families where the father does go to church, the boys go to church. There is the nurturing impact of the father, or a male figure, and then you have the discipline. Women do not like disciplining—‘Wait until Dad comes home’—that syndrome.

CHAIR—Really?

Mr Barich—It is true.

CHAIR—It might be in some households.

Mr Barich—You might be a tough lady.

CHAIR—Maybe I am.

Mr Barich—Yes, you probably are. Most of the women I know do not want to discipline, whereas the fathers do. They see it as part of their job in life, like a policeman does. So you have those two factors. And in the Aboriginal community, apart from those factors, they have a communal attitude and everyone brings up the boy—uncles, aunties, grandmothers, everybody. Everybody means nobody. That Clinton thing about the village brings up the kid is a nonsense, because in the end everybody means nobody; you are just left in the street to look after yourself, as we see in our society.

Mr MURPHY—Mr Moran, since 1949 you have painted a very bleak picture of Australian society and I feel—

Mr Moran—A deterioration.

Mr MURPHY—A deterioration which now is a very bleak picture or reflection of society. I want to highlight the speech you made on 2 July 1998 for Joan Torr’s ‘action against crime’. On page 2 of that speech you suggest that you feel let down by the social workers, psychologists, health workers, academics, lawyers, criminologists, educational theorists, child rights advocates, civil rights activists and the politically correct, and you conclude ‘and the politicians listen’. You have four politicians here today. What message do you have for us by way of summary in regard to what recommendations we might make to reduce crime?

Mr Moran—What you have to do as politicians or as a government is simply change society for the better, not for the worse, which is what has been happening. I have mentioned ‘groupthink’; groupthink relates to social justice and it includes both sides of parliament. Most politicians now are university graduates—not all but most. Universities used to be a great place

for free thought and original ideas. Now they are places of indoctrination for groupthink—you have to think in a certain way. What happens is this. Thirty per cent of the population has a university degree; 70 per cent do not. Thirty per cent are basically making the laws and controlling the majority. We have a minority controlling a majority. I am not saying that is a good or a bad thing, but the education that people receive in a university provides a different perspective.

CHAIR—I have to tell you that we have a lot of people in parliament with no university degrees—a lot of them. It is a pretty good cross-section of the community.

Mr Moran—Okay, that is good. This is probably the first time I have seen a committee come around to speak to the average Joe Blow. If you want to know something as a politician or as a government, you mainly seek the advice of the academic. The voice of the common people is not heard because they are not the experts. They might be living it, but they do not know it. You go and see the experts.

CHAIR—We are not doing that.

Mr Moran—I am very pleased to hear that. We have made a mess. We have fragmented our society so badly and we have allowed historians to distort our past so badly that we are a mishmash of a society.

Mr MURPHY—In response to my question, how do we fix society? How do we as politicians fix society, as you see it?

Mr Moran—On page 9, I have made some suggestions. I am not saying the recommendations even make sense, but at least I have tried and it may provoke some thought. There are recommendations there. One of the organisations I was in was ‘Call against crime’. I want to refer to the graph on crime which is in the attachments. Looking at that graph you will see where the crime starts to rise rapidly. You will see how it goes along to the 1950s in a relatively flat way, then all of a sudden in the mid-1950s it screams upwards. There must be a reason for that, and I have been trying to put some background to what I believe is the reason. Child rights is obviously a big one, which is the youth industry as well; multiculturalism is another; and feminism is another. That is not to say they did not all have decent objectives, but they have gone wrong.

CHAIR—Mr Moran, I am going to hand the chairmanship over to my deputy, Mr Murphy, because I have to catch a plane. I would like personally to thank you for coming in, and I apologise for the discourtesy of not being able to hear all you have to say.

Mr Moran—My remarks have been a bit disjointed, unfortunately, because of the toing-and-froing. I would ask you to read what I have written, particularly the attachments, because they reflect what I am saying.

CHAIR—We will do that.

Mr Moran—I apologise for my remarks being disjointed, but all of a sudden there was a rush, people were going to leave and I thought I would try to get it all in.

CHAIR—No, it was fine.

Mr Moran—Anyway it cannot be helped. Thank you very much.

CHAIR—Thank you very much.

ACTING CHAIR (Mr Murphy)—I would like to get some comments from you in relation to children's rights and your concerns in that area—just briefly, because we only have a few minutes.

Mr Moran—Let us look at the right not to attend school because they say it is an imprisonment. They are still pushing that to a degree, if it has not arisen now. Another is the right to educational democracy—in other words, that the children run the schools. The right to freedom of expression has been very successful.

ACTING CHAIR—What do you feel about the children's rights movement, particularly over the last decade when some terrible cases of child abuse have come to light. Surely, you would not change the rights of the child—

Mr Moran—There are no arguments about the rights that are in the criminal area. If a person sexually abuses or bashes a child, a woman or a man, there are laws in place to severely deal with it. It has nothing to do with a child's rights or anything; it is about a criminal activity. The victim happens to be, in a paedophilia matter, a child. In a rape matter, it might be a woman or a man, but it is a criminal activity. Perhaps the child matter is more serious and will be treated more seriously by the courts, but there are things in place. The abolition of corporal punishment is another thing. You can see that corporal punishment has been abolished. You may think that is good or bad, but I am saying that it is about a child's right. They have been very successful.

There is freedom of worship, and they are still pushing that. Freedom of worship sounds fairly innocuous, but start thinking about those strange sects—witchcraft or whatever you like. Once a child has a right to go where he wants and worship how he wants, you have got to read what they want but that is the agreed right of free access to knowledge. Free access to knowledge includes the pornography and the violence on the Internet. There is a right to sexual freedom. We even had a push for the right to sexual freedom in the Law Reform Commission—or committee or something—that was run by the Commonwealth government. They wanted to allow incest. They could not see any problem with incest and they made a recommendation that it be allowed. You may not know.

ACTING CHAIR—I am not aware of that. I do not think anyone would condone incest in any circumstance whatsoever.

Mr Moran—That was a recommendation by this Law Reform Commission.

ACTING CHAIR—Promoting incest?

Mr Moran—Yes, I kid you not. Go back and go to the recommendations. It was probably in 1996 or in 1997.

ACTING CHAIR—I can assure you that there would not be a member of the 40th Parliament, which includes all the politicians who are here before you today, who would in any respect condone incest.

Mr Moran—I can certainly find it for you and send it to you if you like. It was in a big, thick book in relation to sexual criminal matters. The other one was a lower age of consent for children. I am just saying that that is a manifestation of child rights. It did happen. It is there. All you need to do is look and you will see that what I have said is right.

ACTING CHAIR—I put it to you that it has had no impact on the parliament.

Mr Moran—No, but it was an attempt.

ACTING CHAIR—You cannot stop ratbags making—

Mr Moran—On a committee of the Commonwealth?

ACTING CHAIR—I would like you to forward that to me—

Mr Moran—I will.

ACTING CHAIR—because I am completely unaware of that and I can tell you that there would not be a member of this committee or any member of the parliament who would in any way condone that.

Mr Moran—We had a meeting with representatives of that committee here in Perth. Have a look at right of expression; we have explained that. They have been successful in the abolition of corporal punishment and on freedom of worship. I have just talked about the right to sexual freedom. Free access to knowledge sounds fairly innocuous, but you think about it. Further rights they need include the right to use drugs—think about that. The success of that in regard to marijuana—

ACTING CHAIR—But I put it to you, Mr Moran, that no-one has the right to break the law.

Mr Moran—No, but I am saying is that the law is being changed to suit the child rights advocates. Now, you only need to look at what they are looking for and then see what successes they have had and you will appreciate that they are a very strong and very potent force—perhaps not very large, but very potent within our community. They have had successes, and I have nominated a few. They need the right to an income. Remember when all those children were to be given money? All they had to do was simply leave home and get all this money—and we are talking about children, not juveniles. Remember that kerfuffle just a few years ago? That was a child rights matter. I think a committee even sat to consider the matter, and it was reined back. But they were successful there. The right to choose one's guardian is another issue. You may have read things about their right to divorce their parents. There has been discussion about that. That is sort of inching forward very slowly.

I am just trying to say, 'Look, there has been a deterioration of the fabric of our community through all these organisations.' These organisations were of good intent but, somehow or other,

they turned into organisations that are not very good for our community. Multiculturalism was a good idea, but it has turned back on itself. We have got young folk who really do not want to be Australians. The rapes in Sydney are a manifestation of a young group of kids who did not feel part of the Australian community. They felt more aligned to their parents' origins—and they were born here, some of these kids—than to being Australians themselves. And when they raped, they racially abused the girls that were raped. That is a manifestation.

ACTING CHAIR—Yes, but the laws we had in place in relation to those cases, which received a lot of publicity, dealt with those cases appropriately in view of what has been reported in the media.

Mr Moran—But it would not have happened, perhaps, if they had felt part of the wider community. See what I mean? Instead of us being all one, we are all little tribes here and there, and we are not a cohesive society anymore. Perhaps the majority of people are still cohesive, but multiculturalism has sidelined—they are isolated from the community. They should not be.

ACTING CHAIR—We have not got time to have a discussion on multiculturalism—and there would be a lot of people who would argue that it has been quite successful—but perhaps we will keep that for another day. We will have to conclude now because we have not got sufficient time. I thank you, Mr Moran, for your evidence and your submissions, and I would be grateful if you could forward a copy of that committee report that you referred to. I find it astonishing, and I would like to read it.

Mr Moran—I have not got it—I threw it away—but I will find it. It was called law review or something like that.

ACTING CHAIR—We will try to track it down if you cannot find it, but try and find it: it would make it easier for us.

Mr Moran—If you find it, send me a copy too, because I might get some submissions from it. But it is true, absolutely; if it is not true, I will eat humble pie.

ACTING CHAIR—Thank you for your evidence this morning.

Resolved (on motion by **Dr Washer**):

That this committee authorises publication, including publication on the electronic parliamentary database, of the proof transcript of the evidence given before it at public hearing this day.

Committee adjourned at 9.39 a.m.