

29 July 2011

**BY EMAIL: [pcmc@parliament.qld.gov.au](mailto:pcmc@parliament.qld.gov.au)**Partner & Writer:  
Direct Line:  
Email:  
ABN:  
Our Ref:Rowan Lyndon  
07 3231 8728  
[rlyndon@thymac.com.au](mailto:rlyndon@thymac.com.au)  
79 763 953 991  
EKG:RKL:112864The Research Director  
Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee  
Parliament House  
George Street  
Brisbane QLD 4000

Dear Sir/Madam

**Three Yearly Review of the Crime and Misconduct Commission**

We act for Queensland Newspapers Pty Ltd, the publisher of *The Courier-Mail*, *The Sunday Mail* and [www.couriermail.com.au](http://www.couriermail.com.au), and Channel Seven Brisbane Pty Ltd, the licensed television broadcaster for Channel Seven in Brisbane.

Our clients welcome the opportunity to make a submission to the Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee regarding amendments that need to be made to the *Crime and Misconduct Act 2001* (Qld) (**Act**) in view of systemic issues with the current powers and operations of the Crime and Misconduct Commission (**Commission**).

1. Systemic issue – Inadequate protection of the identity of a journalist's confidential source
  - 1.1 The Act does not protect the identity of a journalist's confidential source. On the contrary, the Act empowers the Commission to:
    - (a) compel a journalist to:
      - (i) secretly produce documents (ss. 74, 74A and 75 Act);
      - (ii) give an oral statement under oath or a sworn written statement behind closed doors (ss. 75 and 75A Act);
      - (iii) attend a secret Commission hearing to give evidence or produce documents (s. 82 Act);
    - (b) enter and search any place or person and seize evidence (Chapter 3, Parts 2 to 5, inclusive, Act); and

1701538v1

LEVEL 27, 12 CREEK STREET, BRISBANE QLD 4000 GPO BOX 245, BRISBANE QLD 4001

P. +61 7 3231 8888 F. +61 7 3229 0855 [www.thymac.com.au](http://www.thymac.com.au) ABN 79 763 953 991

AFFILIATED FIRMS PRACTISING SEPARATELY IN SYDNEY • MELBOURNE • BRISBANE • ADELAIDE

Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standards Legislation.

- (c) use covert surveillance devices to monitor a journalist (Chapter 3, Parts 6 and 7 Act), even though that may result in the identification of a journalist's confidential source.

1.2 Not only does the Commission have these incredibly broad powers, but it has used these powers repeatedly to pressure journalists to reveal the identity of their confidential sources. This is unacceptable in view of the matters set out below.

- (a) The enunciated policy of the Commission not to use its powers to compel a journalist to identify a confidential source. In an interview given by Mr Robert Needham, the immediate past Commission Chairman, to Steve Austin during the Evenings programme on the Australian Broadcasting Corporation's Brisbane radio station 612 on 10 September 2008 at 8.43pm (transcript **attached**), Mr Needham said:

*"...it is certainly... policy that no journalist would be called and asked to declare their sources...And quite frankly if they get shield laws it won't worry me. I won't mind at all because we will not do it." (Also, see representations made by the Honourable KG Shine in relation to a discussion about shield laws in the Queensland Parliament's *Record of Proceedings (Hansard)*, 10 September 2008 at pages 2620 and 2639 and 11 September 2008 at page 2703 (copies **attached**)).*

- (b) The overriding public interest in the protection of the identity of a journalist's confidential source. This point is perhaps best summarised by the European Court of Human Rights in *Goodwin v UK* (1996) where it said:

*"The Court recalls that freedom of expression constitutes one of the essential foundations of a democratic society and that the safeguards to be afforded to the press are of particular importance. Protection of journalistic sources is one of the basic conditions for press freedom...Without such protection, sources may be deterred from assisting the press in informing the public on matters of public interest. As a result the vital public watchdog role of the press may be undermined and the ability of the press to provide accurate and reliable information may be adversely affected."*

- (c) The invidious position it places a journalist. A journalist who is pressured by the Commission to reveal the identity of their confidential source is forced to choose between:
- (i) honouring their ethical obligation to maintain their source's confidence (see, for example, Media, Entertainment and Arts Alliance Code of Ethics available at <http://www.alliance.org.au/resources/media/>) and risking criminal prosecution for contravening the Act; or
  - (ii) breaching their ethical obligation to maintain their source's confidence and avoiding criminal prosecution under the Act.

2. Proposed amendments to Act

- 2.1 In view of the above considerations, our clients believe the most appropriate way to redress this systemic issue is to amend the Act so that the Commission's powers are subjected to a journalist's privilege similar to Division 1C, Part 3.10, Chapter 3 of the *Evidence Act 1995* (NSW) (copy **attached**) with the Supreme Court of Queensland to decide any application by the Commission to compel the disclosure of the identity of any confidential source.

Yours sincerely



for: **Rowan Lyndon**  
**Partner**

Enclosures



# MEDIA MONITORS

## Transcript

Station: **ABC 612 BRISBANE** Date: **10/09/2008**  
 Program: **EVENINGS** Time: **08:43 PM**  
 Compere: **STEVE AUSTIN** Summary ID: **B00032038986**

Item: **ROBERT NEEDHAM, CRIME AND MISCONDUCT COMMISSION, SAYS HE INCORRECTLY TOLD ATTORNEY-GENERAL KERRY SHINE THAT NO JOURNALIST HAS EVER BEEN BROUGHT BEFORE THE CMC WITH REGARD TO FAILING TO REVEAL SOURCES.**

**INTERVIEWEES: ROBERT NEEDHAM, CRIME AND MISCONDUCT COMMISSION**

<b>Demographics:</b>	<b>Male 16+</b> 4000	<b>Female 16+</b> 3000	<b>All people</b> 7000	<b>ABs</b> 0	<b>GBs</b> 5000
----------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------	--------------------

**STEVE AUSTIN:** Let me bring into the discussion about journalists revealing their sources at this point in time Robert Needham. Robert Needham is the chairman of the Crime and Misconduct Commission.

Robert Needham, just clarify for me, I'm sure it was you who advised Kerry Shine that no journalist has been called to a CMC inquiry and asked to reveal details of their sources in the past. Is that right?

**ROBERT NEEDHAM:** Yes Steve, and contrary to what you've just said, in fact I - what the attorney said was wrong but it wasn't his fault, it was mine. We told him that today, but it was brought to my attention by one of my staff that you were raising this as an issue tonight and in fact he told me that what I'd conveyed through to the attorney was wrong. That in fact a journalist was asked in one particular CJC inquiry to reveal his sources.



## MEDIA MONITORS

So you can't blame the attorney, if you want to blame anyone blame me.

STEVE AUSTIN: We're not into blame but we are into truth.

ROBERT NEEDHAM: Yeah, sure.

STEVE AUSTIN: So just can you give us the details...

ROBERT NEEDHAM: And that's why...

STEVE AUSTIN: ... of the story.

ROBERT NEEDHAM: ... I'm correcting the record on this, because truth is important. It was in a matter where the CJC - look, I - it was before my time with the commission.

STEVE AUSTIN: Yes.

ROBERT NEEDHAM: In the latter part of the '90s they engaged - at that time they could do this, we can't do it anymore, but they engaged a QC from the private bar to conduct a hearing for them. That QC called a journalist, asked the journalist to reveal his source or her sources, I don't even know whether it was a man or a woman.

STEVE AUSTIN: Which QC was it can I ask? Was it Russell Hanson?

ROBERT NEEDHAM: Yes, it was. And the journalist declined. In the report to the commission I'm told, and this is just



## MEDIA MONITORS

what my office was telling me, so this - I'm sure he'd be correct. But this is his recollection now from a number of years later. In the report to the CJC the QC recommended that that journalist be cited for contempt and the commission declined to accept that recommendation. And it was never cited.

But while we're on the issue, it is certainly my policy that no journalist would be called and asked to declare their sources. And in fact I'm a bit surprised in some ways that *The Courier Mail* are running with it because I've made that plain to the editor of *The Courier Mail*. Though I don't blame them because I can understand them having a go for shield laws. And quite frankly if they get shield laws it won't worry me. I won't mind at all because we will not do it.

STEVE AUSTIN:

Problem is though in spite of your I'm sure very genuine remarks, it's now happened twice. Once in the Fitzgerald Inquiry and once with the Russell Hanson QC mention. And each time the only thing that could be relied upon was the pure human good will of the commissioner presiding.

ROBERT NEEDHAM: [Indistinct] Yes. But Steve, there's an interesting thing that no-one seems to have picked up on. There is a provision in our act in a misconduct, not in a crime hearing, but in misconduct hearing; a claim can be made on the basis of confidentiality. No-one's ever picked up on this and to my knowledge, and again I might be wrong because



## MEDIA MONITORS

I've only been there three and a half years, but to my knowledge that's never been claimed.

But Phil Dickie(\*), whom I listen to, said that priests can claim it. But see there's nothing in our act allowing priests to claim it, except for the provision about confidentiality. I would think, it's never been tested, but I would think a doctor could come in and claim patient confidentiality. I would think a priest could come in and claim priest confessor confidentiality and I would think a journalist could come in.

If that happens and someone claims it, what the provision in our act is, that if we want to pursue it further we then have to take it to the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court then has to consider whether it's in the public interest [indistinct].

STEVE AUSTIN: They'd rule on the matter on the law though wouldn't they Bob Needham.

ROBERT NEEDHAM: Sorry?

STEVE AUSTIN: The Supreme Court would rule on a matter of pure law wouldn't they?

ROBERT NEEDHAM: No, no, no. We - the law is the section in our act that says the Supreme Court has to determine whether it's in the public interest that the person should be required to answer the question. Now of course the Supreme Court might determine that.



## MEDIA MONITORS

And that wouldn't be a full shield law, but it is a form of shield law. But even apart from that...

STEVE AUSTIN: So journalists would have to rely on a shield law that was written for priests?

ROBERT NEEDHAM: No, no, no, that's unfair. I don't know that it was written for priests. I would think it probably wasn't.

STEVE AUSTIN: Okay.

ROBERT NEEDHAM: But it's - I don't know the origin of this but it is a provision in our act that people can come in and claim to not answer the question on the grounds of confidentiality.

STEVE AUSTIN: Okay. All right, so we're look...

ROBERT NEEDHAM: Yep. Can I raise a couple of other matters while I'm...

STEVE AUSTIN: Briefly if you would, but certainly Bob Needham go for your life.

ROBERT NEEDHAM: The issue that's been raised in the media about whistleblowers and that we're going to send whistleblowers to jail when they refuse to answer questions really, you know, is quite - being fair about it is a furphy.



## MEDIA MONITORS

Whistleblowers want to help us. You know, they want to tell us, that's what a whistleblower is. We don't have to force whistleblowers to talk to us. Whistleblowers just want to talk to us.

Sometimes we will call the whistleblower to a hearing but that's more at their request and for their protection. Then they can go and say to anyone, I had to tell them because they put me in the witness box and made me answer the questions. But we don't have to force whistleblowers to answer questions. And the suggestion - you talk about not being able to fin... think of situations where a journalist has been required, I can assure you will never find a situation where a whistleblower's been sent to jail for refusing to answer, because whistleblowers want to answer. That is a pure beat up, that one.

STEVE AUSTIN: All right. No, look, a beat up not made by me or us but I take your point.

ROBERT NEEDHAM: Oh no, no. Not made by you but it's been in the paper and everything today and I thought while I'm on the air I'll take the opportunity to put that one to rest.

STEVE AUSTIN: All right. Was there a final remark you wanted to make, Bob Needham? You said you had a couple of final points you wanted to make.



## MEDIA MONITORS

ROBERT NEEDHAM: No, no, I think that was it. The journalist issue that a) I will not ask a journalist to reveal their source. I suspect that they could probably claim a confidentiality claim anyway. And then the whistleblowers, that we're not going to - oh, the third and final point I suppose I should say is that this thing about the powers we've been granted as it was made plain to be fair, in the media today, they're not new powers. They're powers that the CJC, CMC have had since day one. It's just that the way that the wording is drafted in the way that it was put into the Crime and Misconduct Act, there's a little bit of ambiguity about it.

That witness took us on on it, as the witness is entitled to. That ambiguity has been really definitely raised now in the Supreme Court and at my request, the Attorney-General has now introduced into Parliament a bill that will just clarify and make certain the power that we have always understood we've had and we've always exercised.

And might I say, even though there is obviously an ambiguity in the act, the explanatory notes that were introduced with the Crime and Misconduct Act or the Bill when it was first presented to Parliament made it very plain that it was intended that we always have the power to require witnesses to answer, even though the answers might tent to incriminate. However, they are given the protection that the answers they give then cannot be used in



## MEDIA MONITORS

court against them in any civil or criminal proceedings.

STEVE AUSTIN: You've been very forceful with your time tonight. Bob Needham, thank you very much.

ROBERT NEEDHAM: Thank you, Steve.

STEVE AUSTIN: Bob Needham is the - oh sorry, Robert Needham, I'm sorry, is the chairman of the Crime and Misconduct Commission.

Robert Needham there has just clarified essentially for the minister, the Attorney-General Kerry Shine who had said, or told Parliament in fact that no journalist has been called to a CMC inquiry and asked to reveal the details of the source.

Bob Needham has admitted that he advised Kerry Shine that, that there had been one in the - where Russell Hanson QC during one of the CJC hearings did in fact do that. And Phil Dickie before that mentioned that while it wasn't a CJC or CMC hearing as such, before the Fitzgerald Inquiry, he was asked on a number of occasions to reveal his sources.

So there's at least two so far that we've been able to recall and we might dig up some more. But Mr Needham has been decent enough to say look, it was he who advised the Attorney-General of that.



# MEDIA MONITORS

\* \* END \* \*

TRANSCRIPT PRODUCED BY MEDIA MONITORS  
*target-monitor-analyse*

---

ADELAIDE	BRISBANE	CANBERRA	MELBOURNE	PERTH	SYDNEY
08 8132 4800	07 3259 2100	02 6124 5200	03 8327 6400	08 9228 5800	02 9318 4000

---

AGENCY REPORT For private research and not to be disseminated. Every effort made to ensure accuracy for the benefit of our clients but no legal responsibility is taken for errors or omissions. (\*) - Indicates unknown spelling or phonetic spelling. Metro TV demographics are supplied by OzTAM, Radio and Non-Metro TV demographics are supplied by Nielsen Media Research.

ABs = Managers, administrators, professions. GBs = Grocery buyers.

---

## Evidence Act 1995 No 25

Current version for 21 June 2011 to date (accessed 28 July 2011 at 17:09)

[Chapter 3](#) > [Part 3.10](#) > Division 1C

<< page >>

### Division 1C Journalist privilege

#### 126J Definitions

In this Division:

*informant* means a person who gives information to a journalist in the normal course of the journalist's work in the expectation that the information may be published in a news medium.

*journalist* means a person engaged in the profession or occupation of journalism in connection with the publication of information in a news medium.

*news medium* means a medium for the dissemination to the public or a section of the public of news and observations on news.

#### 126K Journalist privilege relating to identity of informant

- (1) If a journalist has promised an informant not to disclose the informant's identity, neither the journalist nor his or her employer is compellable to give evidence that would disclose the identity of the informant or enable that identity to be ascertained.
- (2) The court may, on the application of a party, order that subsection (1) is not to apply if it is satisfied that, having regard to the issues to be determined in the proceeding, the public interest in the disclosure of the identity of the informant outweighs:
  - (a) any likely adverse effect of the disclosure on the informant or any other person, and
  - (b) the public interest in the communication of facts and opinion to the public by the news media and, accordingly also, in the ability of the news media to access sources of facts.
- (3) An order under subsection (2) may be made subject to such terms and conditions (if any) as the court thinks fit.

#### 126L Application of Division

- (1) This Division extends to information given by an informant before the commencement of this Division.
- (2) This Division does not apply in relation to a proceeding the hearing of which began before the commencement of this Division.
- (3) This Division (as applied by section 131A) does not apply to a disclosure requirement referred to in that section made before the commencement of this Division.

teacher numbers? Does he intend that schools will not be cleaned and that cleaner numbers will be cut? On the one hand he wants more teacher aides in prep, but on the other hand he wants to cut their jobs. Talk about double standards and hypocrisy! The Leader of the Opposition says one thing to one group and something else to someone else, depending on which hounds he is hunting and which foxes he is running with. The opposition would have our students taught outside under the trees. They would have them sharpening pencils on rocks instead of putting USB connections into computers.

**Mr Lucas:** Using their rods or their blocks.

**Mr WELFORD:** Except that there'd be no trees left to cut them from. The Department of Education, Training and the Arts is one of the largest government departments in the state with nearly 65,000 full-time staff. Over 91 per cent of those staff hold front-line positions, teaching our children, up-skilling our workers and providing a vibrant cultural life for our state. The services that support those front-line staff include quality control over higher education courses, raising the profile of our education system in international markets, providing the state-of-the-art technology and support services that enable our schools to be among the best in the country and managing our facilities to ensure that we can continue to roll out new schools where they are needed and upgrade schools under our State Schools of Tomorrow program. All of those things are critical to the effective functioning of our education system and the future of our state, yet the opposition leader wants to continue to cut them.

As the Premier outlined in *Toward Q2: Tomorrow's Queensland*, we are focused on delivering a world-class education and training system. We are investing in 240 new kindergartens to meet the needs of early childhood education services. Our new Queensland Skills Plan is about building the skills of Queenslanders to meet the growing economy and the jobs that demand to be filled in the months and years ahead. We have an ambitious target to increase the number of Queenslanders holding trade training and tertiary qualifications. None of these targets can be achieved, no matter how high or low the opposition wants to set them, without keeping our front-line staff employed.

### Shield Laws

**Mr COPELAND:** My question is to the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice. I refer to the minister's statement to the House this morning, and I ask: has he ever been made aware of a situation where a member of the media has been called before the Crime and Misconduct Commission and asked to provide details on the source of their information?

**Mr SHINE:** I have been informed of certain information. I would have to give serious consideration to the member's question before venturing a reply that might in some way impede the investigation of the CMC. For that reason, I will take the question on notice.

### Public Service, Jobs

**Mrs SULLIVAN:** My question without notice is to the Deputy Premier. The opposition target to cut 12,000 jobs from the Public Service is not a plan for the future. Can the Deputy Premier inform the House about what work is already undertaken to plan a better future for Queenslanders?

**Mr LUCAS:** My state Department of Infrastructure and Planning is playing a vital role in protecting our lifestyle for the future with a \$16.9 billion infrastructure spend, which is \$3 billion more than any other state in Australia. People in my department are working to protect our green space, they are working to ensure we have the infrastructure we need when we need it, and they are doing everything they can to secure housing affordability so that our children and their children can afford a home in the future.

Under the Bligh government you get delivery, delivery, delivery: the Tugun bypass, the Inner Northern Busway and the water grid. What has the other side of the House delivered? They have delivered on one thing, which is a National Party takeover of the Liberal Party. As we all know because the cat is out of the bag, the Leader of the Opposition is now planning to shrink the Queensland Public Service. While he wants to cut public services, we build public services for a bigger and better Queensland, not bigger bureaucracies.

There is one thing that I can tell the House that the Leader of the Opposition will deliver on for sure when it comes to employment and that is jobs for washed-up National and Liberal Party hacks. We have only to look at the former hacks who they have lined up as candidates: former federal politicians Warren Entsch, Teresa Gambaro and—God help us—Cameron Thompson, Gary Hardgrave and De-Anne Kelly. However, that is not enough. We also have Ted Shepherd from the Gold Coast, Kevin Byrne and Ted Sorensen from Hervey Bay. So much for the vision of the Leader of the Opposition! It is to get tired local and federal government hacks for the National Liberal Party. Our backbench is a blend of youth and experience that is ready to serve a long time into the future. What do we have on the other side? Retread candidates!

supply of alcohol. Proactive strategies include a ministerial banning power of undesirable liquor products, irresponsible supply provisions where liquor may be seized from minors and young people, mandatory training for all paid staff selling or supplying liquor on licensed premises and the legislative recognition of local liquor accords.

On the issue of the local liquor accords, I am extremely pleased to report that one of most successful accords in the state is the Valley Liquor Accord, developed by a number of Fortitude Valley licensees, chaired by Mr Les Pullos. This accord is all about being part of a safe venue program embracing the main object of the bill, harm minimisation. I congratulate them on this initiative.

Sitting suspended from 1.00 pm to 2.30 pm.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Moorhead): Order! Before calling the Attorney-General, can I acknowledge in the gallery students, parents and teachers from the Maryborough West State School in the electorate of Maryborough, represented in this House by Mr Chris Foley.

Debate, on motion of Ms Grace, adjourned.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

### Further Answer to Question; Shield Laws

**Hon. KG SHINE** (Toowoomba North—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister Assisting the Premier in Western Queensland) (2.30 pm), by leave: The member for Cunningham asked me in this House this morning whether I have ever been made aware of a situation where a member of the media has been called before the Crime and Misconduct Commission and asked to provide details on the source of their information. The short answer is that the information provided to me by the CMC is that within the corporate memory of the CMC at present no journalist has been called to a CMC inquiry and asked to reveal the details of the source of his or her information. I am advised that the CMC policy is to not call journalists to hearings to reveal their sources.

## LIQUOR AND OTHER ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

### Second Reading

Resumed.

**Ms GRACE** (Brisbane Central—ALP) (2.31 pm): This is clear evidence that already the main elements of this bill are being used practically by industry that acknowledge that good regulation based on safe harm minimisation policies are also good for business, their patrons and the community. The prioritisation of harm minimisation as the first objective reflects the community's attitude to the sale and supply of liquor and builds on developments in national and international jurisdictions.

The bill's remaining objectives are also most welcome. I would like to go through half a dozen of those very quickly. Firstly, the expanded definition of 'liquor' ensures that products which target young people and encourage the rapid consumption of alcohol are able to be captured. Secondly, there are new powers to issue guidelines to assist in the interpretation and application of the act and liquor regulations. Thirdly, the creation of an irresponsible supply provision makes it an offence for an adult to supply alcohol to a minor in private places. This issue has attracted significant attention in the community, particularly in the context of youth parties and schoolies celebrations. It will be addressed through this provision. I do not think that anyone in the community can argue against the ability for the law to do something about clear breaches of this provision.

Fourthly, I welcome mandatory training requirements for the responsible service of alcohol and the responsible management of a licensed venue. I believe increased professionalism aimed at harm minimisation throughout the industry can only be achieved with properly trained staff completing government-endorsed training. This is a most welcome aspect of the bill. Fifthly, there are new powers to order emergency closure or licence suspension where riotous behaviour is occurring or is likely to occur. Sixthly, I welcome the introduction of annual liquor licence fees based on the risk a licensed premises poses such as from its trading hours and compliance history.

The government has undertaken extensive consultation with the industry and the community since the introduction of the Brisbane City Safety Action Plan in March 2005. Comments from the public and industry in response to this review have guided the government in developing the resulting liquor reforms. In fact, over 8,400 submissions were received from the public in response to the government's draft regulatory impact statement on the public benefit test that was released in February this year. I also want to place on record my thanks to the Treasurer who met a delegation from the Fortitude Valley area to discuss the draft regulatory impact statement.

## THURSDAY, 11 SEPTEMBER 2008

---

The Legislative Assembly met at 9.30 am.

Mr Speaker (Hon. MF Reynolds, Townsville) read prayers and took the chair.

Mr Speaker acknowledged the traditional owners of the land upon which this parliament is assembled and the custodians of the sacred lands of our state.

### PRIVILEGE

#### Referral to Members' Ethics and Parliamentary Privileges Committee

**Mr GIBSON** (Gympie—NPA) (9.32 am): I rise on a matter of privilege. The former minister for the environment, the member for Mundingburra, it appears has misled the parliament with regard to an answer to a question on notice in relation to a Mr Michael Gloster and visitors centres in the Noosa parks area. I will be writing to you with the details and asking you to refer it to the Members' Ethics and Parliamentary Privileges Committee.

**Mr SPEAKER:** I will await your letter.

#### Further Answer to Question; Shield Laws

**Hon. KG SHINE** (Toowoomba North—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister Assisting the Premier in Western Queensland) (9.32 am): Yesterday I made a ministerial statement in response to a question from the member for Cunningham asking if I had been made aware of a situation where a member of the media has been called before the Crime and Misconduct Commission and asked to provide details of the source of their information. At the time, and on advice from the CMC, I informed the House that I had not been made aware of a situation where a reporter had been asked to reveal a source.

The advice given to me by the CMC was that within the CMC's corporate memory no journalist has been called to a CMC inquiry and asked to reveal the details of the source of his or her information. Last night after my statement in the House the Chairman of the CMC, Mr Robert Needham, advised my office that the information provided to me by the CMC was not correct. The CMC has now informed me that there was one previous occasion where a journalist was asked for information about sources. The chairman has advised me that the commission took no action against that journalist as a result of the journalist's failure to reveal a source. Mr Needham reinforced my statement yesterday that the CMC has a policy that it does not call journalists to hearings to reveal their sources.

Of the many CMC or CJC inquiries since 1989, this is the only case of which I am now aware where a journalist was asked for a source. I repeat that no action was taken against that journalist when the journalist declined to reveal the information.

### SPEAKER'S RULING

#### Tabled Papers, Out of Order

**Mr SPEAKER:** On 21 February 2007 I made a statement regarding tabled papers. I noted that with regard to the tabling of documents the Queensland Legislative Assembly is very liberal compared to other houses of parliament. The particular distinction in this House is that members have an almost unfettered right to table documents, at least in the first instance, unless those tablings offend standing orders. In most other houses of parliament the tabling of documents is limited to particular classes of documents or tablings by ministers of the Crown only, unless the leave of the House or the chair is first sought and given. For example, in the UK House of Commons, the Canadian House of Commons and the Australian House of Representatives, private members have no right to table papers without the specific consent of the House.

It is with a growing sense of disappointment that I note that this week there has been a number of matters tabled that are bulky and the tabling of which serves no purpose. I would ask members to carefully consider the items they are tabling, given that such items, when tabled, have to be stored at public expense forever. It is simply not necessary to table documents and items such as placards, a ream of photocopies of front pages of documents probably already tabled and extracts from the House's own records of proceedings. Members can make their point without tabling those items. If members wish the right to table matters to remain unfettered then they must be responsible in their tablings. If not, I will have no hesitation in taking this matter to the Standing Orders Committee myself.