Speech By

Annastacia Palaszczuk

MEMBER FOR INALA

Record of Proceedings, 21 November 2013

CRIMINAL LAW (CRIMINAL ORGANISATIONS DISRUPTION) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Ms PALASZCZUK (Inala—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (12.45 pm): Thank goodness this is the last day of parliamentary sittings for the year and we will not have to listen to the long diatribes of the Attorney-General. I rise to make a contribution to the debate on the Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. Let me make it very clear that it was the Labor government back in 2009 that recognised—

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Robinson): Order! The Leader of the Opposition has barely begun her speech. The Leader of the Opposition has the call.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I know some members have not had much sleep. I will continue. It was the Labor government back in 2009 that recognised that there were issues in relation to outlaw motorcycle gangs in Queensland. That is why the Labor government at the time took the very serious decision to enact the criminal organisation bill.

I have listened to what the Attorney-General has said on many occasions in this House. I need to remind the House that the only person who spoke about the civil liberties of bikies when debating our legislation was the now Attorney-General and some of the other LNP members. He talked about the civil liberties of bikies. Here we are at the end of 2013 and he has changed his tune. If we want to talk about people flip-flopping, I rest my case—it is the Attorney-General.

We can also talk about the bungles of the Attorney-General. There are so many. I obviously do not have enough time to go through all of the bungles of the state's first law officer. The state's first law officer sat in this chamber and talked about a test. Let me issue a test to the Attorney-General. The real test is: will he stop talking about issues related to the PCMC when discussing motions that he has raised today when he is directly named in public documents that have been tabled as a person linked to the whole issue—

Mr DILLAWAY: I rise to a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I would like you to rule on relevance with regard to the bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am listening to the Leader of the Opposition's speech. I did not pick up anything that seemed to be veering off the bill. I will listen intently. The Leader of the Opposition has the call.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I sat here for about 20 minutes and listened to the Attorney-General talk about a whole range of issues in the past and now. He was issuing tests. I issue the same test for the Attorney-General. It is very simple. If he wants to issue a test for us then there is a test for him.

The Labor Party and the Labor opposition will not be hypocrites because we recognise that there have been issues in relation to outlaw criminal organisations in this state and that is why the Labor government took—

Mr Choat interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: How are the racing pigeons going, member for Ipswich West?

Mr Choat: They are going very well.

Ms PALASZCZUK: That is very good to hear. Before I go into the substance of the bill, I want to talk once again about rushing legislation through the House. What we saw the other day was an attempt by the government to rush the bill through the committee. I was surprised when the member for Rockhampton, the opposition's nominee on that committee, said outside the chamber that there was not really going to be a briefing at all and that it was going to be just the members of the committee going through the bill clause by clause. Then all of a sudden—I think it was maybe even less than 15 minutes after the member for Rockhampton stood up—we found out that in fact, yes, there was going to be a departmental briefing and that a departmental officer was going to come along and explain the aspects of the bill.

Mr Berry: Ooh, someone's in trouble!

Ms PALASZCZUK: No, no, no. That is what I have been told. It was public.

Mr Berry: It was not public.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I am talking about public tweets.

Mr Berry: It was not public.

Ms PALASZCZUK: That was a private hearing. I understand it was a private hearing with some departmental people, and you have tabled your report. So it is absolutely all on the public record.

Mr Berry interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Robinson): Order! The member for Ipswich—

Ms PALASZCZUK: Is the member trying to intimidate me?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the member for Ipswich wants to take a point of order, take a point of order. Do you have a point of order, member for Ipswich?

Mr BERRY: I rise to a point of order. The point of order is that the matters discussed by the Leader of the Opposition are privileged and were in a privileged meeting.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is no point of order. The member will take his seat. The Leader of the Opposition has the call.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Thank you very much, Mr Deputy Speaker. I have recalled a press release that the member for Rockhampton issued. I understand that it was not a public hearing but there was a departmental hearing and you have tabled a report.

Mr Berry: We will see.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Yes, we will see, because I understand it is all on the public record. But, once again, let me say that if this government were to be open and transparent why was a public hearing not called? What we have seen this week are allegations of cover-up and what we have now seen in relation to this bill that is currently before the House is that once again there was no public hearing—no ability for the Law Society and no ability for the Bar Association to come before the committee, to have a public avenue, to have their views heard.

Miss Barton interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition has the call.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Thank you very much, Mr Deputy Speaker. So I am very concerned that, once again, we had legislation introduced on the Tuesday, it went to a committee on the Wednesday and now we are here on the Thursday once again debating approximately 180 pages of legislation. These are laws that the government tells us are aimed at dismantling criminal gangs, making club members hand in their colours and get a real job, and protecting Queenslanders from the frightening actions of outlaw motorcycle gangs.

A government member interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition has the call.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker, and I am not taking interjections. The Attorney-General, when introducing the bill late on Tuesday night, said—

... the Queensland opposition, the Labor Party in this state, has to work out which side it is on—criminal gangs or Queenslanders. Do members know what? The Liberal-National government will always choose the side of Queenslanders.

The Labor Party will always choose the side of Queenslanders against criminal gangs. It did so back in 2009 when the then Labor government introduced the Criminal Organisation Bill, the bill that the LNP voted against. It is ironic that that was the legislation being debated on the final sitting day of the year in 2009 and tonight, four years later, the LNP have had the biggest change of heart we have ever seen in Queensland. This is a flip-flop the size of which we have never seen before. Back in 2009 the LNP were the friends of outlaw motorcycle gangs and criminals. Our legislation, which required persons to actually be convicted of a criminal offence to be caught by it, was ridiculed and challenged as being a breach of the civil liberties of the bikies.

Mr Stevens: You caught nobody.

Ms PALASZCZUK: The LNP—champions of the criminal bikie gangs at that time. In fact, I think the Leader of the House actually voted against that bill at the time because your leader was talking about the civil liberties of the bikies.

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members!

Ms PALASZCZUK: Now, in order to prove they are tough on law and order, they have had to make laws that criminalise not just criminal behaviour but people associating with each other. The Labor opposition is not opposed to laws that seek to combat criminal behaviour.

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members! The leader is not taking interjections at the moment. The leader has the call.

Ms PALASZCZUK: People who commit serious criminal behaviour, who threaten and intimidate police officers and ordinary citizens going about their business, should face the full result of the laws. Laws that create harsh penalties for these people are not out of place. Laws that create harsh penalties for people who commit no criminal offence, who may never be charged with a criminal offence or who are not members of criminal organisations cannot be acceptable in our society. Anyone who says they do not agree with the extent to which these laws attack ordinary Queenslanders is not a supporter of criminal gangs; they are a supporter of Queenslanders.

The sentiment of these laws, if they applied only to appropriate criminal gangs and people convicted of criminal offences, would be commendable. Some of the provisions that take away rights of review or appeal are problematic. However, attacking criminal gangs is what governments should be about. The best way to do that is to attack their income—confiscate their ill-gotten gains. We should use the resources of government to infiltrate their organisations and remove the incentive for their existence by making sure they do not benefit from criminal activity.

Attacking innocent Queenslanders because you are bound to catch some of the real criminals if you cast the net wide enough may seem like a good idea until one of your family members is caught up in it. Then we might see the real LNP principles come to the fore—the principles that are embodied in your constitution such as the preservation of the Westminster system of government; parliament controlling the executive and the law controlling all; independence of the judiciary; freedom of speech, religion, association and the media; freedom of citizens to choose their own way of living and of life, subject to the rights of others and the laws of the land and the protection of private property.

There are some sensible provisions in this bill which will assist agencies such as police and the CMC to dismantle criminal organisations. That is where the legislature should be setting its sights, not on the scattergun approach we have seen thus far from the LNP. Again, we have the situation where the Attorney-General has brought a bill into the House and rushed it through the committee system without allowing what I consider to be due consideration and due consultation with stakeholders.

Much of the reason why we are here debating this bill today is that the first bill was flawed, and we are having to perform a fix-up for the Attorney-General. The Attorney-General accused me of hypocrisy when the opposition opposed the motion to require the committee to report back on the bill by 10 am today. He quoted what I said in relation to the previous bill. However, that was a different situation. That bill was introduced after lunch, and the Attorney's department provided a briefing shortly thereafter. Stakeholders were given copies—

Mr Berry interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition has the call.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Thank you very much, Mr Deputy Speaker. The member for Ipswich is rather rude. Stakeholders were given copies of the bill and were able to at least have a quick look at it that day and evening, and the following day. The Attorney-General introduced this bill at 10.23 pm. He claimed he could not do it any earlier because the opposition had called so many divisions on the IR bill. But he could have introduced it in the morning when he introduced his other bill or after lunch as he did the previous bill or after dinner as he did with his bills yesterday. It is extreme for the Attorney to have made such a false claim in the parliament. Without providing any evidence for the urgency of this bill, it is difficult to see why, again, we have been forced to debate a bill of some 175 pages, amending 23 acts, in such a short time frame.

In the debate on the previous bill, the Leader of Opposition Business quoted from a statement by Peter Callaghan SC, President of the Law and Justice Institute. Mr Callaghan has made a submission to the committee which I will take the opportunity to quote. He states—

Membership of the Law & Justice Institute (Qld) Inc includes some of the most senior and experienced lawyers in the State of Queensland. We would welcome the opportunity to make submissions on a Bill that, amongst other things, challenges notions which are fundamental to the rule of law.

Even with all the experience and ability at our disposal, it is simply impossible for this exercise to be done intelligently in the time that has been allowed for the purpose. Any attempt to assert that it is possible will endanger the reputation of the parliamentary committee process as a whole.

———

Ms PALASZCZUK (Inala—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (4.27 pm), continuing: Prior to lunch and before the debate was adjourned I was finishing a quote. I will finish the last paragraph of that quote and then I will continue. It states—

The Law & Justice Institute urges you to request an extension of time within which to consider this Bill.

We do not see how your committee can claim to have applied intellectual rigour to its task unless it does so.

The last time the Attorney-General brought similar amendments to this House he asked for support for the government's approach to the response to outlaw criminal gangs. The opposition did not oppose that legislation. We certainly expressed our concerns about aspects of the legislation and doubted that, after it had the benefit of scrutiny by the courts, it would resemble very closely the legislation that had been presented by the Attorney-General. But what we made very clear was that the failures of the bill would fall at the feet of the Attorney-General. He alone would be responsible for its deficiencies. And what deficiencies we have seen so far, all in one month!

We take the same approach with this bill. There are certain provisions that are of enormous concern and we will be opposing those specific provisions. But, again, we will not oppose the bill. The Attorney-General will, again, have to take responsibility for the deficiencies in this rushed bill. It seems to offend the sensibilities of the Attorney-General, who appears to be quite sensitive about this matter. However, if he says he needs these powers to combat criminal organisations in Queensland, we will not stand in his way. What we will do, however, is hold him to account. If the Attorney-General thinks he knows more than the collective minds of the legal profession in this state, if the Attorney-General is unwilling to allow proper scrutiny by stakeholders, people who have been able to identify defects in past bills, then he must bear the brunt of any criticism of the bill. We will be watching with keen interest.

From the outset, we have offered our bipartisan support for an approach to tackling this problem in a calm and considered manner, to put our experience together with the experience of the government and members of the community, to come up with the very best solution to provide protection for Queenslanders.

The Attorney-General even asked for our bipartisan support for the laws, but then refused to even brief us or provide any information on what was proposed. What he was in fact asking was for blind support for something unseen. This is just posturing, Attorney-General, and we can see through what is not genuine. I will now raise the concerns we have with the bill.

I would like to now address the amendments to the Bail Act. Some of these amendments relating to the use of audio link and video link facilities are the implementation of the Costello audit to make better use of resources in the courts. Recommendation 121 of the Commission of Audit recommended that the government make greater use of ICT to drive cost savings and efficiencies in

court operations by significantly expanding the use of video conferencing between correctional centres and courts for all bail, procedural and committal matters. A further amendment provides that where a bail hearing is being heard by the Magistrates Court in a district or division outside the one in which the bail proceeding would have otherwise been required to be heard but for a practice direction of the Chief Magistrate, that court can make any order necessary to dispose of the matter.

In relation to the next amendment, the explanatory notes refer to a decision of Justice Wilson in the matter of an application for bail by Michael Kenneth Spence. Justice Wilson found that if the show cause provision is to apply, the person must have been a participant in a criminal organisation at the time of the bail hearing because, under the October amendment, the onus was on the person opposing the bail to prove that the applicant was a participant in a criminal organisation. This current amendment changes that to merely require an allegation of that fact rather than proof. This is in keeping with the other reverse onus provisions in the Bail Act. Where it was the only part of the amendment it may be justified; however, the amendment purports to capture anyone who has ever been a participant in a criminal organisation.

The amendment made to the Bail Act in November was very clear in its meaning. It clearly referred to a defendant who 'is a participant in a criminal organisation'. That section could never be argued to have referred to a past participant. Because the Attorney-General got it wrong once again and rushed the laws through without the opportunity for proper scrutiny, that bungle was not picked up and he was placed in an embarrassing situation when the Supreme Court highlighted the bungle. Defendants who left criminal organisations after being charged, as the Premier told them to, were not caught by the provision. To cover that embarrassment, the Attorney claimed it was a grammatical error and said he would make amendments to fix it up. However, his amendments have gone much further than that. It is not an error of grammar; it is an error of policy. These amendments change the policy to apply to past participants in criminal organisations. They do not just catch people who were participants when they allegedly committed the offence and subsequently purported to resign; they capture everyone who was ever not only a member of a criminal gang, but a participant in such a group.

This provision has retrospective effect; not just from the time the original bill was passed, but since time immemorial. There may have been some justification for moving an amendment to provide that the show cause provision should apply where a defendant is a participant in a criminal organisation at the time of the alleged offence, but the Attorney cannot make an argument that his original provision stating 'is a participant' actually meant to say 'is or has ever been', which is what this amendment now seeks to do. This is a fix-up of a bungle, a mistake in policy, and the Attorney has taken the opportunity to go even further.

In its submission to the committee, the Queensland Law Society has made a similar suggestion. It said—

> We are concerned with the broad nature of this provision, as there is no timing provision linking when a person was a participant in an organisation and when an offence was committed. This means that once it is established that you are a participant, it will always be the case and the presumption against bail will always apply.
>
> It appears unfair that a person can be punished for behaviour which may have taken place a significant time ago, where no recent evidence supports the notion that a person is still a participant and despite any rehabilitation of the person which may have occurred since then.
>
> We consider that these provisions should be time bound to the commission of an offence. We suggest that the provision should be changed to reflect that the presumption against bail should apply "if the defendant is charged with an offence and it is alleged the defendant was at the time of the commission of the offence a participant in a criminal organisation".

The Bar Association has a similar concern. The president of the Bar Association said—

> Clause 7 has the effect of reversing the onus of proof for bail applicants for any person who has, at any time, been a member of a criminal organisation. Previously, s 16 of the Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2013 was confined to a defendant who "is a participant in a criminal organisation".
>
> This constitutes a widening of the provision. On one view the measure is contrary to one of the primary aims of the recent legislative measures, that is, to cause members of criminal organisations to dissociate.

Last month we saw legislation that sought to licence workers in tattoo parlours so as to ensure that participants in criminal organisations could not be employed in that industry. This bill extends the number of industries in which such participants will be banned from working. There has been clear evidence for years that certain industries have or attract an inordinately high number of members of criminal organisations. In the Criminal Organisation Act, introduced in 2009 by the former Labor government, people who were members of a criminal organisation and who had been made the subject of a control order were banned from certain prescribed activities. These included many of the

industries included in this bill and in the bills introduced by the Attorney-General last night; however, this bill includes the building industry and the electrical industry. There has been no evidence that I can find that these are industries heavily infiltrated by organised crime gangs, and I want the evidence and so do Queenslanders. When the Attorney comes back for his reply, I challenge him to please tell the members of this House what the evidence is. What is the evidence against the building industry and the electrical industry?

A government member: CFMEU, that's what it's called!

Ms PALASZCZUK: I will take that interjection. The CFMEU is a union, so once again is this purely an ideological attack on unions—which this government loves doing day in and day out? We have seen what has happened with the industrial relations laws this week: stripping back provisions, putting doctors and senior nurses on to individual contracts. We have seen what this government is capable of. Are these genuine provisions, or—the member for Ipswich said the BLF and another member said the CFMEU—are these targeted at specific unions? What I am saying today is I want the evidence. I want the evidence that there is a clear association with criminal organisations and gangs infiltrating these two industries. I am yet to see the evidence, so the challenge is for the Attorney to come forward and show the House that there is clear evidence relating to these two industries.

Even the Bar Association made mention of this in its submission to the committee. It said—

The areas of occupation addressed are: electrical licences; licences under the Liquor Act; adult entertainment permits; contractor's licences and supervisor's licences under the Queensland Building Services Authority Act 1991; certificates under the Racing Act 2002; permits under the Secondhand Dealers and Pawnbrokers Act 2003; licences under the Security Providers Act 1993; and licences and certificates under the Tow Truck Act 1973.

In broad terms, we understand some of the areas of prohibition to relate to the hydroponic cultivation of drugs, the sale of stolen goods, money laundering through betting and prostitution and extortion. The reasons for including the building industry within the regime are less clear than the other areas.

And that is from the Bar Association! I am merely asking for clarification from the government and this Attorney as to why the electrical industry and the building industry are now captured within the provisions. The opposition has a theory about this. The Attorney-General has a nasty, vindictive streak in him about any industry where trade unions have significant influence. I invite the Attorney to outline to the House the particular advice he has that the building and electrical industries should be included in this bill.

The bill also contains amendments to provide greater power to the CMC to conduct investigations into organised criminal gangs. It allows the CMC to give notice to require the production of documents, information or statements for an intelligence operation. It also extends the definition of 'participant' to include someone who was a participant in the preceding two years. Given the fact that investigation and prosecution of persons may take some time, this appears to be a not-unreasonable provision. These amendments strengthen the capacity of the CMC to dismantle the criminal groups by attacking their wealth and confiscating their profits. This is where the real energy of the legislature should be directed.

But the amendments to the Crime and Misconduct Act do contain some very disturbing elements. These relate to the capacity of the government to appoint acting part-time commissioners. Once again, this strikes at the very independence of what should be the most independent agency in Queensland. There is already an acting chair of the CMC. There are also two vacancies in the position of part-time commissioner. The Attorney-General has failed to fill those two vacancies in a timely fashion and has also failed to fill the position of chair. The acting chair was recently reappointed for a further seven months. This is a disgrace. Appointees should have security of tenure. How can the public have confidence in anyone who is reliant on the government for reappointment to their position?

At the public hearing on the bill we were advised that acting appointments are meant to be of a temporary nature. If that is the case, surely the appointments could be restricted to a certain period of time, such as three months, with no capacity for reappointment in an acting capacity. This would ensure proper steps are taken to fill vacancies.

We were told that these amendments are to bring things into line with the appointment of an acting chair. The fact is that one bad situation is not justification for replicating it. Reappointment of the chair on an acting basis also undermines the public's confidence in the position and should also have a similar time restriction.

But what is most disturbing is that the acting appointments are exempt from the consultation provisions, which include consultation with the Law Society and the Bar Association and the PCMC and requiring the bipartisan support of the PCMC. These amendments are typical of the LNP and its campaign against the CMC.

The thing the LNP hates most about the CMC is obviously its independence. It cannot stand that it cannot influence the CMC so it appointed its own hand-picked acting chair and then, despite controversy surrounding him, reappointed him for a further seven months amidst that controversy.

But the independent part-time commissioners are still standing in their way. At the public hearing of the PCMC with the CMC held on 1 November the chair of the PCMC, the member for Gladstone, asked the chair of the CMC about the filling of the vacancies. She said—

CHAIR: … Mrs Judith Bell, her turn as assistant commissioner has ended, and Mr Nase is finishing, as you said, this month. To your knowledge has there been any progress in reappointments?

Dr Levy: I cannot say there has been any obvious progress, but I have again been in contact with the minister's adviser and he assured me that there would be an appointment made soon.

CHAIR: I have actually raised with the Attorney-General, too, that under the act there are certain functions with the CMC that you cannot carry out without a full complement of commissioners.

Dr Levy: I have mentioned that to his adviser also.

CHAIR: Do you see that as being problematic in the next—

Dr Levy: We will still have a quorum for meetings at the moment, but if we had to put out a public report we would not have a quorum, but there is no indication that we will be doing that this side of Christmas.

Despite this advice, there have still been no replacement part-time commissioners appointed. There has been ample opportunity, and I ask the Attorney-General if he might please update the House on when he intends to appoint these replacement part-time commissioners. Or is this bill just a ruse—an attempt to sneak in more of the Attorney-General's acting appointments who do not have to go through the normal consultation procedure? The independence of the CMC is integral to the management of serious crime and misconduct in this state. The Attorney-General should stop playing politics with this institution that has proven to be so essential in Queensland.

The next amendments I would like to comment on are those relating to the restrictive management regime to be implemented in Queensland prisons for participants in a criminal organisation. Again, it is the very wide definition of 'participant' that causes concern. The Commissioner of Police has power to advise the Corrective Services Commissioner that a prisoner is an 'identified participant'. It is not for prisoners who have been found by a court to be such a prisoner; it is merely on the advice of the commissioner. And this is a mandatory provision. The chief executive must make an order if the commissioner provides that advice. There is no review of this decision—the usual review mechanisms are excluded—and that order stays in place for the duration of the prisoner's imprisonment unless the commissioner advises that the person is no longer an identified participant. There are no guidelines in place to assist the commissioner to make such a decision. There is no discernible way for people to disassociate themselves from a criminal organisation, which is the Premier's stated purpose with these bills. In fact, I understand that people have been posting questions on the Premier's website asking this very question—a question which has been met with a wall of silence. So this restrictive regime, which means a prisoner is confined for 23 out of every 24 hours, would apply mandatorily against any 'identified participant'.

The submissions to the committee from the Catholic Prison Ministry and the Prisoners Legal Service both refer to the lack of rehabilitation opportunities that would be available to prisoners under a criminal organisation segregation order. At present prisoners are being held under 'safety orders'. Those safety orders are for a maximum of 28 days, after which time they must be reviewed. It is the lack of opportunity for review that is concerning. The Judicial Review Act is expressly excluded. The only ground of review is the very limited ground of 'jurisdictional error'. There are review provisions in place for administrative decisions for very good reasons. No-one is perfect. No single entity of administration has a 100 per cent accuracy record. It must be recognised that errors can occur and there should be some avenue for review.

I now turn to the Bail Act. I appreciate that when criminal intelligence is involved there may be some complications. However, the Bail Act amendments require a defendant to prove that they are no longer a 'participant' to defeat the show-cause provision. If they can prove it for the Bail Act, surely they can have the opportunity to prove it in relation to these orders. The same applies to the

truncation of the review process in the licensing provisions. The exclusion of normal judicial review processes must be a matter of concern.

One of the very interesting aspects of the bill that I would like the Attorney-General to provide information about is the capacity for a chief executive to 'order a corrective services officer to give directions to an offender to permit the installation of a device or equipment at a place where the offender resides'. The installation of listening or video-monitoring devices in the homes of a person on a supervision order in the community would ordinarily require the issuance of a warrant, subject to the usual protections that attend such an application. This bypasses those protections. I ask the Attorney-General to please explain to the House what systems will be in place to monitor those devices, who will be responsible for oversight and what reporting mechanisms are envisaged.

I turn to the Transport Planning and Coordination Act and regulations. The bill also contains amendments to the Transport Planning and Coordination Act and regulations to allow the chief executive of the Department of Transport and Main Roads to provide information from any transport information database to enable an approved agency to use the information for a law enforcement purpose. This would include information ordinarily held by the department such as details about vehicle registration, drivers licences or other matters that the department would hold information about, such as certain licences that may have been issued.

The explanatory notes explain that these amendments are made at the request of the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation, or ASIO. In reviewing its powers and procedures in preparation for the G20 summit to be held in Brisbane next year, ASIO has recognised a deficiency in its investigative powers. This information will be of benefit to ASIO not only for the G20 summit but also in its ongoing responsibility in protecting national security. I understand that the information will be provided from the chief executive to the head of the approved agency and a memorandum of understanding will be put in place to outline the conditions that will apply to the release of the information. The amendment to the regulations will declare ASIO to be an approved agency.

The Bar Association raised an issue which had interesting ramifications in relation to innocent people who are affected by such things as cancellation of licenses under the occupational licensing provisions. Its submission states—

> In respect of licensed premises, the Bill has the effect of withdrawing approvals of relevant agreements (eg. lease, franchise agreement, management agreement) ... This will have an effect on third parties. For example, it appears likely that a lessor of hotel premises which has entered into a lease with a lessee who is a participant in a criminal organisation will have the lease effectively ended. Whether there exists for the lessor a right of legal recourse against the former lessee is unclear. It is unlikely. This and otherwise the unexpected loss of a lessee, licensee or franchisee may cause economic loss to innocent third parties.

There may also be a vast range of other innocent Queenslanders who will be caught up by these measures and suffer some financial disadvantage. What will happen where a wedding is booked for a premises and, the night before, the licence of the licensee is revoked, closing the premises? What will happen if a building contractor's licence is revoked and the 10 people working for him are suddenly out of work? I wonder whether the LNP has looked at these particular examples.

In conclusion, this bill has some worthwhile inclusions. It also has some very worrying inclusions. Once again I put on the public record that the lack of consultation by the Attorney-General is still generating great concern for people in the community. As I said earlier in my speech, the opposition will not stand in the way of the government in its preferred method of managing criminal outlaw gangs in Queensland. We offered our support to work through the issues to come to a workable solution for the people of Queensland. That offer was rejected. We are still prepared to work with the government. The problems of organised crime will not go away next week, so there should be a systematic approach to work through the issues in a bipartisan spirit of cooperation.