From: <u>Doug Young</u>

To: Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee
Subject: Re: Submission regarding the Belcarra Bill
Date: Thursday, 26 October 2017 9:51:33 AM

Further to my earlier submission, I wish to note comments by other parties regarding the undue haste with which the Belcarra Bill was conceived, the blatantly obvious issues resulting from this haste, the lack of attention paid to unmentioned donation sources, the recommendation by several parties that ALL donations be banned, the feeble attempt to address conflict of interest issues, and last but not least, the abysmal lack of remedies / penalties in this and indeed all legislation ostensibly intended to regulate the actions of official parties.

This Bill must be sent back to wherever it can from with instructions to re-think every single proposal contained therein,

I specifically object to accepting ANY of the CCC recommendations as both history and the recent debacle have ably demonstrated that the CCC is not, and probably never has been, up to the task of addressing official corruption. The CCC should be abolished forthwith with all staff permanently banned from holding any comparable position in the future. Whilst Queenslanders certainly need a crime and corruption investigative body, we also need one totally independent (dictionary meaning) of government interference. There has never been any doubt that the CCC is merely a crime cover-up commission which has the task of hiding complaints against official individuals and entities.

```
On 26/10/2017 09:29, Doug Young wrote:
> Submission by Doug Young
                                                                          in
> respect of the Belcarra Bill
>
>
> In addition to the following, I hereby request the opportunity to
> address the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee regarding the
> Belcarra Bill
>
> The Belcarra Bill was clearly conceived purely for the purpose of
> deluding gullible Queenslanders into supporting the ALP regime whilst
> disadvantaging as far as the ALP could envisage, the LNP and other
> political parties and candidates the ALP perceives may be inclined to
> accept developer donations. Note that the Bill makes no provision
> whatever to limit donations from union affiliated and related entities.
> The Bill was evidently the result of a brainstorm by the
                                                                           and it was extremely poorly
conceived, proposing only to ban direct developer donations to candidates; it does not address
> other illicit donations including those from unions or from third party trust funds and bank accounts.
> I believe the wording of the Bill deliberately allows these entities (unions, third party trust funds and bank
accounts) to accept (legally) developer donations and then pass on to candidates as
> they are not subject to the proposed legislation. (Private entities)
> In order for legitimate regulation of donations to be possible, ALL donations to candidates should be made
direct to candidate with 3rd party accounts banned.
> In my opinion, ALL donations of whatever kind to political candidates and parties should be banned in
```

perpetuity, as history has shown that political parties and those with a wont to influence > them are inclined to be extremely inventive in respect of workarounds. A total ban on donations together with provision for extremely heavy penalties for malpractice would ensure that independents > and minor parties are not discriminated against. The legislature should not be the exclusive domain of major parties and / or those with a big bank account If passed, this Bill would quite > obviously favour the ALP over all other parties and independent candidates. > Time elapsed for prosecution should be done away with altogether so that candidates can be prosecuted when found to have breached legislation. > As a minimum, prosecution should be available any time during the 4 year term in office. > Conflict of Interest should be adjudicated by an independent party, not by fellow councillors with the same vested interests. > The term 'independent' must be read as the Macquarie dictionary meaning, NOT the deliberately borked political / bureaucratic version which entails putting together a group of drones known to be > well-disposed to the individual or entity in question. In particular, current or past employees of any official entity, members of the legal profession, and any party with developer connections > is expressly excluded. > Conflict of Interest should be defined as "any association with the persons/ companies involved in the decision before council" or similar. > The patently ridiculous statement by Crime and Corruption Commission that council corruption is too systemic to prosecute, warrants immediate dismissal of > with total loss of all benefits and perks. Numerous parties who have submitted complaints to the Crime Cover-up Commission have been informed 'your complaint does not comply with our requirement > regarding systemic malpractice'. How then can and the Crime Cover-up Commission claim that issues to do with council corruption are 'too systemic' to warrant prosecution. Furthermore, > government support for this impossibly inane decision on the part of has the potential to create an EXTREMELY dangerous legal precedent whereby even serial murderers could potentially precedent. > claim immunity from prosecution on the basis of the > The only legitimate official response must include immediate dismissal of unsatisfactory report ensuring he can never again be employed in a comparable position, > immediate prosecution of all currently known instances of council corruption, and creation of a special investigative unit including majority representation by community representatives to > investigate the actions of ALL local authorities and related entities in Queensland, including the highly suspect Local Government Association and the Local Government Department. > > Comments and feedback to Doug Young /