LEGAL AFFAIRS AND COMMUNITY SAFETY COMMITTEE

Members present:

Mr PS Russo MP (Chair)
Mr JP Lister MP (via teleconference)
Mr SSJ Andrew MP (via teleconference)
Mr JJ McDonald MP (via teleconference)
Mrs MF McMahon MP
Ms CP McMillan MP

Staff present:

Ms L Pretty (Acting Inquiry Secretary)
Ms A Beem (Assistant Committee Secretary)

PUBLIC BRIEFING—INQUIRY INTO THE JUSTICE AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL 2019

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, 10 DECEMBER 2019

Brisbane

TUESDAY, 10 DECEMBER 2019

_____

The committee met at 11.00 am.

CHAIR: Good morning. I declare open this public briefing for the committee's inquiry into the Justice and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019. My name is Peter Russo. I am the member for Toohey and chair of the committee. With me here today via teleconference are James Lister, the member for Southern Downs and deputy chair; Stephen Andrew, the member for Mirani; and Jim McDonald, the member for Lockyer. Present here are Melissa McMahon, the member for Macalister, and Corrine McMillan, the member for Mansfield.

On 28 November 2019 the Hon. Yvette D'Ath MP, the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice, introduced the Justice and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019 into the Legislative Assembly. The parliament has referred the bill to the committee for examination, with a reporting date of 21 February 2020. The purpose of the briefing today is to assist the committee with its examination of the bill.

The committee's proceedings are proceedings of the Queensland parliament and are subject to the standing rules and orders of the parliament. The proceedings are being recorded by Hansard and broadcast live on the parliament's website. Media may be present and will be subject to my direction at all times. The media rules endorsed by the committee are available from committee staff if required. All those present today should note that it is possible you might be filmed or photographed during the proceedings. These images may be posted on the parliament's website or social media sites.

Only the committee and invited officers may participate in the proceedings. As parliamentary proceedings, any person may be excluded from the hearing at my discretion or by order of the committee. I ask everyone present to turn mobiles phones off or to silent mode.

BRADLEY, Ms Imelda, Director, Strategic Policy and Legal Services, Department of Justice and Attorney-General

CHANDLER, Ms Kim, Director, Strategic Policy and Legal Services, Department of Justice and Attorney-General

FLOWER, Ms Jane, Acting Principal Legal Officer, Strategic Policy and Legal Services, Department of Justice and Attorney-General

KAY, Ms Sarah, Director, Strategic Policy and Legal Services, Department of Justice and Attorney-General

ROBERTSON, Mrs Leanne, Assistant Director-General, Strategic Policy and Legal Services, Department of Justice and Attorney-General

RYLKO, Ms Julie, Director, Strategic Policy and Legal Services, Department of Justice and Attorney-General

CHAIR: Good morning. I invite you to brief the committee after which committee members will have some questions for you.

Mrs Robertson: Thank you for the opportunity to brief the committee on the Justice and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019. I understand that the department has provided written briefing material to the committee on the amendments in the bill. As the committee notes, the bill proposes amendments to over 30 criminal and civil law acts within the justice portfolio. The principal purposes of the bill are to amend criminal and civil legislation within the justice portfolio to provide for fairness, legislative parity and improved administration of justice and operational efficiency in court and government processes.

The subject matter for the bill, while diverse, has a number of common themes: amendments to the Coroners Act to extend the acts operation to all inquests regardless of when a death was reported and otherwise to support the operation and efficiency of the coronial system in response to issues

identified by the State Coroner and also highlighted in the 2018-19 Queensland Auditor-Generals report *Delivering coronial services* and coronial findings; amendments to various criminal laws to simplify and clarify the operation of existing provisions and to make procedural enhancements to increase efficiency in the criminal justice system; amendments that will clarify jurisdiction and improve the administration of the courts as well as provide administrative efficiencies for the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal, known as QCAT; amendments to improve the administration of justice in Queensland; amendments directed to clarifying and streamlining aspects of Queensland's civil law legislation; and amendments that streamline administrative processes, clarify and update various provisions and make amendments of a technical or drafting nature.

I will speak first to the amendments to the Coroners Act 2003. The bill includes important amendments to the Coroners Act to apply that act to all future inquests, including where a death or disappearance was reported before the commencement of that act. This will allow coroners to compel a witness to give evidence that may incriminate them at an inquest for a death that happened before 2003 and otherwise improve the operational and administrative efficiency of the coronial system.

The bill also amends the Coroners Act to allow authorised approved doctors or a suitably qualified person under the supervision of an approved doctor to perform preliminary examinations when a death is reported to a coroner to assist a coroner in performing his or her functions under the act.

The Coroners Act is also amended in the bill to, firstly, provide a coroner with the discretion to order an autopsy where necessary for an investigation; allow a coroner to stop investigating a death after an autopsy is completed if the coroner has determined that the death is due to natural causes, the death is not reportable under any other criteria and an autopsy certificate has been issued; allow for the appointment of more than one registrar; allow the State Coroner to delegate power to a registrar to, in an investigation, require a person to give information, a document or anything else that is relevant to the investigation in certain circumstances; and also allow the State Coroner to delegate the power to provide consent to the removal of tissue under the Transplantation and Anatomy Act 1979.

Turning now to some of the criminal law amendments contained in the bill, the bill contains amendments to the Dangerous Prisoners (Sexual Offenders) Act 2003 to correct an anomaly in its operation with respect to prisoners returned to custody on parole suspensions and to confirm its application to those serving periods of detention while being held in custody in a corrective services facility. The bill also amends the Peace and Good Behaviour Act 1982 to include general criminal activity that is likely to pose a risk to the safety of another person in the definition of disorderly activity.

Other criminal law related amendments in the bill include amending the Criminal Code and the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992 to increase summary disposition of indictable property offences; optimising the disposal of summary matters with contemporaneous indictable matters through amendments in relation to pre-sentence custody to simplify the process for transmitting a summary charge to a higher court; and also clarifying the offence in section 463 of the Criminal Code, which currently applies to setting fire to crops and growing plants so that it applies to naturally growing grass and any other vegetation.

Turning now to those aspects of the bill that make civil law amendments, the bill contains a package of amendments to the Land Court Act 2000, including related consequential amendments to the Mineral Resources Act 1989, in response to issues raised by the president of the Land Court. These include amendments to clarify powers and improve processes for the courts recommendatory jurisdiction in relation to mining and environmental objections hearings.

The bill also amends the Succession Act 1981 to remove the requirement to obtain the courts leave to apply for an order authorising a will to be made, altered or revoked on behalf of a person without testamentary capacity, together with a requirement for the proposed testator to be alive when the registrar signs and stamps with the courts seal a will or other instrument made pursuant to court order. The bill amends the Property Law Act to clarify that a mortgagee may exercise a power of sale following the disclaimer of freehold land by a trustee in bankruptcy or liquidator without the need to apply for court orders under the Commonwealth Bankruptcy Act 1966 or the Corporations Act 2001.

The bill also includes amendments to the Legal Profession Act 2007, in particular to further strengthen provisions relating to directors of insolvent incorporated legal practices and corporations and clarifies that the Queensland Law Society's power to conduct a trust account investigation of the affairs of a law practice may be exercised routinely, not just in relation to a particular allegation or suspicion. The bill also includes a variety of amendments that streamline administrative processes, clarify and update various provisions and make amendments of a technical or drafting nature. I thank you for the opportunity to provide information on the bill and we are happy to assist the committee by taking questions.

CHAIR: In relation to the amendments to the Corrective Services Act, the Crime and Corruption Act and the Judges (Pensions and Long Leave) Act and in relation to a senior board member of the Parole Board, does that relate to the current arrangement of the Parole Board—or is that question not relevant to this legislation?

Ms Bradley: In relation to the amendment to the pensions and long leave act, the amendments to the Corrective Services Act and the Crime and Corruption Act were consequential because they were mirror provisions.

CHAIR: Yes. That is in relation to fixing up the regulation as to who can be qualified—and correct me if I am wrong—to give a certificate that the person is no longer fit for service?

Ms Bradley: That is right.

CHAIR: The bill talks about a former senior board member, but the Parole Board is constituted differently. It has a president and a deputy president. I am just trying to identify who is a senior board member. If it is outside the ambit of the bill, just tell me; I will not be offended.

Mrs Robertson: I think it is probably easier if we just take it on notice for you.

CHAIR: If it cannot be answered, you can tell me that.

Mrs Robertson: We can advise accordingly.

Mr LISTER: Mrs Robertson, I want to ask a question regarding consultation. I see in the explanatory notes the list of those bodies that were consulted. Many of them were consulted about areas that the department felt would be appropriate for their interests. Regarding the removal of the requirement to advertise positions at QCAT, which of the stakeholders in that list were consulted?

Ms Chandler: Regarding the removal of the requirement to advertise, we consulted with the president of QCAT on that.

Mrs Robertson: I understand that we did consult, if my memory serves me correct. I will correct the record if that is not correct. We certainly did consult QCAT in relation to that amendment. The idea of that amendment is to remove the advertising requirement each time. It does not mean—and I think the Attorney-General might have adverted to this in her explanatory speech—

CHAIR: Yes, she did.

Mrs Robertson: It does not mean that there will not be a public process; it is just removing that requirement every time.

Mr LISTER: Can I ask if you could take on notice the list of stakeholders who were consulted over that amendment—if there were any more than just the QCAT president?

Mrs Robertson: Yes. We are happy to clarify that for you, yes.

Mr LISTER: Thank you.

CHAIR: Is it fair to put the position this way: when people apply for that position there becomes a list of people who are suitably qualified. Therefore, rather than readvertise, they go back to the list, for want of a better explanation, rather than call again for expressions of interest, to make the process quicker to appoint a replacement?

Ms Chandler: It is for a number of reasons. It really will give QCAT flexibility. It will mean that, for example, if they suddenly have resource requirements they could appoint a member without having to go through the advertising process. There is already a provision in the act which means that the minister can appoint a pool of members that can be drawn on from time to time to act as members as well, so they already have that flexibility. It really is about not having to go through a full advertising process each time if you suddenly need a new member so that QCAT can respond to its resource requirements. No other civil and administrative tribunal of the other states and territories has that advertising requirement, but, as Mrs Robertson said, it does not mean that QCAT would not go through a public process or advertising requirement from time to time. They might do an expression of interest and, as you say, have that pool of readily available applications to draw from.

Mr ANDREW: I do not have anything at this time.

Mr LISTER: At this stage I have no further questions.

Mr McDONALD: I do not have any questions at this stage.

Ms McMILLAN: Why are trial assessors treated differently to account assessors and cost assessors in relation to protection and immunity?

Ms Bradley: The purpose of the amendment is to treat them similarly to cost assessors and trial assessors. The way the provisions were worded just was not covered by the legislation, so it is really just a correction to make sure that they are covered in the same way.

Mrs McMAHON: In relation to the amendments to sections 651 and 652 of the Criminal Code, could someone elaborate on the advantages of making these changes to 652, either for defendants or for the processes of hearing and deciding those summary offences?

Ms Rylko: Section 651 of the Criminal Code allows a District and Supreme court to hear and decide a summary offence if an indictment has been presented against a person before those courts. Normally a summary offence would have to be heard in the Magistrates Court. Under section 651(2) the court must hear and decide a summary offence only if certain conditions are satisfied, including that the accused person is represented by a legal practitioner and states their intention to plead guilty to the charge. A summary offence is defined in section 651(7), for the purposes of that provision, as a simple or regulatory offence or certain indictable offences which can only be dealt with summarily.

Currently section 652 of the Criminal Code means that if a defendant wishes to have a summary offence dealt with under section 651 they must make a written application to the clerk of the Magistrates Court that complies with the requirements in section 652(3) of the Criminal Code, including that a declaration is signed under the Oaths Act. Some concerns have been raised in relation to that requirement for a defendant to personally sign the application to transmit a charge under section 652. It particularly raises difficulties where the defendant or accused person is held in custody and does not have ready access to their legal representative. The issue was also raised in the recent Queensland Sentencing Advisory Council report relating to community based sentencing orders, imprisonment and parole options where it states at page 433 of that report that requiring the persons signature in the form of a sworn declaration constitutes two significant impediments that have resource implications for defence, which is often Legal Aid Queensland, and also prison management staff.

The bill amends those provisions in the Criminal Code to allow either a person charged with those offences or a lawyer on their behalf to make an application to transmit those summary offences or charges from the Magistrates Court to a higher court registry to allow them to be dealt with contemporaneously with indictable offences and also omits the requirement for the defendant to personally sign the application on oath.

Mrs McMAHON: In relation to amendments to section 463, Setting fire to crops and growing plants, I note the expansion of the definition to include grasses with a reference to any grass other than paragraph (b) and then any other vegetation. I am assuming this is meant to assist us in terms of current issues of vegetation fires where it is not necessarily a crop, per se, that has been set fire to but basically any bit of grass is going to be captured under this. Are deliberately set fires, which we are seeing now, meant to be captured under these amendments or are there still restrictions on when this offence would be applied?

Ms Rylko: Yes, the amendments in the bill are intended to clarify the operation of that provision in the code, section 463. Paragraph (d) particularly refers to any heath, gorse, furze or fern. That offence has been in place since the Criminal Code was originally enacted. The changes in the bill seek to essentially modernise and clarify the application of that provision, as you have referred to, particularly to naturally growing grass, for example on a roadside, or any other types of vegetation.

The offence is not changed in the sense that it is a crime which carries a maximum penalty of 14 years imprisonment, but it applies where a person wilfully and unlawfully sets fire to those things that are listed in the section.

Mrs McMAHON: We are talking about the deliberate fires that are being lit, almost regardless of where they are now. It is pretty much going to capture any deliberate and wilful lighting of fires just about anywhere.

Ms Rylko: Section 463 relates to setting fire to those particular things listed in that section. There are other provisions in the Criminal Code, for example section 461, that apply in relation to arson, which is about lighting fire to other types of things.

Mrs McMAHON: My last question is in relation to clause 49, which is the changes to stalking and the expansion of the term officer to law enforcement officer. Could you elaborate on the expansion of that definition? Who is now going to be protected under that expanded definition of law enforcement officer when it comes to stalking related offences?

Ms Kay: The new definition of law enforcement officer is the current definition at section 1 of the Criminal Code. That particular definition covers three categories of people. It can be an officer of a law enforcement agency, a person appearing for the director under the DPP Act, a person authorised by the CCC or a person that belongs to a class of person who is authorised in writing by the Commissioner of the Police Service or the Crime and Corruption Commission as a law enforcement officer. It is a very broad definition of law enforcement officer.

This is not really an expansion of that provision so much as a clarification of the way it was always meant to apply. In 2009 there were two amendments made, one to the offence of threats in the Criminal Code and one to the stalking offence. They both provided for a circumstance of aggravation when a law enforcement officer was investigating an offence. The words law enforcement officer were used with respect to the threats offence but the words law enforcement went missing from the amendment to the circumstance of aggravation to the stalking offence, so this is just to clarify, as per the intention at the introduction of those circumstances of aggravation in 2009, that it was always meant to apply to that broad definition in section 1 of the Criminal Code.

Mrs McMAHON: Do we know if there were any instances where people should have been protected under the definition officer when it came to this but it was not clear or there was a misinterpretation?

Ms Kay: No. We did check the court records and there are no instances of that offence being prosecuted, that circumstance of aggravation.

Mrs McMAHON: In relation to the changes to the DP(SO) Act, specifically clause 62 and the amended definition of prisoner, I note the report that you provide for us indicates that there is a distinction between prisoners who have had their parole cancelled and prisoners who have had their parole suspended. Could someone explain to the committee how that has been functioning previously, where that distinction has caused issues and what the amendment seeks to do to correct that distinction?

Ms Kay: As part of our business as usual, we always make sure that the legislation under the Attorneys portfolio is working to achieve its objects. Community protection is obviously the strong object behind the DPSO legislation and the strategic policies involved in DPSO in various capacities, and this is just an anomaly that came to our attention as part of business as usual. Currently under section 206 of the Corrective Services Act they treat a cancellation of a person's parole slightly different to a suspension. It all falls on the words a term of imprisonment, which you will see flows through all of these. We are clarifying that it applies to all people who are serving a term of imprisonment.

Section 206 of the Corrective Services Act says that when your parole is cancelled you return to serve a period of imprisonment but when your parole is suspended you return to serve a suspension period. They just do not use those words term of imprisonment which makes it clear that they are captured. That is an anomaly because obviously when the Parole Board has decided to suspend or cancel a prisoners parole they have been engaged in a risk behaviour which means that they should be reconsidered under the DPSO scheme, and if they return to imprisonment within the last six months of that term of imprisonment then they will be able to be captured by the legislation if they also meet the other criteria under the DP(SO) Act.

Ms McMILLAN: The committee recently examined the Auditor-Generals report on coronial services. Can you please tell us how these proposed amendments address the concerns raised by the Auditor-General?

Ms Kay: The specific recommendation in that auditor's report that these amendments address is recommendation 3. That asked the department to have a look, with other bodies, at ways in which we could improve efficiencies in the coronial system. You will see there is a whole handful of amendments that will do that. The largest one will be the ability for preliminary examinations to be held on a police officer reporting a death. At the moment there is no ability, without a coroner actually giving authority, for those preliminary examinations to take place. That will allow a triage of deaths for the coroner to decide which ones need to be investigated further and discretion to order an autopsy, which will allow in circumstances where it is unclear on the face, in such cases as a death in a healthcare scenario, so we know why the person died and there is no need to order an autopsy to further investigate that death. There is a series of amendments—they are all listed; I will not go through them—designed to assist in the triage of deaths to make that coronial system more efficient both from the health side and from the Coroners Court side.

CHAIR: In relation to the Coroners Court, is there still the requirement that once the paperwork has been prepared by the police that is then sent to the coroner's office so that the coroner still has to tick off on that, or is there a mechanism now where, for example, it is obvious how the person passed so the coroner then does not have to look at them, or does every one still go to the coroner?

Ms Kay: If it is a reportable death—so if it falls under the current section 8 of the Coroners Act—it will still go to the coroner and it will still go through that process.

CHAIR: That process is still the same, basically?

Ms Kay: Yes. The amendments do not alter that process.

CHAIR: In relation to specimen tissue, are there times when samples will be kept and times when samples will not be kept? Who makes the decision? Does the coroner make the decision?

Ms Kay: No. The amendments concerning the keeping of specimen tissue are with regard to those transitionals where we bring the old 1958 inquests into the modern coronial system under the 2003 act. Under the 1958 act, there was no provision that required the keeping of specimen tissue. Under the current act, all specimen tissue that is taken must be retained. Those transitionals, though, will provide that, in certain circumstances, where for some reason an inquest is reopened from the 1958 act and we have an old specimen tissue left, they then have to retain that. We only place that obligation on them quite fairly if they have it at the time it is reopened under the modern act.

CHAIR: Technically, if there is no sample it is all fine but if there is a sample it has to be retained?

Ms Kay: That is correct.

CHAIR: Are a lot of these amendments drawn from other states? There is mention here of Victoria.

Ms Kay: The mention of Victoria is particularly to do with preliminary examinations. I think Victoria was identified in the audit commission report as being a state where they did have this ability to triage using preliminary medical examinations. It is very difficult to line up the states as to who is like another but, for instance, the amendments regarding giving a discretion to a coroner with respect to the autopsy will mirror the provisions in other states. It is very hard to get like for like. The Victorian example is particularly related to that preliminary examination amendment.

CHAIR: One of the challenges in Queensland is remoteness in terms of where people may pass as a result of a tragedy or just from natural causes. Is there anything in the act that makes the system easier to manage? I do not know if it is still the case, but Cairns Magistrates Court, for want of a better description, was responsible for all of the outlying areas, from as far away as Weipa. I know that Weipa has a Magistrates Court but I think it is a visiting magistrate; I do not think it has a permanent one. A lot of work is generated. Will this bill help manage what occurs in remote areas, for example where there is not a doctor but there is a registered nurse?

Ms Kay: There is nothing really specific in the amendments that goes to that, but there are provisions to allow further delegation of some tasks to the additional coronial registrar. We hope that allowing that delegation of extra tasks will take some of the load off the coroner in that initial system, but there is no specific amendment directed at those regional challenges.

CHAIR: Again, that gets back to the preliminary examination. For example, could the coroner enlist the services of the registrar of a particular court to do the function?

Ms Kay: No. This is the coronial registrar. They are appointed under section 86 of the act. Currently there is only one. These amendments allow for the appointment of a second registrar and for the delegation of other functions that the coronial registrar does not currently have.

CHAIR: Does it allow, for example, where there is a clerk of the court to be appointed? Sometimes in those regional areas the clerk of the court wears many hats.

Mrs Robertson: Our understanding is that the effect will be that the position of whoever is going to be a coronial registrar is a matter for decision down the track, once the legislation is passed, but it is linked to that as opposed to a linkage back into the clerk of the court regime.

CHAIR: There could be more than one coronial registrar?

Mrs Robertson: Yes, but that is an officer under the Coroners Act itself. This amendment facilitates the possibility of there being another coronial registrar and that person could have delegations. We have seen in other legislation where there is linkage to that office of clerk of the court, but there is not that linkage there, as we understand it.

Mrs McMAHON: My next question refers to amendments to the Drugs Misuse Act. The report you have provided for the committee identifies the intent to protect drug informants with the creation of the offence—section 119—against people who disclose the identify, but in the next paragraph it implies that there are provisions which prevent the prosecution of an offence of disclosing identifying information about a drug informer. Can you explain to the committee how that has operated or failed to operate? What will this proposed amendment do to address or rectify that anomaly?

Ms Kay: The offence in the Drugs Misuse Act has existed since the act commenced in 1986, and it provides for the prosecution of a person who discloses the name of an informer. The difficulty with the way it was drafted is that it did not provide any exception for the disclosure of that person as an informer in a prosecution of that offence. We have amended the act, because obviously one of the key elements of proving that offence beyond reasonable doubt is that the person was an informer. It is

really a drafting oversight that has been corrected by this amendment. We are aware of only one matter that was ever charged, and it was discontinued. Again, this is a matter that has been brought to our attention to correct it.

Mrs McMAHON: How have we worked our way around this provision which precluded us from identifying who the informers were as part of a prosecution?

Ms Kay: We have provided that it is only when you disclose the informer's identity unlawfully. By adding the word unlawfully we make that clear, and we make clear the relevant provisions to which it applies.

Mrs McMAHON: My next question is in relation to the Evidence Act and 93A statements. Understanding that 93A statements are there to protect vulnerable witnesses, can you explain how 93A statements are currently being used, particularly in relation to exclusion of the public, and how the amendments will enhance protection of those witnesses? Basically, what is not currently being done and what is proposed to be done with 93A statements in court?

Ms Rylko: As you refer to, a section 93A statement is commonly a videotaped interview with a child or a person with an impairment of the mind that is taken by a police officer and used as the persons evidence in criminal proceedings. The Evidence Act already contains a number of provisions which aim to preserve the integrity of the evidence of vulnerable witnesses. Those include a scheme for the prerecording of evidence of affected children and also special witnesses, which may include children but also extends to a range of other types of vulnerable witnesses, for example a victim of a sexual offence.

These provisions include the ability for the court to exclude the public while those witnesses are giving evidence but also, when they have taken prerecorded evidence, while the playing of prerecorded evidence is undertaken before the court. However, there is currently no provision or power for the court to exclude the public when, similarly, a 93A statement that might have been taken from those witnesses is presented to the court. The amendments in the bill to the Evidence Act will ensure consistency across all of those provisions for those affected witnesses and special witnesses, whether it is through the presentation of a prerecorded statement or ensuring that, when a 93A statement is played before the court, the court has the power to exclude certain persons from the courtroom while that is being played.

Mrs McMAHON: I guess each case is different, but is there a blanket ban in terms of 93A statements as to who can be in the court? I know you used the term excluding certain persons. Is that a magistrates or judge's discretion in terms of when that occurs, or will it be standard operating procedure in a court that when a 93A statement is to be played or heard it will be a closed court and members of the public are excluded?

Ms Rylko: The amendments in the bill amend the existing provisions in relation to special witnesses and affected child witnesses. At the moment there is some discretion for the court, but generally they cannot exclude someone who is the accused in the proceeding, to ensure fairness in those particular proceedings. Other people who are not necessarily part of the proceedings may be excluded by the court.

Mrs McMAHON: I note the amendment in relation to directions to a jury if persons are excluded. Can you explain why the directions to a jury become important when referencing people who are excluded?

Ms Rylko: Again, those provisions expand the existing provisions in relation to the directions given to a jury. Those provisions—and I am sorry that I do not have a copy in front of me—are intended to ensure that the jury does not take any particular type of message away from the fact that people are excluded from the courtroom and the impact that may have on the persons evidence.

Mrs Robertson: Can I clarify the questions we have taken on notice? As I understand it, we need to clarify that consequential amendment to the Parole Board legislation in relation to the medical certificate being prescribed and who could prescribe that, and also give some understanding of the current Parole Broad structure. Secondly, we need clarification about whether the president of QCAT was specifically consulted in relation to the advertising requirement. That is my understanding of the two questions.

CHAIR: Thank you. Your responses to the two questions as outlined and taken on notice will be required by close of business on Wednesday, 18 December so that they can be included in our deliberations. That concludes this briefing. Thank you very much, Mrs Robertson, Ms Bradley, Ms Kay, Ms Rylko, Ms Chandler and Ms Flower for appearing today. I thank the secretariat staff and Hansard. A transcript of these proceedings will be available on the committee's parliamentary web page in due course. I declare the public briefing for the committees inquiry into the Justice and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019 closed.

The committee adjourned at 11.45 am.