Speech By

Hon. Yvette D'Ath

MEMBER FOR REDCLIFFE

Record of Proceedings, 10 November 2016

SERIOUS AND ORGANISED CRIME LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (12.33 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

On 13 September 2016 the Serious and Organised Crime Legislation Amendment Bill 2016 was introduced into parliament. Parliament referred the bill to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee for consideration and requested the committee to report on its consideration of the bill by Tuesday, 1 November. The committee tabled its report on 1 November 2016, which does not include any recommendations to the government. I thank the committee for its timely and detailed consideration of the bill. I also wish to thank all of the submitters and persons who gave evidence before the committee.

The bill before the House implements a new organised crime regime for Queensland to tackle serious and organised crime in all its forms. The regime is the response to three important reviews commissioned by this government: the Queensland Organised Crime Commission of Inquiry, the statutory review of the Criminal Organisation Act 2009 and the Taskforce on Organised Crime Legislation. This government commissioned these reviews because it believes that Queenslanders deserve a well-considered response to the complex problem of organised crime. These three independent reviews drew upon the expertise and wisdom of senior members within Queensland's law enforcement agencies and the legal community. The government has used the findings from these reviews to create a response to organised crime for Queensland that is grounded in evidence and is both operationally strong and legally robust.

The key elements of the bill include:

- new offences and increased penalties relating to child exploitation material, sophisticated financial crimes, including boiler room frauds, and drug trafficking;
- extended powers for police and the Crime and Corruption Commission officers to require passwords or encryption keys to search computers and other electronic storage devices;
- a new offence of habitually consorting with recognised offenders under Queensland's Criminal Code;
- a new public safety protection order regime inserted under the Peace and Good Behaviour Act 1982, creating three new regimes: public safety orders, restricted premises orders and fortification removal orders;
- a new serious organised crime circumstance of aggravation applicable to a prescribed list of offences, which is punishable by a strong and targeted mandatory sentencing regime;
- a new sentencing order for Queensland to directly target organised crime including the organised crime control order under the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992; and
- a ban on the visible wearing or carrying of outlaw motorcycle gang 'colours' in all public places.

Amendments to occupational licensing legislation are also made under this bill to appropriately and fairly balance the rights of individuals, including the right to obtain lawful employment, against the need to protect the community. The changes ensure there are proper tests in place to promote public safety while managing the demands of the Queensland Police Service. The current occupational licensing provisions introduced by the Newman government lead to significant use of police resources as identified by the task force in its report. The task force, in recommending changes, stated—

The requirement that Chief Executives refer every application for a licence to the Commissioner of Police requires a deployment of QPS and government resources which is disproportionate to the risk posed by the potential infiltration of organised crime groups to the respective industry, and to community safety.

As the government has made it clear, our serious and organised crime legislation is designed to tackle all forms of organised crime, not just outlaw motorcycle gangs. The bill will make the following amendments in response to the increasing prevalence and seriousness of cold-call investment or 'boiler room' fraud and evolving threats in financial crimes, particularly identity crime, that may not be adequately deterred by existing penalties. It will provide:

- an increase in the maximum penalties for existing aggravated offences of fraud from 12 to 14 years imprisonment;
- the creation of a new circumstance of aggravation for the offence of fraud, carrying a maximum penalty of 20 years imprisonment, where the property or yield to the offender from the fraud is $100,000 or more;
- the creation of a new circumstance of aggravation for the offence of fraud, carrying a maximum penalty of 20 years imprisonment, where the offender carries on the business of committing fraud; and
- an increase in the maximum penalties for the offences relating to obtaining or dealing with identification information, from three to five years imprisonment.

The bill will enable police and Crime and Corruption Commission officers to apply for a warrant to require a person, either the suspect or a specified person with the necessary information, to provide information necessary, such as passwords, to gain access to information stored electronically. Police and the CCC officers will also be able to seek a further order if a person of interest has more than one level of security hiding relevant evidence.

One of the most worrying aspects raised in the commission of inquiry was the expansion of the child exploitation material market and the utilisation of technology to produce and distribute material. This bill provides new offences and expanded powers in response to the proliferation of child exploitation material over the internet and the increased use of technology to promote and distribute offending material as well as to conceal offending. The bill creates three new offences in the Criminal Code that target administrators of websites connected with child exploitation material. Each new offence has a maximum penalty of 14 years imprisonment.

The new offence will target persons who knowingly administer websites used to distribute child exploitation material, knowing encourage the use of, promote or advertise websites used to distribute child exploitation material, and distribute information about how to avoid detection of, or prosecution for, an offence involving child exploitation material. The bill will also increase maximum penalties for the offence of involving a child in making child exploitation material and the offence of making child exploitation material from 14 to 20 years imprisonment.

In recognition that this market and these offences are prevalent on the internet, the bill establishes a new circumstance of aggravation for each of the existing child exploitation offences as well as the new offences that will apply where the darknet or a similar hidden network or anonymising service is used in the commission of the offence. The new circumstance of aggravation will increase the relevant maximum penalty. For the offence of involving a child in making child exploitation material and the offence of making child exploitation material, the penalty will increase from 20 years to 25 years imprisonment. For the remaining offences the penalty will increase from 14 years to 20 years imprisonment.

The bill also creates a new offence in the Criminal Code which will support the new child exploitation and financial crime offences and increase penalties by providing that it is an offence for a person to fail to comply with an order in a search warrant requiring them to provide access to information. This offence is punishable by a maximum of five years imprisonment. The bill also delivers key sentencing reforms for serious and organised criminals, whether they be involved in outlaw motorcycle gangs, child exploitation material, sophisticated financial crimes or drug trafficking.

The initiatives under the new organised crime regime will complement each other and work together to deliver a comprehensive, targeted and multifaceted approach to tackling serious and organised crime in Queensland. This is a regime which will deliver an effective and considered response

to counter the threat posed to the community by organised criminals. A number of these measures are modelled on New South Wales laws and, where appropriate, have been enhanced to ensure that the Queensland Police Service is equipped with the powers they need to tackle organised crime and ensure appropriate oversight.

In identifying the benefits of using this scheme over section 60A and 60B, the task force stated that New South Wales police's 'consequence-based policing' also means that police resources are targeted at actual unlawful and antisocial behaviour rather than an entire genre or association: criminal motorcycle gangs. The latter is resource intensive and arguably not the best allocation of limited law enforcement resources.

The key provisions of the new regime are as follows: the introduction of a new habitual consorting offence and the repeal of the 2013 anti-association offence. The task force critiqued section 60A of the Criminal Code, participants in criminal organisations being knowingly present in public places, for a number of reasons. The report noted the difficulty in successfully prosecuting the offence, and the task force majority was of the view that it was unlikely that the offence would survive a constitutional challenge on the basis of the implied right to political communication and association.

The task force considered that the most appropriate measure to combat high-risk associations was through a conviction based scheme, including organised crime control orders and the introduction of a new offence of habitual consorting into the Criminal Code. I note that the task force also suggested a sunset clause after seven years for consorting offences, which the government will not be progressing. Importantly, the New South Wales consorting offence recently withstood constitutional challenge in the High Court of Australia—see Tajjour v State of New South Wales (2014) 254 CLR 508.

As noted by the task force, the New South Wales consorting offence is not only constitutionally robust but also fairer and more effective and efficient. The offence is arguably fairer in a number of ways. As stated by the task force—

> They are not contingent on a declaration of criminality by the executive branch of government and are, then, less exposed to any risk of misuse; they are targeted at associations with persons who have proved to be guilty of criminal offending in a court of law; they target 'habitual' rather than 'one-off' associations; they provide for warnings about the offending conduct; they provide exceptions to allow all persons to participate in civic life (for example, lawful employment); and they are subject to review.

In outlining why the consorting offence is more effective and efficient the task force states that, between October 2013 and January 2016, 36 people were charged with the anti-association offence under section 60A of the Criminal Code. Updated statistics obtained confirm that up to August 2016 a total of 43 people have been charged, but of those 23 have already had their charge discontinued. There have been no convictions under section 60A, and that remains the case. In contrast, within 12 months of its introduction in New South Wales over 1,200 individuals have been subject to the consorting laws under the New South Wales consorting offence scheme. The New South Wales police Gangs Squad has successfully used a consorting regime against serious and organised criminals. Publicly released figures by the New South Wales Ombudsman show that in the three years between April 2012 and April 2015 the Gangs Squad issued 4,527 consorting warnings. Forty-two individuals have been charged with the actual consorting offence, with the majority of those charges being brought by the Gangs Squad. So far, in terms of the charges laid by the Gangs Squad, 22 of those charges have resulted in successful convictions.

A consorting offence makes it a criminal offence for a person to associate with two other people who have certain previous convictions. It is preceded by a warning to the person that continued association is a criminal offence. The new Queensland consorting offence is modelled substantially on the New South Wales offence but with a key variant. The threshold for the Queensland offence in the bill is higher in that the conviction must be for an indictable offence punishable by a maximum penalty of five years imprisonment or a prescribed offence. The higher threshold addresses the issues raised in the 2016 New South Wales Ombudsman's review of the New South Wales consorting offence regarding the potential for misuse of the offence in respect of people who are outside the purpose of this legislation; namely, targeting those involved in serious and organised crime. The new offence will only apply to adults, that is, people aged 18 years or over, and will not apply to young people. The person must consort on two occasions with at least two people who are recognised offenders.

A recognised offender is defined to mean a person who has previously been convicted of an indictable offence punishable by a maximum penalty of five or more years imprisonment or a list of prescribed offences where the maximum penalty falls below five years but which has been identified as being associated with organised crime, such as riot. The previous convictions cannot relate to convictions that are spent under the Criminal Law (Rehabilitation of Offenders) Act 1986 and a conviction must have been actually recorded.

In relation to the issuing of warnings, the bill provides that a person must first be officially warned, and at least one of those occasions of consorting must occur after the issuing of the warning. The official warning can be given orally or in writing and must be given in relation to each convicted offender. If the

official warning is given orally it must be confirmed in writing—which includes by electronic means—within 72 hours, otherwise the oral warning lapses and has no legal effect. Warnings can be given pre-emptively—for example, the official warning can be issued by police without any consorting ever having occurred—but the person must then consort with those persons on two occasions post receipt of the warning. Warnings can also be given retrospectively, for example, where there is video footage uncovered that shows consorting. The consorting can occur in public or in private and is not limited to physical association. The offence is sufficiently broad so as to capture any kind of communication; for example, over the phone, email or social media. There is no requirement that the consorting be linked to, or have any suspected link to, criminal activity in any way.

Provision is made to ensure that certain types of consorting must be disregarded if the person can satisfy the court on the balance of probabilities that the consorting was reasonable in the circumstances and that one of the following applies:

- consorting with close family members, which is defined to capture the concept of immediate family members such as parents, grandparents, step-parents, spouses, siblings (blood or marriage), stepsiblings, aunts and uncles but not necessarily extending past first cousins. The definition also recognises and includes Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultural norms of kinship;
- consorting that occurs in the course of lawful employment or the legitimate conduct of an occupation, business or profession;
- consorting that occurs in the course of the provision of a legitimate and necessary health service or where they are obtaining health services for a dependent child, including managing physical and mental health including drug and alcohol counselling;
- consorting that occurs in the course of a person obtaining legitimate education or training or where they are obtaining legitimate education or training for a dependent child;
- consorting that occurs in the course of a person obtaining legal services; and
- consorting that occurs in lawful custody.

The onus of proving that the act of consorting is one that must be disregarded and was reasonable in the circumstance falls to the person. The offence is punishable by a maximum penalty of three years imprisonment or 300 penalty units, or both. The offence is indictable but may be dealt with summarily on defence election.

To accompany the new consorting offence, the bill provides for certain warrantless stop, search and detain powers for police under the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000. This is to give effect to the consorting offences and the warning provisions. To ensure effective enforcement of the new habitual consorting offence, part 21 of the bill amends the PPRA to provide police officers with the power to stop, detain and search a person they reasonably suspect has consorted, is consorting or is likely to consort with one or more recognised offenders. Where a police officer holds this suspicion they may also:

- require the person to provide their name, address and date of birth;
- take the person's identifying particulars if necessary to confirm their identification;
- where applicable, give the person an official warning for consorting; and
- require the person to move on from the place where an official warning has been issued.

Importantly, the powers provide police with a valuable tool to ensure the safety of officers when dealing with recognised offenders. Recognised offenders are persons with convictions for unspent indictable offences punishable by five years or more, such as the unlawful supply of handguns and robbery with violence, or a prescribed offence associated with organised crime. It is not unrealistic that persons with this background may be in possession of weapons or dangerous items with the propensity to use them to harm police officers.

The new section 53BAE of the PPRA provides that, where a police officer has given a person an official warning for consorting and the officer reasonably suspects the person is consorting at the place with the recognised offender, the officer may require the person to leave and not return within a reasonable time of not more than 24 hours. This allows police to ensure that multiple acts of consorting are clearly separated from each by a period of time. The New South Wales case of Police v Klein found that two observations of persons consorting in a motor vehicle were the one consorting event viewed twice and is an example of the need to clearly separate the consorting events by time.

This move-on power is balanced by a safeguard that provides that police cannot require the person to leave the place if doing so would endanger the safety of the person or someone else—for example, requiring the person to leave a vehicle in which recognised offenders are passengers in circumstances in which the person has no access to alternative transport.

Importantly, the bill provides for the proper review and analysis of the new laws. The effectiveness and use of the offence and associated police powers must be done by a retired Supreme Court or retired District Court judge as soon as practicable five years after the commencement of provisions. One of the lessons from New South Wales was the impediment that a lack of data can have in the proper review of the operation of the laws. Therefore, there is an obligation on police to collect antecedent data when issuing warnings to facilitate an accurate review. Further, the bill provides for further oversight and proper data collection.

The bill extends the statutory functions of the Public Interest Monitor, PIM, to include the monitoring of the giving of official warnings for consorting by police and to gather statistical information about the use and effectiveness of official warnings. The PIM must include details of the official warnings for consorting as part of his/her annual report, which is to be provided to the minister and thereafter tabled in parliament.

All amendments in the bill commence on assent with the exception of the following, which will commence three months post assent date:

- repeal of the vehicle impoundment scheme under the PPRA;
- repeal of the 2013 stop, search and detain police powers under the PPRA;
- establishment of a new consorting offence and associated police powers;
- establishment of the package of public safety protection orders and associated police powers, including the regulation prescribing the 2013 clubhouses; and
- Tattoo Parlour Act licensing reforms.

The following will take effect two years post assent date: repeal of sections 60A and 60B and the executive declaration of criminal organisations. That is, to allow for a smooth transition the bill provides for the temporary retention of sections 60A and 60B of the Criminal Code for a period of two years. For the transitional period, the bill significantly amends the offences under sections 60A and 60B by converting them to an indictable offence and removing the strict mandatory minimum penalties.

In relation to the repeal of the current clubhouse offence and replacement with a new public safety protection order scheme, currently section 60B, 'Participants in criminal organisation entering prescribed places and attending prescribed events', of the Criminal Code provides the offence for a participant in a criminal organisation who enters or attempts to enter a prescribed place, or attends or attempts to attend a prescribed event. The task force majority identified a number of issues with the section 60B offence, in particular problems attaching to successful prosecutions and constitutional concerns, and ultimately recommended that the offence be repealed.

The government is putting in place a more effective regime: a new public safety protection order scheme for Queensland. This consists of the restricted premises order scheme, public safety order scheme and fortification removal order scheme. This scheme as recommended by the task force is, in part, modelled around the New South Wales laws, with some specific modifications to strengthen those provisions even further to the benefit of the Queensland Police Service to ensure they have the most effective and efficient laws to tackle organised crime in this state.

The bill establishes the new restricted premises order scheme to enable a magistrate to declare a place to be a 'restricted premises' if satisfied on the application of a senior police officer—rank of sergeant or above—that there are reasonable grounds for suspecting that any of the following disorderly activities have taken place and are likely to take place again at the premises and the court is satisfied that the making of the order is appropriate in the circumstances:

- drunkenness or disorderly or indecent conduct, or any entertainment of a demoralising character, or has taken place and is likely to take place again on the premises; or
- liquor or a drug is unlawfully supplied on or from the premises, or has been supplied on or from the premises and is likely to be again; or
- unlawful possession or supply of firearms or explosives at or from the premises;
- recognised offenders, or their associates, go to the premises, or have and are likely to again; or
- the premises is excessively fortified, which will be covered under the fortification removal orders.

A 'recognised offender' means:

- a person who is convicted of an indictable offence with a maximum penalty of five or more years imprisonment or another prescribed offence and whose conviction is not spent. This picks up the language used under new consorting provisions; or
- a person who is subject to the new organised crime control order; or
- a person who has been convicted of the new habitual consorting offence and whose conviction has not become spent.

An ‘associate of a recognised offender’ is a reference to a person who has been given an official warning under the new habitual consorting offence. The restricted premises order provides, inter alia, that disorderly activities must not take place at the premises, that recognised offenders or associates not be present at the premises and that the premises not be fortified. The latter is to ensure that police are able to properly execute their search powers. If these prohibited activities occur on premises subject to a restricted premises order and owners/occupiers of premises knew or ought reasonably to have known that the disorderly activity has taken place, they commit an indictable offence:

- for a first offence—150 penalty units or 18 months imprisonment, or both; and
- for a second or subsequent offences—300 penalty units or three years imprisonment, or both.

A restricted premises order lasts for at least six months and up to two years.

This bill also ensures that clubhouses currently declared to be prescribed premises under the Criminal Code (Criminal Organisations) Regulation 2013 will be grandfathered into the new regime. They will be automatically and legislatively deemed to be subject to a restricted premises order for a period of two years after the bill has commenced. A senior police officer may apply to the Magistrates Court to extend this order by a further two years. The bill provides that the magistrate must grant the extension if the court is satisfied that disorderly activities are likely to take place if the restricted premises order lapses. In making its determination the Magistrates Court is able to consider disorderly activities that occurred before the commencement of the bill.

The Queensland scheme has been modelled primarily on the equivalent in New South Wales, which is the only other Australian jurisdiction with a comparable scheme. Both the scheme contained in the bill and the New South Wales equivalent are court ordered. The task force, in recommending this scheme, noted that in New South Wales the ‘police officers advised the New South Wales Ombudsman that the powers under the Restricted Premises Act have been used to dismantle 30 clubhouses in its first 20 months of operation’.

Hon. YM D’ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (3.01 pm), continuing: As I was saying before the break, the task force, in recommending this scheme, noted that in New South Wales the ‘police officers advised the New South Wales Ombudsman that the powers under the Restricted Premises Act have been used to dismantle 30 clubhouses in its first 20 months of operation’. This again ensures court oversight and can increase the public confidence in the legitimacy of the criminal justice system and minimise appealable error.

The COA review recognised that the current use of a Public Safety Order Scheme should be reworked from its current application to participants in declared organisations. In implementing this recommendation, the bill introduces a new Public Safety Order Scheme into part 3 of the Peace and Good Behaviour Act 1982, allowing police issued and court ordered public safety orders made against an individual or group if the presence of the individual or group at a premises or an event or within an area poses a serious risk to public safety or security. A public safety order can contain conditions prohibiting a person from entering, attending or remaining or doing a stated thing in a certain area or at a certain event.

A public safety order can be made by a commissioned police officer, rank of inspector or above, for up to seven days. If the order is longer than 72 hours, the respondent will have a right of appeal to the Magistrates Court. The police issued orders will ordinarily be written and served personally, if it is practicable. However, urgent police issued orders can be given verbally and a copy is to be made available for inspection at a police station or on the QPS website. Orders longer than seven days must be made by the Magistrates Court on the application of a senior police officer.

The ability for police to make these orders for up to seven days acknowledges that circumstances will arise where it is neither practical nor in the public interest to wait the time it may take to obtain an order via the full hearing process through the courts. However, recognising the importance of oversight, the bill requires police to record the details of any police issued public safety orders and to report annually to the PIM, who will report to the minister. The reports will then need to be tabled in parliament, consistent with the approach to official warnings under the new consorting offence. A person who, without reasonable excuse, knowingly contravenes a public safety order will commit an indictable offence that is punishable by a maximum penalty of three years imprisonment.

All applications for public safety protection orders will be civil applications. All questions of fact in those proceedings other than a proceeding for a criminal offence will be determined on the balance of probabilities. The Uniform Civil Procedure Rules 1999 will apply to all applications made to the court to the extent the rules are consistent with any specific provisions. Further, the bill provides that decisions of the Magistrates Court with respect to the public safety protection orders will be appealable to the District Court. Public safety orders that are longer than 72 hours in length and made by a commissioned police officer may be appealed to the Magistrates Court.

The bill also creates the Fortification Removal Order Scheme. The scheme takes what is currently contained in Part 5 of the Criminal Organisation Act 2009, but modifies it so as to increase its utility and overcome the problems identified by the COA Review. All Australian jurisdictions, with the exception of the Australian Capital Territory, have an equivalent scheme. Of those schemes, all are court ordered except for Western Australia.

The Fortification Removal Order Scheme has two key aspects: first, the ability for police to issue stop and desist fortification notices; and, second, the ability to apply to the court to obtain a fortification removal order. The first element enables a commissioned police officer, rank of inspector or above, to issue an on-the-spot stop and desist notice stopping fortification of the premises if they have a reasonable belief the premises is being used for criminal purposes or habitually occupied by recognised offenders or participants in criminal organisations. The notice will be for 14 days. Police need to commence, not finalise, the court ordered fortification removal order process in that time. The court can confirm the notice pending finalisation of the actual order.

A breach of a stop and desist notice will be deemed to be evidence that the grounds for making a fortification removal order are met, unless the contrary is proven by the respondent. A breach of a stop and desist order will also be deemed evidence that disorderly activities are taking place on a premises, for the purpose of the Restricted Premises Order Scheme outlined above, unless the contrary is proven by a respondent. The court must be satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that there are reasonable grounds to suspect the premises are fortified and habitually used by a class of people of which a significant number may reasonably be suspected to be participants in a criminal organisation. A requirement for notice of the application to be given to the respondent before the order is made and that the respondent have an opportunity to be heard is included in the scheme.

Once an order is made, the owner/occupier of the premises must remove or modify the fortifications in the period determined by the court. If the order is not complied with, police are empowered to enter the premises to remove or modify the fortifications using whatever force is necessary. A person who does an act or makes an omission with the intent to hinder the enforcement of a fortification removal order commits an indictable offence that is punishable by a maximum penalty of five years imprisonment.

To allow for a smooth transition to the new Public Safety Protection Order Scheme, the bill provides for, as stated earlier, the temporary retention of section 60B of the Criminal Code for a period of two years, the reclassification of the offence as indictable and for the removal of the associated mandatory minimum penalty.

The government, and the task force, recognised the real and valid concerns of many Queenslanders, including police officers, about the wearing of bikie colours and similar paraphernalia. Those items exist for the purpose of intimidating others, especially when worn in public places. As such, the bill introduces a new offence prohibiting the wearing or carrying of a prohibited item in a public place. I should note that one of the consequences of the former government's laws, and the rhetoric and pressure that was associated with it, saw a lot of recreational motorcyclists inconvenienced and a sense that they were being tarnished and attacked as collateral damage. Our changes are aimed squarely at those prescribed items of organised criminals, not recreational clubs or their members. Indeed, we all have recreational motorcyclists in our electorates and some of those riders belong to recreational motorcycle clubs.

I am aware of clubs such as the Patriots Australia Moreton Bay Chapter, which is a military motorcycle club for regular, reserve and ex-serving members of the Defence Force. I wish to acknowledge their support for all serving and ex-service men and women across the Moreton Bay region. Clubs such as those are not outlaw motorcycle clubs and, as such, their club colours and paraphernalia are lawful. Those clubs should not be tarnished with the brand that comes with outlaw motorcycle gangs. That is why, by getting outlaw motorcycle gang colours off our streets, lawful recreational motorcyclists should wear their colours without the stigma that has unfortunately come from those clubs that choose to engage in unlawful activity.

In addition, to address the concerns raised by the Court of Appeal in R v Clark, the bill will also amend the Drugs Misuse Act 1986 to remove the minimum 80 per cent non-parole period that currently applies to the offence of trafficking and restore that offence to the serious violent offences regime under the Penalties and Sentences Act. Importantly, the bill amends the Drugs Misuse Act 1986 to increase the maximum penalty for the offence of trafficking in dangerous drugs listed in scheduled 2 of the Drugs Misuse Regulation 1987 to 25 years imprisonment.

I also wish to advise the House that I will be moving some amendments to the bill during the consideration in detail stage of debate. These are amendments of a technical and/or consequential nature. The following is a brief overview of the amendments to be circulated for debate: an amendment to clause 50 of the bill to make a clarifying amendment to the heading of existing section 205 of the

Crime and Corruption Act 2001; an amendment to clause 205 of the bill to correct a numbering error that has occurred during drafting of amendments to section 142ZO(5) of the Liquor Act 1992; an amendment to clause 267 of the bill to amend new sections 30 and 63 inserted under the Peace and Good Behaviour Act to ensure service of an application for, or order for, revocation or variation of a public safety order or fortification order can be done by a police officer of any rank; to insert a new clause into the bill to make consequential amendments to certain definitions under schedule 2, 'Dictionary', of the Weapons Act 1990, which were inadvertently overlooked during the drafting process; and amendments to clauses 182, 251, 348, 373, 391, 440 and 464 of the bill to clarify the application of the information-sharing provisions inserted by the bill regarding the occupational licensing legislation.

The amendments respond to a concern raised by the CCC during a public hearing conducted by the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee. The amendments will clarify that protections contained in the Crime and Corruption Act regarding information disseminated by the CCC to other agencies, such as the Queensland Police Service, are not overridden by the new information-sharing provisions under this bill.

I also intend moving an amendment to clause 269 of the bill relating to the list of prescribed places under new section 11A of the Peace and Good Behaviour Act Regulation 2010. The list of premises under the Peace and Good Behaviour Regulation mirrors that under the Criminal Code (Criminal Organisations) Regulation 2013. The Queensland Police Service has advised the government that one of the premises on that list—namely, unit 5, 27-31 Pound Street, Kingaroy—is no longer linked to declared criminal organisations and that there are no outstanding investigations or prosecutions linked to that address.

An amendment will also be moved to omit clause 6 of the bill so as to retain existing section 15A of the Bail Act. Section 15A provides for bail proceedings to be heard in an alternative court outside of the original jurisdiction of the charge. This, in turn, provides flexibility to the administration of the Magistrates Court and allows bail hearings to proceed without needless delay—in particular, over holiday and court closure periods and in relation to regional and remote courts where there are limited resources to hear applications.

Again, I would like to thank the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee for its consideration of the bill and acknowledge the contribution of those who have made submissions on the bill and assisted the committee during its deliberations. I would also like to thank Michael Byrne QC for his work on the Organised Crime Commission of Inquiry, Alan Wilson QC for his work on the Criminal Organisations Act review and as chair of the Taskforce on Organised Crime Legislation. I also acknowledge and thank the other members of the task force that consisted of senior representatives from the Queensland Police Service, the Queensland Police Union, the Queensland Police Commissioned Officers' Union of Employees, the Queensland Law Society, the Bar Association of Queensland, the Public Interest Monitor, the Department of Justice and Attorney-General and the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

I would also like to take this opportunity to give a huge thanks to the staff at the Department of Justice and Attorney-General who have worked tirelessly over the last 18 months overseeing these reviews and working on the development of this extensive piece of legislation to see Queensland have the strongest laws to deal with serious and organised crime in this state. I thank them immensely for the work they have done. I also want to acknowledge the Minister for Police, the Police Commissioner and the Queensland Police Service for working with my department to develop this legislation to ensure that it is not just legally robust but is operationally sound and will work. These are good laws that should have been in place many years ago but for those who sought to make this more about politics than about good laws.

The bill represents this government's commitment to protect the Queensland community. It delivers strong laws that are focused on community and police officer safety and wellbeing and that will be effective in disrupting and preventing the activity of serious and organised criminals. I commend the bill to the House.