

The Senate

Legal and Constitutional
Legislation Committee

Provisions of the Law and Justice Legislation
Amendment (Serious Drug Offences and Other
Measures) Bill 2005

August 2005

© Commonwealth of Australia 2005

ISBN 0 642 71545 9

This document was printed by the Senate Printing Unit, Department of the Senate,
Parliament House, Canberra

MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATION COMMITTEE

Members

Senator Marise Payne, **Chair**, LP, NSW
Senator Patricia Crossin, **Deputy Chair**, ALP, NT
Senator Andrew Bartlett, AD, QLD
Senator Linda Kirk, ALP, SA
Senator Brett Mason, LP, QLD
Senator Nigel Scullion, CLP, NT

Substitute Member

Senator Natasha Stott Despoja, AD, SA to replace Senator Andrew Bartlett for matters relating to the Attorney-General's Portfolio

Participating Members

Senator the Hon. Eric Abetz, LP, TAS	Senator Jeannie Ferris, LP, SA
Senator Guy Barnett, LP, TAS	Senator Steve Fielding, VIC, FFP
Senator Mark Bishop, ALP, WA	Senator John Hogg, ALP, QLD
Senator George Brandis, LP, QLD	Senator Gary Humphries, LP, ACT
Senator Bob Brown, AG, TAS	Senator Ross Lightfoot, LP, WA
Senator George Campbell, ALP, NSW	Senator Joseph Ludwig, ALP, QLD
Senator Kim Carr, ALP, VIC	Senator Kate Lundy, ALP, ACT
Senator Grant Chapman, LP, SA	Senator Julian McGauran, NPA, VIC
Senator the Hon R Colbeck, LP, TAS	Senator Jan McLucas, ALP, QLD
Senator Stephen Conroy, ALP, VIC	Senator Kerry Nettle, AG, NSW
Senator Alan Eggleston, LP, WA	Senator Robert Ray, ALP, VIC
Senator Christopher Evans, ALP, WA	Senator the Hon. Nick Sherry, ALP, TAS
Senator the Hon. John Faulkner, ALP, NSW	Senator Ursula Stephens, ALP, NSW
Senator Alan Ferguson, LP, SA	Senator John Watson, LP, TAS

Secretariat

Mr Owen Walsh	Secretary
Ms Sophie Power	Principal Research Officer
Ms Marina Seminara	Executive Assistant

Suite S1.61
Parliament House

Telephone: (02) 6277 3560 Fax: (02) 6277 5794
E-mail: legcon.sen@aph.gov.au

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Members of the Legislation Committee	iii
Abbreviations	vii
CHAPTER 1	1
INTRODUCTION	1
Background	1
Conduct of the inquiry	1
Acknowledgement	1
Note on references	2
CHAPTER 2	3
OVERVIEW OF THE BILL	3
Schedule 1 – serious drug offences	3
Other schedules	12
CHAPTER 3	15
KEY ISSUES	15
Interaction with state and territory legislation	15
Fault elements and burdens of proof	19
Other specific aspects of the drugs offence provisions	24
Other schedules in the Bill	37
The committee's view	41
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS BY THE AUSTRALIAN DEMOCRATS	43
APPENDIX 1 - Submissions Received	45
APPENDIX 2 – Witnesses who appeared before the Committee	47

ABBREVIATIONS

AFP	Australian Federal Police
the AFP Act	<i>Australian Federal Police Act 1979</i>
ANCD	Australian National Council on Drugs
the Bill	Law and Justice Legislation Amendment (Serious Drug Offences and Other Measures) Bill 2005
the Criminal Code	<i>Criminal Code Act 1995</i>
Customs	Australian Customs Service
the Customs Act	<i>Customs Act 1901</i>
the Department	Attorney-General's Department
DPP	Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions
EM	Explanatory Memorandum
FFDLR	Families and Friends for Drug Law Reform
HREOC	Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission
ICCPR	International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
the Law Council	Law Council of Australia
MCCOC	Model Criminal Code Officers Committee of the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General
MCCOC report	Model Criminal Code Officers Committee of the Standing Committee of Attorneys General, <i>Model Criminal Code Chapter 6 Serious Drug Offences Report</i> , October 1998
MDA	<i>Misuse of Drugs Act 1981</i> (WA)
MOU	memorandum of understanding
the Optional Protocol	Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict
WA Police	Western Australia Police

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background

1.1 On 15 June 2005, the Senate referred the provisions of the Law and Justice Legislation Amendment (Serious Drug Offences and Other Measures) Bill 2005 (the Bill) to the Senate Legal and Constitutional Legislation Committee for inquiry and report by 9 August 2005. On 9 August 2005, the Senate agreed to extend the reporting date to 15 August 2005.

1.2 The Bill proposes to insert a range of serious drug offences into Chapter 9 of the *Criminal Code Act 1995* (the Criminal Code), including:

- import and export offences based on existing offences in the *Customs Act 1901* (the Customs Act);
- offences based on Chapter 6 of the Model Criminal Code; and
- new offences, including offences relating to the manufacture or possession of precursor chemicals for the purpose of manufacturing illicit drugs, and to endangering children during the drug manufacturing process.

1.3 The Bill also makes a number of minor amendments to existing offences in the Criminal Code relating to children in armed conflict, and makes some minor amendments to other legislation.

1.4 Chapter 2 provides a more detailed overview of the Bill.

Conduct of the inquiry

1.5 The committee advertised the inquiry in *The Australian* newspaper on 22 June 2005, and invited submissions by 6 July 2005. Details of the inquiry, the Bill and associated documents were placed on the committee's website. The committee also wrote to over 60 organisations and individuals.

1.6 The committee received 13 submissions, and these are listed at Appendix 1. Submissions were placed on the committee's website for ease of access by the public.

1.7 The committee held a public hearing in Canberra on 3 August 2005. A list of witnesses who appeared at the hearing is at Appendix 2 and copies of the Hansard transcript are available through the Internet at <http://aph.gov.au/hansard>.

Acknowledgement

1.8 The committee thanks those organisations and individuals who made submissions and gave evidence at the public hearing.

Note on references

1.9 References in this report are to individual submissions as received by the committee, not to a bound volume. References to the committee Hansard are to the proof Hansard: page numbers may vary between the proof and the official Hansard transcript.

CHAPTER 2

OVERVIEW OF THE BILL

2.1 This chapter briefly outlines the main provisions of the Bill.

Schedule 1 – serious drug offences

2.2 Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Bill seeks to insert a range of serious drug offences into a new Part 9.1 in Chapter 9 of the Criminal Code.¹ Division 307 of the Bill sets out import and export offences, which are based on existing offences in the Customs Act. Most of the other proposed offences are based on Chapter 6 of the Model Criminal Code, which was developed in 1998 by the Model Criminal Code Officers Committee of the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General (MCCOC).² As the Explanatory Memorandum (EM) states:

Updating and moving existing serious drugs offences into the Criminal Code is part of an ongoing process of placing all the Commonwealth's serious offences in the Criminal Code.³

2.3 However, the EM notes that Chapter 6 of the Model Criminal Code has been 'modified in some respects to take into account developments since 1998.'⁴ In particular, the Bill contains new offences targeting those who manufacture or possess drugs and chemical substances used to make drugs ('precursors'). Further, the Bill includes additional offences targeting those who endanger children during the drug manufacturing process.⁵

2.4 Proposed section 300.2 sets out definitions of a number of terms used in the proposed Part 9.1 of the Criminal Code, including, for example, 'controlled drug', 'commercial quantity', 'controlled plant', 'controlled precursor', and 'marketable quantity'.

1 Part 2 of Schedule 1 of the Bill makes a number of consequential amendments to the *Crimes Act 1914* and the *Customs Act 1901*.

2 See further: Model Criminal Code Officers Committee of the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General, *Model Criminal Code Chapter 6 Serious Drug Offences Report*, October 1998 (MCCOC report).

3 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 6.

4 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 1.

5 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 1; see also Attorney-General's Department, *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 13; and *Submission 13*, pp 7-9. The possession offences in proposed sections 308.1 and 308.2 of the Bill also have no corresponding offences in the Model Criminal Code: see *Submission 13*, p. 8.

Impact on state and territory laws

2.5 Proposed section 300.4 of the Bill provides for concurrent operation of state and territory laws. The EM states:

Overlapping State and Territory drug offences will also continue to operate alongside the offences in Part 9.1 of the Criminal Code. This approach is consistent with the approach taken in other areas of criminal law, such as terrorism, fraud, computer crime, money laundering and sexual servitude. It is intended that drug offences will continue to be investigated in accordance with the established division of responsibility between federal and State and Territory law enforcement agencies. The Bill preserves the existing powers of law enforcement officers, including Customs officials and the Australian Federal Police, in relation to serious drugs offences.⁶

2.6 The EM also notes that it will be a defence to the offences in the Bill if the relevant conduct is justified or excused under a law of the Commonwealth or a state or territory.⁷ Further, the EM explains that subsection 4C(2) of the *Crimes Act 1914* protects defendants from double jeopardy by preventing multiple penalties being imposed for substantially the same conduct.⁸

Division 301 - listing additional drugs, plants and precursors

2.7 Most drugs and related substances covered by the proposed offences are set out in proposed Division 314 of the Bill, along with their threshold quantities. However, proposed Division 301 of the Bill also provides for additional substances and threshold quantities to be prescribed by either interim regulations (with a 12 month lifespan) or emergency ministerial determinations (with a 28 day lifespan). Such regulations and determinations can only be made if certain conditions are met, as set out in proposed Division 301 of the Bill. Emergency determinations will be legislative instruments for the purposes of the *Legislative Instruments Act 2003*.⁹

Division 302 – trafficking in controlled drugs

2.8 Proposed Division 302 sets out offences for trafficking controlled drugs.¹⁰ Division 302 sets out three grades of trafficking offence, based on the quantity of controlled drug involved:

- commercial quantity (attracting a maximum penalty of life imprisonment);

6 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 2.

7 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 1.

8 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 13.

9 *Explanatory Memorandum*, pp 13-16.

10 The term 'traffics' is defined broadly in proposed section 302.1 to include conduct extending beyond sale to the ancillary activities of transport and delivery, as well as preparatory conduct such as preparation for supply, packaging, and possession with the intention of selling a drug.

- marketable quantity (attracting a maximum penalty of 25 years imprisonment); and
- the general trafficking offence which has no minimum quantity (attracting a maximum penalty of 10 years).

2.9 For the first two most serious trafficking offences, absolute liability attaches to the circumstance of quantity of controlled drug. This means that the prosecution does not need to prove that the defendant either knew, or was reckless as to whether, the quantity involved was a commercial or marketable quantity.¹¹

2.10 However, a qualified defence of mistake is available to a defendant who can prove, on the balance of probabilities, that at the time of the alleged offence he or she mistakenly believed that the quantity of the drug involved was less than the relevant threshold quantity. In those circumstances, the defendant may be found guilty of a lesser offence, depending on the quantity of drug the defendant mistakenly believed was involved. In order for the qualified defence to operate, it is not necessary for the defendant to prove that his or her belief as to quantity was a reasonable belief.¹²

2.11 The EM states that:

Applying absolute liability to the element of quantity and applying a qualified defence of mistake as to quantity will markedly improve the enforceability of these offences. This approach was recommended by MCCOC in 2003 as a modification to the model offences originally proposed in its 1998 report, and was also endorsed by the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General.¹³

2.12 Proposed subsection 302.5 further provides that where the prosecution can show that a 'trafficable quantity'¹⁴ is involved in the offence, the relevant commercial element of the offence need not be proven, but is presumed.¹⁵ That is, the person involved in the offence will be taken to have had the necessary intention or belief concerning the sale of the substance for a commercial purpose. The EM states that it is intended that a trafficable quantity will be set at an amount less than a marketable quantity.¹⁶

11 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 20.

12 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 21.

13 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 21; see also Attorney-General's Department, *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 23.

14 'Trafficable quantity' is defined in section 300.2 and is prescribed in relation to a range of controlled drugs and plants in proposed Division 314.

15 Note that similar presumptions relating to 'trafficable quantity' are contained in other offences in the Bill: see, for example, proposed sections 303.7; 305.6 and 309.5.

16 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 24.

Division 303 – commercial cultivation of controlled plants

2.13 Proposed Division 303 sets out offences for cultivation of controlled plants for commercial purposes. As with the trafficking offences in Division 302, there will be three grades of cultivation offence, based on the quantity of controlled plants involved:

- commercial quantity (attracting a maximum penalty of life imprisonment);
- marketable quantity (attracting a maximum penalty of 25 years imprisonment); and
- no minimum quantity (attracting a maximum penalty of 10 years).

2.14 Again, for the two most serious cultivation offences, absolute liability attaches to the circumstance of quantity of controlled plant, with a qualified defence of mistake as to quantity.

Division 304 – selling controlled plants

2.15 Proposed Division 304 sets out offences for the sale of controlled plants. Two situations are targeted by these proposed offences:

- sale of seedlings for cultivation (for example, where a person sells seedlings to growers who will each cultivate a small number of plants); and
- sale of growing plants for harvest (including where land is sold with its crop, as well as where a crop alone is sold for harvest).¹⁷

2.16 The EM also notes that a purchaser who cultivates, as well as harvests, the plants will be caught by both the cultivation and sale offences — because harvest is included in the meaning of cultivation.¹⁸

2.17 As with offences in other divisions, three grades of offence are proposed based on the quantity of controlled plants involved: commercial quantity (with a maximum penalty of life imprisonment); marketable quantity (with a maximum penalty of 25 years imprisonment); and no minimum quantity (maximum penalty of 10 years). Again, for the two most serious offences, absolute liability attaches to the circumstance of quantity of controlled plant, with a qualified defence of mistake as to quantity.

Division 305 – commercial manufacture of controlled drugs

2.18 Proposed Division 305 sets out offences for the illicit commercial manufacture¹⁹ of controlled drugs. The EM states that:

17 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 30.

18 *Explanatory Memorandum*, pp 29-30.

19 'Manufacture' and associated terms are defined in proposed sections 305.1 and 305.2.

Although occasional instances of the manufacture of heroin and other narcotics are reported, the majority of offences falling under this proposed Division will involve synthetic drugs, such as amphetamines, which can be manufactured from chemicals and substances which have legitimate uses in industry.²⁰

2.19 As with the previous Divisions, three grades of drug manufacturing offence (with similar penalties) are proposed, based on the quantity of drug involved. For the two most serious offences, absolute liability attaches to the circumstance of quantity of controlled drug, with a qualified defence of mistake as to quantity.

Division 306 – pre-trafficking controlled precursors

2.20 Division 306 creates new federal offences targeting illicit dealings in precursor chemicals for the purpose of manufacturing controlled drugs. The EM states that:

Precursors are chemical substances that are used in the manufacture of controlled drugs, particularly amphetamines. Most, if not all, precursors also have legitimate uses, and are subject to regulatory controls to limit their diversion to the illicit manufacture of amphetamines and other controlled drugs.²¹

2.21 Proposed section 306.1 defines the term 'pre-traffics' to cover a range of conduct involving precursors. In particular, the definition of pre-trafficking covers the sale, commercially-motivated manufacture or possession, of a substance, where there is an intention to use the substance to manufacture a controlled drug or a belief that another person intends to use the substance for that purpose.²²

2.22 As the EM notes, the pre-trafficking offences have slightly lower penalties than the trafficking offences to reflect the fact that the conduct involved is preparatory to illicit drug manufacturing.²³ Once again, three tiers of pre-trafficking offences are proposed, depending on the quantity of controlled precursor involved: a commercial quantity pre-trafficking offence (maximum penalty of 25 years imprisonment); a marketable quantity offence (maximum penalty of 15 years imprisonment); and a base offence with no minimum quantity attracting a maximum penalty of 7 years.

Division 307 – import-export offences

2.23 The import and export offences in proposed Division 307 will bring existing drug offences, primarily in section 233B of the Customs Act, into the Criminal

20 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 32.

21 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 37.

22 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 37.

23 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 37.

Code.²⁴ The EM states that the proposed offences 'have been designed to accord as closely as possible to the offences they are replacing in the Customs Act'.²⁵

2.24 However, there are some differences between the proposed offences and the existing offences in the Customs Act. For example, some maximum penalties will be increased under the proposed offences, as recommended by the MCCOC Report. The penalties for the offence of importing or exporting a middle-tier quantity of cannabis will be increased from a maximum of 10 years imprisonment to a maximum of 25 years imprisonment. The EM states that this will 'bring the treatment of cannabis into line with the treatment of other illicit drugs'.²⁶ Further, an additional penalty tier of 10 years imprisonment is proposed where relatively small quantities of drugs are imported or exported but the prosecution can prove the offence was commercially motivated. Currently, under the Customs Act, the maximum penalty for all illicit imports or exports involving less than a trafficable quantity is 2 years imprisonment.²⁷

2.25 Proposed Division 307 also creates new offences of importing and exporting border controlled precursors, as recommended in the MCCOC Report.²⁸

2.26 In addition, under Division 307, the issue of quantity of drug would be placed before the arbiter of fact (judge or jury). According to the EM, 'this will remedy existing legal vulnerabilities with the structure of the offences in the Customs Act that have previously been the subject of legal challenge'.²⁹

2.27 The categories of offences in Division 307 are:

- importing and exporting border controlled drugs or border controlled plants (subdivision A);
- possessing unlawfully imported border controlled drugs or border controlled plants (subdivision B);
- possessing border controlled drugs or border controlled plants reasonably suspected of having been unlawfully imported (subdivision C); and
- importing and exporting border controlled precursors (subdivision D).

2.28 Consistent with offences in the rest of the Bill, there are three tiers of offences for each of these categories, and absolute liability attaches to the circumstance of quantity of border controlled drug for offences in this proposed division. However, unlike the other offences in the Bill, the alternative verdict provisions do not apply to

24 Proposed Part 3 of Schedule 1 of the Bill repeals existing offences in the Customs Act.

25 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 46; also Attorney-General's Department, *Submission 13*, pp 4-5.

26 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 45.

27 *Explanatory Memorandum*, pp 45-46.

28 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 46.

29 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 45.

offences under Division 307 and the qualified defence of mistake as to quantity is not available.³⁰ The EM states that this is consistent with the current offences in the Customs Act, and will ensure that the offences in proposed Division 307 are no more difficult to prove than the existing offences in the Customs Act.³¹

Division 308 – possession offences

2.29 Proposed division 308 sets out four categories of possession offences:

- possessing controlled drugs (with up to two years imprisonment);
- possessing controlled precursors (with up to two years imprisonment);
- possessing plant material, equipment or instructions for commercial cultivation of controlled plants (with up to seven years imprisonment); and
- possessing substance, equipment or instructions for commercial manufacture of controlled drugs (with up to seven years imprisonment).

Division 309 – drug offences involving children

2.30 Proposed Division 309 creates a regime of offences directed against adults who exploit children³² for commercial gain in the illicit drug industry. The offences included in this proposed division extend to persons who supply controlled drugs to children or who use children to facilitate trafficking controlled drugs. This proposed division also includes offences against persons who procure children to sell, prepare for supply, transport, guard or conceal a controlled drug or procure children to sell, manufacture or possess a controlled precursor. Under this division, the penalties available for the offences of importing and exporting border controlled drugs, plants or precursors will also be increased where those offences involve the exploitation of children.³³

2.31 Strict liability attaches to the age of the child for all of the offences in this proposed division. This means that the prosecution does not have to prove that the defendant knew that the individual to whom they supplied the controlled drug was in fact a child. However, subsection 6.1(2) of the Criminal Code makes available to the defendant the defence of mistake of fact. The EM suggests that:

Strict liability is appropriate in this context given the serious harm caused to children when they are supplied with controlled drugs or procured to engage in other unlawful activities involving controlled drugs, plants and precursors.³⁴

30 *Explanatory Memorandum*, pp 45 and 57.

31 *Explanatory Memorandum*, pp 45 and 57.

32 A child is defined as an individual under 18 years of age: proposed section 300.2.

33 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 63.

34 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 64.

2.32 Further, as with other offences in the Bill, absolute liability applies as to the quantity of controlled drug involved under proposed Division 309, although a qualified defence of mistake is available.

Division 310 – harm and danger to children

2.33 Proposed Division 310 creates offences directed against adults who endanger children under 14 years of age by exposing them to the manufacture of controlled drugs or controlled precursors. First, stand-alone offences are created for:

- engaging in conduct that gives rise to a danger of serious harm to a child under 14 by exposing the child to the manufacture of a controlled drug or controlled precursor (proposed section 310.2); and
- causing actual harm to a child under 14 by exposing the child to the manufacture of a controlled drug or controlled precursor (proposed section 310.3).

2.34 Proposed section 310.4 then sets out circumstances of aggravation for the manufacturing of controlled drugs offences included in proposed sections 305.4 and 305.5, and the pre-trafficking controlled precursor offences included in proposed sections 306.2, 306.3 and 306.4. These offences target persons who have been found guilty of manufacturing a controlled drug or pre-trafficking a controlled precursor where the commission of that offence gives rise to a danger of harm to a child under 14.³⁵

2.35 As with proposed Division 309, strict liability attaches to the age of the child for all of the offences in this proposed division. The EM notes that:

The MCCOC model endangerment offences are aggravated when committed against children under 10 years of age, but this age threshold is considered too low in the drug endangerment context. On the other hand, persons who are 14 years or older are largely capable of looking after themselves. A 14 year age threshold represents a good balance.³⁶

Division 311 – combining quantities of drugs, plants or precursors

2.36 The aggregation provisions in proposed Division 311 allow prosecutions for offences based on combined amounts of drugs, plants or precursors. The EM states that this division will allow prosecutions to be based on:

...evidence of a course of action which amounts, in its totality, to major drug criminality. This is available even though individual instances of dealing, manufacture or cultivation may involve relatively small quantities.³⁷

35 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 77.

36 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 77.

37 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 83.

2.37 Three types of aggregation are available to the prosecution for the proposed Part 9.1 offences:

- combining different parcels on the same occasion (subdivision A);
- combining parcels from organised commercial activities (subdivision B); and
- combining parcels from multiple offences occurring within a certain period (subdivision C).

Division 312 – working out quantities of drugs, plants or precursors

2.38 Proposed Division 312 contains provisions for determining the quantities of controlled substances, particularly when different kinds of controlled substances are involved, or where dilute quantities of substances are used.

Division 313 – defences and alternative verdicts

2.39 Proposed Division 313 sets out defences that apply to the offences in proposed Part 9.1. There are two complete defences that relate to conduct that is justified or excused by or under state or territory law (proposed section 313.1) and where there is a reasonable belief that conduct is justified or excused by or under a law (proposed section 313.2).

2.40 Three alternative verdict provisions operate as qualified defences (proposed sections 313.3 to 313.5). For example, section 313.4 applies where there is a mistake as to the quantity of drug involved. Under this provision, a defendant does not completely escape criminal liability but may be found guilty of an offence with the same or lesser penalty.³⁸

Division 314 – drugs, plants, precursors and quantities

2.41 Proposed Division 314 contains two sets of interim lists of controlled substances and threshold quantities. The first set applies to the import-export offences – that is, lists of 'border controlled drugs', 'border controlled plants', 'border controlled precursors'. The EM notes that these lists have been based on the lists that apply to the current import-export offences under the Customs Act.³⁹ The second set of lists are lists of 'controlled drugs', 'controlled plants', 'controlled precursors', which apply to the other offences under the Bill.

2.42 In setting out these lists in the legislation, the Bill departs from the MCCOC recommendation that the lists of controlled substances and threshold quantities be contained in interim regulations. The rationale for the MCCOC recommendation was

38 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 99.

39 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 104. Note that there are some minor technical differences between the lists prescribed under the Customs Act and the lists in the Bill. These differences were explained by the Attorney-General's Department: see *Submission 13*, pp 3-6.

so that the lists could be 'updated quickly and therefore be responsive to changes in the illicit drug market.' However, the EM states that:

...given the serious nature of the offences in proposed Part 9.1 (with some offences carrying the highest penalty available in Australia — life imprisonment), and the fact that the lists of controlled substances, border controlled substances and threshold quantities define the scope of those offences, it was considered that those lists should be contained in the parent Act and subject to full Parliamentary scrutiny.⁴⁰

2.43 The EM further notes that the Bill retains the capacity to respond to rapid changes in the illicit drug market through proposed Division 301. As discussed earlier, Division 301 allows new substances and quantities to be added on a temporary basis through interim regulations and emergency determinations.⁴¹

2.44 The EM refers to the lists in the Bill as 'interim lists', to be revised by a Working Party established by the Ministerial Council on Drug Strategy. According to the EM, this Working Party is developing a uniform schedule of illicit substances and threshold quantities to be adopted by all Australian jurisdictions, which is not due to be released before late 2005. The EM explains that:

As the Bill includes important new child protection offences and precursor offences, the proposal is not to delay the Bill waiting for the Working Party recommendations, but instead to include interim lists of drugs and quantities to be revised when the Working Party makes its recommendations.⁴²

2.45 The EM further notes that:

Pending the availability of the model lists being developed by the Working Party, a minimal approach has been adopted with the domestic lists limited to a relatively small number of common illicit drugs and plants and precursor chemicals that can be used to manufacture those drugs and plants. On an interim basis, the threshold quantities for those substances have been set at a level that is consistent with the quantities prescribed by other jurisdictions that have introduced the model drug offences.⁴³

Other schedules

2.46 The Bill also makes minor amendments to other legislation. These are outlined below.⁴⁴

40 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 104.

41 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 104.

42 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 103.

43 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 104; see also Attorney-General's Department, *Submission 13*, pp 1-2.

44 This section draws on pp 3-4 and pp 117-124 of the *Explanatory Memorandum*.

2.47 Schedule 2 gives effect to an obligation under the *Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict* (the Optional Protocol). The Optional Protocol requires parties to take all measures necessary to criminalise the recruitment or use in hostilities of persons under the age of 18 years by armed groups not part of the State. The Bill will comply with this obligation by amending the Criminal Code to provide that these activities constitute federal offences, punishable by imprisonment for up to 17 years.

2.48 Schedule 3 amends the *Proceeds of Crime Act 2002* to enable a court to make a restraining order over a bankrupt's property where the property has vested in a trustee under the *Bankruptcy Act 1996*. According to the EM, this will 'give effect to existing policy intentions of the *Proceeds of Crime Act 2002*.'⁴⁵

2.49 Schedule 4 amends the *Australian Federal Police Act 1979* (the AFP Act) to clarify that the functions of the Australian Federal Police (AFP) extend to:

- providing assistance to, and cooperating with, Australian and foreign law enforcement agencies, intelligence or security agencies and government regulatory agencies; and
- establishing, developing and monitoring peace, stability and security in other countries.

2.50 This schedule will also create an exception to the secrecy provision in the AFP Act to clarify that the AFP can disclose personal information about a person with that person's consent.

2.51 Schedule 5 amends the *Mutual Assistance in Business Regulation Act 1992* to facilitate transfer of responsibility from the Attorney-General to the Treasurer for consideration of requests received from foreign regulators for information, documents or evidence.

2.52 Schedule 6 inserts an explanatory example after subsection 20A(1) of the *Financial Transaction Reports Act 1988* to clarify that cash dealers are not required to obtain multiple identification references from a person who is a signatory to different accounts with the cash dealer. The EM states that this is intended to clarify subsection 20A(1) 'especially for the benefit of solicitors administering deceased estates'.⁴⁶

2.53 Schedule 7 repeals the *Defence (Transitional Provisions) Act 1950* which no longer has any legal effect.

2.54 Schedule 8 makes a technical amendment to a power in the Customs Act which allows Customs officers to detain people who are on bail and are caught trying to leave Australia in breach of their bail conditions. The EM states that:

45 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 117.

46 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 122.

This amendment will put beyond doubt that the detention power applies where the relevant bail condition is worded to prohibit the person 'from approaching an international departure point'.⁴⁷

2.55 Schedule 9 exempts the Australian Transaction Reports and Analysis Centre from the operation of the *Freedom of Information Act 1982* in relation to documents concerning information communicated to it under section 16 of the *Financial Transaction Reports Act 1988*.⁴⁸

47 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 3.

48 See further *Explanatory Memorandum*, pp 123-124.

CHAPTER 3

KEY ISSUES

3.1 This chapter discusses the key issues and concerns raised in submissions, and in particular:

- the Bill's interaction with state and territory legislation;
- fault elements and burdens of proof in the Bill's drug offence provisions;
- other specific aspects of the drug offence provisions;
- policy aspects of the drug offence provisions; and
- other schedules of the Bill.

3.2 Most submissions received by the committee were focussed on the drug offence provisions in Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Bill, and this chapter therefore focuses on these provisions.¹

3.3 In general, the majority of submissions expressed support for the Bill.² However, the Families and Friends for Drug Law Reform (FFDLR) expressed serious misgivings about the Bill, and queried whether the Bill would meet some of its objectives.³ The Law Council of Australia (the Law Council) also raised a number of concerns in relation to the Bill. Some submissions also raised issues in relation to the Bill's interaction with state and/or territory legislation.⁴ This is discussed further below.

Interaction with state and territory legislation

3.4 A key objective of the Bill is 'to achieve national consistency in this very significant area of criminal law'.⁵ A number of submissions were supportive of this objective, and the Bill as a means of achieving this objective.

1 Note that unless otherwise stated, references in this report to proposed sections or divisions of the Bill are to those sections or divisions in Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Bill.

2 See, for example, Australian National Council on Drugs, *Submission 1*; Queensland Police Service, *Submission 2*; Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions, *Submission 3*; Dr Gregor Urbas, *Submission 4*; Australian Customs Service, *Submission 9*; Drug Free Australia, *Submission 12*.

3 *Submission 8*.

4 See, for example, Western Australia Police (WA Police), *Submission 5*; FFDLR, *Submission 8*, pp 21-23.

5 The Hon Philip Ruddock MP, Attorney-General, *House of Representatives Hansard*, 26 May 2005, p. 6; see also Attorney-General's Department, *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 14.

3.5 For example, the Australian National Council on Drugs (ANCD) recognised 'the inherent benefits of the criminal justice sector implementing a consistent approach across jurisdictions to the treatment of serious drug offences.'⁶ The ANCD was particularly supportive of the development of a nationally consistent list of drugs and quantities to be linked to the model drug offences.⁷

3.6 Similarly, Dr Gregor Urbas welcomed the Bill's 'move towards greater consistency and uniformity in Australian drug law'.⁸ He hoped that the Bill would provide a 'more settled and comprehensive model for the States and Territories to follow in reforming their own criminal laws.'⁹

3.7 The Queensland Police Service stated that the Bill mirrors some of the provisions of Queensland's *Drugs Misuse Act 1990*. The Queensland Police Service also observed that the Bill would not affect the operations of the *Drugs Misuse Act 1990* (Qld) 'because the Bill expressly states that the Commonwealth law is not intended to limit the State law'.¹⁰ The Queensland Police Service further submitted that:

Similar offences are currently being formulated for inclusion in the State legislation and the new penalties proposed in the Bill are consistent with existing State legislation.¹¹

3.8 Similarly, the South Australia Police noted that draft South Australian legislation to amend its *Controlled Substances Act 1985* (SA) is currently being considered, and that the changes proposed in the draft state legislation and the Bill are 'largely consistent with each other'.¹²

3.9 In contrast, Mr Brian McConnell of the FFDLR argued that the Bill is 'a radical and heavy-handed extension of the Commonwealth's legislative authority into the criminal law on drugs'.¹³ The FFDLR were particularly concerned that the Bill would give the Commonwealth greater control over the area of drugs, and potentially provides a means to 'trump' several aspects of the law of some states and territories. In particular, they were concerned about the impact on:

- provisions for 'expiation notices' for minor cannabis offences (under legislation in South Australia, Western Australia and the Australian Capital Territory); and

6 *Submission 1*, p. 1.

7 *Submission 1*, p. 1.

8 *Submission 4*, p. 1.

9 *Submission 4*, p. 5.

10 *Submission 2*, p. 1.

11 *Submission 2*, p. 1.

12 *Submission 7*, p. 1; see also WA Police, *Submission 5*, p. 2.

13 *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 8; see also *Submission 8*, p. 21.

- legislation for the provision of syringes and medically supervised injecting rooms (under legislation in New South Wales and the Australian Capital Territory).¹⁴

3.10 Mr Bill Bush from the FFDLR further queried the need for Commonwealth legislation in this area at all:

...why is the Commonwealth at this stage enacting general drug legislation applying across the Commonwealth?...[D]rug legislation has been here for years and years, and it has been regulated...on the basis that it has been adequately covered by state legislation.¹⁵

3.11 The Western Australia Police (WA Police) also expressed concerns about aspects of the Bill's relationship with state legislation. The WA Police had no objection to the transfer of existing offences from the Customs Act into the Criminal Code. However, the WA Police believed that other offences proposed in the Bill could 'result in complicated over-regulation in relation to controlled drugs and plants.'¹⁶ The WA Police noted that certain provisions in proposed Divisions 302, 303 and 305 of the Bill create offences that are already provided for under state legislation such as the *Misuse of Drugs Act 1981* (WA) (MDA). For example, in relation to the manufacturing offences in proposed Division 305 of the Bill, the WA Police argued that:

...all matters related to manufacturing of illicit drugs should be controlled by State legislation without the complication of Commonwealth legislation.¹⁷

3.12 At the same time, the Western Australian (WA) Government submitted that:

The Bill provides for the concurrent operation of the Commonwealth law alongside existing State and Territory law, and if enacted, its provisions would not interfere with the operation of our State regime. The new offences do, however, apply to drug dealing interstate and give more flexibility to Commonwealth law enforcement agencies to encroach on matters that were previously for exclusive consideration by the State.¹⁸

3.13 The WA Government concluded that the Bill 'conforms largely in content with the Western Australian regime and any divergences are, in any event, in line with the overarching purpose and appropriate intentions of our own regime.'¹⁹

14 *Submission 8*, pp 22-23; see also *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, pp 11-12.

15 *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 11; see also *Submission 8*, p. 21.

16 *Submission 5*, p. 1.

17 *Submission 5*, p. 2.

18 *Submission 11*, p. 1.

19 *Submission 11*, p. 3.

3.14 At the hearing, a representative of the Attorney-General's Department (the Department) acknowledged that if the Bill is passed:

For the first time there will be a comprehensive range of drug offences at Commonwealth level and that will give Commonwealth agencies the flexibility to deal with the full range of conduct that they come across in the course of drug investigations.²⁰

3.15 The representative continued:

The objective of the Bill is not to override state and territory laws. They will be preserved by the operation of section 300.4. The aim is to avoid a situation where Commonwealth agencies need to prosecute under state law or refer a case to state authorities in order to deal with the full range of conduct that comes to light in a Commonwealth investigation.²¹

3.16 Similarly, the Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP) submitted that:

...section 300.4 provides that Part 9.1 is not intended to exclude or limit the concurrent operation of any law of a State or Territory. This has the effect that some alleged conduct might be prosecuted pursuant to State or Commonwealth law.²²

3.17 The DPP believed that the new Commonwealth offences, particularly in proposed Divisions 302-306, would have the advantage that:

...in many circumstances it will not be necessary for joint trials of Commonwealth and State/Territory offences to be conducted, as Commonwealth provisions may be relied on. This will avoid the complexity involved in running trials involving both Commonwealth and State/Territory offences.²³

3.18 The DPP further noted the EM's statement that it is intended that drug offences will continue to be investigated in accordance with the established division of responsibility between federal and state and territory enforcement agencies.²⁴

3.19 Similarly, the Attorney-General stated in his second reading speech that the offences in the Bill:

...will operate alongside state and territory offences to give more flexibility to law enforcement agencies. This approach will ensure there are no gaps between federal and state laws that can be exploited by drug cartels.²⁵

20 *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 13.

21 *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 13.

22 *Submission 3*, p. 1.

23 *Submission 3*, p. 2; see also DPP, *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, pp 14 and 23.

24 *Submission 3*, p. 1.

Fault elements and burdens of proof

Presumptions and absolute liability

3.20 Some submissions expressed concerns about the use of presumptions, and the application of absolute liability, to certain elements of some offences in the Bill.

3.21 For example, the Law Council noted that there are a range of presumptions attached to certain offences in the Bill, including:

- presumptions, where a trafficable quantity of drugs is involved, of an intention or belief to sell the substance,²⁶ and
- presumptions of intention to manufacture, or to sell where another person has manufactured a substance, where that manufacture was not authorised by law (where required) and/or a marketable quantity of the substance is involved.²⁷

3.22 The Law Council further noted that, for many offences, absolute liability attaches to the quantity of controlled drugs or plant.²⁸ Mr John North, President of the Law Council, stated that the Law Council was opposed to 'this scheme of shifting the burden of proof upon the defendant by introducing a raft of presumptions and absolute liability.'²⁹ The Law Council argued that the operation of these presumptions and absolute liability favour the prosecution, and 'effectively shifts the burden from proving guilt to establishing innocence.'³⁰ The Law Council felt that this was 'unfair and unjust' and undermined the presumption of innocence as set out in article 14(2) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR).³¹ Mr North further explained:

...the trouble is if you are the innocent person who is caught up in the absolute liability or in the presumptions and find yourself incarcerated for 20 years to life on a serious matter when you are not guilty. That is the reason why, for murder and everything else, we say that when the crown, with all of its resources, goes against the individual, the crown should prove things beyond reasonable doubt...³²

25 The Hon Philip Ruddock MP, Attorney-General, *House of Representatives Hansard*, 26 May 2005, p. 6.

26 See, for example, proposed ss. 302.5, 303.7, 305.6 and 309.5 as outlined in chapter 2 of this report.

27 *Submission 10*, p. 3; see also proposed ss. 306.6, 306.7, 306.8, 307.14(1) and 307.14(3).

28 See, for example, proposed ss. 302.2(3), 302.3(3), 303.4(3), 303.5(3), 304.1(3), 304.2(3), 305.3(3), 305.4(3), 306.2(3), 306.3(3) as outlined in chapter 2 of this report.

29 *Submission 10*, p. 3; *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 3.

30 *Submission 10*, p. 4.

31 *Submission 10*, p. 4.

32 *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 4.

3.23 The FFDLR were also concerned about the application of absolute liability, particularly in relation to elements of the import-export offences in proposed Division 307 of the Bill,³³ and recommended that:

The evidentiary rules in favour of the prosecution in cls. 307.6 and 307.9 and in related provisions should be trimmed back better to reflect the basic rule of the criminal law that the prosecution should prove its case beyond a reasonable doubt.³⁴

3.24 However, the DPP submitted that:

Based on our practical experience in prosecuting drug matters, in our submission providing for absolute liability in relation to this single element is justified and vital to the effective operation of these offences. Were it not applied, a requirement to prove fault in relation to this element would undermine the effectiveness of the offence and its deterrent effect. Currently, the objective fact of the amount of drug involved determines the available penalty, though subjective knowledge as to the amount may be relevant to the sentence imposed.³⁵

3.25 Similarly, the FFDLR also raised concerns about the presumptions in the Bill where a trafficable quantity of drugs is involved. In particular, the FFDLR were concerned about the application of this presumption in proposed sections 302.5 and 303.7 in the context of user-dealers and cannabis growers. For example, the FFDLR argued that a single, average size cannabis plant could meet the threshold for a trafficable quantity of 250g (as specified in proposed section 314.2). The FFDLR argued that a home cultivator and consumer of cannabis could therefore be caught by these provisions, and as a result:

...the onerous burden will be thrown onto the cultivator of an average size plant to prove that he or she was not cultivating to sell.³⁶

3.26 The FFDLR disagreed with the statement in the EM that trafficable quantity thresholds, at least in relation to cannabis, are 'indicative of an intention to sell rather than personal use'.³⁷ The FFDLR therefore suggested that the reversal of the burden of proof in proposed sections 302.5 and 303.7 should be deleted because it 'unfairly targets those whom drug policy and law should be designed to help'.³⁸

3.27 However, the DPP expressed support for these provisions, stating that:

33 See discussion of proposed Division 307 in chapter 2 of this report; *Explanatory Memorandum*, pp 46 and 52.

34 *Submission 8*, p. 4.

35 *Submission 3*, pp 3-4.

36 *Submission 8*, p. 5.

37 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 29; and *Submission 8*, pp 5-6.

38 *Submission 8*, pp 5-6.

...this presumption is appropriate when such a [trafficable] quantity is involved. The presumption does not apply if the person proves on the balance of probabilities that he or she had neither that intention nor belief.³⁹

3.28 The DPP further maintained that:

In our view stating that absolute liability applies to quantity, together with the burden discussed above on the defendant to establish a lack of commercial intention are essential components of these offences, as without them, the prosecution would face formidable difficulty in securing convictions. The effective operation of these proposed offences is heavily dependent on these provisions.⁴⁰

3.29 However, Mr John North of the Law Council argued that:

People get caught on a daily basis coming into Australia with suitcases of drugs or drugs hidden in machinery or anything else, and convictions are regularly obtained...If someone is found bringing drugs in on their person then the presumption is there...It is a very difficult presumption to get over. In other ways they are getting convictions on a daily basis in the courts under the existing law. There is not an outcry that lots of drug smugglers or drug dealers are walking the streets having been freed.⁴¹

3.30 In the same vein, Mr Bill Bush of the FFDLR argued that:

The government's intention should be to police existing drug laws and, if necessary, to put more resources into the policing of those laws. But to remove those protections which...are protections that were established through many centuries and of which we are the inheritors—to do it for this particular end, or for any reason, is unsound.⁴²

3.31 However, a representative of the Department pointed out that the use of rebuttable presumptions is not new in drug law:

There is nothing new about reversing the onus of proof in relation to various elements. It is in the Customs Act. It is in state laws...law enforcement community agencies...find those essential to the proper prosecution of the offences. The reason is quite simple. Because it is very difficult to know what is going on in the mind of a person, you have to look at the surrounding circumstances...If you find somebody with a warehouse full of drugs, you can assume they intend to sell it.⁴³

3.32 Indeed, South Australia Police submitted that a similar presumption occurs in section 32 of the *Controlled Substances Act 1985* (SA), noting that it had found that:

39 *Submission 3*, p. 2.

40 *Submission 3*, p. 2.

41 *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 7.

42 *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 9.

43 *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 21.

...the inclusion of an evidentiary presumption in the State legislation has proven to be of significant benefit to this agency when prosecuting drug sale and supply matters.⁴⁴

3.33 Similarly, the WA Government observed that its MDA also imposed a presumption of commercial intent where a specified threshold quantity is involved. It noted, however, that the Bill imposes this presumption in a wider range of circumstances, such as the preparation, transportation or concealment of a trafficable quantity.⁴⁵

Import-export offences – fault elements

3.34 Some submissions also commented on the fault elements in proposed Division 307 of the Bill. For example, Dr Gregor Urbas welcomed proposed Division 307, stating his belief that this will bring 'a greater degree of clarity and predictability to this area of Commonwealth criminal law.'⁴⁶ Dr Urbas explained that section 233B of the Customs Act has been problematic, noting that:

...there has been considerable judicial uncertainty about the *mens rea* or...fault elements for the importation and possession offences under this provision.⁴⁷

3.35 Dr Urbas observed that the provisions of the Bill are consistent with the courts' analysis of section 233B of the Customs Act, but:

...given the altogether more explicit drafting of the new provisions, in conformity with the methodology underlying the Criminal Code, there should now be little doubt as to the requisite fault elements for the offence and the appropriate directions to give to a jury.⁴⁸

3.36 Dr Urbas concluded:

...it is to be hoped that the days of successful appeals based on judicial uncertainty over the requisite physical and fault elements for the central offence of narcotics importation are in the past. While s233B and the caselaw it has generated have been important in shaping Australian criminal law, and of considerable interest to legal academics, the greater certainty provided by relocating this and other Commonwealth drug offences under the *Criminal Code Act 1995* (Cth) is to be welcomed.⁴⁹

44 *Submission 7*, p. 1.

45 *Submission 11*, p. 2.

46 *Submission 4*, p. 5.

47 *Submission 4*, p. 2.

48 *Submission 4*, p. 4.

49 *Submission 4*, p. 4.

3.37 In contrast, the Law Council expressed opposition to the proposed standards in the Bill. The Law Council pointed to the history of section 233B of the Customs Act, and suggested that the proposed amendments would replace the higher threshold of 'guilty knowledge' with a lower standard of 'recklessness'.⁵⁰ It argued further that:

A central objective of criminal law of deterring criminal behaviour is better achieved by punishing a person who knowingly and intentionally commits an offence.⁵¹

3.38 The Law Council concluded that:

...it is unnecessary to lower the fault element to recklessness as there is authority that in appropriate circumstances the requisite intention or knowledge may be inferred where there is awareness of a "real chance" that drugs were imported...the High Court [has] held that it is sufficient to infer intention or knowledge if the accused realised there was a likelihood that the substance he or she was importing or had in his or her possession was a prohibited drug.⁵²

3.39 However, the Department and the DPP disagreed with the Law Council's interpretation of the existing provisions in the Customs Act, and its conclusion that the Bill would lower the standards of proof required.⁵³ A representative of the DPP stated that the provisions:

...do not involve lowering the proof; the stated aim was to replicate the current proof requirements of the Customs Act in the proposed offences in division 307 of the bill.⁵⁴

3.40 Similarly, a representative of the Department stated that 'the approach that has been taken is that there should be no diminution of existing law dealing with drug offences at Commonwealth level or with the penalty levels that apply to them.'⁵⁵ Indeed, the DPP submitted that, in relation to the offences in proposed Division 307:

The proposed offences require that the prosecution must prove that a defendant was reckless as to whether the substance involved was a border controlled drug. This replicates the existing position in section 233B of the Customs Act 1901 after it was amended by the *Crimes Legislation Amendment (Telecommunications Offences and Other Measures Act (No 2)*

50 *Submission 10*, pp 4-5; see also Mr John North, Law Council, *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 3.

51 *Submission 10*, p. 5.

52 *Submission 10*, p. 5.

53 *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, pp 13 and 14.

54 *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 14.

55 *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, 13.

2004 which came into effect on 28 September 2004. In our submission this is appropriate.⁵⁶

Other specific aspects of the drugs offence provisions

3.41 A number of other specific aspects of the drugs offence provisions were also raised in submissions and evidence. Some of these are discussed below.

Interim regulations

3.42 The Law Council raised concerns with the use of interim regulations and emergency determinations in proposed Division 301 to prescribe controlled substances and threshold quantities for 12 months. As Mr John North stated:

The interim regulations concern us because they will have an effective life of 12 months and they will allow authorities to proscribe substances that have not yet been checked by experts. The Law Council are concerned that interim regulations could take effect without any adequate public consultation and there would be great uncertainty created by regulations due to lack of public knowledge. There is an absence of full consideration by experts. The possibility of not enacting the legislative amendments prior to the lapse of the interim regulations is also of concern.⁵⁷

3.43 The Law Council therefore recommended that:

...interim regulations should be introduced once full consideration by experts has occurred. This will provide some certainty and minimise changes in the legal status of substances and plants. For the same reasons, the Law Council also recommends that legislative amendments be introduced as soon as practicable following the introduction of interim regulations.⁵⁸

3.44 Mr North elaborated on this in response to the committee's questioning:

...the people who are brought before the courts under these new bills need...to understand the law. You cannot understand the law if you do not even know that a substance is prohibited because it is there by way of an interim regulation.⁵⁹

3.45 Mr North explained that the Law Council's objections also flowed from the fact that criminal liability for 'severe' penalties flowed from these regulations.⁶⁰

56 *Submission 3*, p. 4.

57 *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 2; see also Law Council, *Submission 10*, p. 2.

58 *Submission 10*, p. 2.

59 *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 2; see also Law Council, *Submission 10*, p. 2.

60 *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 4.

3.46 A representative of the Department explained that the purpose behind the interim regulations and emergency determinations is:

...to make this legislation responsive, flexible and able to be effective. There have been situations where drugs have been on the way to Australia or a new drug has been manufactured. The provision for emergency determinations is meant to cover those situations. It can take time to get regulations, even interim regulations, enacted.⁶¹

3.47 In response to the Law Council's concerns as to what might happen if such a determination or interim regulation lapsed, the departmental representative stated:

There is an assumption that, if the drug is seen to be a serious enough risk by the responsible minister to make its way into an emergency determination, eventually it will make its way into the schedule. It is possible theoretically that parliament might decide not to pass an act or an amendment to the schedule, but by that stage parliament would have passed up the opportunity to disallow the emergency determination and the interim regulations. It is not as though it will come as an amendment before the parliament for the first time.⁶²

3.48 The representative also pointed out that there are qualifications in the Bill on the ability to make such interim regulations and emergency determinations:

The minister has to be satisfied that taking the drug 'would create a substantial risk of death or serious harm' or 'would have a physical or mental effect substantially similar to that caused by taking' another illicit drug and there is a substantial risk that the drug will be 'taken without appropriate medical supervision'.⁶³

3.49 In response to the committee's questioning, the Department submitted that, once a particular substance has been prescribed in regulations for a period of 12 months, it cannot be re-prescribed in regulations.⁶⁴

3.50 The committee also notes that, under the *Legislative Instruments Act 2003*, the interim regulations will be subject to parliamentary scrutiny and possible disallowance, and will also be publicly available on the Internet.

Defences and alternative verdicts

3.51 The Law Council also commented on proposed Division 313, which sets out complete defences for conduct justified or excused under state or territory law. The Law Council appreciated the need for these defences, but stated its hope that:

61 *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 18.

62 *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, pp 18-19.

63 *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 18.

64 *Submission 13*, p. 6; see also proposed ss. 301.3(3) and 301.4(3).

...the prosecution would not pursue a matter to trial should its investigation lead to a conclusion that the conduct was justified or excused under a State or Territory law or where the circumstances, say a valid licence was believed to be held though the relevant authority was found to make an administrative error.⁶⁵

3.52 However, the Law Council was opposed to the alternative verdict provisions in proposed section 313.3, stating its belief that:

...alternative verdicts should only be permitted where the prosecution has raised them at the outset of the trial at the very latest. This is a basic safeguard to achieve procedural fairness.⁶⁶

3.53 As Mr John North of the Law Council explained:

...in the determination of any criminal charge against any person, as a minimum they should be informed in detail of the charges against them and have adequate time and facilities for the preparation of a defence. That does not occur if you allow alternative verdicts, even at the time the judge is summing up.⁶⁷

3.54 In particular, the Law Council was concerned that these provisions could breach the ICCPR:

According to the proposal, it would appear that an alternative verdict can be raised by the judge or jury in the absence of an alternative charge. This feature does not necessarily allow the defendant to be fully informed of all the charges against him or her and to have adequate time to prepare a defence, thereby breaching the ICCPR. Had all the charges been known, the defendant would have been able to better prepare his or her defence.⁶⁸

3.55 The Law Council also suggested that the alternative verdict provisions could heighten the prospects of appeals on the basis of a denial of procedural fairness.⁶⁹ The Law Council therefore recommended that 'the use of alternative verdicts be limited to circumstances where the alternative verdict is raised in the indictment or at the outset of the trial and is truly an appropriate alternative to the offence charged.'⁷⁰

3.56 In contrast, the DPP expressed support for the alternative verdict provisions in proposed Division 313, noting in particular that:

Clause 313.3 is significant in relation to prosecutions in providing flexibility as it allows for an alternative verdict where the trier of fact is not

65 *Submission 10*, p. 6.

66 *Submission 10*, p. 6.

67 *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 3.

68 *Submission 10*, p. 7.

69 *Submission 10*, p. 7.

70 *Submission 10*, p. 7.

satisfied that the defendant is guilty of the alleged offence but is guilty of another offence against the Part and the maximum penalty for the other offence is not greater. The trier of fact may find the defendant guilty of that other offence, so long as the defendant has been accorded procedural fairness in relation to that finding of guilt.⁷¹

3.57 A representative of the DPP also pointed out that there are other alternative verdict provisions in the Criminal Code, for example, in relation to money laundering offences.⁷²

3.58 The committee also notes that proposed section 313.3 specifically states that the trier of fact may only find the defendant guilty of another offence 'so long as the defendant has been accorded procedural fairness in relation to that finding of guilt.'⁷³

Import-export offences

3.59 As outlined in chapter 2, proposed Division 307 would relocate the import-export offences from the Customs Act (particularly section 233B) into the Criminal Code. Both the DPP and the Australian Customs Service (Customs) supported proposed Division 307 of the Bill.⁷⁴

3.60 Customs noted that the Bill 'addresses a number of important issues for Customs in its role in border security and regulation as well as in its investigation capability.'⁷⁵ In particular, Customs accepted the removal of serious narcotic offences from the Customs Act to the Criminal Code as proposed by the Bill.⁷⁶ Customs also noted that the Bill maintains, and does not extend, appropriate law enforcement powers for the investigation and prosecution of these offences.⁷⁷ For example, Customs stated that the Bill would maintain its existing powers to seize illicit drugs and precursors.⁷⁸

3.61 However, the FFDLR expressed concern that, under proposed Division 307, the possession of even small quantities of imported drugs would be an offence, with quite severe penalties. The FFDLR suggested that possession of imported drugs in small quantities typical of users and user-dealers should be a separate offence (if at all), with much lower penalties.⁷⁹ As discussed elsewhere in this report, the FFDLR

71 *Submission 3*, pp 2-3.

72 *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 24.

73 See also DPP, *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 24.

74 DPP, *Submission 3*, pp 3-6; Customs, *Submission 9*, p. 3.

75 *Submission 9*, p. 3.

76 *Submission 9*, p. 3.

77 *Submission 9*, pp 2, 4-6; see also *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 24.

78 *Submission 9*, p. 4.

79 *Submission 8*, p. 3.

and the Law Council both raised concerns with the presumption and the application of absolute liability in this proposed division of the Bill.

Calculation of weight

3.62 The WA Police was concerned that proposed Division 312 of the Bill could potentially cause confusion in relation to the calculation of the weight of drugs involved in the proposed offences. The WA Police submitted that:

Under Western Australia legislation, the total weight of the substance (drug + admixture) is taken to be the relevant weight of the drug for the purposes of prosecution. In contrast, s312.1 of the Bill sets out a complicated method of ascertaining quantity based on purity or the quantity of the 'pure' form of the drug...The MDA is more practical to apply as illicit drugs are rarely found in pure form, but are most commonly found as a substance comprised of the drug 'cut' with an admixture. The purity or percentage (ie strength) of the drug is then taken into consideration at sentencing.⁸⁰

3.63 However, the committee notes that the EM states that:

The quantities of controlled drugs and border controlled drugs are able to be specified as either a pure or dilute quantity, or both...Dilute quantities are not listed in proposed Division 314, however it is intended that they will be added in future.⁸¹

3.64 The FFDLR also raised concerns about the calculation of weights in relation to cannabis, pointing out their understanding that the dry weight is only about 30% of the fresh weight.⁸² The FFDLR recommended that:

Given the vast discrepancy between dry and fresh weights of cannabis and the prospect that if the prosecution used fresh weight genuine consumer growers would routinely commit crimes carrying enormous penalties, the weights specified for cannabis in cls. 314.1 and 314.2 should be specified to be dry weight or dry weight equivalent.⁸³

3.65 However a representative of the Department stated that 'our view of how this provision should be interpreted is that it is the weight of the plant at the time it is seized.'⁸⁴ The representative pointed out that:

...we do not think any other test is workable. What are you going to do—take a plant and dry it, so it has to go through some chemical process? What if there is a paddock full of plants? It is hard enough to count them, harder

80 *Submission 5*, p. 2.

81 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 98.

82 *Submission 8*, p. 5.

83 *Submission 8*, p. 5; see also Mr Bill Bush, *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 11.

84 *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 21.

to weigh them, virtually impossible to dry them all in some scientific way and weigh the dry product.⁸⁵

Aggregation

3.66 The DPP welcomed the provision in proposed Division 311 to enable charges to be brought based on combined amounts of drugs, plants or precursors.⁸⁶ The DPP noted the EM's explanation that:

The primary object of the [aggregation] provision[s] is to expose offenders who engage in frequent small dealings to the higher penalties usually reserved for those who deal in bulk quantities.⁸⁷

3.67 However, the DPP commented that:

If enacted, whether or not these provisions were utilised would depend on the circumstances involved. For example, they would not be appropriate where individual dealings involved substantial amounts and the laying of separate charges would be necessary to reflect the criminality involved.⁸⁸

3.68 The WA Government also appeared to support these provisions, submitting that:

Significantly, the Bill closes the legal loopholes that are exploited by drug traffickers who fragment their commercial dealings to avoid the full consequences of the law...The Western Australian regime does not provide for the accumulation of transactions in this way.⁸⁹

3.69 In contrast, the Law Council expressed concern about aspects of proposed section 311.2, which allows parcels of controlled drugs to be combined where the prosecution can show that the defendant was involved in an organised commercial activity. As the EM notes, there is no restriction on the amount of time over which the organised commercial activity takes place in order to use this type of aggregation.⁹⁰ The Law Council suggested that:

...section 311.2(2) which permits the prosecution to not provide exact dates of alleged occasions of trafficking and exact quantities trafficked on each occasion should be removed. The Law Council considers that details pertaining to each alleged act should be specified and supporting evidence in relation to each act provided by the prosecution.⁹¹

85 *Submission 8*, p. 5; see also Mr Bill Bush, *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 11.

86 *Submission 3*, pp 6-7.

87 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 84.

88 *Submission 3*, p. 6.

89 *Submission 11*, p. 2.

90 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 85.

91 *Submission 10*, p. 6; see also Mr John North, Law Council, *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 3.

3.70 The FFDLR recognised that there is a valid role for aggregation at higher levels in the drug distribution pyramid. However, the FFDLR pointed out the MCCOC report admitted that 'aggregation of small transactions has the potential to amplify the liability of habitual users who engage in frequent small sales to sustain a habit.'⁹² The FFDLR therefore suggested that aggregation should not be permitted for an offence under proposed section 302.4 of trafficking in less than a marketable quantity of controlled drugs.⁹³

3.71 However, the EM states that:

Evidence that a large quantity was involved in a particular transaction is often a good indication that the offender was a major dealer. However, seizure of a small quantity is less often a good indication of minor dealing. This is because the particular person may have taken care to avoid large transactions on any particular occasion (to try to avoid the higher penalties), or an offender who is a major supplier may have simply been caught with a small quantity because stocks were low at that time.⁹⁴

3.72 The committee also notes the MCCOC report's conclusion that:

...there is a limit to the precision with which the effects of criminal prohibitions can be limited to their intended targets. Though culpability for dealing in commercial quantities may be less when the offender is an habitual users, this is a consideration which must be addressed in sentencing rather than in the definition of the aggravated forms of trafficking.⁹⁵

Offences involving children

3.73 Some submissions were particularly supportive of the Bill's provisions relating to the endangerment of children in the trafficking and manufacture of drugs.⁹⁶ For example, the WA Government submitted that:

These measures recognise the harm that may be caused to innocent bystanders to clandestine laboratories and provides an appropriate deterrent to such acts...the inclusion of specific provisions in drug legislation renders offenders placing children in danger in these circumstances more amenable to justice.⁹⁷

92 *Submission 8*, p. 8; see also MCCOC report, p. 191.

93 *Submission 8*, pp 8-9. Note that the FFDLR's first preference was for this proposed offence to be omitted from the Bill altogether.

94 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 83.

95 MCCOC report, p. 193.

96 See, for example, WA Government, *Submission 11*, p. 3; Law Council, *Submission 10*, p. 5.

97 *Submission 11*, p. 3.

3.74 The WA Police noted that, while there are currently no provisions in drugs legislation in its state which specifically relate to children, it is:

...developing a proposal that will deal with drug offences relating to the endangerment of children. As part of this exercise Western Australia Police will take into consideration the draft provision of the Commonwealth Bill in framing any equivalent State legislation.⁹⁸

3.75 The FFDLR noted the Attorney-General's comments that the Bill 'also provides important protection to children', particularly through the offences for endangering children during the drug manufacturing process, or using children to traffic drugs.⁹⁹ However, the FFDLR suggested that consideration should be given to the harm caused to children and young people by the Bill as a result of 'excessive reliance on criminal prohibitions against drug use.'¹⁰⁰ The FFDLR argued that the Bill, if enacted, would 'expose hundreds of thousands of young people across the country to a new set of Commonwealth crimes.'¹⁰¹ They pointed to research indicating that a high number of children had used illicit drugs, or were at risk of trying out illicit drugs, and argued that under the Bill, 'a big proportion of Australian children will be serious drug offenders.'¹⁰² They also noted that children are excluded from liability for the offences under proposed Division 309 (offences for people using children to traffic drugs), but not the other offences in the rest of the Bill.¹⁰³ As Mr Brian McConnell observed:

Parents do not want their children's life chances destroyed by a conviction for a serious drug offence...children should not be disproportionately punished for the youthful indiscretion of dabbling in drugs.¹⁰⁴

Precursor offences

3.76 In relation to the proposed precursor offences in proposed Division 306 of the Bill, the WA Government noted that similar measures were recently inserted into the WA MDA.¹⁰⁵ However, the WA Police observed the offences in the Bill only relate to:

...prescribed controlled precursors (essential chemical ingredients such as pseudoephedrine). However, the MDA is broader and more practical in that

98 *Submission 5*, p. 3; see also WA Government, *Submission 11*, p. 3.

99 The Hon Philip Ruddock MP, Attorney-General, *House of Representatives Hansard*, 26 May 2005, p. 6.

100 *Submission 8*, p. 12.

101 *Submission 8*, p. 10.

102 *Submission 8*, p. 11.

103 *Submission 8*, p. 10.

104 *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 8.

105 *Submission 5*, p. 3; see also Queensland Police Service, *Submission 2*, p. 1.

it also includes substances and chemicals that *facilitate* the manufacturing process, such as iodine and hypophosphorous acid.¹⁰⁶

Penalties

3.77 The WA Government observed that there are significantly larger penalties for the possession of equipment for manufacture than in the WA legislation.¹⁰⁷ Otherwise, the WA Government submitted that the penalties proposed by the Bill:

...are not identical with penalties in the WA Act, however they do conform generally in the sense of the ratio of culpability to punishment. The new increased penalties in the Bill that apply to the manufacture of commercial quantities of controlled drugs represent a general deterrent in the face of increasing manufacture and trade in 'designer drugs'. Those measures appear appropriate in that context.¹⁰⁸

3.78 On other hand, the FFDLR argued that the penalties in the Bill are disproportionate and 'draconian'.¹⁰⁹ These concerns are discussed further in the section on 'impact of the Bill' later in this chapter.

Consultation with state and territory governments

3.79 The Queensland Police Service submitted that it had not been consulted about the Bill.¹¹⁰ In response to the committee's questioning on the level of consultation in relation to the Bill, the Department noted that neither the draft Bill, nor an exposure draft of the Bill, had been provided to state and territory governments prior to its introduction to Parliament.¹¹¹ However, the Department did note that many provisions of the Bill were subject to extensive consultation as part of the MCCOC Model Criminal Code development process.¹¹² In particular, the Department submitted that:

In 2002, Commonwealth, State and Territory jurisdictions resolved at the Leaders Summit on Terrorism and Multi-jurisdictional Crime to implement the model offences recommended in the MCCOC Report.¹¹³

3.80 The Department also noted that the Working Party established by the Ministerial Council on Drug Strategy¹¹⁴ includes representatives of state and territory

106 *Submission 5*, p. 3.

107 *Submission 11*, p. 3.

108 *Submission 11*, p. 3.

109 Mr Brian McConnell, *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 8; *Submission 8*, p. 1.

110 *Submission 2*, p. 1.

111 *Submission 13*, pp 10-11.

112 *Submission 13*, pp 10-11; see also *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 22.

113 *Submission 13*, p. 10.

114 See para 2.44 of chapter 2; and *Explanatory Memorandum*, pp 103-104.

governments and police. The Department further submitted that departmental representatives attended a meeting of the Working Party in July 2005 and gave a presentation on the Bill.¹¹⁵

3.81 Further, the committee notes that several state agencies made submissions to this inquiry, and the overwhelming majority of these appeared to be supportive of the Bill.¹¹⁶

Policy aspects of the Bill

3.82 Concerns were also raised in submissions and evidence in relation to policy aspects of the Bill, particularly the impact of the Bill on smaller scale drug crime; and on the supply of illicit drugs. These are discussed below.

Impact of the Bill

3.83 The FFDLR raised a number of concerns about the impact of the Bill on smaller scale drug crime. In particular, the FFDLR argued that the Bill:

...is far from confined to serious drug offences by large scale suppliers. It is a radical extension of Commonwealth legislative authority into the criminal law of drugs with potential application to every drug user in the country. Moreover, it does this in a heavy handed way. Actions that in plain language would not be regarded as 'serious crimes' will be labelled as serious drug offences to which draconian penalties will apply.¹¹⁷

3.84 In contrast, Drug Free Australia believed that the characterisation of offences as 'serious offences' was appropriate given the serious consequences associated with drug use, including adverse individual and public health consequences, and other wider considerations such as crime and public amenity.¹¹⁸ Drug Free Australia submitted that:

...any manufacture, importation, interference with, trafficking, possession, or use of goods generally known as 'illicit drugs' is a most serious matter of a criminal nature and should therefore be dealt with in an appropriately serious manner before the courts.¹¹⁹

3.85 However, while the FFDLR appeared to support the Bill where it targets commercially motivated drug crime further up the supply chain, they were particularly

115 *Submission 13*, p. 11.

116 Queensland Police Service, *Submission 2*; South Australia Police, *Submission 7*; WA Government, *Submission 11*; cf WA Police, *Submission 5*.

117 *Submission 8*, p. 1; see also Mr Brian McConnell, *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 8.

118 *Submission 12*, p. 3.

119 *Submission 12*, p. 1.

concerned that the Bill might transform user-dealers into 'very serious criminals'.¹²⁰ Mr Brian McConnell explained:

The attention given to the commercial manufacture of controlled drugs is appropriate, but that is the top end of the market. Families and Friends for Drug Law Reform are more concerned about the bottom end of the market. We have grave concerns that the bill characterises as serious drug offences a host of activities among users at the bottom of the drug distribution pyramid. In plain language, these may be drug offences but they are not serious drug offences. They are offences involving possession and dealing in small quantities. A number of these are not even recommended in the report of the Model Criminal Code Officers Committee.¹²¹

3.86 In particular, the FFDLR were concerned that dealing in small quantities of drugs will be caught by the provisions of the Bill. Mr McConnell pointed out that:

By way of example, under clause 302.4 a young person who has grown just one mature cannabis plant weighing at least 250 grams could be expected to be found guilty of trafficking and could be liable to be imprisoned for 10 years or fined \$220,000 or to suffer both penalties. Given the quantity, the onus of proof would fall on him to prove that he did not intend to sell any of it. As another example, a young woman who bought ecstasy tablets for a night out with a few friends would face similarly draconian consequences.¹²²

3.87 The FFDLR also raised objections to the possession offence in clause 308.1 of the Bill, arguing that it:

...is a new catch-all provision for the mere possession of even small quantities of drugs. It can be aimed only at drug users. They will end up with a conviction under "serious drug offences" legislation that can blight their whole life and be liable to two years in prison, a fine of \$44,000 or both.¹²³

3.88 The FFDLR pointed to recent research indicating that 2,510,100 Australians can be expected to use drugs in any 12 month period. The FFDLR submitted that this offence would therefore make 'serious' criminals out of those Australians – or every seventh member of the community.¹²⁴ The FFDLR therefore made a number of recommendations for amendments to the Bill, which were:

120 *Submission 8*, p. 2.

121 *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 8. As noted in chapter 2, the possession offences in proposed ss. 308.1 and 308.2 of the Bill have no corresponding offences in the Model Criminal Code: see *Submission 13*, p. 8.

122 *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 8; see also *Submission 8*, p. 7.

123 *Submission 8*, p. 4.

124 *Submission 8*, p. 4.

...intended to restore some balance in this bill so that its application does not cause more harm to the young people we should protect and does not undermine some of the basic tenets that form the foundation of our criminal justice system.¹²⁵

3.89 These recommendations included the removal of a range of offences relating to 'mere possession' or dealing in small quantities of drugs; and changes to the burden of proof in relation to certain offences.¹²⁶ Some of the FFDLR's suggestions are considered in the discussion of specific offences earlier in this chapter.

3.90 However, Drug Free Australia submitted its belief that:

It is wrong to argue that something so serious is “mere possession” of small quantities of illicit drugs, or even the use of small quantities of illicit drugs for that matter, play any less of a part in the seriousness of the overall illicit drug problem. Without the user the entire supply chain breaks down as having no purpose.¹²⁷

3.91 In this context, the committee also notes that MCCOC considered the exclusion of dependent users from the proposed offences, and concluded that this would be 'unwise' and politically divisive. The MCCOC report concluded:

Political acceptability aside, the consequences in terms of harm minimisation, are incalculable. The restrictions which would be necessary to avoid creating loopholes for abuse might deprive the defence of all practical effect. To the extent to which lenience is justifiable, when trafficking by dependent users is in issue, discriminating exercise of the prosecutorial and sentencing discretions offers a more flexible method of mitigating the harms associated with law enforcement.¹²⁸

3.92 Mr Bill Bush of the FFDLR responded to the suggestion that prosecutorial and sentencing discretions are the appropriate manner of dealing with those at the lower end of the drug market as follows:

Why don't we just have, under the penal code, one sentencing provision: life imprisonment and a \$10 million fine? The fact is that in the media the seriousness of the proscribed offence is used as an argument in relation to the expectations of the community of the penalty that should be imposed. It is an indication to the police in their work as to the seriousness of the offence for which they should be deploying their resources. It means something. It is not just an irrelevant thing.¹²⁹

3.93 Mr Bush continued:

125 Mr Brian McConnell, *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 9.

126 *Submission 8*, pp 2 and 4-6.

127 *Submission 12*, p. 5.

128 MCCOC report, pp 10-11.

129 *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 10.

...the effect of a particular level of penalty affects the response of those who administer the law and it affects the response of the courts. They have to get their cue as to what the parliament regards as the level of penalty to be applied. That is done by the reference to the penalty that is imposed in the act...it sends a message.¹³⁰

3.94 In response to the FFDLR's concerns as to the impact of the Bill, a representative of the Department stated that 'possession of a plant for personal use is not caught by these provisions.'¹³¹ The representative further pointed out that:

There is nothing in this [A]ct which is going to criminalise something that is not already criminal at state level. This is the concept of consistency with state law that I talked about...There can be differences with penalties, expiation notices and diversion schemes. If you go to specific state laws you may very well find that in some states a person who is prosecuted under one of these provisions would be dealt with in a different way. And that is something we decry. Basically what we want to see at the Commonwealth level is consistent drug laws...We see this as very much a trigger or a basis for the Commonwealth to now go to the states, which have not all enacted MCCOC model laws, and say, 'Please do so. Let us have some consistent laws.'¹³²

Reducing the supply of illicit drugs

3.95 The Attorney-General stated in his second reading speech that:

This bill demonstrates the government's commitment to reduce the supply of illicit drugs by strengthening anti-drug laws.¹³³

3.96 However, the FFDLR disputed whether the Bill would actually achieve this aim.¹³⁴ In particular, they argued that there are 'persuasive reasons to believe that repressive measures at the retail level do not lead to any significant reduction in availability of drugs'.¹³⁵ They pointed to relevant research, and other reasons including that:

- the level of illicit drug use in various countries bears no direct relationship to the repressiveness of measures against that use; and

130 *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 11.

131 *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 21.

132 *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 20.

133 The Hon Philip Ruddock MP, Attorney-General, *House of Representatives Hansard*, 26 May 2005, p. 6.

134 Mr Brian McConnell, *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, pp 8-9; and *Submission 8*, pp 13-21.

135 *Submission 8*, p. 15.

- in Australia a reduction in cannabis usage has accompanied the relaxation of cannabis law enforcement.¹³⁶

3.97 The FFDLR also queried whether the Bill would reduce the supply of illicit drugs by disrupting distribution networks at the border and within Australia.¹³⁷ By way of example, the FFDLR argued that the recent 'heroin drought' in Australia was not brought about by law enforcement, but by a number of other circumstances.¹³⁸

3.98 In contrast, Drug Free Australia submitted that:

The strong nexus between supply and use of illicit drugs should never be overlooked, nor can it be discounted that the primary aim of supply is aimed at inducting persons to, and prolonging use.¹³⁹

3.99 Further, the DPP submitted that:

Intercepting drugs before they enter the community and are distributed has always been regarded as vital...substantial and deterrent sentences are required in order to protect the community and the seriousness of this offending is reflected in the courts imposing very substantial prison sentences, including the most severe penalty, life imprisonment in the most grave cases.¹⁴⁰

Other schedules in the Bill

Schedule 4 – Australian Federal Police Act 1979

3.100 Some submissions commented on the amendments to the AFP Act in Schedule 4 of the Bill, which would clarify that the functions of the AFP extend to providing assistance to, and cooperating with, Australian and foreign law enforcement agencies, intelligence or security agencies and government regulatory agencies.

3.101 In particular, the WA Government observed that the provisions to clarify the scope of the AFP's functions 'may provide an avenue for increased involvement by the AFP in matters previously handled by State law enforcement agencies.'¹⁴¹

3.102 The Law Council supported these amendments in principle, but believed that:

...the AFP should not assist countries in circumstances in which the assistance could potentially lead to a person being sentenced to treatment that is harsh, cruel and inhumane by international standards. For instance, in

136 *Submission 8*, p. 15.

137 *Submission 8*, p. 17.

138 *Submission 8*, pp 17-21.

139 *Submission 12*, p. 5.

140 *Submission 3*, p. 1.

141 *Submission 11*, p. 3.

assisting Indonesian authorities in relation to drug traffickers, there is a risk that a person who is convicted of a drug offence could be sentenced to death.¹⁴²

3.103 The Law Council therefore suggested that the AFP should only provide such assistance where there is a memorandum of understanding (MOU) between Australia and the foreign jurisdiction. The Law Council suggested that such an MOU should state that cruel, harsh or inhumane treatment or punishment, such as the death penalty, would not be applied where the AFP assisted in the process of conviction.¹⁴³

3.104 Mr John North of the Law Council noted the recent case of the 'Bali 9' as an example of the problems that may arise in this situation. The 'Bali 9' refers to nine Australians arrested in Bali, Indonesia, earlier this year, who were allegedly involved in smuggling heroin.¹⁴⁴ Mr North commented:

The Bali nine is an unfortunate situation because, as we understand it, the AFP cooperation with the Indonesians occurred at the police to police level, not at the government level. I understand that had our Attorney-General and others been involved the Bali nine would not be open to charges that carry the death penalty. The Australian government at this moment understands that the death penalty should not be there. I believe that the cooperation was at the police to police level, and we are saying that needs to be looked at.¹⁴⁵

3.105 Mr North further explained:

Our information is that the AFP acted according to internal policy and not with any MOU or any other government interference in place, because we wonder whether the Australian government would have wanted them arrested there and be subject to the death penalty. I have spoken personally to the Attorney-General, and the Australian government, as I understand it, remains very much opposed to placing Australians in jeopardy of the death penalty.¹⁴⁶

3.106 In response to the committee's questioning on this issue, the AFP noted that it may sometimes have an MOU with a particular country. However, a representative of the AFP stated that:

The Australian Federal Police have an internal guideline which replicates government policy in relation to how we go about investigating offences that may attract the death penalty. It clearly sets out what information we

142 *Submission 10*, p. 8.

143 Mr John North, *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 3; *Submission 10*, p. 8.

144 See further: "Nine Aussies face death over Bali drug bust" *The Australian*, 19 April 2005, p. 1; "Australia to hand over Bali 9 evidence", *Sydney Morning Herald*, 25 April 2005, p. 1.

145 *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, pp 4 and 6.

146 *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 6.

will pass over to foreign law enforcement agencies, what we will not and at what stages we will do that.¹⁴⁷

3.107 However, the AFP noted that the guidelines distinguish between situations where no charges have been laid and situations where charges have been laid under the law of that foreign country.¹⁴⁸ Once a person has been charged with an offence that carries the death penalty, advice must be provided to the Attorney-General and the Minister for Justice and Customs. However, up until that point, the guidelines state that the AFP may provide such assistance as is requested, irrespective of whether the investigation may later result in charges being laid which may attract the death penalty.¹⁴⁹

3.108 The committee understands that, in cases where the Australian Government receives a formal request for assistance from a foreign government to investigate an offence which carries the death penalty, the *Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters Act 1987* provides the Attorney-General or the Minister for Justice and Customs with a discretion to refuse to provide assistance at the point before charges have been laid. Where a person has been charged with, or convicted of, an offence which carries the death penalty, the responsible Minister must refuse to provide the assistance unless there are special circumstances.¹⁵⁰ Assistance not involving coercive powers and given directly by police or other law enforcement agencies is not regulated by the *Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters Act 1987*, but by administrative direction. That is, in the AFP's case, by the above-mentioned guidelines.¹⁵¹

Schedule 8 – bail conditions

3.109 Customs expressed support for a technical amendment to section 219ZJC of the Customs Act in Schedule 8 of the Bill. Section 219ZJC currently provides a power for Customs to detain a person at the border where they are subject to a warrant or certain bail conditions. Customs explained in its submission that:

Customs is concerned that as there are a variety of ways in which bail conditions may be expressed, the existing effect of s.219ZJC could be to be unable to provide a basis for detention unless there is a specific reference to the bailee not leaving Australia. This might be the case even if following

147 *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 14.

148 *The AFP Practical Guide on International Police to Police Assistance in Death Penalty Charge Situations*, Tabled Document No. 6, Senate Legal and Constitutional Legislation Committee Budget Estimates 2005-2006, 24 May 2005.

149 See also, AFP, *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 15.

150 See s. 8, *Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters Act 1987*. Special circumstances include where the evidence would assist the defence or where the foreign country undertakes not to impose or carry out the death penalty.

151 See also Attorney-General's Department, *Estimates Hansard*, 23 May 2005, p. 105; Attorney-General's Department and AFP, *Estimates Hansard*, 23 May 2005, pp 42-43.

what was required by the bail conditions could have the effect of preventing the person departing Australia.¹⁵²

3.110 Customs explained that this amendment would ensure that Customs would have the power to detain a person at the Australian border where that person is subject to bail conditions which effectively prevent them from leaving Australia, however that bail condition is expressed.¹⁵³ A representative of Customs further explained in response to the committee's questioning on this issue that:

...we already have a clause that enables a person on bail to be detained at the port of entry. All this does is to clarify the situation where we have a range of different ways in which the condition might be expressed. It ensures that, however it is expressed, we can still detain someone.¹⁵⁴

3.111 The representative continued:

It is simply that bail conditions were expressed in different ways, and you could take the view that at times the effect of the wording was to prevent a person leaving the country. But on a strict reading, it did not actually say that. What we were after was an amendment that ensured that, however the condition was expressed, we could still take the action.¹⁵⁵

3.112 The committee notes there are conditions on the detention powers of Customs officers under section 219ZJC, including that the person must be delivered, as soon as practicable, into the custody of a police officer to be dealt with according to law.¹⁵⁶

Schedule 2 – children in armed conflict

3.113 The Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission (HREOC) welcomed the proposed amendments in Schedule 2 of the Bill to implement Australia's obligations under the Optional Protocol. HREOC noted that the Optional Protocol was the subject of inquiry and report by the Joint Standing Committee on Treaties.¹⁵⁷ In particular, HREOC noted that Defence Instruction (General) PERS 33-4 sets out, among other matters, the minimum age of voluntary recruits into the Australian Defence Force. HREOC supported the recommendation of the Joint Standing Committee on Treaties that this Defence Instruction should be made readily accessible to the public, for example, by making it available on the Department of Defence

152 *Submission 10*, p. 7.

153 *Submission 9*, p. 8.

154 *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 17.

155 *Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2005, p. 17.

156 s. 219ZJC(3).

157 *Submission 6*, p. 1; see also Joint Standing Committee on Treaties, *Review of treaties tabled on 7 December 2004, Report 63*, Chapter 8.

website.¹⁵⁸ However, the committee considers that this issue is outside the scope of this inquiry.

The committee's view

3.114 The committee acknowledges that the overwhelming majority of the submissions received during this inquiry supported the Bill.

3.115 The committee notes that issues were raised during the inquiry in relation to the interaction of the Bill with state and territory legislation. However, the committee notes that the Bill provides for the concurrent operation of state and territory legislation, and that the state government agencies that provided evidence to the committee generally supported the Bill. The committee further acknowledges the evidence that the intention is that the Bill will give law enforcement agencies greater flexibility, and that drug offences will continue to be investigated in accordance with the established division of responsibility between federal, state and territory enforcement agencies. In particular, the committee supports the need for greater national consistency in Australian drug law.

3.116 In relation to the concerns raised about the use of presumptions and absolute liability in the Bill, the committee considers that these provisions have been adequately justified in the Explanatory Memorandum and by departmental representatives. In particular, the committee received evidence that similar presumptions are used in many state laws, and that the defence of mistake is available where absolute liability applies. The committee further notes that the use of absolute liability was supported by MCCOC, and endorsed by the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General. However, the committee suggests that the Working Party established by the Ministerial Council on Drug Strategy may wish to examine whether the thresholds for 'trafficable quantities' of controlled drugs and plants are set at an appropriate level.

3.117 The committee also received evidence of concerns about the potential impact of the Bill, particularly on smaller scale drug crime. However, the committee notes that many of the offences in the Bill already exist at the state and territory level. The committee also acknowledges the MCCOC report's conclusions that this issue can best be addressed in prosecution and/or sentencing processes.

3.118 As to the other specific issues raised in relation to the drug offence provisions in the Bill, the committee considers that the Explanatory Memorandum, the Department and the DPP have adequately responded to these concerns. The committee therefore considers that these provisions of the Bill are appropriate.

3.119 In relation to the other schedules of the Bill, the committee acknowledges the evidence of Customs in relation to the need to clarify the detention power in the

158 *Submission 6*, p. 1.

Customs Act relating to bail conditions (in Schedule 8 of the Bill). The committee also notes that there are conditions in the Customs Act on the exercise of this power.

3.120 However, in relation to Schedule 4 of the Bill, the committee acknowledges concerns that the AFP is providing assistance in matters in foreign countries which may result in Australians facing the death penalty. The committee particularly notes the Law Council's suggestion that the AFP should only provide such assistance where there is an MOU between Australia and the foreign jurisdiction which states that cruel, harsh or inhumane treatment or punishment such as the death penalty would not be applied where the AFP assisted in the process of conviction. The committee is also concerned that AFP internal guidelines do not appear to adequately deal with this situation. The committee therefore recommends that the Australian Government, in conjunction with the AFP and other stakeholders, review its policy and procedures on this issue. In particular, the Australian Government should ensure appropriate ministerial supervision of assistance provided by Australian law enforcement agencies, where that assistance may expose Australians overseas to cruel, harsh or inhumane treatment or punishment, including the death penalty.

Recommendation 1

3.121 The committee recommends that the Australian Government, in conjunction with the Australian Federal Police and other stakeholders, review its policy and procedures on international police to police assistance. In particular, the Australian Government should ensure appropriate ministerial supervision of assistance provided to overseas jurisdictions by Australian law enforcement agencies, where that assistance may expose Australians overseas to cruel, harsh or inhumane treatment or punishment, including the death penalty.

Recommendation 2

3.122 Subject to the preceding recommendation, the committee recommends that the Senate pass the Bill.

**Senator Marise Payne
Chair**

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS BY THE AUSTRALIAN DEMOCRATS

1.1 The Australian Democrats share many of the concerns raised by the Law Council, in particular the operation of the presumptions and absolute liability that ‘effectively shifts the burden from proving guilt to establishing innocence.’ This represents a marked departure from current practice and dramatically undermines the presumption of innocence as set out in article 14(2) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR).

1.2 The Australian Democrats also note we are sympathetic to many of the concerns raised by the Families and Friends for Drug Law Reform (FFDLR), in particular, concerns relating to clause 308.1 of the Bill. FFDLR contends that this provision is aimed only at drug users and creates a serious offence out of the possession of even ‘small quantities of drugs.’ In highlighting this issue, the Democrats note that the MCOCC’s 1998 report on Serious Drug Offences did not contain a simple possession offence.

1.3 Furthermore, while there are provisions for the continued operation of State and Territory laws, in proposed sections 308.1 and 300.4, there appears to be no guarantee that an individual who commits an offence in a jurisdiction that allows for such an offence to be expiated on payment of a fine will not be proceeded against under Commonwealth law.

1.4 The Australian Democrats agree with the evidence as presented, however, we reserve our judgement on the Bill contingent with the committee's recommendation and the resolution of the matters outlined above.

Senator Natasha Stott Despoja
Australian Democrats

APPENDIX 1

SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED

- 1 Australian National Council on Drugs
- 2 Queensland Police Service
- 3 Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions
- 4 Dr Gregor Urbas
- 5 Western Australia Police
- 6 Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission
- 7 South Australia Police
- 8 Families and Friends for Drug Law Reform (ACT)
- 9 Australian Customs Service
- 10 Law Council of Australia
- 11 Western Australian Government
- 12 Drug Free Australia
- 13 Attorney-General's Department

APPENDIX 2

WITNESSES WHO APPEARED BEFORE THE COMMITTEE

Canberra, Wednesday 3 August 2005

Law Council of Australia (submission 10)

Mr John North, President

Families and Friends for Drug Law Reform (submission 8)

Mr Brian McConnell, President

Mr Bill Bush, Member

Attorney-General's Department (no submission)

Mr Geoff Gray, Acting Assistant Secretary, Criminal Law Branch

Ms Melinda Cockshutt, Principal Legal Officer, Criminal Law Branch

Ms Corinne Vale, Senior Legal Officer, Criminal Law Branch

Australian Federal Police (no submission)

Federal Agent Mike Phelan, National Manager, Border and International Network

Federal Agent John Beveridge, National Coordinator, Border (Drugs)

Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions (submission 3)

Mr Mark Pedley, Acting Deputy Director

Mr James Carter, Acting Assistant Director

Australian Customs Service (submission 9)

Mr Paul Hill, Director, Law Enforcement Policy

