

From: Chas. Steff. [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, 14 October 2016 9:10 PM
To: Crime and Corruption Commission
Subject: HPRM: Additional submission subsequent to the CCC forum regarding transparency.

Record Number: [REDACTED]

Dear Mr MacSporran.

I congratulate you and the CCC on a well conducted forum. I'm pleased to have taken a small part in that forum. [REDACTED] that the media representatives directed at the panel. Their transparency concerns came across as of a commercial nature only, designed to hopefully increase their income from the [REDACTED] disclosure of allegations, along with the identities of persons that must be presumed at that time to be only under investigation, and not guilty of anything apart from being in public life.

As I clarified, my belief is that allegations should be disclosed, but only subsequent to a brief, but comprehensive, initial investigation that had established sufficient evidence existed to warrant prosecution. At no time should the identity of a whistleblower be disclosed without their consent. Of course, as discussed at the forum, the issue of serial complainants and their motives really does need to be addressed, but should never deter potential whistleblowers from coming forward. Considering that it seems whistleblowers are mainly one off complainants, it should be relatively easy to recognise this, and introduce legislation to combat the occurrence of serial complainants, to the extent of identifying those serial complainants, especially if those complaints are for personal gain or political advantage.

I also oppose the practice of devolving complaints to agencies complained about to investigate themselves. My reasons are quite simple. The CCC is perceived and promoted as an apolitical, independent organisation, free from bias and coercion, and rightly so, but it must be recognised that as soon as an investigation is devolved to an agency headed by a politician (Minister), it could reasonably be considered that the investigation is no longer independent, and therefore, open to compromise and or manipulation by ministerial sycophants. Whilst not suggesting that any of the above is occurring, it must be acknowledged there is the probability of something along this line happening.

I personally had the unfortunate experience of a complaint being dealt with by a government agency's Ethical Standards Unit. My complaints were regarding grossly misleading letters [REDACTED]. The complaints were dealt with over a nine month period, the investigation ended without establishing who had sent the letters [REDACTED], something I find hard to believe, as all mail [REDACTED] is surely recorded. The same [REDACTED] person then investigated investigators at another associated agency. [REDACTED] had previously worked as an investigator for that very same agency. Again, unsurprisingly, [REDACTED] no problems. I consider [REDACTED] a possible conflict of interest existed.

Additionally, investigators should never telegraph their intention to visit government agencies. To do so leaves the investigation open to the possibility of concealment or destruction of evidence.

Another complaint involved wrongfully gained possession of private and confidential documents by deceit, using that information for advantage, passing it on to a third party, and finally including that document in the records of a government agency. All efforts to have that private and confidential information removed were rebuffed by [REDACTED] of the agency involved. An investigation into this

matter was carried out by a person working in the [REDACTED] agency complained about. I questioned [REDACTED] qualifications in conducting such an investigation, but was told [REDACTED] was independent, which is implausible, considering she was investigating possible criminal acts by a senior staff member. A senior administrator informed me in writing, that basically, there was no law broken as the offence happened prior to 2009 when the Qld Privacy Laws were passed. But prior to that law being passed, the offence was covered by Commonwealth law, and should have been dealt with under that law. Later, I was informed by [REDACTED] of the CMC that it could be considered criminal to have obtained that document by deceit. Regretfully, my complaints regarding the investigation, and requests for oversight of this, and other matters of concern, fell upon deaf ears at the CMC, despite the CMC being provided with hard evidence backing my complaints of misconduct. To this day, that private and confidential document, [REDACTED], remains in that agency's files.

I suppose one solution to problems with agencies investigating their own, would be an additional group of police officers under your command, who may be unable to partake in general police duties due to a physical incapacity, but who are more than able to conduct investigations. That would also solve the problems concerning the rotation of your existing police officers, as well as introducing a greater perception of impartiality in the way investigations are conducted. Of course, the issue of police investigating police would have to be overcome by possibly requiring a stated "No conflict of Interest".

I consider that the time frames between lodging genuine complaints, and actually receiving a reply from all concerned, to be excessively long. I personally, waited for a reply for the best part of a year from the CMC, and even then my concerns were not fully addressed, the requested oversight was not even mentioned or acted on.

I hope the above gets some consideration when you finally address this very difficult problem. As I stated at the forum, my particular problems go back over ten years, without any resolution. During that time, I've heard a lot regarding "The Law", I've even managed to understand some decisions, but for me to experience justice, is something which, regretfully, has so far eluded me.

Charles Steff.