



PARLIAMENTARY CRIME AND CORRUPTION COMMITTEE

Members present:

Hon. ML Furner MP—Chair
Hon. GJ Butcher MP
Mr MA Hunt MP
Mr JJ McDonald MP
Ms JC Pugh MP
Mr RA Stevens MP (via teleconference)
Hon. AJ Stoker MP (via teleconference)

Staff present:

Ms H Radunz—Assistant Committee Secretary
Ms C Reissis—Senior Committee Support Officer

MEETING WITH THE PARLIAMENTARY COMMISSIONER

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Tuesday, 19 August 2025

Brisbane

TUESDAY, 19 AUGUST 2025

The committee met at 9.15 am.

CHAIR: Good morning, everyone. I am Mark Furner, member for Ferny Grove and chair of the committee. Joining me on the committee are: the Hon. Amanda Stoker, member for Oodgeroo and deputy chair; the Hon. Glenn Butcher, member for Gladstone; Mr Marty Hunt, member for Nicklin; Mr Jim McDonald, member for Lockyer; Ms Jess Pugh, member for Mount Ommaney; and Mr Ray Stevens, member for Mermaid Beach.

I would like to respectfully acknowledge the traditional custodians of the land on which we meet today and pay our respects to elders past and present. We are very fortunate to live in a country with two of the oldest continuing cultures in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples whose lands, winds and waters we 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 meetings at the discretion of the chair or by order of the committee. The proceedings are being recorded by Hansard and broadcast live on the parliament's website. I ask everyone participating in today's proceedings to ensure they turn their microphone on before speaking and off once they have finished to ensure they can be heard clearly and proceedings are accurately captured for broadcast and transcription purposes. Media may be present and will be subject to the chair's direction at all times. The media rules endorsed by the committee are available from committee staff. All those present today should note that it is possible you may be filmed or photographed by media during the proceedings and images may also appear on the parliament's website or social media pages. Before we proceed, I ask everyone present to please turn mobiles phones off or switch them to silent mode.

The committee's proceedings today will commence with a public meeting with the parliamentary commissioner which will run for approximately 30 minutes. The committee will then close the public part of the meeting and continue its meeting with the parliamentary commissioner in private session. Following that, the committee will meet in public from approximately 10.30 am with the Crime and Corruption Commission before closing the public part of that meeting to continue the remainder of the proceedings with the Crime and Corruption Commission in private session.

Before we proceed, I am not aware of any apologies or declarations of interest relevant to the public sessions with the parliamentary commissioner or the Crime and Corruption Commission. Members have been provided with a secretariat briefing, a copy of the parliamentary commissioner's public report and appendix for the period from 23 April 2025 and 29 July 2025, and the transcript of the last public meeting with the parliamentary commissioner on 13 May 2025. The proposed resolution of the committee is that the committee authorises the publication of the parliamentary commissioner's public report to the committee for the period 23 April 2025 and 29 July 2025. It is moved by?

Ms PUGH: Me.

CHAIR: Jess Pugh, the member for Mount Ommaney. All those in favour? Carried. The committee will now commence its public discussion with the parliamentary commissioner.

MORGAN, Dr Daniel, Parliamentary Commissioner, Office of the Parliamentary Commissioner

KUNDE, Mr Mitchell, Principal Legal Officer, Office of the Parliamentary Commissioner

CHAIR: Dr Morgan, this is your first meeting with us since commencing the role of parliamentary commissioner on 26 May. On behalf of the committee, I take this opportunity to publicly congratulate you on your appointment and warmly welcome you to the first of many joint proceedings with the committee. Thank you, Mr Kunde, for your ongoing assistance. Dr Morgan, I will start by inviting you to make an opening statement after which I will turn to members for questions. Before I do so, I want to remind members to take care not to refer to any private matters in the public part of this meeting. Over to you, Dr Morgan.

Dr Morgan: Thank you, Chair, and thank you to the members of the committee. It is indeed my first hearing before the committee and I would like, if I may, to recognise and thank Mr Kunde and my predecessor, Mr Woodford—Mr Kunde for being the acting parliamentary commissioner and Mr Woodford, my predecessor, as I was blessed with an office that was completely up to date with its work tasks and completely over the issues. I would like to record those thanks publicly.

The written report which I have submitted to the committee spans that time prior to and post my appointment. Mr Kunde is here to go into any specific details that I am not across with respect to things that he was involved with as acting commissioner. I am pleased with the way that we have been able to onboard me and I am pleased that I have come up to speed, I think, with the tasks of the office. It was a convenient time, it seems, to have been appointed because a lot of the major work tasks had been completed. There is no particular work task that was underway but incomplete. There are a few that I have flagged in the report that we will be looking at in the second part of this year.

Apart from that, if it is convenient to go through my report and if there are any particular questions members may have that is probably a more efficient way, from my point of view, to ensure that we are able to respond to the particular issues that members of the committee might have.

Ms PUGH: Congratulations on your recent appointment. Mr Kunde, I think it is great that you have been able to seamlessly support that. Now that you have been in the role for a few months, my question is what has surprised you? You applied for a particular role. Everybody has expectations about the role that they apply for. What has been the difference in reality, if any, or is there anything you would like to share about the start of your time in this role?

Dr Morgan: I have been pleasantly surprised. I have not been surprised in any bad way with respect to anything. I have been welcomed collegially by everybody I have come into contact with. Everybody has been greatly supportive, I have to say. It is in many ways a pleasant change from adversarial court applications where there is still that collegial activity but everybody is trying to win a particular side of their case. I have been pleased to see how in practice the moving parts work together. I have been pleased to see the attitudes. I am not saying I was surprised that this happened, but I was pleased to see that from what I detect there is an attitude of cooperation and transparency and a recognition that there are checks and balances in the system and this is just the way things are done.

I am mindful it is the public session. I do read the newspapers and I do see the clippings, and we have not been in the paper, if I can say it that way, but some other jurisdictions have. We take that as a learning experience. Mr Kunde and I have had the opportunity, particularly as he is having to step me through the minutiae of how the theory is put into practice, to war game, if you like—what would we do if this happens. That is an ongoing process and I think that is a good discipline to have. What is happening in other jurisdictions, why is it not happening here is a good question and a lot of that is about the statutory basis in other jurisdictions. I think we have a very good statutory basis here where people in my role are not asked to do things that they are in other states as part of their statutory duties, like make findings. I think that is the key one. I think it is very beneficial that this commissioner is statutorily prohibited from making findings whereas other commissioners are required to make findings.

The other thing that is of interest, I think, is the litigation in the ACT arising from the inquiry into the Drumgold matter—the commission of inquiry. We are watching that because it has implications with respect to parliamentary privilege and the Carne case. There is also a decision that has been given in the ACT—I am sorry, it has been reserved, it has not been given. We would be interested to see whether and if that decision, or those decisions if they are appealed, has implications for this office.

Mr McDONALD: Thank you, Dr Morgan, and Mitchell for being here, and congratulations on your appointment. My interest is in the 329 notifications. I note your report about the level of workload, as well as the opportunities that might exist to look at some of the minor changes regarding that. Is there anything you would like to share with the committee about those 329 notifications in the public meeting?

Dr Morgan: Sure, and I am mindful that it is the public hearing. Generally speaking we receive several of those a week, depending from week to week, and the committee receives those too. It is something that Mr Kunde and I have discussed. I find it helpful to see what is going on. In saying that, I am mindful that just because somebody like me says it is helpful, once it is transmitted down the line I do not want that to turn into lots of concern with line managers and people being terrified of making a mistake and onerous reporting requirements. We find it helpful because it gives an idea of what is going on and this sounds a bit hifalutin for an office of two people, but our intake procedure

means that both of us read it and both of us form a judgement. If you had the bureaucracy here you would say that you can do a trend analysis. Really we know what is going on because we read these things and reflect on them and talk to them and we each have a different opinion, which sometimes is the same, if I can put it that way. We read the same document and our conclusions might be the same. I think that is good from the point of view of us keeping a handle on what is going on. At a higher level it is good for those reporting to know that people are reading and watching and that there is that discipline that the report has to be made and somebody is reading it and not just ticking it off.

The other thing, which I think goes back to my earlier remarks and something which you can compare with other states based on those media clips, is the attitude of transparency and cooperation. There is no pushback, if you like, from having to make those reports. From time to time we do ask questions or make comments and they are responded to in an open, meaningful and sincere way. I think that as an approach is just as important as well as what is going on. We do not do formal analyses, but we know exactly what is going on and we review what sorts of complaints there are; are they from the same people and that sort of thing. That is why I say that there is, if you would like to talk about it, a trend analysis—that is a bit hifalutin—but that is what we are doing so that hopefully that would be a leading indicator before there was a major problem.

CHAIR: Dr Morgan, I might ask a question in regards to your obligations under the investigation into intelligence data. You have written to the Commissioner of Police, and you are considering the matter with the Australian government security clearances and Mr Kunde as well. Is there any update you would like to inform the committee of as to when that may be progressed?

Dr Morgan: Yes. That was resolved at about 7 o'clock on Friday evening, to my surprise—successfully—and I will just leave it there in the public space. We will be able to progress that. On Friday we did visit the offices and did an audit into the telephone intercept logs. I was also able to meet and greet, if you like, and see the operations for myself on Friday. That has happened since our report. The intel review will be the next big item. That is probably overly elaborate because I do have my statutory oath that Mr Kunde and I have both taken to keep things secret—but now everybody is happy.

CHAIR: Member for Mermaid Beach, do you have any questions?

Mr STEVENS: I was going to ask if there are any matters in relation to the ongoing issue of the storage of those Connolly-Ryan records.

Dr Morgan: That is mentioned in my report. Candidly, it has not advanced much. I am on top of the issues. I think it is just a question of I will have to speak to the Clerk and the State Archivist as well, frankly, to finalise the actual practicalities of how that would be done.

Mr STEVENS: When are we expecting a result on that?

Dr Morgan: I could not make a promise that I cannot keep in having it resolved by Christmas, but it is certainly part of our work plan before then.

Mr STEVENS: Thank you.

Mr BUTCHER: My question is around the amendments to the Telecommunications (Interception and Access) Act. Is there anything you can share with the committee in the public session today regarding an update on those amendments to the act and the progress of the discussions with the Commonwealth?

Dr Morgan: Again, that is a matter that has not progressed to any great extent. I am on top of the issue; I know what it is. We have informally discussed it with the CCC as late as Friday. I do not see my office as being the lead agency in that. We are happy to be cooperative and to support whatever is done. These are slow moving. I should indicate that the commissioners and inspectors—they have different names in different jurisdictions—are meeting in Adelaide in October, so that is probably the sort of thing that could be advanced at that meeting. It is not something that I see myself having the lead on.

Mr Kunde: It might be helpful if you ask how that is going during the next meeting—just to kick it along a little bit.

Mr BUTCHER: As a follow-up, at the last meeting we had in May it was basically the same information coming through—that nothing really has changed. Can you see that happening this year, or is it just going to be one of these things that goes on forever? This is pretty important. I know you only have a small part to play, but you can help resolve some of these issues, I guess.

Dr Morgan: It might be the sort of thing that I can have a meeting with some people informally and just use that as a briefing for my purposes and see. I do not know mechanically the extent to which the Commonwealth is being proactive in this, but I do know that it is going to be a root-and-branch amendment because the act is older than I am and it contemplates people with alligator clips and thermoses going, 'Quick, wake up. The good bit's coming. Press play and record on your reel.' It does not contemplate how these things are done in reality. I would be interested to see whether it contemplates AI playing a role because AI may or may not be playing a role in the real world because of the vast amount of data that is processed and captured. Again, I will have to take that on notice. It is not being ignored; there are lots of moving parts, I suspect.

CHAIR: We will go to the deputy chair, and my apologies for not calling you earlier.

Mrs STOKER: That is all right, and my apologies for being on the telephone. Dr Morgan, congratulations on the role and thank you for your service so far. You touched on something in your last answer which I wanted to ask you about—that is, do you see the role of technological change, and in particular AI, having an impact on the work that you do, and does that impact the skill sets that your office requires or the resources that you require?

Dr Morgan: That is an interesting question. I have not paid it any particular concern arising from this particular office. I know that AI is spoken about in theory everywhere. I know that in practice it is embedded in all of the software that the lawyers use. I am trying my best to get a practical skill set of doing this. I am sceptical about the extent to which it is currently suitable to outsource things. I know from personal experience and also reading some of the cases that you cannot rely on it to come up with a citation. It will literally just make up a citation which looks plausible, but unless you actually go and check the citations with the law reports they could be completely different things. I know a couple of practitioners have been caught out by not doing the proofreading.

Another thing that is of concern—and, again, I am a keen amateur in this and I am trying to keep my skills current—is that I understand that one of the ways it works is uploading the data to the cloud and they are trying to use I think they call it the large language model. You might have seen in the newspapers that they are sucking up novels and trying to teach it by having regard to the novels. There are very big issues about confidential information being uploaded to a cloud to be used by third parties. The legal professional software promise that they will purge all of the data that you have uploaded within two weeks and will not use it for purposes outside the matter you are using it in. Forgive me for being overly cautious, but it is not something that I would do lightly.

To answer your question, I think it is one of these things that, like everything else, will have its uses and we will have to come to use it as a tool, but there seems to be a gap between the reality and the expectation at this stage. That might be me speaking as a gen Xer. I think it is a really valuable tool and there will be specific instances where it can be used as data processing, particularly in the analysis. It is probably a tool that we need to keep our eyes on at the moment and keep those skills up. That is an overly lengthy and perhaps not particularly well targeted answer to your question, but that is my experience so far with AI.

Ms PUGH: I have a question on some of the work that the previous commissioner and Mr Kunde were doing around witness welfare. It is an ongoing area of interest for a number of corruption bodies around the country. I am curious as to whether there have been any recent developments or anything you would like to share with the committee with regard to work happening in either Queensland or other jurisdictions that you think might inform our work here.

Dr Morgan: I am aware generally of some very unfortunate personal consequences that happened in other jurisdictions with investigations. I have not obviously done an investigation myself. Mr Kunde, is there anything that you can add?

Mr Kunde: I have not briefed Dan on where we are up to on this, but we are basically maintaining a watching brief on how the CCC are working with their policies. The last I was aware was they were having them assessed by outside consultants. I have not briefed Dan on that particularly.

Dr Morgan: I am aware of the issue generally though and it is something that we would be concerned to monitor.

Mr HUNT: In the table of key outputs in your public report, the cumulative average time taken to finalise complaints against the CCC was 24 weeks, which seems consistent with previous times. There do not appear to be any significant issues, but are there any significant issues arising from those key outputs from your perspective?

Dr Morgan: No. There is nothing that I am concerned about. There are patterns, but each notification is a separate potentially important issue that needs to be explored. Again, we are not overwhelmed at the moment. I do not want to be the person who says, 'It's a quiet time.'

Mr HUNT: Do not say that at a police station!

Dr Morgan: I know—or a hospital, I am told! I am not going to say that. I am just going to say that that is a sign of success. I am obviously looking at those figures and thinking, 'Is there something that's going on that we're not detecting?' I am satisfied that it is just ticking away nicely, if I can jinx it that way.

CHAIR: As there are no further questions and there were no questions taken on notice, I declare the public meeting closed. We will now enter into a private session until approximately 10.30 am.

The committee adjourned at 9.43 am.