



Speech By  
**Tim Nicholls**


**MEMBER FOR CLAYFIELD**

---

Record of Proceedings, 31 March 2022

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENT**

**Attorney-General and Minister for Justice**

 **Mr NICHOLLS** (Clayfield—LNP) (2.06 pm): The Attorney-General is in danger of joining the ranks—and they are long and hallowed ranks—of dodgy former Labor attorneys-general, such as the member for Woodridge. The attorney-general is the first law officer of the government and in that role the Attorney is expected to be frank and fulsome in her actions and in answering questions in this place, not to be tricky or evasive.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Kelly): Pause the clock. I ask you to withdraw that unparliamentary language.

**Mr NICHOLLS:** I withdraw. In effect, the Attorney-General is expected to uphold the highest standards in the same way that the Crown is required to act as a model litigant. Yesterday and today in question time the Attorney failed that test. Yesterday I asked a specific question—

Can the Attorney outline to the House if she or any member of her staff requested advice from Crown law on legal steps to remove Mr Alan MacSporran QC as head of the CCC?

The Attorney answered, 'No, I requested no such advice,' and sat down so quickly that the tilting seat base barely had time to pop up. The answer was tricky because it was not the full answer. The Attorney dodged the question by refusing to say whether her staff had sought such advice. The question has to be asked: why would she do that?

The member for Glass House then directly asked the Attorney if any member of her staff had requested advice from Crown law on the same matter. While not answering directly, the Attorney said she would ask and come back to the member. She also said, 'I am not aware of any request that has been made for that advice.' Just after lunch yesterday the Attorney made a statement to the House. The Attorney said that she had sought further advice from her office and she confirmed that advice had been sought by an adviser about the general powers that exist in relation to the chair of the CCC. In attempting to explain the request, she told the House it was made in the context of the ongoing parliamentary inquiry into the Queensland Crime and Corruption Commission.

Because the Attorney knows the political danger she is in and is desperately distancing herself from this action, she also said—

As Attorney-General, I did not request that advice and it was requested without my knowledge. A copy of it has not been provided to me.

Over and above the fact that that shows the Attorney does not know what is going on in her own office, what she carefully avoided saying is whether she was actually aware of the advice, irrespective of having received it. When asked today whether she had discussed the advice with anyone, the Attorney again dodged the question.

What we now know is that, while the Premier was publicly backing Mr MacSporran, an unnamed senior advisor in the Attorney's office was secretly asking Crown law how he could be sacked. There are some questions the Attorney must answer. Has she discussed the advice with anyone, and if not

why not? Has the Attorney now seen the Crown law advice, and if not why not? Will the Attorney release that advice, and if not why not? The answer that privilege attaches hardly rings true when the Attorney did not request the advice and tells us she has not seen it. How can she claim privilege for a document that was not hers? Who is the mysterious unnamed senior adviser? If the Attorney did not receive the advice, who did? There are a lot of unanswered questions that this Attorney needs to answer.

*(Time expired)*