

	Paper No.: 5413T4093
	Date: 20/11/13
	Member: <i>M. L. ...</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tabled	<input type="checkbox"/> Tabled, by leave
<input type="checkbox"/> Incorporated, by leave	<input type="checkbox"/> Remainder incorporated, by leave

This is an uncorrected proof of private and confidential evidence taken before the committee. It is made available for correction purposes only and should not be copied or republished in any way without the express authority of the committee. Any authorised publication of this Hansard may constitute a contempt of Parliament. If the transcript becomes the subject of any request under the Right to Information Act, the committee should be notified.

Check at the Table:



PARLIAMENTARY CRIME AND MISCONDUCT COMMITTEE

Members present:

Mrs EA Cunningham MP (Chair)
 Mrs JR Miller MP (Deputy Chair)
 Mr MJ Crandon MP
 Mr IS Kaye MP
 Mr SJ Minnikin MP
 Ms J Trad MP
 Mr PW Wellington MP

Staff present:

Ms A Honeyman (Research Director)
 Mr P Rogers (Principal Research Officer)
 Ms K Christensen (Principal Research Officer)

PRIVATE HEARING—CONSIDERATION OF ISSUES ARISING FROM THE PUBLIC HEARING ON 1 NOVEMBER 2013 AND MATTERS RELATING TO AN ANSWER PROVIDED BY DR LEVY

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

(In camera)

MONDAY, 18 NOVEMBER 2013

Brisbane

MONDAY, 18 NOVEMBER 2013

Committee met at 10.00 am

ANDERSON, Russell Lee, Director, Government Media Unit

DUNNING, Mr Peter SC

KAPELERIS, Mr Joseph, Crown Law

CHAIR: Welcome, Mr Anderson. As part of the pro forma, I need you to seek leave to have your legal representatives with you, please, and introduce yourself and them, if you would?

Mr Anderson: Certainly. My name is Russell Lee Anderson. I am the director of the government media unit. Certainly I seek leave to have my counsel representative here, Peter Dunning.

Mr Dunning: And I am instructed by Joseph Kapeleris from Crown Law.

CHAIR: Is leave granted? Leave is granted. I welcome you, Mr Anderson, and your legal team. This private hearing of the committee is to consider issues arising from the committee's public hearing on 1 November 2013 and specifically matters relating to an answer provided by Dr Levy. I remind you that you appear as a witness before the committee and as such you are subject to the standing orders and the Criminal Code in relation to the information you provide to the committee. Any information you provide is privileged and cannot be released without a resolution of the committee authorising its release. If you feel you are unable to answer a question, please advise us and let us know why you think you cannot answer. The committee secretariat provided a copy of schedule 3 and schedule 8. Were they provided to you? The standing orders and the—

Mr Anderson: Yes, I think so. I think they were with the letter that I received. I think one schedule was attached, yes.

CHAIR: Not schedule 8?

Mr Anderson: No.

CHAIR: These are the rules for the committee regarding witnesses and schedule 8 is to assist public servants appearing before the committee. Would you like a copy of schedule 8?

Mr Anderson: No, that is fine.

CHAIR: You have requested legal representation and the committee has agreed. I would clarify that while the committee has agreed to your legal representation, that team is only able to give you legal advice but is not able to address the committee. The hearing is being transcribed and a proof transcript will be provided to you once it is available. You have identified yourself. I ask that you speak clearly in order to assist Hansard. I remind each one of you that these proceedings are confidential unless, as previously stated, there is a release given to you or unless the proceedings are released by the committee. Do you have any opening statement that you would like to make?

Mr Anderson: No, that is fine, thank you.

CHAIR: In particular, the committee is interested in the interaction between yourself and either Ken Levy separately or the CMC as a whole. It is my understanding that at some date you contacted either Dr Levy or the CMC to request a meeting with Ken Levy with the Premier and the Attorney-General. Do you recall what date that request was made?

Mr Anderson: No, that is not an accurate portrayal of what happened.

CHAIR: This is prior to the article being written—well prior.

Mr CRANDON: Quite some weeks ago.

Mr Anderson: No, there certainly was not a request for any meeting.

Ms TRAD: Just to clarify, Mr Anderson. I am Jackie Trad from South Brisbane, hello. This was in relation to setting up the visit by the Premier and the Attorney-General.

Mr Anderson: I didn't have a whole lot to do with that. There was some involvement in that. I am sorry; I thought you were referring to a later situation. Yes, there was some—I think the Premier and the Attorney-General had been invited to attend the CMC for a briefing and to be shown around the area there. Certainly there was some discussion about media involvement in that. I do not actually recall in detail what those discussions were. I think there were some discussions about how much media involvement would be undertaken on the day. But it ended up we organised, I think, a pool camera to be available and then for the Premier and the Attorney-General to speak after the visit. But I cannot actually recall in detail the arrangements around that visit.

CHAIR: You were not involved?

Mr Anderson: Not to any great degree, no.

CHAIR: Could you then clarify for us the phone call that you made on 22 October?

Mr Anderson: Yes. Both the Premier and the Attorney-General had had discussions, particularly the Premier, had had discussions with me about the way the criminal bikie gang situation was being portrayed in the media. The Premier in particular was concerned that there was a continuing view amongst some areas that these guys were, I think to use his term, loveable rogues who went on toy runs and their involvement in serious criminal activity was limited. My understanding is both the CMC and the QPS were providing regular updates and briefings to the Premier, in particular about the involvement of the criminal motorcycle gangs in drugs and the Premier was certainly keen to have more media attention around that particular subject and there was a desire, perhaps, for the CMC to be more proactive in explaining to the public of Queensland what those activities were. So subsequently, I made a call to the CMC media office. I first talked to a woman who turned out to be the junior, who told me that the senior media adviser would be in contact with me, which he did, I think, later that day. I had a discussion with him in those terms, suggesting that it would be useful for the CMC and certainly, if possible, the chairman to consider being available for media interviews to give that sort of information to the general public. That was what the telephone call was about. The gentleman told me that they had been considering making themselves more available to the media and that they would consider the suggestion.

Mr MINNIKIN: Do you recall exactly the name of that man that you eventually spoke with on 22 October?

Mr Anderson: I don't off the top of my head, Steve. The gentleman is the main media officer for the commission. He had an issue at that time. I think he had to leave Brisbane for a personal matter so there was some—it was suggested that there would be some delay perhaps in responding.

CHAIR: Member for South Brisbane?

Ms TRAD: Can I ask, Mr Anderson, in relation to that visit, and I will just take you back to that visit by the Premier and the Attorney-General to the CMC for a tour and a briefing.

Mr Anderson: Yes.

Ms TRAD: Did you at all contact Mr Ken Levy in the organisation of that?

Mr Anderson: Not that I recall.

Ms TRAD: Not that you recall?

Mr Anderson: No.

Ms TRAD: Can I then take you to that phone call which occurred, I think it was on 22 October. When you first spoke to the junior media officer, did you make that phone call directly? Did you put that phone call directly through to her?

Mr Anderson: I am sorry, I don't understand the question.

Ms TRAD: Did you call the CMC general number?

Mr Anderson: I actually obtained the number from the internet.

Ms TRAD: GovNet?

Mr Anderson: From the CMC site.

Ms TRAD: In relation to the phone call, can you recall exactly how you put the request to—

Mr Anderson: Sorry, it was very much in the way that I just described.

Ms TRAD: Okay. So do you recall mentioning that you had spoken to the Attorney-General?

Mr Anderson: Yes, I do believe that I said that I had spoken to the Attorney-General or the Attorney-General was certainly—yes, I did. Yes, I did.

Ms TRAD: Can you just recall for the committee's benefit that conversation you had with the Attorney-General in relation to the CMC making media comment?

Mr Anderson: No, I cannot recall specifically, member, but certainly both the Premier and the Attorney-General had had discussions with me, and it could have well been that morning or certainly the previous afternoon, about the need for more information to be made readily available to the public. I cannot recall the details of that conversation with the Attorney-General, but certainly my general recollection is that the prospect of suggesting to the commission that it do media interviews, or the commissioner in particular, was something that there was certainly keenness on the part of both the Attorney-General and the Premier.

Ms TRAD: Thank you, Mr Anderson. I appreciate that. But one of the things that you do recall with some certainty is that the time that elapsed between your conversation with the Premier and the Attorney-General was quite short before you made the call to the commission?

Mr Anderson: I think so. This was a matter that had been obviously in the public's eye for a little bit of time, but certainly I do think that there could well have been discussions before that call was made on the Tuesday. Look, I have to say I am presuming that I was following up from conversations that occurred either that day or the day before, but I cannot actually be sure of that.

Ms TRAD: Mr Anderson, can you recollect how much personal contact or one-on-one contact, rather than personal—one-on-one contact you have had with Dr Levy? On how many occasions have you had one-on-one contact with Dr Levy?

Mr Anderson: My recollection is that I have only had one-on-one contact with Dr Levy on one occasion.

Ms TRAD: When was that, Mr Anderson?

Mr Anderson: It would have been in the week—I am not sure of the exact date. It would have been, I think, the week following the telephone call to the CMC. I do believe it was some time during that week.

Ms TRAD: Can you talk to the committee about what that contact was about?

Mr Anderson: Certainly. Maybe if I take it through?

Ms TRAD: Sure.

Mr Anderson: That might make it easier. Following my conversation with the media officer for the CMC, I think he came back to me. I am not sure of exactly when he came back to me, but he let me know that the matter had been considered and that the commission did not want to make Dr Levy available to do media interviews, which was fine. I subsequently did not give that a great deal of thought, until I got a call some time that following week from the media adviser to the Attorney-General to say that Dr Levy had contacted their office, he did want to undertake a media interview and had sought some advice on the best way to progress that.

Ms TRAD: Mr Anderson, can you advise who that media adviser was from the Attorney-General's office?

Mr Anderson: Yes. Katherine Hornbuckle who is the Attorney-General's media adviser, not the senior media adviser. I then advised her—and I cannot recall whether I suggested that Dr Levy contact me or I would contact him, but certainly I had a subsequent discussion via telephone with Dr Levy suggesting how he could progress his desire to grant an interview to discuss the matters that we had talked about. I subsequently made contact with a reporter, who had taken an interest, to suggest that Dr Levy would be available. Then I had a subsequent conversation with Dr Levy providing, I think, the journalist's number.

CHAIR: Sorry, just to clarify. You contacted a journalist saying Dr Levy might be interested in—

Mr Anderson: Correct.

CHAIR: Which journalist?

Mr Anderson: Mr Houghton.

Ms TRAD: And then you made a subsequent phone call to Dr Levy advising of Des Houghton's contact details?

Mr Anderson: As I recall, yes.

Ms TRAD: So that is two one-on-one contacts with Dr Levy?

Mr Anderson: Yes. I cannot actually recall, but certainly there was a conversation to provide contact with Mr Houghton.

Ms TRAD: Mr Anderson, in relation to the advice that you said you provided Dr Levy in relation to getting up his story, can you just furnish the committee with the advice that you gave him? What did you tell him to do, Mr Anderson?

Mr Anderson: It was particularly in regard to initially perhaps what form it would take. I think I might have either suggested or Dr Levy was certainly more comfortable with a discussion with a newspaper reporter rather than a television reporter. I was keen to suggest to him, which I would have done—which I did—that I think doing more of a feature story on the threat these criminal gangs posed. I certainly recall as part of that discussion telling him that there would obviously be no need for him to discuss any matters that were sensitive or should not be made public. Part of the discussion was that I felt that Mr Houghton would be a good person for him to speak to because I thought that would be the best avenue for that sort of feature story in a high circulation paper.

Ms TRAD: Thank you, Mr Anderson. Just one quick question before I hand back to you, Madam Chair. In relation to Des Houghton, did you make that recommendation or did Dr Levy suggest Des Houghton to you?

Mr Anderson: No, that was my suggestion.

Ms TRAD: So did Dr Ken Levy suggest to you at any stage who he might talk to from the *Courier-Mail*?

Mr Anderson: No.

Ms TRAD: I have other questions, but I will defer to others.

CHAIR: The member for Bundamba.

Mrs MILLER: Lee, just a quick question. Did you or anyone else from any government media unit or any public servant at all go with Dr Levy to meet with Des Houghton?

Mr Anderson: I am not aware of that. I certainly did not. I am not aware of anyone from the government media unit going—and I would have been aware of that—and I am certainly not aware of any public servant going.

Mrs MILLER: Just following on from that. Does it strike you as being completely inappropriate for you to be providing this advice to the independent chair of the CMC?

Mr Anderson: No, it does not. I feel that I would provide that sort of advice to any government official or organisation that was dealing with the government in these matters. I would have given similar advice to police officers or to other stakeholders in other areas.

Mrs MILLER: But the police are part of the government. The CMC is an independent statutory crime fighting body. I put it to you that you crossed the line here; you did the wrong thing.

Mr Anderson: It is an observation.

CHAIR: Member for Coomera.

Mr CRANDON: If we are going to pursue that matter any further, I think we need to have a little break for a discussion.

CHAIR: I do not think we are.

Mr CRANDON: Thank you.

CHAIR: Mr Anderson, can you clarify for me, just for my own information, you called the CMC and spoke with Ms Barry, in the first instance, saying that media from the CMC would be good because that would provide the community with a greater understanding of the criminal motorcycle gangs. It is my understand from the evidence you have given that Dr Levy contacted you subsequently in order to find out from you an appropriate or a suitable journalist.

Mr Anderson: No, I am sorry, Madam Chair. That initial contact went to the Attorney-General's office.

CHAIR: The initial contact about an appropriate journalist?

Mr Anderson: Yes.

CHAIR: Okay. Did you contact him back after the AG's office contacted you?

Mr Anderson: I cannot recall whether I gave advice to the AG's media office to suggest to Dr Levy he contact me or if I contacted him in response to that inquiry.

CHAIR: The AG's office contacted you and you are not sure whether you said to them, 'Tell him to contact me,' or whether you then contacted him?

Mr Anderson: Correct.

CHAIR: You said then that you rang him back and suggested Des Houghton would be a good journalist to talk to and you discussed 'the matters that we talked about previously'. That infers that there had been two conversations that you had had with Dr Levy?

Mr Anderson: No, the matters that I had raised with the CMC media—

CHAIR: Ms Barry.

Mr Anderson:— team.

CHAIR: And then you called Dr Levy back and had a discussion outlining the sort of matters, I am assuming, that you thought were appropriate to have in the article but also to reinforce that he did not need to discuss sensitive matters or operational matters of the CMC?

Mr Anderson: That is true, yes.

CHAIR: How long would that conversation—

Mr Anderson: As I recall, it was not a terribly long conversation.

CHAIR: Help me because I do not know what terribly long—

Mr Anderson: It is difficult. My recollection would have been a five minute conversation.

CHAIR: Okay, all right. The member for Nicklin

Mr WELLINGTON: Mr Anderson, are you aware of what other media outlets were seeking comment from the Crime and Misconduct Commission prior to your suggestion?

Mr Anderson: No. Certainly I was aware that a number of journalists were very keen, in my generally discussions with journalists, for as much information as they could get and indeed were keen for the CMC to be available to them.

Mr WELLINGTON: How did Des Houghton come to get to the top of the pecking order?

Mr Anderson: The sort of story that I thought would be useful was a feature story. Des has got a set page in a very high circulating Saturday newspaper. I thought, in my professional judgement, that that would have been a good outlet for that.

Mr WELLINGTON: Bearing in mind you are, in your words, the director of the government media unit—so the director of the state government's media unit—I would have thought you would use television. If you wanted to respond, in your words, 'to the concerns that the Premier and Attorney-General have about the perception about the motorcycle people', I would have thought the number of people who watch the television far outweighs the number of people who might read the *Courier-Mail*.

Mr Anderson: No, not in terms of numbers, member. I would have thought that the impact of a feature article in the *Courier-Mail* could have well then led to follow-up with television. I would have been very comfortable with Dr Levy, if he felt so inclined, following up with television interviews. I think that would have been very useful.

Mr WELLINGTON: On the issue of Mr Houghton, for you to suggest or support that, have you had previously dealings with Mr Houghton?

Mr Anderson: Yes, I have.

Mr WELLINGTON: And your evidence here is in relation to the relationship with Dr Levy. So what is your relationship with him? How many times have you met or spoken to him? Was it only these two phone calls?

Mr Anderson: There was a subsequent face-to-face meeting with Dr Levy. I think later that week Dr Levy contacted me. I think by that stage he certainly had not undertaken the interview with Mr Houghton. I am not sure whether he had actually arranged to have that interview undertaken at that time. But he contacted me and said that he would just like to have a chat about the article and he was in the area. He then asked if he could come to my office, which he did. We had a conversation there about the sort of questioning he might get from Mr Houghton. We had a discussion about that and about some general things. That was the first time I had met Dr Levy face to face.

Mr WELLINGTON: My final question: in your evidence this morning you refer to them as Dr Levy and Mr Houghton. Is that the terminology you have always used in discussions with other people?

Mr Anderson: I would certainly refer to Dr Levy as Dr Levy. I would not feel comfortable calling him Ken. I would have called Des either Des or probably some other things when he might have written something I did not particularly like.

CHAIR: Before I hand to the next member, which is the member for Greenslopes, you said that you talked to Dr Ken Levy about the article and general things when he visited your office.

Mr Anderson: Yes.

CHAIR: What were the general things?

Mr Anderson: Just about his background.

CHAIR: About Levy's background or Houghton's background?

Mr Anderson: About his. It was the first time I had met him and it was a bit of a general chat about him—more social things, I suppose.

CHAIR: Was the discussion any relationship to his role at the CMC?

Mr Anderson: No.

CHAIR: I call the member for Greenslopes.

Mr KAYE: Mr Anderson, just taking it back to after the AG's office mentioned that there had been contact from Dr Levy. You mentioned that you had a conversation but you cannot remember how that came about, in terms of whether you contacted him or he contacted you. I think that is what you said.

Mr Anderson: Yes.

Mr KAYE: And then you spoke about a subsequent phone call with Dr Levy, perhaps to give him the name of the journalist. But you seemed a bit vague about that to me.

Mr Anderson: Right.

Mr KAYE: Are you saying that there may have only been one call or there were two calls—you just do not remember?

Mr Anderson: I do not. Certainly my recollection is that I think I did have a discussion with him before I had the face-to-face discussion with him and the call that I either made to him or he made to me after the contact with the Attorney-General's office. I just cannot recall. The contact was certainly there in response to the call to the Attorney-General's office. There would have been that call. I cannot, in all honesty, recall the sequence of contact. I think there was one more call before the face-to-face meeting.

Mr KAYE: So there could be two; might be one. You are not 100 per cent certain.

Mr Anderson: That is correct.

CHAIR: I call the member for South Brisbane.

Mr CRANDON: Madam Chair, we have had one question here. There are a lot of other questions needed. In fact, the member for Chatsworth is ready.

CHAIR: All right. I call the member for Chatsworth.

Mr MINNIKIN: Mr Anderson, I am a fairly recent participant on the PCMC. Just going back to the whole genesis behind the initial call, so are you aware under the CMC Act of I think it is section 24(f)? The whole background to that particular section is public awareness. Was that the genesis behind the initial call to initially a woman and then a subsequent member of the CMC unit—that the initial background to it was simply a public awareness campaign to try to trigger something there in terms of the public debate that was in the public domain at that time about criminal motorcycle gangs? Is that the background for the call?

Mr Anderson: Yes, that is the situation. As I say, I think certainly there was a need, and there is a continuing need, for the activities of the criminal motorcycle gangs to receive public attention. The CMC's activities in dealing with that, I think, are also very useful for the public to be aware of. I think the CMC do have a role in the education of the public.

Mr WELLINGTON: Madam Chairman, can I just ask for a short adjournment so we can discuss the matter in private, please?

CHAIR: Sure. We will adjourn. If you would not mind waiting outside and we will call you back in. Thank you.

Proceedings suspended from 10.32 am to 10.46 am

CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Anderson and colleagues. Mr Anderson, the committee is concerned to have you step through each of the contacts that you have had with Dr Levy. If you could clarify for us the date and, from your recollection, the time—if you need to refer to your electronic diary or whatever, you are welcome to—of those contacts either by phone, face to face or by any other means. If you could do that for us to clarify those contacts, please.

Mr Anderson: Yes. I am sorry I cannot give you specific dates or times. I am working from recollection. I have not made any notes of the contacts. As I say, there would have been a contact subsequent to Dr Levy's contact with the Attorney-General's office. I cannot tell you the exact day. I do believe it was either on the same day that the contact with the Attorney-General's office was made or the following day. It would not have been any longer than that. I am sure we could obtain for the committee probably a date of that contact via the Attorney-General's office.

CHAIR: That would be helpful, thank you.

Mr Anderson: I would have thought that information is available. So there would have been that initial contact with Dr Levy following up the contact made to the Attorney-General's office. I have a recollection of another contact that would have been made some time later that week, although I cannot be more specific than that, arranging the contact with the journalist.

CHAIR: So that was you calling Dr Levy or Dr Levy calling you?

Mr Anderson: No. I would imagine that that would have been me calling Dr Levy to advise him. As I say, there may have been a subsequent phone call, but I cannot remember if there was a subsequent call. Then there was the telephone call that he made to me to ask if I was available to see him and then there was soon after that phone call a face-to-face meeting, as described. I cannot actually recall the exact date or time of that meeting. I do not have a record of it. I could certainly try to tie that down a little bit more.

CHAIR: Do you recall how close to the release of the article it was?

Mr Anderson: I think it would have been in the week prior to the article appearing.

CHAIR: There were two public articles, if you like. One was just the comments, some of which were attributed to Mr Levy.

Mr Anderson: Yes.

CHAIR: That was on 30 November and then the opinion piece was on 1 November—

Ms TRAD: 30 October.

CHAIR: 30 October, sorry, and the 1st—

Ms TRAD: The 30th, the 31st and then the public hearing was on the 1st.

CHAIR: So the 30th was the first article. The 31st was the opinion piece—we call it that obviously. So you are saying in the few days before that—

Mr Anderson: Certainly it would have been in that week—I think in that week. It really depends on when the actual interview took place and I am not aware of that. That would tend to tie it down because it obviously would have been prior to that interview taking place.

Mr CRANDON: Just to clarify, we are actually talking dates but we are not talking days. So the 31st was a Thursday. The 30th was a Wednesday. So I am just putting the days of the week in there.

Mr Anderson: That is true. Thank you. So it could have actually been the latter part of the week prior. It really depends on, as I say, when that interview took place. That would probably tie that down a little bit more. But certainly it was obviously prior to the interview taking place.

CHAIR: In that face-to-face meeting, can you recall for the committee please the progression of that conversation, the content of that conversation—if you could just step us through that?

Mr Anderson: Yes. The conversation was very much in regard to the description I have previously given the committee. It was about the fact that there seemed to be a disconnect between some of the public commentary around the seriousness of what was going on—what is going on—with these criminal motorcycle gangs and the public perception, in particular. In fact, I could probably tie down the date and I will get back to you because I have just recalled I had a conversation with Bill Mellor, who is actually implementing a response to this across government. I

think that was earlier that day. He was expressing a view to me about particularly the involvement of criminal motorcycle gangs in the ice and methamphetamine manufacturing.

CHAIR: Can I just interrupt to ask you formally to advise us to the best of your records what date that was?

Mr Anderson: Yes, I will. Yes, certainly.

CHAIR: Thank you. So you discussed the disconnect—

Mr Anderson: So it was certainly in regard to the seriousness of the threat. It was about what information the CMC could provide the public about that threat and about the CMC's role in dealing with that threat. My view was that I think that it was useful for the CMC to be discussing their role in this coordinated approach, with legislation in place, supported by both the government and opposition—key agencies now actually carrying out the implementation of this.

There was also a part of the discussion about given the fact that I think Dr Levy's experience in dealing with the media was limited. I suggested some of the lines of questioning that Mr Houghton might pursue. I pointed out to Dr Levy that in the past Mr Houghton had been very critical of the CMC, particularly over the University of Queensland issue. I wanted to make him aware of that and also the fact that in some conversations I had had with Mr Houghton he was following a line of inquiry about allegations that police officers had ties with criminal motorcycle gangs. I was concerned that Mr Houghton would go down that line of questioning, and my advice to Dr Levy was that he should not be drawn into any line of questioning he was uncomfortable with, that he should only be responding to Mr Houghton on terms that he was comfortable with. And I suggested to him that if there was any line of questioning that he was uncomfortable with he should tell Mr Houghton that it was operational and he would not be prepared to answer that. That was pretty much the substance of the conversation. As I say, I think then there was a bit of a general chitchat, for want of a better term, about his background.

CHAIR: I am sure members have other questions, but after that face-to-face meeting did you report to anybody that you had had a meeting with Dr Levy, either in the AG's office, in the Premier's office or anywhere else? Did you report that conversation to anyone?

Mr Anderson: I spoke generally about it to my deputy in the Government Media Unit. I also kept the chief of staff in the Premier's office up to date with it. I might have—although I cannot recall whether there would have been that afternoon or subsequently at some stage. We have a daily team leaders' meeting in our office. I do not have specific recollection of raising it then, but I imagine it would have been something that I would have done.

CHAIR: Thank you. I call the member for South Brisbane.

Ms TRAD: Thank you, Mr Anderson. I just want to take you back really quickly to that call originally to the CMC not to arrange the visit by the Premier and the Attorney-General but your initial contact in relation to the CMC doing media.

Mr Anderson: Yes.

Ms TRAD: When you got through to Ms Barry, did you identify yourself as the Director of the Government Media Unit?

Mr Anderson: I would have done so, yes.

Ms TRAD: Thank you. Mr Anderson, I am interested in what you said before about Des Houghton. You thought that Des Houghton would be—and if I am verballing you or representing you incorrectly, please pull me up. You said that Des Houghton was a feature writer—good circulation.

Mr Anderson: Certainly. What I was referring to there was the page that Des does have in the Saturday edition of the *Courier-Mail*.

Ms TRAD: And that he was a feature writer. I remember you saying because he was a feature writer.

Mr Anderson: That was in reference to—in my mind when I am describing him thus, it is to that section of the paper.

Ms TRAD: You would agree, I assume, that a number of other reporters also write up features like Steven Wardill, who had covered the criminal motorcycle gangs already in the paper, and Robyn Ironside had been doing a lot. As the director of the Government Media Unit, you would know who were the key journalists who had been covering this story and that they also get features up in the *Courier-Mail* on a Saturday. Is that right?

Mr Anderson: Sorry, just repeat the question?

Ms TRAD: My question is: you would agree, I assume, that there had been other journalists who had been covering the criminal motorcycle gang issue and the legislative changes already who also get feature stories up on a Saturday; is that right?

Mr Anderson: I think that their main area of focus is more of a news reporting role. I think they probably would have been unlikely to have the time or the inclination to be pitching a longer piece.

Ms TRAD: Because I am really interested in why Des Houghton—according to my research, Des had not done anything in relation to the criminal motorcycle gang issue in Queensland in 2013.

Mr Anderson: He certainly had a previous interest in the topic. He has a broad range of interests and I thought particularly the CMG links to the amphetamine trade and the wider threat that these people pose would have been of good interest to Des. I also think that he has had quite a bit to do with the workings of the CMC and I thought he would be interested in a piece that also discussed how they were responding to this issue.

Ms TRAD: You said that you had, to the best of your recollection, advised the deputy media director—the assistant media director?

Mr Anderson: Yes.

Ms TRAD: And also the chief of staff in relation to Mr Levy's visit?

Mr Anderson: Yes.

Ms TRAD: Was the Premier informed?

Mr Anderson: I could not say. I have lots of conversations with the Premier in the course of the day. I cannot recall a specific conversation with him about that meeting. In fact, I cannot recall a conversation about that particular meeting.

Ms TRAD: I am interested in this because your evidence previously was that you had a conversation with the Attorney and the Premier about the CMC weighing into the criminal motorcycle gang issue.

Mr Anderson: Yes.

Ms TRAD: And then that is what made you contact the CMC.

Mr Anderson: Yes.

Ms TRAD: And then you had the acting chair of the CMC in your office, I assume in the Premier's office; is that right?

Mr Anderson: On the 15th floor, yes.

Ms TRAD: And you did not think to close the loop by telling the Premier that you had met with the acting chair?

Mr Anderson: As I say, I may well have done so. I do not recall specifically doing so. I would have certainly kept him up to date about matters generally. I cannot specifically recall informing him of that.

Ms TRAD: If you do recall, it would be great for you to advise the committee if your recollection comes back. Mr Anderson, did Dr Ken Levy ever email you or did you ever email Dr Levy?

Mr Anderson: No. No, I do not believe so.

Ms TRAD: Could you check your email records?

Mr Anderson: Certainly.

Ms TRAD: I understand that you said in relation to the whole sit-down that Dr Levy had with Mr Houghton—what I understand from your testimony is you suggested Houghton; is that right?

Mr Anderson: Correct.

Ms TRAD: That you essentially contacted Houghton and facilitated the meeting between Dr Levy and Houghton?

Mr Anderson: Certainly I would have contacted Houghton. In terms of facilitated I did leave it to Dr Levy and Mr Houghton to organise that.

Ms TRAD: But you lined up the ducks, so to speak?

Mr Anderson: From the point of view that I did not—if Dr Levy had not contacted Mr Houghton—

Ms TRAD: That is fine, but you made the call for Dr Levy first up?

Mr Anderson: Yes.

Ms TRAD: You sat down with Dr Levy and had a face-to-face and discussed possible topics; is that right?

Mr Anderson: Yes.

Ms TRAD: And also in that face-to-face you did a bit of prepping in terms of questions and where not to go?

Mr Anderson: Yes.

Ms TRAD: Given, Mr Anderson, that you are the director of the Government Media Unit and you essentially suggested Houghton—coordinated his contact with Houghton, prepped Dr Levy in relation to his sit-down with Des Houghton, it would seem like quite an extraordinary amount of assistance for the acting chair of a statutory independent crime-fighting organisation to have from the government's chief media officer, don't you think?

Mr Anderson: No, I do not.

Ms TRAD: You do not? You think that this is appropriate behaviour? Do you think that this is appropriate, this level of assistance and intervention?

Mr Anderson: Yes, I do.

Ms TRAD: Do you, Mr Anderson?

Mr Anderson: I just said yes, I do.

Ms TRAD: Mr Anderson, you have been in the media in Queensland for a very long period of time, haven't you?

Mr Anderson: Yes, I have.

Ms TRAD: And you are aware of how the CMC came into existence?

Mr Anderson: Yes, I am.

Mr CRANDON: Madam Chair, I fail to see the relevance of this line of questioning. We are now going away from—

CHAIR: Sorry, member for Coomera, I think let's see—there are a couple of questions clarifying Mr Anderson's understanding. Your questions are relevant to this matter?

Ms TRAD: Madam Chair, they are relevant. They are relevant in terms of an understanding by the government's chief media adviser in relation to the role and the independence of the CMC. I think it is incredibly important in terms of giving context to the contact between Dr Levy and Mr Anderson.

Mr CRANDON: If I may respond to that—

Mr WELLINGTON: It is not a debate.

CHAIR: Let's adjourn again for a couple of moments. I am sorry, Mr Anderson, and team, could you leave us for a couple of moments, please?

Proceedings suspended from 11.06 am to 11.17 am

CHAIR: Thank you very much and I apologise again for those interruptions. Member for South Brisbane.

Ms TRAD: Mr Anderson, before we adjourned we were talking about the level of assistance provided to Dr Levy before his feature article and whether or not you thought that the level of assistance you provided to him was appropriate as he is the acting chair of the statutory independent crime and misconduct organisation of Queensland and you thought it appropriate. Is that your understanding? Is that your belief?

Mr Anderson: Yes.

Ms TRAD: And you are aware of how the CMC came into existence?

Mr Anderson: Yes.

Ms TRAD: Mr Anderson, can I ask you: when you spoke to the chief of staff and the deputy media director after your conversation with Dr Levy, did anyone suggest to you that perhaps you should not continue contact with Dr Levy?

Mr Anderson: No.

Ms TRAD: Did anyone suggest to you that you should make a file note of your contact with Dr Levy?

Mr Anderson: No.

Ms TRAD: Did you suggest to Dr Levy that perhaps he should have someone from the CMC media unit attending with him?

Mr Anderson: No.

Ms TRAD: Did you suggest that anyone from the CMC media unit should accompany Dr Levy to his interview with Des Houghton?

Mr Anderson: No.

Mr WELLINGTON: Mr Anderson, in light of your evidence this morning, did you consider someone else from the Crime and Misconduct Commission contacting the media and speaking about the issues that you were keen to be pursued by Mr Houghton or someone else?

Mr Anderson: Sorry, did I consider it?

Mr WELLINGTON: Did you consider it? Did you consider anyone else?

Mr Anderson: I would have been happy for anyone else from the commission to do so. That was originally—I think in my initial conversation with the CMC's media unit, the senior media officer suggested that it was something that they were looking at, that they might be making someone available other than Dr Levy.

Mr WELLINGTON: Did you consider that adverse inferences might be made in light of Dr Levy's position being an acting position, due to be renewed or not extended, that you on behalf of the government were having this dialogue with him and not someone else?

Mr Anderson: I am sorry, what is the question?

Mr WELLINGTON: Were you aware of any possible adverse ramifications that might flow from Dr Levy's position—

Mr Anderson: No.

Mr WELLINGTON:—as I understand it at the time not being extended?

Mr Anderson: No.

Mr WELLINGTON: When were you aware that Dr Levy's term was going to be extended?

Mr Anderson: I think when I read it in the paper.

Mr WELLINGTON: You think when you read it in the paper.

Mr Anderson: Yes. I certainly was not—I do not think I was aware of it. I cannot recall being aware of it before then.

Mrs MILLER: Lee, do you read the *Government Gazette*?

Mr Anderson: No.

Mrs MILLER: Are you aware that there was an Order in Council that—it is a normal government practice that whenever government takes over whereby the government departments and the independent statutory bodies establish whereby they report to certain ministers; are you aware of that?

Mr Anderson: I am sorry, am I aware of what—

Mrs MILLER: The Orders in Council that are published in the *Government Gazette* whereby it would have said that the CMC reports to the Attorney-General?

CHAIR: Would this be the administrative arrangements?

Mrs MILLER: Yes, the administrative arrangements. Are you aware of the administrative arrangements?

Mr Anderson: I am aware that the CMC reports to the Attorney-General, yes.

Mrs MILLER: I suppose what I am asking here is would it not be more appropriate for the Attorney-General's media people, either in his office or in the department, to be providing any such advice rather than the chief of the government media unit?

Mr Anderson: No. I provide overarching advice to any of the portfolios.

Mrs MILLER: But this is not a portfolio. That is my whole question. This is not a portfolio. This is an independent statutory body with which I think reasonable people would infer you have interfered.

CHAIR: Is there a question?

Mrs MILLER: I am just asking—

Mr CRANDON: That is an opinion.

CHAIR: Is there a question?

Mr CRANDON: You see, Madam Chair, they cannot—

Mrs MILLER: It is order in council—

CHAIR: Order! Order! Is there a question?

Mrs MILLER: Yes. I am asking you whether—my line of questioning was the *Government Gazette*. He said he does not read it, which I find amazing. The Orders in Council—

Mr CRANDON: Madam Chair—

CHAIR: I ask you not to proffer your opinion. It does not help the substance of this hearing.

Mrs MILLER: I am asking, therefore, in relation to the fact that the CMC reports through to the Attorney-General, would it not have been more appropriate for perhaps your advice to have been that the chair of the CMC seeks independent media advice in relation to any proposal of him to do a media story?

Mr Anderson: No. I was comfortable with the advice that I was giving.

Mrs MILLER: So you do not think it was appropriate for you to provide that—

Mr CRANDON: Question asked and answered.

Mr MINNIKIN: It has been answered.

CHAIR: Did you want to add any more, Mr Anderson, to that question?

Mr Anderson: No.

Mrs MILLER: Just given the administrative arrangements even?

Mr Anderson: I am comfortable with the advice that I gave.

Mrs MILLER: In relation to the meeting that you had with Dr Levy—and I understand that you are going to provide the date and the time, hopefully, of that meeting—there was no-one else in that meeting? You said it was on the 15th floor. Was it in your office on the 15th floor?

Mr Anderson: It was at one of the meeting rooms.

Mrs MILLER: And was the Attorney-General or his office advised of the outcome of this meeting with Dr Levy, or did or any of his office staff ring about it?

Mr Anderson: I may have well kept the Attorney-General's media adviser across developments, but I cannot recall that specifically.

Mrs MILLER: Do you think you could have another think about that and maybe tell us at a future time whether or not your recollection might come back to hand on this?

Mr Anderson: Yes, if you like, certainly.

Mr CRANDON: I just a question in relation to the AG's media person that was contacted, Katherine Hornbuckle: are you aware of her level? Is she an AO6, an—

Mr Anderson: I am not aware of—

Mr CRANDON: Would you class her as a senior person, a junior person—

Mr Anderson: No, she is the more junior person in that office.

Mr CRANDON: More junior person.

Mr Anderson: There are two media advisors in the Attorney-General's office really: a senior and a junior.

CHAIR: Just a clarifying question. The phone calls that you had with Dr Levy and the meeting that you had on level 15, did you keep any notes of those contacts?

Mr Anderson: No, I did not.

CHAIR: No notes at all?

Ms TRAD: Mr Anderson, can you think about anything else that was happening at the time that you had your face-to-face meeting with Dr Levy?

Mr Anderson: There was a great deal happening; there usually is.

Ms TRAD: I understand.

Mr Anderson: Specifically I do not—

Ms TRAD: Can you contextualise or can you plot your face-to-face meeting with Dr Ken Levy around when Tony Fitzgerald's op-ed piece appeared in the paper, for example?

Mr Anderson: I cannot. It was around the same time. There has obviously been a great deal of debate around these matters. It certainly was not largely relevant to me. The discussions that I had with Dr Levy were in regards to the matters that I have already raised. They were not in regards to the correctness, for want of a better term, of the legislation, the Premier's comments in regards to the judiciary or other matters surrounding current events. It was very much in regards to the operations of the criminal motorcycle gangs. I was unaware that Dr Levy was supplying an opinion piece that tended to discuss those issues.

Ms TRAD: So Dr Levy did not show you any written documentation at that face-to-face meeting?

Mr Anderson: No.

Ms TRAD: But you agree that your earlier testimony is that you talked about potential topics and also lines of questioning.

Mr Anderson: Yes.

Ms TRAD: And the government's, I guess, alternate position to that of the judiciary in relation to criminal motorcycle gangs or the legislation that they had put in the House was one of those topics?

Mr Anderson: Certainly the measures that had been put in place.

Ms TRAD: And I guess the conflict that had emerged between the government and the judiciary in relation to—

Mr Anderson: No.

Ms TRAD: You did not discuss that with Dr Levy?

Mr Anderson: No.

Ms TRAD: You did say before you did mention the judiciary and the debate with the judiciary.

Mr Anderson: Yes.

Ms TRAD: What did you say to Dr Levy about that as a topic of conversation?

Mr Anderson: I was not terribly focused on that at all in the discussions. The discussion I had with him was very much in regards to the threat that these gangs posed and the commission's response to it.

Ms TRAD: We will just have to check the transcript, because you did volunteer up, Mr Anderson, the judiciary and the position that the judiciary was taking as a possible topic to be explored.

Mr Anderson: Yes.

Ms TRAD: We will have to go back and have a look at Hansard. Can we ask Hansard to just have a look at that?

CHAIR: Yes.

Ms TRAD: Mr Anderson, I just want to make clear that at no stage did anyone in government who you had divulged that you had been having contact with Dr Levy about this media engagement or this media intervention from the CMC said to you, 'Stop. This shouldn't be happening'?

Mr Anderson: At no stage did that occur.

Ms TRAD: Mr Anderson, you were aware of the public hearing that occurred on 1 November?

Mr Anderson: Yes, I am.

Ms TRAD: Were you aware of the evidence that Dr Levy provided at that public hearing that he had no contact with government before his opinion piece?

Mr Anderson: I saw reports.

Ms TRAD: So you were aware that Dr Levy's testimony to this committee was that he had no contact with government before his—

Mr Anderson: No, I was not aware that that was his testimony. I was aware of reports of what his testimony was.

Ms TRAD: Okay. It was on the TV news. The exchange between the Leader of the Opposition and Dr Levy's response to the Leader of the Opposition was actually on the TV footage that night. So did you see the TV footage?

Mr Anderson: I would have, yes.

Ms TRAD: You would have. So you would be aware that they were statements that Dr Levy made to this committee?

Mr Anderson: I am sorry?

Ms TRAD: So you saw the TV footage of the news that night?

Mr Anderson: Yes.

Ms TRAD: You saw the Leader of the Opposition asking Dr Levy whether or not he had contact with government before his op-ed piece appeared?

Mr Anderson: I am sorry; I understand where you are coming from. Yes, I would have seen that exchange, yes.

Ms TRAD: Did you have a discussion after that with anyone in government about Dr Levy's testimony to the committee that day?

Mr Anderson: No. I am sorry. I certainly do not recall having a specific conversation about it. Again, it was part of the current events of the day and I well might have discussed them generally. My feeling was that Dr Levy had indicated or had stated that he had not had contact with—and I cannot recall whether he specifically said—government. He may well have in regard to his op-ed piece. My discussions with Dr Levy were not concerning—I was not aware that Dr Levy was writing an op-ed piece. It did not—

Ms TRAD: Mr Anderson, sorry. Just to take you back, this was a feature article.

Mr Anderson: Yes.

Ms TRAD: You nominated the journalist.

Mr Anderson: Yes.

Ms TRAD: You made initial contact with the journalist. You suggested topics to Dr Levy and you prepped him in relation to questions for a feature article.

Mr Anderson: Yes.

Ms TRAD: So when you heard Dr Levy's testimony to this committee, did you at any stage think to raise the anomaly with anyone in government or to write to the PCMC to advise them of your involvement?

Mr Anderson: No, I did not.

Ms TRAD: Why is that, Mr Anderson?

Mr Anderson: I am not sure. It did not enter my head that I should do so.

Ms TRAD: Did it enter your head when you saw the TV footage that night of the exchange—the questioning—between the Leader of the Opposition and Dr Levy that perhaps Dr Levy needed to correct the record?

Mr Anderson: No, it did not. I would imagine that that would have been a matter for Dr Levy.

Ms TRAD: Right. So you cannot recall whether or not after the news that night you had a conversation with anyone in government about your assistance to Dr Levy prior to the publication of his piece in the *Courier-Mail*?

Mr Anderson: No, I cannot. No, I do not recall having a specific conversation about that topic.

CHAIR: Thank you. Member for Bundamba.

Mrs MILLER: Briefly, can you tell me what training you get as the government's chief media spin doctor? Do you get any training at all when you first undertake the role?

Mr Anderson: I am not sure that that is a reasonable description of the role, but—

Mrs MILLER: Well, your role. Are there any training programs at all?

Mr Anderson: No. I am not aware of any training programs. Certainly I have not undertaken any specific training programs in that regard.

Mrs MILLER: Okay. I suppose of interest to me is that there are no training programs in relation to the role of the parliament, the executive government, the judiciary—colloquially known as the doctrine of the separation of powers? There is no formal training for anyone in ministerial offices around these sorts of areas?

Mr Anderson: I could not speak of what training there is. Certainly I have not undertaken any formal training in those matters.

Mrs MILLER: And this training has not been offered to you at all?

Mr Anderson: No, I do not think so.

Mrs MILLER: Okay. Just one question in relation to the Chief of Staff. When you went to advise the Chief of Staff about the meeting with Dr Levy, was there any surprise by the Chief of Staff or any reaction of the Chief of Staff to you when you reported the conversations between—

Mr Anderson: No. As I say, I cannot recall a specific conversation. But certainly the general view was that we were very keen to see the CMC engage in more open public discourse.

Mrs MILLER: Okay. So basically would the Chief of Staff been happy with the fact that you did what you were asked to do by the Premier and the Attorney-General?

Mr Anderson: I am certainly—I would not think that he would have any problem with it.

Mrs MILLER: Okay.

CHAIR: Thank you. Member for Greenslopes.

Mr KAYE: Mr Anderson, just in relation to the exchange between the Leader of the Opposition and Dr Levy at that public meeting that the member for South Brisbane was referring to then, do you recall when you saw that in relation to the questioning—which was along the lines of the Leader of the Opposition asking Dr Levy if he had had any contact with anybody in government—what was your opinion of that line of questioning in terms of who the Leader of the Opposition was referring to?

Mr Anderson: Look, I am not sure that—I cannot think of how I would have thought of that. I certainly think that—I do have a recollection that there had been some discussion about contact with the Premier and the Attorney-General and I think there was certainly some subsequent commentary that Dr Levy may have been believing that the reference was more specifically to the Premier and the Attorney-General rather than anything to do with, for instance, the government media unit.

Mr KAYE: All right. Thank you.

CHAIR: I have a follow-up question, and perhaps you have answered it but it is not clear in my own mind. You sat and spoke with Dr Levy on level 15 and you talked about, as you have already said, that if there were matters that he was uncomfortable about he should not answer.

Mr Anderson: Yes.

CHAIR: Were there any matters that you specifically recommended that he should include in his interview with Des Houghton that you proactively encouraged him to include?

Mr Anderson: I was very keen for him to, as I have said, make sure that people were aware of the activities of criminal motorcycle gangs, particularly their links to the illegal drug trade.

CHAIR: Thank you. But nothing else that you sort of more strongly encouraged him to include?

Mr Anderson: That was certainly my very strong focus, what I was wanting him to talk about.

CHAIR: Did the issue of potential legislation come up in your conversation with Dr Levy that day?

Mr Anderson: Look, I do not recall it doing so. As I say, it is not something that I really was focused on. It is not something that my—much more I wanted the debate to be about or the—what I was attempting to do was to have a much more public awareness of those issues that I have talked about here today rather than the effectiveness of other issues I guess. That was very much where I was wanting the focus to be.

CHAIR: When you read the opinion piece of Dr Levy's, do you believe that your intentions in relation to the publicity were achieved?

Mr Anderson: I was certainly—the initial article that appeared I thought was a useful article.

CHAIR: That is on the 30th?

Mr Anderson: Yes.

CHAIR: And then the 31st was the piece that was purported to be penned by Dr Levy?

Mr Anderson: Yes. I thought he was quite within his rights to express those views.

CHAIR: Member for South Brisbane.

Ms TRAD: Mr Anderson, between the article on the 30th in the *Courier-Mail* in which Dr Levy is quoted written by Des Houghton and the publication of the op-ed piece by Dr Levy, did you have phone contact or face-to-face contact with Des Houghton?

Mr Anderson: Goodness. I might have. I speak to Mr Houghton and a number of reporters on a regular basis. I may well have.

Ms TRAD: So, Mr Anderson, can you recall whether or not you had a conversation with Des Houghton about a follow-up story—a story that better reflected the conversation that you had had with Dr Levy in terms of topics and issues?

Mr Anderson: I can certainly say I did not, because the first I knew of the follow-up was when I read it in the paper.

Ms TRAD: Right. Okay. Mr Anderson, you are the director of the government's media unit. You are a representative of the government, are you not?

Mr Anderson: Correct.

Ms TRAD: Correct. The media knows that and everyone inside government knows that—that you act on behalf of the executive of the government; is that right?

Mr Anderson: I cannot answer for—

Ms TRAD: People know. You have a title. You introduce yourself. You certainly did to the CMC that day, according to your earlier testimony. I am just wondering, Mr Anderson, at what point did Dr Levy acknowledge that he was dealing with a government representative? I guess my question to you is he knew he was dealing with a representative of government when he met with you in the office; is that correct?

Mr Anderson: Well, I presume so.

Ms TRAD: Thank you, Mr Anderson.

CHAIR: Member for Coomera.

Mr CRANDON: Thanks. Mr Anderson, a lot of work has been going into establishing your motives around the reasons why you supported the concept of the CMC doing some media. Is it fair to say that we have the police doing media, the government doing media and then there was your desire to have the CMC do media? Would it be fair to say that that is something that was in your mind to give a positive front—that is, all on the same page, all 100 per cent behind the concept of sorting these bikies out? Can you tell us how you felt why the CMC might be useful in showing that united front?

Mr Anderson: I think the CMC are certainly partners with the government in our endeavours to deal with this problem. I have a strong view that the CMC do need to engage with the public, to share information to highlight problems that we do have when it comes to particularly law and order. As I say, I do believe that the public needs to know about the extent of the criminal gang activity and I also believe that they should know more about the activities of the CMC. I think that gives them confidence in what the organisation is doing.

CHAIR: Member for Bundamba?

Mrs MILLER: Lee, you just said the CMC being partners with the government. Have you read the Fitzgerald report?

Mr Anderson: Yes, I have read it.

Mrs MILLER: Okay.

Mr Anderson: I do believe that the CMC in this particular effort and many others should be partnering with the government to deal with matters like this.

Mr CRANDON: As relates to crime.

Mr Anderson: Correct.

Mrs MILLER: I just find it extraordinary that you think that the CMC should be partners with the government.

Mr CRANDON: Here we go.

CHAIR: Ask a question rather than make an opinion.

Mrs MILLER: All right. Do you believe that the CMC is supposed to be independent of the government rather than partners with the government in any field?

Mr Anderson: I do not think that the two are mutually exclusive. I think the CMC needs to be obviously an independent organisation but, in part of the work that they perform, they certainly act in partnership with the government.

CHAIR: Member for Chatsworth?

Mr MINNIKIN: Mr Anderson, in terms of getting a central message out, did you at any stage take on board the fact that the CMC is a statutory authority as opposed to the Queensland Police Service, particularly their media unit? In terms of crafting a message, did you cognisantly take on board the fact that, in dealing with a statutory body vis-à-vis the CMC, that those contacts, whether they be initially or any subsequent face-to-face meetings, needed to be changed in terms of your communication style as opposed to, say, a government department—the AG's department or the police department?

Mr Anderson: No, my view was that I always had confidence in the commission certainly to have the final decision in terms of what they felt was appropriate communication.

Mr MINNIKIN: And the overarching issue was what? Educating the populace across the different media—

Mrs MILLER: Why don't you answer it for him, too.

CHAIR: Excuse me. Your question, please.

Mr MINNIKIN: My question was: what was the central thrust in terms of the message? What was it that you were trying to achieve?

Mr Anderson: I think it is very much what I have discussed here this morning. I was very keen to make sure that the threat that these organisations pose is well understood and also what responses are being made to deal with it.

CHAIR: Thank you.

Mrs MILLER: Just as a follow-up to that, Lee, you were very keen, I put it to you, that the CMC chair support the government line on these gangs. That is what—

CHAIR: No. Is there a question?

Mrs MILLER: My question is: were you very keen for the acting chair of the CMC to support the government's line in relation to these motorbike gangs?

Mr Anderson: I am not sure what you mean by the government's line. I was very pleased that the acting head of the CMC should discuss a response to an issue that had received bipartisan support in the parliament and I would certainly have every confidence in him to express his views independently.

Mrs MILLER: Of which you coached him, did you not?

Mr Anderson: I assisted him.

CHAIR: Thank you. Mr Anderson, as I have done with all witnesses, I remind you that these deliberations and hearings are confidential and they cannot be discussed out of this room without the express permission of this committee and the transcript would only be made public after consultation with yourself in relation to any concerns that you might have. We have not stood witnesses down to date in a permanent sense in case they have to be re-called for further questions. I will make that same determination in this case. I understand last Friday you were unable to come because [REDACTED].

Mr Anderson: Yes, I apologise for not being able to assist.

CHAIR: No, you do not need to apologise. We certainly hope that [REDACTED].

Mr Anderson: I appreciate that.

CHAIR: I adjourn the hearing. Thank you.

Mr Dunning: Ms Cunningham, may I raise one matter?

CHAIR: Sorry, no.

Mr Dunning: It is not connected—

CHAIR: Sorry, no, you cannot. You are not able to. You may be able to communicate through Mr Anderson. You can confer with Mr Anderson; you cannot directly address the committee.

Mr Dunning: I appreciate that. It was not relation to that that I was asking to address you.

CHAIR: I would suggest then that you put something in writing.

Mr Dunning: Very good.

CHAIR: Thank you. The hearing is adjourned.

Committee adjourned at 11.50 am

Proof