




Speech By
Jarrold Bleijie

MEMBER FOR KAWANA

Record of Proceedings, 19 April 2016

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

Criminal Organisation Legislation

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (12.47 pm): This morning the Premier rose and said that she wants to see workable laws with respect to criminal gang members. The Premier wants workable laws. I put it to the Premier that, if we look at criminal gangs in the state of Queensland and workable laws, we should ask ourselves the question: has giving police more powers and resources to do their job achieved workable laws in this state? Yes. Some 3,000 criminal gang members have been charged with over 9,000 offences in the last three years. It would seem to me that that is because the police have pretty workable laws. We have the CCC's additional powers as endorsed by the CCC chairman, as noted by the shadow Attorney-General this morning when he spoke about the letter that Alan MacSporran wrote to the government essentially warning of criminal gangs coming back to Queensland. That is because of the workable laws we already have in Queensland. Criminal gang clubs have been closed over the last three years. That seems to me to be working. We have not had criminal gang members associating in public for three years. It seems to me as if the laws are working. We have not had one criminal gang public shooting in three years. It seems to me that the laws are working. We have not had another Broadbeach brawl like we saw three years ago. That would indicate to me that the laws are working. But apparently, according to the Premier, the laws are not working. She says that they are terrible and have achieved nothing, yet all of those things I just referred to have been achieved because Queensland does have workable laws.

We have seen the task force set up—which was a set-up in order to repeal the legislation—which the shadow Attorney-General will talk about a little later. We have seen the position reached where they have said, 'Yes, you should repeal the laws,' but we have also seen recommendation 29, which was a unanimous recommendation to repeal the VLAD legislation. The Police Union has come out and said, 'That is not true.' Not only do we have a task force report, which has the result that we all knew would be the case; we also have a difference between a unanimous recommendation and a majority recommendation. No-one has explained how this recommendation got in there, which essentially is untrue.

The Premier also talks about the New South Wales laws and that she is going to meet with the Deputy Premier of New South Wales and the police minister. News flash: I have already talked to the Deputy Premier of New South Wales over a week ago and I can tell members that the New South Wales Deputy Premier indicated only on 16 April that they are going to introduce tough laws. Two and a half weeks ago we had the Premier saying that they are going to copy New South Wales' strong laws, yet the New South Wales Deputy Premier has said that they are only about to introduce their laws. I am not sure what we are copying. The only entity I know that is copying anything is the South Australian Labor government, which is copying the LNP's tough stance against criminal gang members.

The personal explanation delivered by the Independent member for Nicklin was completely unsatisfactory. It was a personal explanation that was designed to disguise his previous support for these criminal gang members, particularly Michael Smith, who is a convicted drug trafficker. This man helped to traffic \$166,000 worth of methamphetamine to kids in this state. How many people died because of those drugs? How many people overdosed because of those drugs? This man, Mr Michael Smith, was also handing out how-to-vote cards wearing a T-shirt supporting the member for Nicklin, Peter Wellington. I say to the member for Nicklin: instead of coming in here and making a personal explanation as the member for Nicklin and saying that he voted for the laws but he had issues with them, he should have condemned Michael Smith. He should have condemned the drug trafficker he is. It is also not excusable for the member for Nicklin to not offer some public explanation other than a bizarre Facebook rant. In fact, what he should have done is said, on behalf of his constituents, that he will take a stand against criminal gang members, including Michael Smith.

The member for Nicklin would have us believe that did he not know about Michael Smith's behaviour or Steven Smith's behaviour. The member for Nicklin knew, because there were articles about them. I table copies of those two articles, one dated 4 February 2014 and one dated 14 January 2014—one year before the election. These people were charged with drug-trafficking offences. The member for Nicklin knew on election day who he had handing out his how-to-vote cards.

Tabled paper: Articles from the *Courier-Mail* online, various dates, regarding criminal charges against Yandina Five [\[525\]](#).

The question that really needs to be asked, in terms of being a member of this place, is about the company we keep and support. The member for Nicklin should stand up for his constituents, not drug traffickers, not people convicted of fraud and other drug related offences. We owe it to the people who have been victims of criminal gang members. The member for Nicklin owes it to people who have been victims of criminal gang members. That is why we should keep our foot on the throat of all criminal gang members in this state.