

CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE — CIVIL LITIGATION — STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS LEGISLATION

563. Mrs L.M. HARVEY to the Attorney General:

I refer to the Attorney General's previous answer about his failure to introduce legislation to remove the statute of limitations for victims of child sex abuse to seek compensation. On the one hand the Attorney General says he does not have the resources of Parliamentary Counsel, but on the other he says the legislation was debated last year. Is it not true that the Attorney General has not introduced the legislation not because of Parliamentary Counsel, but because he was rolled by the member for Cannington and other party colleagues?

Several members interjected.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY replied:

No. No. No. The answer —

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: You might know, but what we want to do is hear the Attorney General's answer.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: The answer is no, but the rhetorical question is: is the member for Scarborough going to support the legislation when we introduce it into this Parliament?

Several members interjected.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: She voted against the private member's bill to lift the statute of limitations. This is a very important issue for all victims of child sexual abuse.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members, listen to the answer!

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: They attend upon me at my electorate office, and I keep them up to date with the development of the policy, including, as I say, the most important issue—the correct identification of the defendant so that church schools cannot hide behind trusts, and not have anyone to sue. This will be brought before Parliament. Is the member for Scarborough going to support it this time? She voted against it on the last occasion: is the member for Scarborough going to support it this time —

Mrs L.M. Harvey: Yes! Yes!

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: — or is she going to further disappoint all the victims of child sexual abuse?