

Submission
No 77

**INQUIRY INTO GREYHOUND WELFARE AND
INTEGRITY COMMISSION**

Name: Name suppressed

Date Received: 21 May 2021

Partially
Confidential

Submission on behalf of

Tuesday 18th May, 2021

Background- on 29/10/2020, two GWIC inspectors, inspected my kennels at my Father's property.

This was done while my Father and I were at the track and my Mother was at work.

These inspectors wandered around the property, which caused some concern for our neighbours who had no idea who they were. They left work orders that I completed. I also sent photos of the work done, as requested.

Despite repeated requests and the fact that the Greyhound Racing Act 2017 Division 4 (80) part 3 states "*A copy of the record must be provided by the inspector to the person who is questioned as soon as practicable after it is made.*"- the body camera recording has not been provided. The initial request was met with " I don't know that I can do that"- obviously the Greyhound Racing Act, says it is possible to do that.

In what well run organisation is five months deemed to be "*as soon as practicable*"?

In what well run government organisation is it acceptable for two inspectors (on generous and secure salaries, with superannuation, and work conditions that many Australians can only dream of) is five months deemed to be "*as soon as practicable*" in regards to providing copies of their own records?

Surely there is an expectation from the taxpayer and the government that not only do inspectors follow the Greyhound Racing Act, but they do it in a prompt and efficient manner.

Instead of efficient work practices and following the law- we in the greyhound community get to read statements in the public domain from GWIC such as " no trainer has ever requested a copy of a body camera recording" which is of course quite simply a lie. Many trainers have requested copies and these requests are just simply ignored.

This type of behaviour by inspectors is not acceptable.

Sending inspectors into relatively remote rural properties when the owners or tenants are not at home is foolish, it puts them at risk of false allegations, particularly when the pattern has been failure to provide camera recordings to greyhound participants.

On Monday 29.3 2021, I attended Greyhound Track with the intent to renew my registration and enjoy the races.

As I waited in line, to renew my registration- Inspector X (one of the original inspectors referred to in my original submission and the points made above) was heard to say to a greyhound trainer "I have been looking for you. I have been to your place two or three times and you were not at home." The greyhound trainer in question replied " I think you are mistaking me for some one else."

The inspector replied " No, I have been to your place before and it was in a terrible state."

Greyhound trainer " No, you have never been to my place and I think you are mistaken."

Finally the Inspector agreed that he was indeed mistaken and then turned on me and said " I have been to your place and it is terrible "

How does an inspector mistake two men when one of them is in his twenties, tall and with black hair and one that is heading towards sixty years of age, of short stature and has blonde hair?

This situation was not only inefficient, it was truly unprofessional. Attempting to humiliate two trainers in public. Absolutely embarrassing performance really, in front of members of the community, including children.

I questioned why, given I have a Biosecurity sign at the front of the property (with my phone number clearly visible) and I have a Biosecurity Farm Plan and my phone number is on record with GRNSW and GWIC, why the inspector had simply not phoned and made an appointment instead of wasting time and taxpayer provided cars and petrol making futile attempts to find me at home.

(I have checked my mobile phone and the home answering service and there were no phone calls).

The Inspector in question was not sure how many times he had actually visited my home looking for me “ two or three times” (what mileage is not recorded, records of visits not kept??) -is it efficient or a good use of taxpayer provided petrol to just drive around the countryside, in a vain hope some one will be at home, rather than phone and make an appointment and then explaining this rather unusual meeting method suggesting it is acceptable with an “ I can do whatever I want” attitude.

Inspector X said he ignored the Biosecurity sign because “ I can do whatever I want, I can go to your home any day at any time without permission and I can search your car if I want to -make sure you clean up before I get there next time”. The Greyhound Act clearly states “ any reasonable time” not “any time of the day I choose” as an Inspector.

This response could perhaps be generously described as arrogant but combined with an inability to distinguish two trainers with approximately a forty year age difference, a failure to clearly identify one trainer from another despite all trainers having photographs on their registration cards, an inability to phone and make an appointment (hardly a high level skill) and a failure to follow the Greyhound Racing Act, it becomes a little concerning.

These inspectors have more power than the Police - yet this person’s efficiency and ability to ask and check registration identity papers before accusing some one of living in “a terrible place and clean up before I get there next time”, in public and within hearing of a number of members of the public and apparently an inability to use a phone and make an appointment, complete disregard for Biosecurity laws and plans- is hardly

“ encouraging the co-operation of trainers” as per GWIC Mission statement or fulfilling the aim of “ maintaining public confidence in the greyhound racing industry” as per the Greyhound Racing Act.

I found this inspector’s behaviour to be bullying, intimidating and unprofessional. I felt very uncomfortable in front of my friends and community members at the track and given I had complied with all work orders, I believe this behaviour is not an acceptable interpretation of the Greyhound Racing Act or the Biosecurity Act, or professional or how a reasonable member of the general public would expect a member of a government agency to conduct themselves.

This behaviour also appears to have very little to do with the genuine welfare of greyhounds either.

Yours faithfully