

Submission 1 - Doug Young

[REDACTED]

The CCC is welcome to publish everything herein however I'll be EXTREMELY surprised if the CCC publishes anything as the very last thing the CCC wants is anyone publicly identifying it or the entities it protects as totally fraudulent organizations.

First and foremost, the official complaint notification form is borked in that many fields have been locked, apparently to make it impossible for anyone to submit complaints. That's exactly what I have come to expect from such a duplicitous entity as the Crime and Corruption Commission. The mere fact that the CCC responds to less than 2% of the complaints it receives proves conclusively that the CCC is farcical and that it is merely a rubber stamp for official corruption. There is no point complaining about the CCC to [REDACTED] as it's even more useless and ineffective than the CCC. To add insult to injury, there is no provision to file complaints regarding [REDACTED] ineptitude.

Secondly, there is absolutely no semblance of openness, transparency and accountability in the Queensland government. Backbenchers are invariably totally ineffective oxygen-bandit drones with no input into decision making and ministers rarely if ever respond to inquiries. Even on the rare occasion that a minister makes a pretence of acknowledging a concern, it typically involves a compliant minion doing a cut and paste of official blurb. If perchance a department or two are asked for comment, yet other cut and paste exercises are all that eventuates. Forget about the [REDACTED] or any other watchdog as they either claim lack of jurisdiction or they adhere to the less than 2% rule. In recent examples to do with blatant misconduct on the part of [REDACTED], the [REDACTED] incorrectly claimed that separation of powers prevented [REDACTED] from intervening even though certain acts specify that [REDACTED] is empowered to intervene. It's doubtful that separation of powers is meaningful with an entity like [REDACTED] but [REDACTED] [REDACTED], we were informed 'the [REDACTED] won't have anything more to do with you'. It's common knowledge to the public and in both legal and political circles that the legislation [REDACTED] was fatally flawed. Furthermore there have been three parliamentary inquiries but findings have not been published. [REDACTED]. This is not just an [REDACTED]-problem as the [REDACTED] has steadfastly refused to take an interest. [REDACTED]

Thirdly, freedom of speech is farcical in that nobody is permitted to expose any member of the triune beast. [REDACTED]—imposes so-called 'protection' on its victims with the intent of preventing collaboration between victims. The argument that vulnerable people need 'protection' is fallacious

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Media entities are aware of this con but are prevented from exposing it due to the 'protection' provision. Fees charged [REDACTED] would be considered exploitation and extortion if imposed by any but a government entity. Again, legislative and other provisions and connections ensure that publication of [REDACTED] misdeeds cannot be published.

Fourthly, regarding reputation of alleged subject officers, without hard copy indemnities, one is inclined to be wary of identifying any individual. Suffice to say there are numerous officials in the legislature, the executive and the judiciary whose actions warrant a genuinely 'independent' investigation. Note particularly that by 'independent' I mean the dictionary meaning rather than the bureaucratic / political meaning that involves a very carefully chosen collection of individuals who will agree to support all aspects of findings made well before the inquiry is convened. I hereby challenge the CCC to instigate a truly 'independent' inquiry into government and individuals.

Fifthly, its blatantly obvious that the concept of 'fairness' is in name only. Australian laws are so poorly conceived and worded that they are meaningless. Lawyers and barristers, with the collusion of the judiciary, argue that black is white even though an Act states clearly that white is really white. No regular person can hope to compete with teams of \$5,000 per hour QCs, even if the laws in contention were written in clear and unambiguous simple english. The suggestion that there is equal access to justice is nonsensical when even an entry level lawyer expects to be paid over twenty times the hourly rate of his or her clients. Compare for example, the unbelievably crappy Australian laws with the inherent simplicity of international (United Nations) instruments that have identical meaning in all UN recognized languages. The argument that 'ignorance of the law is no excuse' is patently ridiculous when lawyers, barristers, magistrates and judges spend most of their life arguing over points of law.

Sixthly, it should not be necessary to even ask a question regarding the effectiveness of the CCC when it fails to deal with even 2% of the complaints it receives. Clearly 'effectiveness' and 'CCC' don't even belong in the same sentence.