

**CORRUPTION, CRIME AND MISCONDUCT AND
CRIMINAL PROPERTY CONFISCATION AMENDMENT BILL 2017**

Third Reading

MR J.R. QUIGLEY (Butler — Attorney General) [5.05 pm]: I move —

That the bill be now read a third time.

MR P.A. KATSAMBANIS (Hillarys) [5.05 pm]: I have some brief comments. Because we went through the Corruption, Crime and Misconduct and Criminal Property Confiscation Amendment Bill in the previous sitting week, many members will have forgotten that this bill initially dealt with two completely different issues. One related to the addition of powers to the Corruption and Crime Commission so it can go after unexplained wealth when there has not been a criminal conviction. That was supported by the opposition and by all parties. We did not have any problem with it. The second part was completely unrelated to the bill. It sought to address some confusion that has arisen about the privileges of Parliament and the relationship between the CCC and examination of members of Parliament. It is a critically important issue that needs to be looked at by the Procedure and Privileges Committee. It should not hold up the passage of the substantive part of the bill to give the CCC powers to investigate unexplained wealth. The government considered the points made by the opposition and agreed that these two concepts should have their own passage. It severed the parliamentary privilege issue from the bill that is before us today at the third reading stage. I thank the government for doing that. There was some public commentary around this matter and I need to point out that no-one on the opposition side has questioned the need to make the amendment that was excised. We suggested two things. The first was that it should not have been merged with another completely unrelated issue; and, secondly, interrelated with the first, when we make changes to parliamentary privilege, they ought to be considered by the Procedure and Privileges Committee. That would have held up the passage of the rest of the bill while it was being considered. During the consideration in detail stage of debate, it came out from the Attorney General and others who were here when the changes were made that the knowledge about why those changes to the relationship between the Parliament and the CCC were made back in 2014 was a little bit scant. That highlights the need for a parliamentary privileges committee inquiry into this. I thank the government for agreeing with the long-established principles of this place that when parliamentary privilege is to be changed, altered, divvied up, or interfered with in some other way, the two houses should look at it as a separate, standalone issue and have the opportunity to speak to the Corruption and Crime Commissioner. We were informed by the speech he gave on this issue and in other public commentary and made a decision. That is a good thing. In relation to the rest of the bill, we ventilated issues when it was debated during the second reading and consideration in detail stages. We realise it is a best-endeavours situation. The opposition has great faith in both the Corruption and Crime Commission and in the Commissioner, Hon John McKechnie. We know that they will judiciously exercise the powers they have been given in good faith. We wish them all the very best in their pursuit of unexplained wealth and, like everyone else in the community, we will be quite carefully watching to see how these new powers for the CCC are exercised, the return they have for the state and, importantly the dent they make into organised crime in this state.

MR R.S. LOVE (Moore) [5.09 pm]: I rise very briefly to reiterate some of the points that the member for Hillarys has already made about the Corruption, Crime and Misconduct and Criminal Property Confiscation Amendment Bill 2017. I was not able to contribute much to the consideration in detail as I was in the chair. During the second reading debate the point was made that although the first part of the bill that deals with unexplained wealth was uncontroversial and would be supported by all parties, the second part was likely to hold up the rest. I acknowledge the fact that the government and the Attorney General took note of that and removed that clause from the bill. I assume that will allow it to come through for further discussion later on. I commend the Attorney General for that act.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.