

~~made at COAG to formalise the recategorisation of lever action shotguns here in Queensland. That is a sensible decision and it is a decision in the interests of safety of all Queenslanders.~~

~~Those opposite have been found wanting on this particular issue. We have not heard their position. We have not heard their position around the COAG decision to recategorise lever action shotguns. Where do they stand on community safety? Where do they stand on backing John Howard's National Firearms Agreement? All we have heard from those opposite is a step back from and a watering down of gun controls. Only a few weeks ago they announced an election policy which would effectively water down our gun controls here in Queensland in respect of category H concealable hand guns for rural use licensees. They announced that they would remove the genuine reasons criteria for reapplication for those particular licences. That is a watering down, a step back, a further deviation from the National Firearms Agreement, and a betrayal of John Howard and his courage on the National Firearms Agreement.~~

~~What do we see from those opposite? We see a watering down, no position at all on lever action shotguns and a betrayal of John Howard. In their policy they announced only a couple of weeks ago how many times did they refer to the National Firearms Agreement? How many times did they refer to John Howard's courage? Zero. That is what they think of John Howard's courage on this particular issue. Perhaps they are listening to people like Ron Owen from Gympie, who seems to have the ear of the LNP on a number of issues. He was demanding only last week after the Las Vegas tragedy that there should be unregulated ownership of guns here in Queensland. 'Gun controls are irrelevant,' Ron Owen says. Those opposite have to come clean on this. Do they back community safety and John Howard's courage or do they want to sell us down the river?~~

~~(Time expired)~~

Mining Industry

~~**Mr WALKER:** My question is to the Premier. Has the CFMEU asked the Premier to change mine safety laws in Queensland and to include that industry in new workplace offences currently before the House?~~

~~**Mr SPEAKER:** The time for question time has expired.~~

013

CIVIL LIABILITY (INSTITUTIONAL CHILD ABUSE) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction



Mr PYNE (Cairns—Ind) (11.34 am): I present a bill for an act to amend the Civil Liability Act 2003 for particular purposes. I table the bill and the explanatory notes. I nominate the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Civil Liability (Institutional Child Abuse) Amendment Bill 2017.

Tabled paper: Civil Liability (Institutional Child Abuse) Amendment Bill 2017, explanatory notes.

In 2015 the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse released the *Redress and civil litigation report*, making 99 recommendations for law reforms to increase child protection and to create consequences for institutions who fail to prevent child abuse or who knowingly conceal abuse. This bill addresses key recommendations for Queensland, including creating a non-delegable duty upon institutions and placing the onus upon institutions to prove that they have taken reasonable steps to prevent abuse. As well, the bill puts an end to institutions evading liability such as by hiding behind property trust arrangements. The bill makes liability recoverable from such trusts.

The royal commission has heard four years of harrowing evidence of horrific sexual, physical and psychological abuse of young, defenceless children. Abuse was often perpetrated with the full knowledge of leaders within institutions. The maltreatment of these children has resulted in lasting traumatic injuries and scars. The royal commission has heard evidence of cover-up after cover-up. Institutions did not take steps to stop abuse but, instead, the royal commission has found that many institutions knew about abuse and they protected offenders, deprived victims of health care and hid assets to prevent victims obtaining financial support such as for health care. In other words, the behaviour of many institutions has been to side with the offenders.

For victims, the abuse stole their childhood but the institutional response is stealing their adulthood. Many survivors have described the institutional response as 'like being abused all over again'. The conduct within these institutions continues to impact our entire community. The royal

commission has heard overwhelming evidence of how institutions—wealthy, multibillion dollar institutions—have paid enormous amounts of money to lawyers to fight victims who seek justice. As well, the royal commission has heard evidence of the widespread practice of using corporate structures and trusts to hide or shield assets from litigation. Many of these institutions are institutions that have traditionally been given special dispensation by the community including substantial tax relief on the basis of being a charity.

It is the community who picks up the bill for the child abuse perpetrated by institutions. The community pay for public health costs for the treatment of survivors. The community pay for welfare costs for survivors who struggle to find work. The community pay through decreased productivity and revenue. Yet the institutions who perpetrated the abuse deny liability, pay no penalty and in fact hide their assets, all while claiming tax-free status.

When child victims grow to become adults they often show great courage by giving evidence in criminal courts to assist the prosecution of offenders to protect future children. Similarly, they show great courage in taking civil action to hold the institution to account to drive changes in the way institutions prevent child abuse and respond to child abuse.

Survivors have told the royal commission that they do not want to be a burden on the community. They want to be healthy and functional and they want to make institutions financially accountable for the cost of the institutions' actions. If victims of abuse are going to model the immense courage of taking on their abusers in order to protect the community, isn't the least we can do as a community and as a parliament is to give survivors the laws they need to do their job? The royal commission thinks so and has passed down its recommendations that this parliament pass these laws. The government has waited since 2015 and has had multiple opportunities to put these reforms before the House, yet with an election in the wings survivors of abuse in Queensland are still waiting for their government and their parliament to fully represent them. I commend the bill to the House.

014

First Reading

~~Mr PYNE (Cairns—Ind) (11.39 am): I move~~

~~That the bill be now read a first time.~~

~~Question put—That the bill be now read a first time.~~

~~Motion agreed to.~~

~~Bill read a first time.~~

Referral to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee

~~Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Crawford): Order! In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee.~~

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

Scott, Dr E, AO; Lenton, Mr G; Las Vegas, Incident; State Election



~~Mr NICHOLLS (Clayfield—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (11.40 am): Let me start by joining with the Premier in expressing condolence regarding the passing of the late Dr Evelyn Scott. I add my personal support and that of the entire opposition to those words of condolence in respect to Dr Scott AO. Born in Ingham in 1935, Dr Scott was an unfaltering fighter for equal rights for Indigenous Australians across more than half a century. Her Vanuatan grandfather had been brought to Queensland as part of the slavery akin indentured labour trade. But it was Dr Scott's father who once told her, 'If you don't think something is right, challenge it.' For Dr Scott, they were words that reverberated and then perennially echoed words that she poured into action time and time again.~~

~~Her early forays were stirred by employment, housing and health discrimination issues in and around Townsville in the 1960s. Dr Scott quickly built momentum to rise to the forefront of the campaign to change the Constitution in the landmark 1967 referendum, and the Premier mentioned the results of that here in Queensland. Yet, following the successful vote to recognise Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, she was far from done, devoting the rest of her life to further improving the circumstances of Indigenous Australians and pushing back against discrimination whenever and wherever it reared its hideous head.~~