



PARLIAMENTARY CRIME AND CORRUPTION COMMITTEE

Members present:

Mr JM Krause MP—Chair
Mr JP Bleijie MP
Ms JM Bush MP
Mr MJ Crandon MP
Ms AB King MP
Ms CP McMillan MP
Ms JC Pugh MP

Staff present:

Ms L Manderson—Committee Secretary
Ms R Ponting—Assistant Committee Secretary

MEETING OF THE PARLIAMENTARY CRIME AND CORRUPTION COMMITTEE

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, 24 MAY 2022

Brisbane

TUESDAY, 24 MAY 2022

The committee met at 1.09 pm.

CHAIR: Good afternoon, everyone, and welcome to the public meeting of the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee. I am Jon Krause, member for Scenic Rim and chair of the committee. Joining me on the committee are: Ms Jonty Bush, member for Cooper; Mr Michael Crandon, member for Coomera; Ms Jess Pugh, member for Mount Ommaney; Ms Corrine McMillan, member for Mansfield, who is substituting for Mr Jimmy Sullivan, member for Stafford, for today's proceedings; Ms Ali King, member for Pumicestone, who is substituting for Mrs Melissa McMahon, member for Macalister, for today's proceedings; and Mr Jarrod Bleijie, member for Kawana, who is substituting for Dr Mark Robinson, member for Oodgeroo, for today's proceedings.

Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the lands on which we meet. I pay my respects to their elders past, present and emerging and the lands, winds and waters we now all share.

The committee's proceedings are proceedings of the Queensland parliament and are subject to the standing rules and orders of the parliament. As parliamentary proceedings, under the standing orders any person may be excluded from today's meeting at my discretion or by order of the committee.

The proceedings are being recorded by Hansard and broadcast live on the parliament's website. Media may be present and are subject to my direction at all times. All those present today should note that it is possible you might be filmed or photographed by media during these proceedings.

The committee is beginning its meeting in public to deal with a number of matters. The committee will then close the public part of the meeting and continue our meeting in private session. Firstly, I ask members if there are any declarations of interest relevant to the public session only.

Ms BUSH: No, not relating to the public session.

Ms KING: No, not relating to the public session.

CHAIR: We do have apologies, as I noted, from Dr Robinson and the other members who have been substituted for today. We will move on to the next item, which is the adoption of the agenda. I move that the agenda for Tuesday, 24 May 2022, as circulated, be adopted. Those in favour? Those against? That is carried.

Members have been provided with the draft minutes from meetings held on 3 May 2022 and 10 May 2022. I move that the minutes of the meetings held on 3 May 2022 and 10 May 2022 be confirmed as a true and accurate record of the meetings. Those in favour? Those against? That is carried.

Members have been provided with copies of the incoming and outgoing correspondence schedules. I move that the inward correspondence is accepted and the outward correspondence is endorsed. Those in favour? Those against? That is carried.

We move to agenda item No. 5: responses to questions taken on notice. Members have been provided with the Crime and Corruption Commission's responses to questions taken on notice during the public meeting held on 3 May 2022. I note that the CCC has requested some parts of those responses be redacted before publication to protect the privacy of individuals and also to ensure compliance with a court order. I move that the committee authorises the publication of the redacted version of the Crime and Corruption Commission's responses to questions taken on notice during the public meeting on 3 May 2022 and notes the additional information provided in the CCC's further response. Is there any discussion on that motion?

Ms BUSH: Chair, I and my colleagues will be opposing the release of this publication to become public material on the basis that it is still a matter under investigation. When the investigation is finalised, I feel that we would be in a position to make that publicly available, but not at this stage.

Mr BLEIJIE: Chair, the proposition put by the member is incorrect because the matter before the court is based on an investigation that I understand was completed. I attended the last public hearing and requested some information from the Crime and Corruption Commission. They

acknowledged that they would come back before the committee. They have given that information. I think the CCC are best placed to know what can be released publicly. They have redacted all the information that they believe needs to be redacted.

Considering we openly discussed it in a public forum, in a public meeting, and the CCC are happy with it then the rest of it should be released publicly. I submit to you, Chair, that if the CCC had the information at that point in the public meeting they would have actually provided it in the public meeting without any issue. Now they have provided it in a letter and redacted some elements of it.

I think the proposition put by the member, that the investigation is still ongoing, is wrong. There is a court matter ongoing but that is not in relation to what the CCC have provided and what the member spoke about in terms of a report or an investigation. It should be a public matter, hence why the CCC have said they are happy for it to be released.

Ms BUSH: Chair, I am happy to rebut that.

CHAIR: Is there anyone else who would like to have a go first?

Ms PUGH: I support what Jonty said. I do not think there is any rush around this. I do not think we need to decide on it today. I am very happy to, at the very least, stay it over. I do not support publishing it in its current form. I do not think we should presuppose what the CCC would or would not have given us if they had had it at the meeting.

Ms BUSH: If I can speak to that point?

CHAIR: Can we go to the member for Coomera and then you can speak after that.

Mr CRANDON: Chair, the questions that were asked in the public meeting last sitting week were that the member for Kawana requested detail on the costs to the CCC of a particular litigation matter. That has been advised to us. All of those costs have been outlined. There are also some internal costs. The second question that they were responding to—

CHAIR: Was from me.

Mr CRANDON:—was from the member for Scenic Rim, who requested data as to whether there has been in the last 12 to 24 months an increase in nepotism allegations particularly for family member appointments to roles in the Public Service or agencies otherwise under CCC oversight. Neither of those have anything to do with matters under investigation or court matters. They are simply giving—

CHAIR: Information.

Mr CRANDON:—the people of Queensland something that they are entitled to, and that is what is the cost of these matters and whether or not there are any concerns around nepotism. I do not see any reason we should not have these papers tabled for publication. It comes back to getting the material out to the people of Queensland in a timely manner. I support the motion.

CHAIR: Member for Cooper to respond, I suppose.

Ms BUSH: And to clarify that we are happy to support the release of the general reports in relation to nepotism. It is the detail relating to the matter that is before the court that we are cautious about. I appreciate that it was asked in a public hearing and put to the CCC by the member for Kawana. At the time that he asked it I believe, if my memory serves me, I did raise a point of order but, unfortunately, Chair, you had ruled that the member for Kawana had his question in before my point was taken.

CHAIR: No.

Ms BUSH: Had that conversation continued, I would have challenged whether that was something that should have been publicly aired. I still do challenge that that should not be something that is publicly aired.

CHAIR: Member, I caution you not to reflect on the ruling of the chair in committee—either now or a previous ruling. Just talk to the proposed resolution before us today, please.

Ms BUSH: My apologies, Chair. My point is that I took issue at the time and still do. That is my position.

CHAIR: Sure.

Mr BLEIJIE: Chair, I cannot see any reason why the Labor Party would want to hide the legal costs that the CCC have incurred in the Jackie Trad legal matter. There is a matter on foot, but revealing the legal costs to the taxpayer that the CCC have spent in court does nothing to impact on

the case before the court. I would put to you, Chair, that if the CCC chair were sitting right here today in this public meeting and I were to ask him the amount the CCC have spent on legal fees in the Jackie Trad matter in court he would tell us.

Ms KING: I raise a point of order, Chair.

Mr BLEIJIE: I have not finished.

CHAIR: Member for Kawana, I have a point of order.

Ms KING: I put it to you that the member for Kawana's objections go to a hypothetical assumption about the decision that would be made by the chair of the CCC.

CHAIR: There is no point of order because he is not asking a question. That point of order you are making is in relation to questions asked. The member for Kawana is speaking to the motion.

Mr BLEIJIE: What is not hypothetical, Chair, is the Labor Party trying to hide the figures again from the Queensland public. That is why I support the motion so moved. Incidentally, it was at the public hearing that we said to the CCC, 'Please go away,' and on their advice they sought—and I would suggest they have spoken to their lawyers in-house about what they can and cannot release that would have a material impact or no impact on the legal matter of the Jackie Trad matter before the court. They have come back with a figure in a letter. They have said what they are happy to be redacted.

This is the PCCC. The Crime and Corruption Commission of Queensland—they are the experts in this field—are happy for the information to be released. Chair, I would encourage the Labor Party members not to try to continue the protection racket on Jackie Trad, even though she is a former colleague. I would ask them to put what is in the public interest, and that is releasing the letter that the CCC are quite happy to have released.

CHAIR: As a general proposition, during my time as chair I have lent my support to the proposition that questions asked in public ought to be answered in public. That is why I have moved this proposed resolution. For the most part, over the last 18 months or so we have, as a committee, agreed to that. I think everyone has had a chance to contribute to this. If there is no other contribution, I intend to put the motion.

Mr CRANDON: I do have one further comment. Chair, given there are two questions that have been responded to by the CCC, it has now become obvious that the Labor members of the committee, sadly, have decided that it is okay to reveal some of the information in the letter of response from the acting CCC chair but are not prepared to support the publication of the other question. The nepotism one is all fine.

CHAIR: Is that in a broad sense correct?

Ms BUSH: Just to clarify, we have no issue with generic information being released by the CCC reports—that is, the report on nepotism. What we are talking about is a particular personal individual's matter that is proceeding through court. We are not stating that that should not be made public. We are querying the timing of that being made public and whether this is the time. As the member for Mount Ommaney has suggested, there will be a time when it will be appropriate to release that. Our view is that that is not now.

CHAIR: Thank you for that. I think Michael might have been working up to something.

Mr CRANDON: I was trying to come to a point where it is clear that there is some sort of protection going on—in my mind anyway—in relation to it. The CCC have already clearly outlined what they do not want in the public sphere. We have seen that. We were looking to table the full document excluding those matters that the CCC does not want made public. The member for Kawana made the point that they probably had a bit of a chat to their lawyers and they are completely comfortable with everything going to the public sphere. I suggest that we move that motion and I might move another motion.

CHAIR: I think we have adequately discussed that. I will put the motion.

Ms BUSH: You will need to break it up, won't you?

CHAIR: No. The motion stands as moved. There has been no proposed amendment. Those in favour?

Opposition members: Aye.

CHAIR: Those against?

Government members: No.

Mr BLEIJIE: Shame.

CHAIR: I think that motion is lost, but I will call for a division. Those in favour?

Mr BLEIJIE: Aye.

Mr CRANDON: Aye.

CHAIR: Members for Kawana, Coomera and Scenic Rim. Those against?

Ms BUSH: No.

Ms PUGH: No.

Ms McMILLAN: No.

Ms KING: No.

CHAIR: Members for Cooper, Mount Ommaney, Mansfield and Pumicestone.

Mr BLEIJIE: Jackie still controls them even though she is gone.

CHAIR: The motion is lost.

Mr CRANDON: Chair, I would like to move a motion.

CHAIR: Member, the agenda does not have another motion on there. If you can tell us what you want to move then maybe we can—

Mr CRANDON: That motion has been lost. What I would like to move is having the balance of the section redacted in relation to request No. 1 and then move a motion to have the further redacted document tabled for publication.

CHAIR: To be clear, you would move that everything in relation to request No. 1 from the member for Kawana be redacted but that information in relation to request No. 2 contained in the letter be published?

Mr CRANDON: Yes.

Ms BUSH: Can someone take us there in the meeting papers?

CHAIR: That includes the information regarding nepotism allegations.

Ms BUSH: For request No. 2.

CHAIR: Have you located it?

Ms BUSH: Yes. Sorry, Michael, what was the motion again?

Mr CRANDON: Redact anything that relates to question No. 1 and then table for publishing everything that relates to request No. 2, the member for Scenic Rim's question and all of the response to that.

Ms BUSH: I just want to be really clear about what I am doing on the fly. We are talking about midway through page 28, from the green highlighted request No. 2, down to—

Mr CRANDON: Then it just goes on to nepotism allegations report.

Ms BUSH: Down to 46.

Mr CRANDON: Does it go that far—46?

Mr BLEIJIE: It does not contain anything about Jackie Trad's situation, so you will be okay.

Ms BUSH: Or anybody's personal information, right?

CHAIR: If there is no objection to Michael moving that motion—

Ms PUGH: What is the wording of the motion you are moving, member for Coomera?

CHAIR: Do you want me to read it out for you?

Mr CRANDON: Sure.

CHAIR: The motion is: 'That the committee authorises the publication of the redacted version of the Crime and Corruption Commission's responses to questions taken on notice during the public meeting on 3 May 2022, excluding any material in relation to request No. 1, as outlined in that response from the CCC, and notes the additional information provided in the CCC's further response'. The practical impact will be, in line with the past resolution, that the material in relation to request No. 1 will not be published but request No. 2 will be. I think we have general acquiescence that Michael will move that?

Ms PUGH: I am happy to move an amendment that we support the nepotism report. I just want a bit more time to consider the rest of it, please.

Mr BLEIJIE: That is it.

CHAIR: That is what we have just moved.

Mr BLEIJIE: The first item was about Jackie Trad. The second item was the nepotism.

Ms PUGH: Yes, so why don't we just amend the wording slightly then?

Mr BLEIJIE: We did.

CHAIR: That motion was lost. It was not amended firstly, so we are moving another motion now.

Ms PUGH: So is there any objection to amending the wording slightly just to make it clearer what we are voting on there?

Ms BUSH: Do you want to go from page 30?

Ms PUGH: Yes. If we are talking about the same thing—I am just suggesting an amendment to the wording.

Ms KING: Is a fresh release of just that nepotism information what is being contemplated or are we talking about a redacted version of the existing documents?

CHAIR: Quite clearly, the CCC in providing us with a redacted letter was satisfied from their perspective that it could be released to the public. What Michael has moved is that their letter be published with the attachment, because that relates to request No. 2, with everything in relation to request No. 1 being excluded.

Ms KING: Excluded or redacted?

Mr CRANDON: Further redacted.

CHAIR: Redacted.

Ms BUSH: I think what I am hearing on our side is that we will not be supporting that motion. We would support a motion put by the member for the release of pages 30 on.

CHAIR: So you object to anything from the CCC being published?

Mr BLEIJIE: The letter.

CHAIR: From their letter.

Ms BUSH: From their letter—correct.

CHAIR: Notwithstanding that they have given us a letter clearly anticipating publication.

Ms BUSH: At this stage.

Ms KING: The letter that has been provided is overwhelmingly about matter No. 1 and a very small portion of it is about matter No. 2. My concern would be that it represents—

Mr BLEIJIE: Lots of expenditure on the Jackie Trad matter.

CHAIR: Member, we have already dealt with that matter.

Ms KING: That will do, member for Kawana. I am finishing my point, if you do not mind.

Mr BLEIJIE: I do mind.

Ms KING: It creates—it is better if the documents referred to are released entirely as a freestanding release.

Mr CRANDON: What you are saying is that it gives a visual representation of a letter that is going to be redacted, totalling about 1¾ pages, and less than half a page would be actually tabled. That is your concern, that it will give a visual representation of what we are talking about here?

Ms KING: Given that the further matters are going to, in due course, be released, perhaps providing it as separate correspondence is more appropriate.

CHAIR: The letter from the CCC actually provides context around the document attached to it.

Mr CRANDON: It does.

CHAIR: It outlines the request I made. I really cannot see an issue with the redacted letter—redacting everything in relation to request No. 1. I cannot see an issue with the rest of it being published, taking into account all of your concerns whether they are valid or not. Anyway, the motion has been moved by the member for Coomera. We have had a good discussion about it. Unless there is any other discussion, I am going to put that motion. Those in favour?

Opposition members: Aye.

CHAIR: Those against?

Government members: No.

CHAIR: I think that motion is lost, but I will call for a division. Members in favour?

Mr BLEIJIE: Aye.

Mr CRANDON: Aye.

CHAIR: Kawana, Coomera and Scenic Rim. Members against?

Ms BUSH: No.

Ms McMILLAN: No.

Ms PUGH: No.

Ms KING: No.

CHAIR: Cooper, Mansfield, Mount Ommaney and Pumicestone. The motion is lost. Members, now that we have addressed those matters or resolved upon those matters not to publish those documents, that concludes the public component of today's meeting. The committee will now continue its meeting in private session. To everyone watching at home and in other parts of Queensland, thank you very much. I declare the public session closed.

The committee adjourned at 1.32 pm.