

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE B

Mr L. W. Stephan (Chair) Mrs E. A. Cunningham
 Mr T. A. Barton Hon. M. J. Foley
 Mr F. E. Carroll Mr R. E. Schwarten

ATTORNEY-GENERAL AND MINISTER FOR JUSTICE**IN ATTENDANCE**

Hon. D. E. Beanland, Attorney-General and
 Minister for Justice
 Mr K. Martin, Director-General
 Dr K. Levy, Deputy Director-General
 Mr F. Clair, Chair, Criminal Justice Commission
 Mr J. Briton, Anti-Discrimination Commissioner
 Mr G. Hoffman, Local Government
 Commissioner
 Mr N. Lawson, Commissioner for Consumer
 Affairs
 Mr J. Hodgins, Director, Legal Aid Commission
 Mr R. Kidston, A/General Manager, Office of
 the Director of Public Prosecutions
 Mr M. Byrne, Deputy Director of Public
 Prosecutions
 Mr R. Newton, A/Director, Corporate Services
 Mr S. McGrory, Management Accountant,
 Corporate Services
 Mr D. O'Shea, Electoral Commissioner
 Mr B. Read, Acting Executive Director,
 Administration of Justice and Criminal
 Justice Programs

The Committee commenced at 9 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: I now declare open the meeting of Estimates Committee B. The Committee will examine the proposed expenditure contained in Appropriation Bill (No. 2) 1996 for the areas set out under the Sessional Orders. The Committee has determined that units will be examined in the following order: Department of Justice, Queensland Police Service and Office of Racing, Queensland Corrective Services Commission, Department of Emergency Services and the Office of Sport. The Committee has resolved that, having in mind the need to preserve privacy of departmental officers, film coverage of Estimates Committee B will be allowed for the Chairman's opening comments. At other times audio and print coverage will be allowed. The Committee has also agreed that it will suspend the hearings for a lunch break from approximately 1 p.m. to 2.30 p.m.

I remind members of the Committee and the Minister that the time limit for questions is one minute and, for the answers, no longer than three minutes. A single chime will give a 15-second warning, and a double chime will sound the expiration of this time limit. An extension of time may be given with the consent of the questioner and, thereafter, the presiding member's consent after every interval of two minutes has elapsed. The Sessional Orders

require that at least half the time is to be allotted to non-Government members. All answers to questions taken on notice must be supplied by 5 p.m. on 23 September 1996. I do ask departmental officers and witnesses to identify themselves before they answer a question so that Hansard can record that information in their transcript.

I would like to introduce the members of the Committee to you. We have Mr Matt Foley, the member for Yeronga; Mr Tom Barton, the member for Waterford; Mr Robert Schwarten, the member for Rockhampton; Mrs Liz Cunningham, the member for Gladstone; Mr Frank Carroll, the member for Mansfield; and I am Len Stephan, the member for Gympie.

I now declare the proposed expenditure for the area of the Department of Justice to be open for examination. The time allocated is three hours. The question before the Committee is—

"That the proposed expenditure be agreed to."

Minister, is it your wish to make a short introductory statement, or do you wish to proceed with the questioning? If you wish to make a statement, I ask that you limit it to five minutes.

Mr BEANLAND: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I will make a very brief statement. The Department of Justice's annual budget has increased by some \$36m this year, mostly in the area of capital works. There has been a sizeable increase in the funding in that particular area. In addition to that, there has been a \$2.8m increase in the Director of Public Prosecutions' Vote. In addition, there has been a \$2.6m increase in the Legal Aid Office. This is to allow for increased prosecutions and representations in those areas respectively. Of course, part of that is the continuation of the committals project, which is currently on trial and has been on trial for the latter part of 1995 and into 1996, both in Brisbane and Ipswich. That will continue in those two centres.

I suppose it is fair to say that, over this period, there have been a number of other areas in which we have worked on improving the delivery of services to the people of Queensland. In relation to that, a great deal of effort has gone into the Public Trust Office in this State. There were a number of outstanding issues there which we have now resolved and settled down to allow the Public Trust Office to function effectively, such as the need to make the Public Trustee an accountable officer, which had been requested for some time. A host of issues are outstanding from the Public Sector Management Commission and those types of things.

There has also been an effort to improve the delivery of service in the processing of justice of the peace applications across the State. Something that has concerned me for some time is the delays that have occurred there. We have managed to improve the processing there somewhat. There are still some hiccups because of the technical requirements of the processes that one needs to go through. We are currently endeavouring to rectify some of those issues.

I suppose it is fair to say that the alternative dispute resolution area is an area which has received some publicity in recent times. We have taken that area and endeavoured to again ensure that mediation services will be delivered through the courts system, as well as continuing with the Community Justice Program around the State. Currently there are mediation or ADR services provided in Brisbane. There are regional offices in Rockhampton, Townsville and Cairns. We will certainly be continuing with that. We have 81 courthouses around the State. We believe that there is a need to extend the breadth of delivery of that particular service. Last year, I discovered that there were some 834 cases handled in that area out of some 15,000 inquiries or applications for a cost of \$240,000. I do feel that we can improve somewhat in relation to that delivery of service.

The victims' injury compensation area is an area of ongoing concern. Last year, a sum of \$8.2m was spent in that area. It is a growing area. It is an area in which, when taking office, I found that there were a range of files and matters outstanding. We have endeavoured to clean up the backlog and get on with it. It is quite a large sum of money—\$8.2m. It is well over what was allocated—almost double what was originally allocated—for injury compensation claims.

I should make some further reference to capital works. This is largely taken up by two major projects: one at Southport, which is the extension of the courthouse; and one at Rockhampton, with the new court complex being constructed there. There are also funds allocated for some minor works right around the State. That includes things such as the sealing of car parks; putting in disabled ramps in a number of court facilities which still do not have those ramps to allow disabled people to gain access to the ground floor of those court facilities; and a range of what is classed as minor work of that nature. Some of the work might amount to \$100,000 or more. That is quite a large sum of money, particularly with providing ramps in some of these court facilities. As members would be aware, it is not always cheap. Some of the court facilities are heritage buildings and therefore they have to be treated very carefully with any application for providing disabled access to those court facilities. We have endeavoured to do that in order to provide greater access to some of the court facilities, as well as other minor work that is required to be carried out to make the court facilities more pleasant and comfortable not only for the people who do business there but also for the staff who work in those facilities in the first instance.

There are a number of other issues which I could canvas, but I think that members will probably canvas those issues as we go along. I will endeavour to answer those questions as they arise through the course of this morning.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. The first period of questions will commence with non-Government members.

Mr FOLEY: Minister, let me take you to page 1-16 of the Ministerial Program Statements. I refer to your Government's cut of \$1.4m in the budget of the

Criminal Justice Commission. I refer also to your answer to question on notice No. 5 to this Committee, wherein you said at page 4, in response to the Committee's question concerning the number of whistleblowers supported, "Budget reductions will have the impact of limiting this activity to whistleblowers located in the Brisbane area." I ask: what is the reason that your Government has cut services to whistleblowers? In particular, why should whistleblowers in Townsville and other parts of regional Queensland be denied support because of your Government's cut to the budget of the Criminal Justice Commission?

Mr BEANLAND: This is an answer which, in fact, comes from the Criminal Justice Commission. It is not an answer which I give; it is a matter for the Criminal Justice Commission. I say in relation to this issue of the Criminal Justice Commission's allocation: it is an allocation of over \$20m—it is well in excess, even with increases for the Director of Public Prosecutions Office. Secondly, if one looks at the figures, one will find that the Criminal Justice Commission—even allowing for a range of adjustments across-the-board in relation to the corporate services area—still has a very large Corporate Services Division. Before the adjustments, it is some 40 per cent of their budget. After adjustments, which we have made—a range of those—it is still some 26 per cent of their budget compared with 7 per cent of the departmental budget which is taken up with the Corporate Services Division. Clearly, that is an answer that comes from the Criminal Justice Commission.

Mr FOLEY: But you are the responsible Minister.

Mr BEANLAND: I cannot direct the Criminal Justice Commission. But I will certainly be indicating to the Criminal Justice Commission where the cuts should come, as I have already indicated to you this morning. I have indicated previously where the cuts should come, not to whistleblowers, not to misconduct areas and those types of things but in the area of corporate services. If one goes through the Corporate Services Division of the Criminal Justice Commission, one will find indeed that there are substantial areas there and significant savings that can be made.

Mr FOLEY: You appear to be unaware that this is, in fact, your answer to the Committee's question. You preface the answer by saying that the information is supplied by the Criminal Justice Commission; but in saying to this Committee "this is not an answer that I give", which are the words you used, you appear to be denying your own ministerial responsibility for the budget.

Mr BEANLAND: I'm not——

Mr FOLEY: I ask: which is false—the material as set out at page 116 of your Ministerial Program Statements or the material set out in your answer to question on notice No. 5, because they are inconsistent with each other? Which is false?

Mr BEANLAND: I simply answer the question that, from our point of view, there will not be a cut to whistleblowers. That answer is provided, as I have

indicated, by the Criminal Justice Commission. I have also indicated—and it is in the statement on page 116, I think—that, in fact, where we will be looking at savings within the Criminal Justice Commission area is within corporate services. I will be indicating that very clearly to the chairman and to the commission members of the Criminal Justice Commission in discussions that I intend to hold with them in the coming days—the coming weeks. So I preface this because this was supplied by the Criminal Justice Commission from their point of view, but it is not, in fact, how the Government and I certainly—and I accept the point from the member for Yeronga, and that is why I make the point; I have always made the point publicly, thank you—do not accept that cuts need to be made in those areas but, in fact, in the area of the Corporate Services Division.

Mr FOLEY: But, Minister, you accept surely that you have a duty to be truthful and responsive to the Parliament—

Mr BEANLAND: I certainly do.

Mr FOLEY:—with respect to the budget and hence to this parliamentary Committee.

Mr BEANLAND: I certainly do, and I have indicated very truthfully—very up-front and truthfully—that I do not accept that the cuts will be made in those particular areas.

Mr FOLEY: But that is inconsistent with the answer that you have given to this Committee to question on notice No. 5, where you were asked a question as to whether the material set out on pages 115 and 116 was accurate. You had the opportunity to answer it, and your answer set out, among other things, that the number of whistleblowers to be supported would be adversely affected. If that answer is not truthful, then I ask: why did you give the Committee an untruthful answer?

Mr BEANLAND: I did not supply it, as was quite clearly indicated.

Mr FOLEY: But you did, with respect, Mr Minister.

Mr BEANLAND: I—

Mr FOLEY: You did supply it to the Committee.

Mr BEANLAND: Can I answer, Mr Chairman? Thank you. We set out here quite clearly the notation that the following information has been provided by the Criminal Justice Commission. It is quite clear that I am not providing that particular answer. I made that quite clear and up-front. I do not see any problem in relation to that. If I were to provide another answer, the member for Yeronga would tell me that I was dictating to the Criminal Justice Commission, of course, exactly where they should and should not spend their money. I have never indicated that; I have indicated that we will assist the Criminal Justice Commission in saving in the particular area of the Corporate Services Division.

Mr FOLEY: Could you explain to the Committee those areas of corporate services where you say the Criminal Justice Commission is able to achieve the savings that you foreshadowed in

answer to question No. 15, namely, \$1.96m? Does that mean cuts to the training that they provide to their staff or cuts to the workplace health and safety that they provide for their staff? Cuts to what areas in particular do you rely upon in discharging your ministerial responsibility for presenting the budget to the Parliament?

Mr BEANLAND: I am happy to answer that. I am yet to go through the details of the Corporate Services Division budget of the Criminal Justice Commission and the departmental officers will be doing that in some detail. I have indicated that very clearly to the Criminal Justice Commission. There are quite a number of areas I am sure where, when we go through it, these savings will be made. After all, if the Department of Justice has a Corporate Services Division of 7 per cent, that says in its own self that there are significant savings that can be made. One has the situation that the chairman and members believe and undertake and, in fact, have indicated to me quite clearly that they are independent and aren't accountable through me as the Minister. I reject that totally as far as funding is concerned. I believe they are. I will be sitting down with them over the next few days, going through the CJC's budget in some detail, assisting them to make particular savings in this particular area.

Mr FOLEY: So you are unable to provide the Committee with any details of the matters upon which you have based the presentation of your budget to the Parliament for a cut in the sum of \$1.96m.

Mr BEANLAND: That is not true.

Mr FOLEY: Please provide those details as to the corporate services you propose should be cut.

Mr BEANLAND: I have indicated, in a corporate services boat of that size—that there are obviously significant areas—

Mr FOLEY: Such as?

Mr BEANLAND:—where savings can be made. I will certainly be going through those particular areas in due course, looking at things.

Mr FOLEY: Such as?

Mr BEANLAND: Such as—we need to look at things such as motor cars, such as the operation, the number of staff in that particular area, the types of operations the staff in the Corporate Services Division do undertake.

Mr FOLEY: What specifically, Minister?

Mr BEANLAND: We will have to sit down and go through those matters in some detail.

Mr FOLEY: I see: budget first and details later; is that it?

Mr BEANLAND: It is not the case at all. I think that, as I have already indicated very clearly, we have already looked at 40 per cent. We have adjusted a number of items off that to get back to 26 per cent. There is still a huge sum of money there that is eaten up by the Corporate Services Division, compared with 7 per cent out of the Department of Justice.

Mr FOLEY: Minister, in your own answer, you have foreshadowed \$1.96m worth of savings and

you seem quite unable to give to this Committee any rationale as to the details upon which you have arrived at that figure of \$1.96m. In detail, what specifically do you say, as the responsible budget Minister, are the cuts that should be made to achieve a saving of nearly \$2m.

Mr BEANLAND: It is \$1.96m. The Department of Justice looked at their corporate services and I think, from memory it was roughly 8 per cent savings across-the-board. Quite clearly, if those savings can be made in the Department of Justice across-the-board in corporate services areas, I believe that, significantly, they can also be made in the Criminal Justice Commission area.

Mr FOLEY: Do you not regard it as astonishing that you are unable to furnish the Parliament through this Committee with any specifics as to how virtually \$2m is to be cut from corporate services other than a blithe assurance that you believe that there are areas to be cut?

Mr BEANLAND: Well, in the corporate services area, if you have a figure of such a size, there are obviously areas which can, in fact, be looked at, savings which can be made in those particular areas.

Mr FOLEY: But, with respect, you do not know what they are.

Mr BEANLAND: It is the case of asking the Criminal Justice Commission to come in. It is a matter for them to come in and we will go through their figures with them. I have indicated to date, of course, that initially they did not feel that that was appropriate, but I have made that offer continuously to the chairman and commission members. I am looking forward, with the relevant officers, to going through the Corporate Services Division. There are always, of course, areas to be looked at in the corporate services area where savings can be made.

Mr FOLEY: Minister, the other construction is that this budget cut is simply a political attack by your Government on the important work of the Criminal Justice Commission. In seeking to rebut that, you have relied upon the explanation that that is not the case—that, in fact, this amounts to a cut with respect to savings in Corporate Services. Hence, your inability to specify any detail with respect to those proposed cuts gives a great deal of weight to the former hypothesis, does it not?

Mr BEANLAND: I do not think it does because there have been savings made across most departments, certainly the Department of Justice, around the 8 per cent figure, which is what we are looking at in this area. If you look at a figure—some 39 or 40 per cent covered in Corporate Services—and after we adjust that with things like administration costs and a range of other areas covered in that, getting accommodation, equipment, expenses and so forth, I think it does show, when you take that off, that there is still 26 per cent. There is certainly something amiss in this particular area. If members are saying that some people should be excluded from these sorts of reductions, well, I do not believe that is so. The department has been able to make significant savings across-the-board and I

think that it is only fair and reasonable that others likewise have to bear their share of the savings that are made.

Mr FOLEY: But is it not the responsibility of any responsible Minister to know the consequences of a budget cut before one makes it rather than figuring out the consequences later?

Mr BEANLAND: The consequences, I have already indicated to you, will be in the Corporate Services Division area. I think if you look at the accommodation situation—and I have raised this issue here previously—it is quite significant, the costs there. There are other costs across-the-board which are quite significant. I think that we need to sit down and work our way through those significant costs in these particular areas so that we can, in fact, ensure that the Criminal Justice Commission has a Corporate Services Division expenditure in keeping with Government across-the-board.

Normally, I do not think it is reasonable for anyone to have a huge Corporate Services Division compared to other parts of the public sector. I know about the independence of the Criminal Justice Commission and that, of course, makes it a little more difficult. They would maintain that they are accountable to the Parliamentary Criminal Justice Commission, as they did to me, and that, in fact, they were not in the first instance accountable to me. Now, I do not accept that and I will be sitting down and working through this Corporate Services area. Quite clearly, it needs some work doing on it in relation to it and some changes made in that area in relation to a range of issues which are currently covered in that particular vote, or that particular section.

Mr FOLEY: I would like to direct some questions to Mr Clair, the Chairperson of the Criminal Justice Commission. If he would come forward? Mr Clair, you have heard the evidence of the Minister in relation to the proposed cuts of \$1.96m. Is it your view that you can achieve those cuts to your Corporate Services budget?

Mr CLAIR: It is my view after careful consideration of the budgetary position and, in fact, quite intense consideration over the past week that not only is it not possible to achieve those cuts within the Corporate Services Division but at the moment the commission is in a position where it simply cannot achieve those cuts.

Mr FOLEY: What are the consequences of the budget cuts to the operation of the Criminal Justice Commission?

Mr CLAIR: The consequences are really very severe. If I can look at it on a division-by-division basis, because I have progressively throughout this exercise from the time at which cuts were first suggested, which was back in May of this year, had my directors in each division and the executive as a whole look at ways in which moneys could be saved and to look at the impact in each division.

The Intelligence Division—the consequences of the cuts that we have been able to manage at this stage—and I might say that is, in fact, at this stage still some \$985,000 short of reaching the target

which we are set under the present budget, that is, we still need to identify savings of \$985,000 and at this stage we can see no way to do that, but on the basis that we still have then almost \$1m to find, these are the impacts so far—in the Intelligence Division, the main impact will be felt in the areas of accountability and security. There will be delays experienced in certain areas of registration of movement of documents into and out of the division. We will not be able to do as frequently as we would like the audits which we have done regularly in the past in the Intelligence Division of all source documents that we have.

With trying to identify further cuts over the past week, the further impacts would be these—and these are more drastic than those earlier ones that were identified—the further cuts in the Intelligence Division will mean that there will have to be a rationing of information and retrieval services, particularly in respect of obtaining any Telstra information. The information from Telstra, which involves principally what we term call charge records—you bear in mind we do not have any telephone tap powers but in the course of its investigations the commission can get access to call charge records which shows who called whom and when—these call charge records, or CCRs, are extremely important in respect of our organised crime investigations. The Intelligence Division will find it very limiting under the additional cuts in terms of organised crime investigations both in collecting intelligence in respect of those and also in supporting investigations then carried out through the Official Misconduct Division or the Joint Organised Crime Task Force. There will be a cutting of travel costs. They will be slashed by 66 per cent within the Intelligence Division. This will limit the operational effectiveness in the investigation of organised crime, particularly the intelligence-gathering area. For example, in respect of the intelligence activities in the investigation of Italian organised crime, the regional collection of statistics is very important. That kind of thing will necessarily be reduced. There will also be a cut to the communications budget. I realise I have gone beyond the bell and, being a debater, I am somewhat embarrassed. May I continue?

Mr FOLEY: Please continue. Just regard it as my next question.

Mr CLAIR: Thank you. In the Research and Coordination Division, the effects of the cuts overall—the first round, as I call them, which led us to the figure we proposed to the Minister earlier and now the second round designed to meet this more drastic cut—the effect in the Research and Coordination Division will be that the division will have to concentrate on what are referred to as core areas. The core area for the Research Division is really managing the reform agenda in respect of the Queensland Police Service. The Research Division has an increased task in that area as a result of the delivery recently of the results of the QPS review committee's activities under Sir Max Bingham. There is quite an increased workload there. That is really going to be by far the major task of the Research Division this year.

It will have to cut back on its work in general criminal justice issues—for instance, the assessment of legislation, recent examples being juvenile justice legislation and some work on the Public Service Bill and other legislation that crops up from time to time—and also on the assessment of other initiatives in that area. It may be that the Research Division can, where there is specific funding for certain projects—and it did have an involvement in the committals project to which the Minister has referred—and if it does have to do work in areas such as that, it will have to look at specific funding out of whatever funding has been allocated within the relevant department for those projects. The cuts will limit the capacity of the Research Division to take the steps which the commission envisaged that it might in respect of making a contribution to crime prevention initiatives within the State. Further, the cuts will reduce the capacity for the Research Division to continue its active participation in the implementation of Queensland Police Service projects. For instance, the community policing project involving beat policing, while driven from within the Police Service, is something which the Research Division has taken some active participation in in the past. It will not be able to continue active participation in such areas.

Mr FOLEY: Can I take you to the Official Misconduct Division?

Mr CLAIR: Yes. For the Official Misconduct Division, the consequence of the cuts will involve disbanding one of three multidisciplinary teams. This will reduce the commission's capacity to investigate complaints. It will mean that the commission, through its assessment process, will have to, as it were, assess out, at the bottom of the initial assessment stage, 200 complaints. That will mean that, measuring it as best we can, there will be 200 fewer complaints which the commission will be able to investigate in the course of the year.

Mr FOLEY: Surely that will weaken the capacity of the commission to combat misconduct and corruption?

Mr CLAIR: Yes, most certainly. Hopefully we will be able to do that with the complaints that at least appear to be at the bottom end of the system. However, one can never be sure of those complaints which are initially assessed as being complaints of not so great a seriousness. Mind you, we already have a system to isolate and put to one side frivolous complaints, of course. However, one can never be sure that those of a greater degree of seriousness which we would ordinarily investigate might not, on further investigation, turn out to be of even greater significance. There is a risk of missing, as it were, quite significant instances of corruption and official misconduct.

The next significant result within the Official Misconduct Division is that the Joint Organised Crime Task Force, which is the body through which the commission, together with the QPS on a cooperative basis, investigates the areas of organised crime which fall within the commission's jurisdiction. That task force will need to be reduced to half of its current strength. Accordingly, it will

have to reduce its activities. In real terms, this means that, out of the four general areas of organised crime which the commission currently has within its jurisdiction, two will need to be sacrificed.

Mr FOLEY: That must inevitably weaken the effort against organised crime?

Mr CLAIR: Without a doubt it will weaken the effort. What it means, and we have no choice but to do this, is that two areas of organised crime—and they are two very significant areas, but not the most significant of the four that we conduct—will have to be abandoned in terms of active investigation. One is Operation Shamrock, which involves the investigation of Chinese organised crime—in a sense, the Triads. The other is the investigation of Japanese organised crime, the Yakuza, which is Operation Tara. We simply will not have the capacity to conduct investigations in those areas.

There is no effective answer to this. We have looked at how we can manage it otherwise. It is a matter of sadness for me, although I am recently within the commission, and certainly for those people who have been involved in these areas, because of the body of expertise which has been built up. If one is to look at it on a commercial basis, there is a body of expertise which has been built up over some five and a half years. In a sense, the mere fact that there is this body of expertise which has been built up is in itself of considerable value. It is very hard to pass that expertise over to another law enforcement agency. There is a difficulty in that the Queensland Police Service at this stage has not developed, to a significant extent anyway, the use of the multidisciplinary team concept which the commission uses in order to, as it were, get a picture on the whole organisation in investigating organised crime.

Mr FOLEY: But they have not been given any extra resources to pick up those tasks?

Mr CLAIR: That would be one side. The other side is a practical one, that it is not simply a case of saying, "Here it is. We have built it up and you look after it." That will mean that there will not be, with that, the expertise and knowledge that has been built up within the commission now.

The reason that those two are chosen as the ones that we will have to step back from is that the other two areas which the commission investigates—that is, the Outlaw motorcycle gangs and Italian organised crime—are both areas which involve a much higher likelihood of involvement of official corruption. The clear evidence in the possession of the commission supports that position, that is, that not only the likelihood but also the reality is that serious occasions and instances of official corruption are identified in respect of both of those groups. Therefore, when the commission comes to make a choice, the commission has to have regard to the rationale that lies behind the Criminal Justice Act, that is, that the reason the commission is given the power to investigate organised crime is because of the likelihood of official corruption, particularly within the Police Service, and the evidence indicates again and again that that is occurring. Those groups—the organised motorcycle gangs and Italian organised crime—are also more entrenched in Australian

society. They are more significant and there is a wider pattern of associated corruption.

Can I mention one more effect within the Official Misconduct Division, and it is a significant one. On the way that we have now had to draw our budget, even though we are almost \$1m short of the mark, we have no capacity within that budget to conduct public hearings. That is a matter which, as chairperson, concerns me greatly because, from time to time, matters arise which require the commission to conduct public hearings. It is no secret that the conduct of public hearings is an expensive matter and we simply have not been able to make any capacity within our budget for that. One thing that concerns me is that evidence of corruption within the Police Service is such that there may well need to be a public hearing at some stage into that. At this stage, we have no capacity in our budget for it and there is a real likelihood of that investigation going stale if the commission has to defer further action on it.

The CHAIRMAN: The time for questions from non-Government members has now expired. I call on Mr Carroll.

Mr CARROLL: My first question is to the Honourable the Minister. The CJC appears to be utilising about one-fourteenth of your overall budget with \$20m out of \$272m. When we look at the criminal justice program budget of \$53m, it gets about 40 per cent. Mr Clair has given us a great detail of the cuts that may have to be effected if the restriction of his budget is to proceed as you have outlined. However, at about 9.20 this morning you indicated, if my memory is correct, that the CJC had declined to come in and discuss these possible cuts. Is there a communication problem between you and the CJC as one of your responsible under-departments?

Mr BEANLAND: There is probably a misunderstanding by the CJC in relation to budgetary matters. They certainly do come under the portfolio. There has to be a great deal of work between both the CJC, the Minister and the department in relation to this, just the same as there has to be in relation to a whole range of other issues. That does not mean to say that the commission should not be independent and is not independent; it certainly is, and I believe rightly so. Nevertheless, independent commissions always indicate the worse case scenario of doom and gloom in relation to any changes to budgetary matters. That always happens no matter what sort of commission it is or group that you might be looking at. Certainly, we will be sitting down with the Criminal Justice Commission accountants and various people who want to come in and work through their budget over the coming days and weeks to ensure that the worst case scenario of doom and gloom is not met but that in fact real savings are made, just the same as real savings need to be made from time to time in Government right across-the-board.

Everyone gets some fat aboard the ship of state. It is only a matter of course that these things happen. With the best will in the world it happens to every committee, commission or whatever it might be

after a period of time. We will certainly be sitting down and working through these things, regardless of feelings about the matter. I believe that it is only correct and proper that this be done. In addition to that, I think there are certain areas, such as the misconduct area, which are the basic reasons for establishment of the CJC in the first instance. I think that we must ensure that they continue to operate fully funded in a way which is appropriate and proper. Regardless of the original comments from the CJC that in fact they are accountable to the parliamentary committee, as far as funding is concerned they certainly come through the portfolio. We will certainly be sitting down and working through these figures. I won't accept that as the answer to this question. I think it is very clearly a matter of simply sitting down and working it through. As the department and departmental officers work through all their various divisions and sections, we will certainly be sitting down and working through this particular matter.

Mr CARROLL: Has the CJC endeavoured to put its budgetary requirements to you through the PCJC?

Mr BEANLAND: I do not recollect having sighted any of those. I would have to just check with the officers. No, we haven't got anything from the PCJC.

Mr CARROLL: I asked that question because you have indicated that your understanding is that the CJC is endeavouring to say that it is accountable to the PCJC.

Mr BEANLAND: It certainly is when it comes to the day-to-day operational basis. But when it comes to funding, of course, that must come through a portfolio, through a Minister and through the Parliament.

Mr CARROLL: Of course. You have indicated that the capital part of your budget is being expanded but that the program and personnel segment, if I might summarise it that way, has been subjected to a restriction of about 8 per cent. Are you simply saying that the CJC, similar to every other part of your portfolio, has to tighten its belt?

Mr BEANLAND: That is so. I think there are some areas on which there is greater pressure today than ever before, such as the Director of Public Prosecutions and the need for more Legal Aid money. Unfortunately, there seems to be a bigger workload in those particular areas than ever before. Consequently, we have endeavoured to meet commitments there to ensure that there are adequate funds for proper prosecutions to occur. Hence, following a report from the CJC, we will continue for at least another 12 months the committals project. I have always believed that, if we can make that effective and show that it is going to save the taxpayers' dollars and bring benefits to taxpayers as a whole at the end of the day, that program should continue. I would hope that, while there still may be some doubts whether that will be the case, the committals project will show that there are great benefits to the community, and that that project will continue also, because I believe that is in the interest of criminal justice in this State as well.

Mr CARROLL: Have any of the heads of other sections of your portfolio run any political campaign or complaint about their budget cuts in the press?

Mr BEANLAND: I am not just offhand aware of it.

Mr FOLEY: On a point of order—the question implies that some organisation has run a political campaign. There is no evidence before the Committee of that.

The CHAIRMAN: No, we are just asking.

Mr BEANLAND: I am not aware. I am happy to answer the question. There are other issues, of course, other concerns about changes that are occurring in a number of areas, not of our ilk or our making, but changes brought about by the Federal Government in relation to the Legal Aid Commission and so forth. They have got some airing. But that's nothing to do with the budget. I am not aware of anyone being in the media in relation to the budget as such.

Mr CARROLL: A short while ago this morning, Mr Clair used words in his statement to the effect that the CJC cannot achieve the cuts which you are imposing. I found it to be almost the case that you are being told that the CJC will simply have to have the money and that it, unlike another department, is really requiring an open cheque. Do you have any comment on that?

Mr FOLEY: On a point of order—this is a matter of fairness. If that proposition is to be put to the Minister, it should be put to Mr Clair first.

The CHAIRMAN: No, he can direct a question to whomever he likes.

Mr FOLEY: I am just drawing to your attention—

The CHAIRMAN: If the Minister wants to redirect the question, that is up to him.

Mr FOLEY: I am just drawing your attention to the requirements of procedural fairness. If such a proposition is to be put about a witness who is before this Committee, then natural justice requires that the proposition be put to him.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, Minister.

Mr BEANLAND: I am sure that we will work through those processes. I appreciate that in commissions and committees everyone puts the worse case scenario. I have always found throughout life, of course, that that's the case where one is affecting the taxpayers' dollars. If you are getting taxpayers' dollars for something and you are not receiving what you received previously, there is always a need for more funding for whatever it might be. That is normal and natural; that is human life. But, of course, at the end of the day commitments have to be met across-the-board and adjustments have to be made. They have been made across-the-board in my department and other departments. Likewise, I think it is only appropriate that, as I have already indicated, the Criminal Justice Commission in the particular area also look at adjustments. I am sure that we will be able to work through these. I have no concerns about that. We are still talking about well in excess of \$20m. That is not a small amount of

money. It is considerably more than the Director of Public Prosecutions gets, even with the considerable increase of \$2.8m, I might add. So I am sure that those issues will be worked through over the coming days.

Mr CARROLL: Will you be looking at the strict requirements of the Criminal Justice Commission Act to see what the core duties of the commission are?

Mr BEANLAND: I certainly will be, and certainly will be as far as the misconduct area is concerned. I only mention that because the chairman has already mentioned it. It is most important to ensure that the misconduct division operates effectively and efficiently. After all, one of the major purposes of establishing the Criminal Justice Commission was to put some outside check on the Police Service and the public sector area generally. That is the role of the misconduct area in the CJC.

Mr CARROLL: So will you be seeing that the core services required of that commission under the Act will be able to be funded by the budget?

Mr BEANLAND: I believe the core services required under the Act can be met, and I see no reason why they should not be met from that sum of money.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: Mr Clair, your budget last year was \$21.6m. It is going down to \$20.1m. I would like a clarification, if I could. A list of cuts is proposed. As to public inquiries—you suggested that one would be held but that it is in doubt because of budgets. You have proposed that whistleblower support be reduced to Brisbane; that misconduct risk reviews be reduced by 60 per cent; and that misconduct workshops be reduced by 80 per cent. In your earlier answer, you talked about travel in the Intelligence Division being reduced by 66 per cent. You said that the review of legislation and the Police Service reform agenda would be affected. As to official misconduct—one out of three teams is to be disbanded. The Joint Organised Crime Task Force will go to half strength, from four to two. Given that it is a \$1.5m reduction, your list seems to reflect a disproportionate impact. Could you clarify why a \$1.5m reduction in a \$20m budget should have such a disproportionate effect?

Mr CLAIR: First of all, the budget for 1995-96 was, as you say, \$22.4m. That was taking the Government appropriation plus the income for the year, plus moneys that were left over from the previous year. There were what can be described as non-discretionary increases, increases which are set out fully in an annexure to a letter which I sent to the Minister back in July 1996 setting out all of the impacts of the first round of cuts that—

Mr FOLEY: Will you table that letter, please?

Mr CLAIR: I can. Can I undertake to provide copies? I don't have copies of it at the moment, but can I undertake to provide copies within the time limit fixed for questions on notice perhaps?

Mr FOLEY: Yes. Thank you.

Mr CLAIR: That annexure indicates that there were increases in what I will refer to as non-discretionary items—rental and all the rest—of some

\$816,000, which brought the requirement by way of budget, in order to operate at the same level as 1995-96, up to \$23.3m in round terms. This year, what we have by way of appropriation is \$20.1m plus about a \$500,000 income, which is the same as last year. So we have \$21.6m. In order to operate at the same level as we were last year, the cut in real terms is \$2.7m rather than \$1.5m.

Now, starting from that base, I can assure the honourable member, Mr Chairman, that we have been through the budget with a fine toothcomb, not only just over the past week but also before that, and all of the percentages which I have given are real percentages in terms of the cuts in those items of the budget. For instance, the travel budget—and I didn't have an opportunity to mention this earlier—for the Corruption Prevention Division has been cut by 32 per cent, and that will have a real effect on the ability of the Corruption Prevention Division to service people in country areas. There has been a 60 per cent cut in moneys available for misconduct risk reviews. That is either where there has been some evidence of official misconduct in an organisation or where we have been invited in to do reviews on risks of corruption. So all the figures have been carefully—

The CHAIRMAN: We have reached the end of the three minutes. Would you like to have the answer continue?

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: If you do not mind—just for a minute or so, please.

Mr CLAIR: Can I say this: all of the percentages are based on actual cuts in figures that have been worked through very carefully. It is not a case of this being, as it were, an ambit claim or stating a worst-case position. What has been done is to work through carefully in each area.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: It just appears to be a disproportionate impact given the dollars involved, albeit you said the real dollar impact was 2.7 and on the Budget papers it is 1.5. Would you say—if I could just ask one more question—that there is a comparatively high cost of non-operative functions of the CJC?

Mr CLAIR: No, I wouldn't say that at all. I think the Minister mentioned that there was a budget of 40 something per cent in corporate services. That in fact arises—and I can give you real figures in a moment—from the fact that our 1995-96 budget was a budget done in divisional terms and not program terms. Therefore, there were many costs within the Corporate Services Division that in fact were costs related to programs, that is, that under a program budgeting system—which we are now using—would be disbursed to programs. Just a quick thumbnail sketch on the figures. The budget on a divisional basis for 1995-96 involved \$8.2m for corporate services, which was 36.44 per cent of the total budget, but of course that budget contained the cost of motor vehicles, fringe benefits tax, accommodation—a large cost—computer hardware and software, all of the IT expenses, telephones and advertising. All of those things were things which were really relevant to programs. Then with the program budgeting we move to a position where,

under the Corporate Support subprogram, other elements of the old divisional budget were brought into Corporate Support, but some things were then disbursed across other programs, and the budget then for the Corporate Support subprogram amounted to almost 25 per cent. But then if one is to take out of that the other elements—for instance, the executive, the Office of General Counsel, Police Command Unit, the library and the misconduct tribunals—and take out other items that should rightly be disbursed across programs, one comes down to a budget for Corporate Services Division of \$1.92m, which is 9.31 per cent.

Can I say this: the first time that I became aware that there was any concern on the part of the Minister or anybody in his department about the amount of money within the corporate services part of the commission's budget was in fact after the budget figure was announced. Can I say this, too, just in that connection: I have never—and I do seek to correct the record, and I am in the unenviable position of having to disagree with the Minister—asserted that the Criminal Justice Commission is not accountable to the Minister for financial matters. In fact, the Act makes it quite plain that the Criminal Justice Commission is. I did assert at one point—if I can just—

The CHAIRMAN: Have you nearly finished?

Mr CLAIR: Almost finished, Mr Chairman. I did assert at one point that it wasn't appropriate for the Under Treasurer to be indicating what functions the commission should carry out, and I did say that that sort of thing was a matter for the commission or for the parliamentary committee. Mr Chairman, can I correct the public record on one other matter, that is, that the question—

The CHAIRMAN: Well, we need questions for you to answer.

Mr CLAIR: You will appreciate, Mr Chairman, that I am a novice in this area, but I do think that, in fairness, there is one further matter that I should correct.

Mr FOLEY: Mr Chairman, I ask for your indulgence.

Mr CLAIR: Otherwise I would go away feeling very dissatisfied with the process.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, but the procedure is usually that you answer questions.

Mr CLAIR: I appreciate that, but there was an answer given by the Minister that indicated that I have never put forward any requests in respect of the budget through the parliamentary committee. In fact, that is because I recognise him as being responsible for budget. When we were asked about costs and the suggestion was made as to what functions we could sacrifice, that came out of an Under Treasurer's memorandum, and I indicated that it wasn't appropriate for the Under Treasurer or for the Director-General of the Justice Department to be dictating functions to us. I did, however, indicate that we would attempt to make cost savings. I then subsequently wrote to the Minister on 11 July a lengthy letter setting out the attempts we had made to save and in fact putting forward a figure as a

proposed budget figure which involved a 5.3 per cent reduction in real terms on the previous year. In that letter, I set out many of the points that I have mentioned today as to the impact of such cuts.

Mr FOLEY: Will you table that letter, Mr Clair?

Mr CLAIR: Yes. That is the same letter to which I referred before, and I will table that letter. That followed an earlier letter of 12 June which was in response to the memorandum.

Mr FOLEY: Would you table that, too, please?

Mr CLAIR: Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr Chairman, for that indulgence.

Mr CARROLL: Minister, mention was made before, I think by Mr Clair, in regard to what I understood to be a substantial outlay and time involved in purchasing call charge records. What was spent on that in 1995-96?

Mr BEANLAND: Sorry, what was that?

Mr CARROLL: What was spent by the CJC on acquiring call charge records in 1995-96? Perhaps Mr Clair might have the answer.

Mr BEANLAND: It is a matter for the Chairman. Mr Clair might give an answer to that.

Mr CLAIR: I am sorry, the honourable member is asking about a difference in cost between one year and the other?

Mr CARROLL: No, I am simply asking what was spent in 1995-96 on the acquisition of call charge records, and I would expect that would be not only fees paid to the provider but also manpower and time involved.

Mr CLAIR: Can I take that question on notice, Mr Chairman, and provide those details?

The CHAIRMAN: You can take it as a question on notice if it is suitable for you.

Mr CARROLL: I am happy for that to go on notice.

Mr CLAIR: I do not know that I would even have those details immediately available to me, but they can be made available.

Mr CARROLL: From Mr Clair's answer to a question this morning, Minister, I gained the impression that the Research Division spends a lot of time on the Police Service review. Should this not be left to the Police Minister? I add that in Mr Clair's statement he went down to such detail as comments on beat policing. Is it not the case that that kind of detail should be really left to the Police Minister?

Mr BEANLAND: I think there probably are some areas that someone needs to do research in and ongoing work. Whether that is a matter for the CJC or for the Police Service—nevertheless, there are areas there. Obviously, through arrangements with the Commissioner of Police, the CJC is continuing doing work in this particular area. There is, of course, the recent inquiry into the Police Service by Sir Max Bingham, and there is a process there now of putting in place a wide-ranging number of those recommendations which will probably, I would think, flow over the top of whatever works the Research Division of the CJC has been doing,

because this inquiry that was set up under Sir Max Bingham now has an implementation unit and that implementation unit is now out putting in place the recommendations, as I understand it, of that particular committee. So there is probably not the degree of work that there was prior to that, but there are, I am sure, certain areas which need ongoing monitoring which in the past has been carried out by the CJC.

Mr CARROLL: But is it not the case, when we bear in mind the number of reports and reviews that have been undertaken on the Police Service, that that kind of review work should be left to the Police Minister now?

Mr BEANLAND: I am sure the implementation unit will do a lot of that work and I am sure there will be a lesser role for that sort of work, anyway. There will be a much lesser role for the CJC to play in that particular area than what there was previously.

Mr FOLEY: Through you, Mr Chairman, by way of a supplementary question, if I may?

The CHAIRMAN: Are you willing to take a supplementary question?

Mr BEANLAND: I am easygoing.

Mr FOLEY: Is the Minister unaware of the statutory function under the Criminal Justice Act which the Minister himself administers requiring the CJC to carry out this function, namely, to review the Police Service?

Mr BEANLAND: I am not unaware of the statutory requirements, Mr Chairman. That is why I kept saying there is a lesser role, because the work the Bingham implementation unit is doing following the Bingham inquiry does not mean to say, of course, that there is no role, and I have indicated that previously. There is a role there still to play, probably a lesser role than what there was because of what the implementation unit and inquiry has come up with. They are going to implement a range of issues there. There is still work and there is still a role and that will continue, lesser though it might be, for the Criminal Justice Commission. There are certain requirements under legislation in relation to that.

Mr CARROLL: Mr Chairman, I have some more questions, but I think it is the Opposition's half hour now.

The CHAIRMAN: We will have another five minutes.

Mr CARROLL: Minister, Mr Clair said that CJC travel costs overall would have to be cut by about 60 per cent. What was the travel costs component of all CJC outlays in the last financial year?

Mr BEANLAND: Perhaps Mr Clair would like to answer that.

Mr CLAIR: I think I indicated that the travel costs in the Intelligence Division would be slashed by 66 per cent. That is one of the items that has been identified by the Director of the Intelligence Division as where he will have to make savings to meet cuts in his budget. It was not travel cuts across-the-board. There are different percentages in each area according to how the directors have seen the need to make cuts. I do not know that I am in

possession at the moment of the actual travel costs within the Intelligence Division last year. I can certainly take that question on notice and provide the details of that accordingly.

Mr CARROLL: My question was the total travel costs outlaid by the CJC in the last financial year. Do you have a figure for that?

Mr CLAIR: Yes, I can provide that. I do have a figure for overseas travel and interstate travel, but I do not have the intrastate travel at this stage. Perhaps I can take it on notice and provide the all-up figure in time.

Mr CARROLL: Mr Chairman, if I might therefore ask the record to be noted that I would like that treated as a question on notice, that is, to provide the full particulars of the travel expenses outlaid, including a break-up at least with the subheadings that Mr Clair has mentioned. May we have here and now those parts of the subheadings that Mr Clair does have?

Mr CLAIR: Yes, I do have those. In 1995-96, overseas travel was \$24,733, and what is described as interstate conference travel was \$12,361. They are the components that I have at hand at the moment, Mr Chairman. There will need to be the intrastate costs and there may be intrastate operational travel—I should say interstate operational travel—but I undertake to provide those in the categories as the honourable member has asked.

The CHAIRMAN: The time for this section of the questioning from Government members has expired. Mr Foley?

Mr FOLEY: Mr Clair, you outlined to the Committee a number of the implications of budget cuts for the Intelligence Division, the Research and Coordination Division and the Official Misconduct Division. Can you indicate to the Committee whether there are implications of budget cuts for the other divisions?

Mr CLAIR: In the Corruption Prevention Division, it starts with the fact that there is really a four-pronged strategy in that division. The first is liaison with principal officers of units of the public sector to assist them to develop prevention strategies. The second strategy is misconduct risk reviews, the third is education and training, and the fourth is whistleblower advice and support. The effects in those areas—a 32 per cent cut in travel means that the chief executive officers of local governments and regional directors of Public Service departments will have reduced assistance in terms of developing prevention strategies.

A 60 per cent cut in misconduct risk reviews means that many of the poor controls or security lapses revealed during the Official Misconduct Division investigations that lead to misconduct occurring may not be addressed by agencies. It has been the CJC's experience in the past that when poor management systems are not addressed, repeat crimes are common. Thirdly, an 80 per cent cut in conference and workshop funds means that the CJC will not be able to conduct conferences that focus on particular types of misconduct, for instance, school-based assault, which is one on which the

commission is wanting to focus, and another area was selling confidential information.

Fourthly, the CJC will not be able to honour a commitment made to the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities to employ a part-time ATSI woman to deal with women's business, involving issues such as assisting Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women to report rape and sexual harassment by teachers, police officers or health workers. Those are the effects in the Corruption Prevention Division.

Mr FOLEY: What about the other divisions?

Mr CLAIR: I think the one that I have not dealt with is the Witness Protection Division. The impacts there are, firstly, that the number of police officers attached to the division may have to be reduced. Staff within that division are already overloaded with cases, and a reduction in staff numbers will result in even heavier case loads for the remaining officers. That, in turn, will result in reduced levels of protection and supervision of witnesses. The division really has no control over the number of witnesses referred to it for protection. So that is necessarily a heavier load. The operational expenditure will have to be reduced substantially. Serious consideration will have to be given to whether we discontinue the 24-hour staffing of the communication rooms, which will result in a reduced level of opportunity for witnesses to contact the commission, and will also reduce the opportunity for the public to contact the commission after hours. The number of support staff attached to the division may have to be reduced. Further, the reductions will have a serious impact on the ability of the division to provide efficient and effective protection to witnesses. It must be borne in mind that those witnesses are witnesses who have assisted the commission or other law enforcement agencies in the State to discharge their functions and responsibilities.

Mr FOLEY: I might try to summarise some of the impacts then on the basis of your evidence. With respect to the Official Misconduct Division, there will be less investigation of complaints against police and public officials as a result of the disbanding of one of the teams; there will be less effort in combating organised crime; and there will be less opportunity for a public hearing into police corruption as a result of the budget cuts. Is that a correct summary of part of the effects?

Mr CLAIR: Yes.

Mr FOLEY: I take you to an answer given by the Minister to a question on notice from this Committee furnished upon advice from the Criminal Justice Commission. In particular, I refer to page 6 of the answer to question 5, wherein the Minister informed the Committee, on the advice of the commission, as follows—

"The commission's ability to combat corruption is severely compromised by the availability of resources."

That is a very serious statement. Is it one that you regard as correct?

Mr CLAIR: I am sorry. Could you read that statement again?

Mr FOLEY: Page 6 of question on notice No. 5.

Mr CLAIR: I do not believe that I have the relevant document.

Mr FOLEY: Part of that question was, "Will this reduction compromise the ability of the CJC to combat corruption?" The answer commences with this statement, "The commission's ability to combat corruption is severely compromised by the availability of resources."

Mr CLAIR: There is no doubt that that is a true statement. The fact is that we have conducted an exercise which is designed to find as many savings as possible. We have moved programs within the information technology area over to next year. We have delayed other programs within the Corporate Services area. We still find ourselves in the position where we have to take the steps which have the effects that I outlined earlier, and we are still almost \$1m short of reaching the mark. So the availability of resources necessarily affects the commission's ability to combat corruption.

Mr FOLEY: Is it not a disturbing state of affairs if the commission's ability to combat corruption is being severely compromised by the availability of resources at a time when the royal commission into police corruption in New South Wales has revealed endemic corruption in that Police Service?

Mr CLAIR: It is certainly a matter of great concern to me what we are seeing at the moment through our investigations both into organised crime and into official misconduct. We are seeing very definite signposts into corruption at relatively high levels within the Police Service. That is a matter which will need to be addressed. When I say "relatively high levels", I mean not just at the very fringes. That is a matter that will need to be addressed, and it may need to be addressed in ways that will necessarily be expensive. If that kind of activity has to be delayed because of lack of resources, then the ability of the commission to fight corruption is severely compromised.

Mr FOLEY: Did I understand your evidence correctly to the effect that, prior to the announcement of the budget, you had not received an approach from the Minister or the Minister's department with respect to any proposed cuts to Corporate Services?

Mr CLAIR: I wrote the letters that I referred to earlier. I did not ever receive any response, even by way of acknowledging receipt of those letters. I received no indication of any concern on the part of anyone within the Justice and Attorney-General's Department or within the Minister's office or the Minister himself indicating that there was concern about the high level of the Corporate Services budget last year. I did speak with the Minister the week before the Budget came down. We were speaking in respect of other matters, but I did mention concern about a cut in the budget when we were together. To my recollection, there was no express concern voiced at that stage about the high

level of the Corporate Services budget in 1995-96. So it did take me somewhat by surprise that the cut to the CJC budget was justified on the basis of what appeared to be a high level of Corporate Services. Had the matter been raised, I could have explained to the Attorney or to responsible officers the same position as I have explained to this Committee today—that our program budgeting had not been introduced to 1995-96.

Mr FOLEY: Minister, in the light of that evidence of a failure by you or your department to approach the CJC with any request for a cut in Corporate Services, and in the light of your earlier evidence where you were quite unable to specify in any detail the implications of the proposed cuts to Corporate Services, do you not now concede that this explanation you have offered as to Corporate Services being the area of cut is nothing but a pretext for a political attack upon the functions of the commission?

Mr BEANLAND: I certainly do not accept that at all. I stand by the comments that I have made in relation to this matter. From listening to the comments from the Chairman of the CJC, nothing has changed that view. In fact, just listening to it, it looks like the whole of the operations of the CJC are about to be closed down. As I have indicated before, other Government areas have been able to respond accordingly to budgetary restraints in areas that have been asked for. Likewise, I believe that the Criminal Justice Commission would be able to respond in those particular areas. I do not accept at all any other premise that has been put—far from it, in fact. As I have already indicated here very clearly, we will certainly be going down the path which I have indicated. It is interesting to note that the Criminal Justice Commission received an escalation factor in their budget this year. They have an enterprise bargaining bonus for the police staff down there. They are not subject to the productivity bonus to which other areas of Government departmental operations are subject.

Mr FOLEY: But a saving of \$1.96m was factored in there.

Mr BEANLAND: Just a moment. The member for Yeronga has had his go. It is my go. You spent \$35m on the workers' compensation scheme. Let us just get to this issue here for a moment.

Mr FOLEY: It would be handy if you could keep with the issue.

Mr BEANLAND: Thank you. The situation is, of course, as I have already indicated, that the Criminal Justice Commission has received certain assistance in some areas. In some areas, of course, it is not included in the same sort of budgetary restraints that other Government areas are, such as not being subject to the productivity bonus, which the department is subject to. I just make the point that, sure, everyone's concerned if they receive a cut in the taxpayers' dollars that they receive—it does not matter what it is across-the-board—but, at the end of the day, we make ends meet and we get on with the job.

I am sure the very useful and very worthwhile areas—important areas—of misconduct which the Criminal Justice Commission have been doing will continue, although I was a little concerned to hear some comments from the Chairman about corruption in the Police Service. I am not quite sure what that means. Nevertheless, we will have to no doubt follow that up in due course in view of the constant monitoring role that the CJC has to play in this area and significant changes that have occurred in the Police Service in the last number of years. I would be extremely concerned if I am led to believe in any way that there is some sort of corruption—at a high level or any level of corruption—now in the Queensland Police Service. I am particularly disturbed about that matter.

Mr FOLEY: Minister, you have heard evidence today that the effect of budget cuts to the Criminal Justice Commission will mean less investigation of complaints against police and public officials, less effort in combating organised crime, and a proposed public hearing into police corruption has been called into question. I refer you to the provisions of the memorandum of understanding between Mr Cooper and Mr Borbidge and the Police Union, where it was contemplated that the function of the Criminal Justice Commission in receiving and investigating complaints against police in particular would be wound back or abolished. I ask: is this not an attempt by the Government through budget cuts to achieve in part what it sought to achieve through making the memorandum of understanding with the Police Union, namely, to weaken the role of the Criminal Justice Commission in rendering the Police Service accountable?

Mr BEANLAND: I refute totally the comments by the member for Yeronga. In no way is the Government in any way, shape or form bound to some memorandum of understanding. I did not see that until after it was made public in the media. The commitment always has been by this Government—whether in Opposition or now in Government—to the CJC, particularly in that area of misconduct, and I stand by that. It is a very important area to ensure that someone checks the Queensland Police Service. There has to be a check and balance, and I think only rightly so. It would be a very sad day indeed to see that there was no check and balance of a law enforcement operation like the Queensland Police Service. In fact, I believe there must be and that must continue. That is why I have already indicated to you here previously that there will not be, in fact, from my point of view any cuts at all in the misconduct area. That is a very important area.

I am surprised, as I have already indicated, by comments from the chairman about corruption in the Queensland Police Service. I understood that that was not the case, but it has been repeated by the member for Yeronga, so I am very concerned about that aspect. That must be investigated fully. I will be following that up and having further discussions about that matter now that it has been raised here. It has not been raised with me previously. I want to make it quite clear that, from my point of view and the Government's point of view, a very strong area of misconduct will continue as far as the CJC is

concerned. Certainly there will be no cuts to that particular area. If there is a concern about police corruption—and I am staggered to think that there is, but if there is and there is police corruption out there—then action will need to be taken on that particular matter very urgently indeed.

Mr FOLEY: Minister, did you read your answers to the Committee before you furnished them?

Mr BEANLAND: I read through the answers from the Criminal Justice Commission. I noticed there was some comment about that, but I did not believe that that related to a "high level", I think it might have been—certainly a level of corruption, anyway—within the Queensland Police Service now, which is the degree that is being emphasised here today. But I gather that there is a degree of concern. I certainly will be following that matter up.

Mr FOLEY: Minister, that is rather surprising, in the light of your answer to question on notice No. 5. I take you to page 6, where your answer to the Committee, on advice from the Criminal Justice Commission, indicated, among other things, that it is probable that within the reduced level of resources the following areas are considered as being under threat: (1) a proposed public inquiry into significant corruption of police by criminal elements. You said today that you are surprised to hear about it, but that was in fact the answer that you yourself supplied to the Committee on advice from the Criminal Justice Commission. It would appear that you simply do not read the answers that you have supplied to this Committee.

Mr BEANLAND: That is not the case. I did see that particular answer. I did not, though, believe that it applied to a range of corruption within the Police Service as is being indicated to me here today. I understood that there must have been one or two problems, which would probably come out through further misconduct hearings, but it is made clear to me now that that is not just a minor detail.

Mr FOLEY: What did you understand by the meaning of your answer, "significant corruption of police by criminal elements"? If it does not mean "significant," what did you understand it to mean?

Mr BEANLAND: I did not believe that it applied to a wide-ranging number of people within the Queensland Police Service. It is quite clear to me now that it does and that there is a major problem there. That is, I think, what the Chairman of the CJC is saying, which certainly has not been brought to my attention before. I want to make it quite clear that if there is a major concern in this area, as has been stated here this morning, and there is a need for a public inquiry, there will certainly be a public inquiry held if that is the view of the Criminal Justice Commission. In no shape or form—I want to make it very clear for the record—will I tolerate an issue of corruption or knowing of corruption within the Queensland Police Service. If that is what the chairman is saying, that there are significant large numbers—and I don't know what level they are at—of concern in this area, and it is worthy of a public inquiry—I thought that that was some sort of ambit claim—but if this is not a situation of a minor

matter but a significant large-scale matter, then certainly there is funding there. We will be ensuring that in fact there is a public inquiry, if that is what the Chairman of the CJC is saying.

I understood that the CJC was monitoring the Queensland Police Service and those sorts of issues were not there abroad, particularly in view of the fact that we have the CJC supposedly doing its work in this area. I accept that. But obviously there are other areas that have now come to light. Also the role of the Bingham inquiry—again, I am not aware that that indicated that there was this sort of problem within the Queensland Police Service. But if it is, it must be stopped, the corruption must be rooted out.

Mr FOLEY: The Government has announced that it proposes to commission a judicial inquiry into the CJC. Can you tell the Committee, please, what budgetary provision has been made for that? If none, what is your estimate of that cost? If you have not made the estimate, do you not regard it as irresponsible to commit yourself without having made such an estimate?

Mr BEANLAND: No doubt funding for those inquiries, as with funding for other inquiries—the Fitzgerald inquiry that has occurred and other inquiries such as Trident; we had a range of those inquiries over time—no doubt funding will be in like form. There is no particular funding or vote set aside, which is what you are asking. The member for Yeronga is asking whether a vote has been set aside in the departmental Estimates. That is not the case.

Mr FOLEY: Well—

Mr BEANLAND: Can I just answer the question? I haven't started yet. There have been no terms of reference yet drawn up. But over the next period we will be drawing up the terms of reference. It is only when one draws up the terms of reference that one will be able to gather some idea about the cost of any inquiry. Of course, no matter how one estimates that an inquiry is going to cost a certain amount of money, inquiries take on a life of their own once they have started off. I think that history has fairly well shown that all inquiries seem to cost a great deal more than what is originally estimated. I do not have any estimate of what the cost of an inquiry might be, nor have I yet worked out the detailed terms of reference in relation to that.

Mr FOLEY: Does not the absence of a budgetary provision for an inquiry indicate that this matter has been brought on by the Government without proper planning and simply as part of its ongoing political attack on the Criminal Justice Commission?

Mr BEANLAND: There are funds within Treasury for unforeseen expenses to cover these inquiries. Clearly, that will be the case in relation to this particular inquiry. That is not something new; that is normally the way, as I understand, these inquiries are covered. I am sure there is a history of that. Funding is made available, special allocations are made available from the Treasury, and I am sure that will be the case in relation to this particular item. There is nothing new in relation to this. My understanding is that this has happened many times and on many occasions in the past.

Mr FOLEY: Do you propose to cover the legal costs of parties appearing before the commission of inquiry in the same way that you are covering the costs of Mr Borbidge and Mr Cooper in their appearances before the Carruthers inquiry? If so, have you made any estimate of the legal costs likely to flow from representation of parties before the wide-ranging inquiry that you propose?

Mr BEANLAND: We are yet to draw up the terms of reference. It is only when you sit down and do the terms of reference in relation to something like this that a number of these matters come to the fore. I understand that New South Wales has recently introduced some new system down there which we will have a look at in relation to having representation for people before this inquiry. We will certainly be undertaking to have a look at that and any other new ways people in other States have come up with in relation to ensuring and meeting legal representation. As for costs and those sorts of issues, I am not in a position to answer them simply because no consideration has yet been given to arrangements.

Mr FOLEY: You cannot say, for example, whether it would be more or less than the proposed \$1.96m worth of savings that you expect from the Criminal Justice Commission?

Mr BEANLAND: I cannot say the amounts that will come for unforeseen expenses.

Mr FOLEY: It could be more than \$2m?

Mr BEANLAND: It may be a lot less; it may be more, you do not know. There has been no consideration given to this issue yet and there is no allocation of funding here. In the past, Fitzgerald, Trident—there is a whole range of these inquiries—they are funded, as I understand, through the Treasury in special allocations.

Mr FOLEY: I direct a question to Mr Clair. I refer again to page 6 and to the answer to question on notice No. 5 with respect to the following areas as being considered to be under threat, including a proposed public inquiry into significant corruption of police by criminal elements. Without wishing in any way to prejudice any inquiry that you may want to have and if you feel that, giving further and better particulars would do so then please do not feel drawn to do so, but if you feel able to do so, are you able to indicate to the Committee the area in which the proposed public inquiry into significant corruption of police by criminal elements might be conducted?

Mr CLAIR: I described that earlier in my evidence as being corruption at what I said were relatively high levels and I qualified that by saying that that is not just matters out at the fringes. By that I meant not just constables on the counter taking money to issue licences or something like that; I am talking about significant examples of corruption. How widespread that might be is something that can only be determined over time. What I have said in evidence today is that during the commission's investigations of organised crime and investigations of official misconduct, we continue to see signposts back into police involvement by way of corrupt

involvement. Evidence is now available and continues to become available of the specific instances of that. I am talking about examples of significant corruption, that is, as I say, not just constables on the front counter taking money for drivers' licences.

Mr FOLEY: What sort of things?

Mr Clair: In respect of involvement in drug activities, that is, protection of drug activities—that kind of matter. The picture which is developing and has been now for some time indicates that there may well be a need for this to be dealt with by way of a public inquiry rather than simple covert or closed hearings. The picture is developing and developing with some speed. The commission would anticipate, and has anticipated now for some time, that if there is to be a public hearing it would be during this current year. Initially, we did intend to have money set aside to cover such a public hearing. The effect of the budget cuts is that we simply can now make no provision for public hearings in that respect.

Mr FOLEY: Thank you, Mr Clair.

The CHAIRMAN: That brings us to the end of that section of the questioning from the non-Government members. I will now ask a question dealing with some of the other areas of the Minister's responsibility. I refer you, Minister, to the MPS on page 1-11 regarding the expenditure of the Queensland Anti-Discrimination Commission of over \$1m. In view of the expiration of the Commonwealth/State arrangements on 9 December 1996, have any negotiations occurred with the Commonwealth Government on the post-December arrangements and what progress has been made if there are discussions going on?

Mr BEANLAND: I can give you some detail in relation to that, but I might ask the director-general to address the issue.

Mr MARTIN: The Commonwealth Government has notified the Queensland Government that the existing arrangements in relation to cooperation in the anti-discrimination area will cease on 9 December of this year. The Commonwealth has proved very difficult to tie down as to the reasons why they want to do this. We have had certain preliminary negotiations with the Commonwealth Government and it would seem that the Commonwealth Government is adopting a policy of rather than having the Commonwealth Human Rights Commission—which operates in Queensland as the agency of the Queensland Government—continue, they wish to adopt a policy whereby they will withdraw the Commonwealth Human Rights Commission back to a general role and require the State to establish a State Anti-discrimination Commission.

To do this would, it is anticipated, involve an additional expenditure of \$1m plus per year. The basis of the renegotiation of arrangements with the Commonwealth Government is still fluid. Policy is still being formulated in Queensland and, in particular, the financial impact of the consequences of the Commonwealth's decision are still to be considered by the Cabinet Budget Committee and by Cabinet.

A number of options have been investigated and are under consideration to enable anti-discrimination services to continue to be delivered in Queensland should the money not be available to replicate the existing arrangements. If existing funds as provided for in the budget are only available, then the Government will have to turn to alternative methodologies other than those which are currently in place. It is fair to say it is under active consideration at the moment and the issue still remains fluid. At the end of the day, the Commonwealth policy in this area will still ensure, or will still require, that the States adopt an attitude which has not been the case that has applied in Queensland in recent years. That poses some significant policy problems for the Queensland Government.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: I have another couple of questions on the CJC, but perhaps before we deal with those I ask a question of the Minister. In your department I want a breakdown, if I could, on moneys paid to consultants for the various disciplines—CJC, DPP and general.

Mr BEANLAND: I will just see which officer might have that information.

Mr McGRORY: Stephen McGrory, Management Accountant. The breakdown of consultancies within programs for the department is: the Administration of Justice Program in 1995-96 was \$348,000; our prosecutions, \$250,000; legal services, \$20,000; Office of Community Affairs, \$24,000; corporate support, \$294,000. That gives a total of \$938,000. I do not have a figure for the Criminal Justice Commission. The Electoral Commission is \$12,000 and the Local Government Commission is \$53,000.

Mr CARROLL: I am not happy to be spending such a disproportionate amount of time on the CJC. I think we seem to be following the press's example and I want to get off the topic shortly. However, the matter of the twelfth-hour announcement of increasing levels of corruption being alleged in the police force surprises me. Has that matter been brought to your attention through the PCJC?

Mr BEANLAND: No, not to my knowledge. I am certainly not aware of increasing levels of corruption within the Queensland Police Service. It had not been brought to my attention until yesterday when I saw some comment in this statement concerning it. I have received nothing from the PCJC. No doubt, the Criminal Justice Commission has reported this to the PCJC, but it certainly has not been brought to my attention. I stress that I am very concerned about that.

Over a period, with the monitoring processes that take place in this State, I would have thought that those monitoring processes would have in fact been able to ensure that that was not the situation. Clearly, if they have not been able to do that and corruption has been increasing, as I am being led to believe, that is a worrying situation. I think probably one of the things that will need to be done is to also look at the monitoring processes that we currently have in place in this State. It seems to me that if the

corruption issue within the Police Service has been increasing, we may have a problem with the monitoring processes as well.

Mr CARROLL: From what Mr Clair has been telling us this morning, the CJC seems to have taken a very active interest in this area. Is it the case then that it is not doing its job, if this surprisingly high level seems to be accelerating as Mr Clair has told us?

Mr BEANLAND: I would have to look at and discuss with the CJC the processes it has in place. Clearly I think the public would have expected that the matter of corruption within the Queensland Police Service was under control. There are various monitoring systems in place and if it is as the chairman has said—and I do not doubt his comments in relation to this for a moment—I am very concerned as to why action has not been taken prior to this, because it now seems to have reached a significant level. That in itself concerns me greatly. The CJC has enormous powers in this area, of course, and is able to do all sorts of work. Therefore, the Bingham inquiry produced a range of evidence and material about ongoing concerns within the Police Service and this seems to be another area of concern that has popped up.

Mr FOLEY: Mr Chairman, on a point of order—again I draw to your attention the requirements of procedural fairness. If members of this Committee wish to put propositions which are adverse to the CJC, and the chairperson is a witness before the Committee, it is basic fairness that those adverse propositions should be put to Mr Clair.

The CHAIRMAN: As I said before, we are asking questions of the Minister at the present time. I do not see Mr Clair at the moment, anyway.

Mr FOLEY: Mr Clair is still in the Chamber. The question was directed—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! We are conducting this inquiry and I do believe that a fairly lenient amount of time has been given to that particular subject. I do not think there is anything untoward in asking the Minister these questions.

Mr CARROLL: Mr Chairman, the Minister is the responsible officer and I want to ask him these questions. We have already seen that there has been a lack of communication between the CJC and the Honourable the Minister. Mr Minister, has any other authority or agency made this kind of allegation to you? I forget the exact words, but the record will reveal the suggestions that Mr Clair has made about increasing corruption.

Mr BEANLAND: Not to my knowledge. I am not aware of it.

Mr CARROLL: Do you have a view as to whether or not, to use Mr Clair's words, this picture which has been "developing for some time" of increasing corruption at higher levels—which, I might point out is only alleged—and the announcement that it has suddenly accelerated recently have something to do with some kind of scare tactic to pressure you not to cut the budget in regard to this particular agency?

Mr BEANLAND: I cannot comment in relation to that. However, I want to make the comment that I will certainly be following this up and having discussions with the chairman over the coming days and weeks. This is a matter about which I am extremely concerned, as I have already indicated. I do not know why or how it has got to this stage, but, as I said, if it has we certainly need to take some urgent action in relation to it. I make that quite clear. It may be, of course, that the CJC is going through the process of gathering certain materials in relation to this and does not necessarily want to crank it up tomorrow or the next day but some time next year—I do not know. I indicate very clearly to the Committee that I will be having discussions with the Chairman of the Criminal Justice Commission in relation to what I consider to be a prime and most important issue. The CJC was set up to check the Queensland Police Service, and the public sector generally, for misconduct. We seem to have a problem there now. I will also be discussing with him whether or not we are in a position to be able to adequately monitor this situation, so that we do not allow it to balloon. I am not saying that it has ballooned, but it has been indicated to me that it is growing and I am concerned that the situation could be growing.

Mr FOLEY: Through the Chairperson, that was actually drawn to the Minister's attention in the letter tabled on 11 July.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Mrs Cunningham?

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: While we are on this issue, Mr Clair, I ask this as a question on notice because of the detail. I continue to be concerned about the actual dollar reduction in your budget and the listed impacts on the functions of the CJC. Could you furnish the Committee with the projected full impact of the proposed budget cuts, including a breakdown under each division of the CJC? Could you also provide a full report on the CJC's perceived achievable cuts and a full report of the impacts on the CJC by division and function, including the dollar amounts, if the Minister's budget cuts are implemented on a line item basis?

Mr CLAIR: I will do so with pleasure, Mr Chairman.

Mr CARROLL: Mr Minister, last week you announced a coming review of the CJC and later in the week another matter was brought before the Parliament with regard to that possible review. Were you pushed towards this action of reviewing the CJC by the Chairman of the CJC? If so, did he raise any of these allegations about increasing levels of alleged corruption in the police force?

Mr BEANLAND: I am not sure I fully understand the question, Mr Chairman.

Mr CARROLL: Can I explain: did the Chairman of the CJC prompt you or invite you to undertake the review of the CJC with any information or claims about the alleged increasing level of police corruption as has been raised this morning?

Mr BEANLAND: No. For my part, certainly that wouldn't be the case. I think that we have indicated previously there would be some review of the CJC. That was prior to 15 July last year, in fact. At the

same time, I was clearly indicating an ongoing commitment to the misconduct and anti-corruption roles of the CJC in this State. Following that period of time, there has been various chitchat about when there might be an inquiry. Of course, there seem to be ongoing sagas every few days or weeks about some new expose or other in the media or elsewhere. It is quite plain that we need to clear the air. We need to get away from this. Everyone needs to get on with the jobs they have to do. One of the ways to do this, obviously, is to bring forward this review of the Criminal Justice Commission.

A number of issues need to be looked at, particularly the accountability issue, which seems to be one of the basic problems and ongoing issues with the PCJC, the CJC and the community generally. A lot of these issues that seem to crop up from time to time wouldn't arise, I think, if there were better accountability mechanisms put in place. It's not for me to sit down and say how or what they should be. That is for other people to work out. But I think there needs to be better accountability mechanisms in place and we need to clear the air so that people don't have this type of thing occurring on a day-to-day basis.

Mr CARROLL: Minister, I refer to page 1-18 of your Ministerial Program Statements and the figure of \$18.4m to be spent on the prosecution of offences, and I ask: has the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions yet been able to establish a sound database for the comparison of penalties and sentences when presenting high-level criminal cases to our courts, and particularly in dealing with appeals in relation to that type of serious offence?

Mr BEANLAND: I can answer part of that. A couple of years ago in the Estimates committee hearings then, I raised the issue of the matters management system, as it was called. The Minister of the day indicated that that was well down the road to occurring. The following year—it must have been last year—I raised it again because it still didn't appear to have occurred. It still hasn't happened, and I now find out that the whole thing has fallen over, in fact, after the expenditure of some sizeable amount of money. I understand—and I will get someone else to give the full details—that we are now looking at the Victorian system, which is taken from the Commonwealth system. So instead of developing our own Queensland computer-based technology in this area, which was being developed, as I understand it, when we started doing the matters management system, the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions is now looking at acquiring the Victorian system—I think it is the Victorian system. Some minor changes would be needed to meet the requirements of the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions. Perhaps I can ask one of the other officers here to give some more detail in relation to it.

I was very disappointed to find that, after being told quite clearly that this was well under way, was happening and was up and more or less running, and in the second year being told that it was only being held up because they wanted some more modifications and improvements, this hasn't in fact occurred. I believe and I would hope that there

could be some improvements made in relation to that. Perhaps I might ask Dr Kidston, who is the senior officer in the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions. Dr Kidston looks after the administration, the management more so, I think, with the approval of the Director of Public Prosecutions. I see he has his approval. I ask that Dr Kidston be able to answer that question.

Mr CARROLL: Minister, I am interested to hear of the problems in the matters management system and the improvements, but at this point I am more interested in the question of a proper reference database which would assist counsel presenting the more serious criminal offences and, of course, the Court of Appeal. I am aware that there is a difficulty in this regard for our Crown prosecutors in not being able to have that type of information readily accessible. Of course, that leads to the accusation that our justice system is not punishing people severely enough. Perhaps Dr Kidston might be able to answer whether or not the department has yet been able to establish that type of database to readily provide the courts with helpful material on sentences?

Dr KIDSTON: At this stage, that database hasn't been developed. It is an issue that was under consideration in the context of the matters management system development. Mr Michael Byrne, QC, the acting deputy director, could give some more information, if the Committee required it, on the sentencing database.

Mr CARROLL: Is it not the case that the work of the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions is severely compromised, to use Mr Clair's words, if these types of essential tools for the prosecution of serious crime in this State and the conduct of appeals are simply not available?

Dr KIDSTON: I think I would have to refer that matter to Mr Byrne.

Mr BEANLAND: While Mr Byrne is coming forward to answer that, can I just say that this is one of the reasons why we have beefed up the allocation to the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions, because I am concerned about a number of issues in relation to the office.

Mr CARROLL: While Mr Byrne is taking his place at the table, might I suggest to you—and I invite your comment—the proposition that really the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions' share of the budget deserves an increase rather than the pruning which has been applied across-the-board. When we look into it, we find that these types of essential tools are not available to them.

Mr BEANLAND: It has received a significant increase in fact of some \$2.8m, I think it is offhand, across-the-board covering a range of issues, including extra workload and committals. Other additional funds have been put in place for the Director of Public Prosecutions to undertake more fully, if possible, the prosecutions that need to be undertaken. I perhaps ask Mr Byrne to give some more detail in relation to that.

Mr BYRNE: It's true that there is no computer-based sentencing system within the Office of the

Director of Public Prosecutions, nor is there one within the courts and nor within Legal Aid. What is used is a paper-based set of appellate decisions. The case management system, which has been running for some time, keeps a collection on database of single or first-instance sentences. But so far as appellate decisions are concerned, they are kept on unreported decisions and reported decisions. They are reduced by staff within the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions to schedules dealing with particular offences, for example, dangerous driving causing death or grievous bodily harm, and those schedules are now as a matter of course given to both sentencing judges and to the Court of Appeal.

Mr CARROLL: Is it not the case, then, that the overall effectiveness of the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions might be significantly improved if that type of database were installed and properly kept up to date? For example, more serious offences such as drug trafficking, where the sentences vary significantly across Australia, might be better prosecuted before our courts.

Mr BYRNE: I could not disagree that it would be to the advantage of everyone within the criminal justice system if such a database were available to all agencies and to the courts.

The CHAIRMAN: That now brings us to the end of this section of questions. The Committee will adjourn for a small break. We will resume in about five minutes.

Sitting suspended from 11 to 11.10 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the Committee reconvened. I invite questions from the non-Government members.

Mr FOLEY: I ask Mr Clair to come to the table, if he is still here, and Mr Briton from the Anti-Discrimination Commission. Mr Clair, a number of propositions were put to the Minister by the member for Mansfield which included an implication that the CJC was not doing its job and a further implication that the reference to the threat to the public inquiry into police corruption amounted to scare tactics. I want to give you the opportunity to respond to those two propositions.

Mr CLAIR: I think the implication that the CJC has not been doing its job was said to arise because, after all, the CJC has some kind of oversight role in respect of the QPS. The reality is that it is through the exercise of that oversight role and through the investigation of organised crime and official misconduct that the CJC has discerned initially the signposts towards official corruption within the Police Service and, as time went on, developed more concrete evidence of it. I have described that official corruption as being at relatively high levels earlier in my evidence. I have qualified that, and I have explained the qualification that I am not just talking about people paying police officers money for driving licences, and I have indicated that the official corruption is significant. It is significant in that it is associated with the activities of drug dealers, and it is, as I say, a picture which has emerged over a period of time. I did not say that there has been

some rapid acceleration recently. I said that things have moved in recent times with greater speed.

The commission has now—over some 18 months, two years—been involved in the investigations which have initially produced the signposts and later some concrete evidence. The commission, as I say, envisaged that at some time during this year there may need to be a public inquiry in respect of this. The commission's obligation in that regard—first of all, I say that there can be no suggestion that the commission is not doing its job in oversight of the QPS because in fact it is through doing that job partly that we discover these things, and it is not something that can be acted on until the proper picture emerges. In fact, it would be wrong to act precipitately. But at the right time the commission did envisage that we may reach a stage during this current financial year where we would need to have a public inquiry. At that time, the commission reported in the proper way. I cannot here speak about details of what might be reported in the parliamentary committee, but I can say that, in respect of these operational matters, the commission is responsible to the parliamentary committee and not responsible to the Minister. The commission is responsible to the Minister, and he has said the same himself, in respect of financial and administrative matters. I think there was a suggestion—at least there was a question as to whether the Minister had been informed through the parliamentary committee of this suggestion of significance in corruption.

Mr FOLEY: Please continue.

Mr CLAIR: Can I say that that would not be feasible, because members of the parliamentary committee are bound, of course, by the obligations of confidentiality.

Mr FOLEY: With respect to the suggestion that the reference to the threat to the public inquiry on police corruption amounts somehow to scare tactics, could I draw your attention to page 5 of your letter to the Minister dated 11 July, where you say, "The commission will be even more confined than at present in its use of public inquiries." That would seem to indicate that you have drawn this problem of a prejudice to public inquiries to the Minister's attention. Far from being a scare tactic, it is something you have drawn to the Minister's attention as far back as 11 July.

Mr CLAIR: I specifically included that on 11 July. I did not feel that it was appropriate to be any more specific at that time about the nature of my concern, though I might say that at that time steps had been taken to ensure that—well, a view had been formed, as I indicated earlier, that most possibly during this financial year there would need to be a public inquiry in respect to this matter. I may be corrected on this, but I think that either around that time or very shortly after in fact this matter was reported in the appropriate way.

Mr FOLEY: I direct a question to Mr Briton of the Anti-Discrimination Commission. We have heard evidence of possible options that have been floated with respect to the future operations of the commission. Can you inform the Committee as to what in your view would be the impact on victims of

discrimination, such as racial discrimination and sex discrimination, of any proposal to require the commission's functions to be discharged through Magistrates Courts registrars?

Mr BRITON: It is my view, and I have expressed the view to the Attorney, that transferring the investigation and conciliation functions of the commission to the Magistrates Court would lead to a form of redress for discrimination complaints that would effectively render the mechanism inaccessible, particularly to indigenous Queenslanders, but also significantly I think to people within the ethnic communities and to women.

Mr FOLEY: For example, do you see any difficulties in Aboriginal people in regional Queensland using the local courthouse to have their complaints dealt with rather than through the independent commission of the Anti-Discrimination Commission?

Mr BRITON: There are some international principles known as the Paris principles that attempt to describe the ways in which human rights agencies ought to work and they talk about, amongst other things, accessibility that takes into account cultural factors and cultural sensitivity. It is a fact, and the indigenous communities in Queensland report this to me over and over again, that if these functions were discharged through the Magistrates Court they simply would not go there. Fancy principles and so on that can be described through United Nations conventions translate to simple words from Aboriginal people, for example, "Magistrates Courts are where we are taken when the coppers take us", words to that effect.

Mr FOLEY: Minister, can you give the Committee an assurance that the Anti-Discrimination Commission will continue in its present form as an independent commission rather than being dismantled and have its functions discharged through the Magistrates Courts registrars?

Mr BEANLAND: Mr Chairman, in answer to the member for Yeronga, the matter of the Anti-Discrimination Commission I am yet to look at in detail. I did ask Mr Briton to come in recently to have a discussion with him in relation to the matter, to get his views as the director of the commission, but I have not advanced further on that at this stage. There is still a deal of work to be done. There are a whole range of options that we need to look at, including the funding arrangements, including the way in which the tribunal has been operating around the State, whether or not one needs to have people on the tribunal from other parts of Queensland as well as from the south-east corner, whether or not one needs to—the commission I think, from memory, has an office in Rockhampton and Cairns as well as Brisbane—whether we need to have more offices around the State, how they are functioning and performing their duties. There are a whole range of issues here that need to be looked at. At this stage, over coming weeks, that will be the case; we will need to address these issues.

Mr FOLEY: But in view of the public importance of having strong human rights laws, why can you not give the Committee an assurance of

your Government's commitment to the ongoing work of the independent Anti-Discrimination Commission?

Mr BEANLAND: Because the agreement with the Commonwealth expires, I think it is, on 9 December and there may be some changes that are required to be made. Now, I am not in a position at this stage—it could very well be that the Anti-Discrimination Commission and the tribunal continue along their current format, but I am not in a position to give any indication of that currently. Certainly, no matters are being considered in detail by myself or the Cabinet in relation to these issues, but as I have already indicated, there are a range of issues. I think the member referred before to the courts. There are a range of other things we need to look at, too, in delivery of this service. Queensland is a very big State, a very lengthy, broad State. We need to see how we are delivering those services in Cairns where we have an office for the Anti-Discrimination Commission, in Rockhampton, whether there is a need to have more offices, how they are functioning, the costs of that and the operation of the Brisbane office. There are a range of issues that we need to get our heads across in relation to this matter.

At the end of the day, it could very well be that Government decides to continue very similar to the way it is now. It may decide on some changes. At this stage, I am not in a position to be able to say what the future—we are still, I think—and I could be corrected—there have been discussions with the Federal Government recently, as I understand it, and there may be more discussions, I think, that are ongoing with the Federal Government. Yes, there are still ongoing discussions with the Federal Government in relation to this matter. We are endeavouring to bring those to a head so that we can resolve some of the outstanding issues on this matter. Obviously, there will need to be an Anti-Discrimination operation to continue in this State. But in what structure and the form, at this stage, I am just not in a position to be able to indicate to the Estimates committee, Mr Chairman.

Mr FOLEY: I ask the Local Government Commissioner, Mr Hoffman, to come forward. While he is coming forward—Minister, I draw your attention to the answer to question on notice No. 1 to the Estimates committee. In particular, I draw your attention to your pre-election promise to appoint an extra five judges to the District and Supreme Courts. I draw your attention to page 1-11 of the Ministerial Program Statements, where the number of judiciary for which budgetary provision has been made shows no increase over the course of this budgetary year. I ask: why have you failed to make budgetary provision to honour your promise to the Queensland people made prior to the last election?

Mr BEANLAND: The very clear position is that, as I indicated, there would be a number of additional judicial officers—not necessarily permanent; they might be temporary officers. The situation is fluid. It changes, of course, in relation to backlogs and delays before the courts and so forth. Already since coming to office, I think I am correct in saying that we have appointed one additional magistrate and two additional District Court judges

to date. As to the matter of the courts system and the jurisdiction and the way in which the courts operate and changes that might occur in relation to the Criminal Code—there may be some changes there. I notice that they have been recommended by the advisory working party. They all need to be taken into account. I recollect that there is some other material that we need to look at in relation to this.

The other point I make is that one has the term of office within which to meet one's commitments in relation to these matters. I think that, to date, we have made a very sizeable move towards meeting that particular commitment. As I said, we have already appointed one additional magistrate—the first in about five or six years—plus two additional District Court judges on a permanent basis. I think that is a very strong move towards not only ensuring that the court processes operate effectively in this State but also in relation to what I indicated we would be looking at prior to the election on 15 July last year.

Mr FOLEY: Your answer is inconsistent with what you have told the Parliament at page 1-11, namely, that at the end of the 1996-97 financial year you estimate that there will be 53 positions in the judiciary, the same as the 1995-96 actual; that is to say that you have made no budgetary provision for any extra judicial officers in the course of preparing the budget.

Mr BEANLAND: Matters of appointment of judicial officers are matters for the Governor in Council. There has been additional funding, as I understand it, in the budget. I am sure that is the case. There are a couple of million dollars in additional funding. I had a look at that recently. The additional District Court people have been appointed since this document was tabled in the Parliament.

Mr FOLEY: But what your document implies is that any extra that you propose to put on—or that you have put on—will be offset by vacancies that may arise. And at the end of the 1996-97 period, on your own figures there will be no more judges than there were in 1995-96—contrary to what you have just told us.

Mr BEANLAND: The Governor in Council, or Executive Council, has recently appointed two District Court judges. I have just indicated that. Also, we have appointed in recent times an additional magistrate. The magistrate was appointed prior to the end of June, lifting the number of magistrates from 71 to 72.

Mr FOLEY: But you promised five extra District and Supreme Court judges. You have made no budgetary provision for them.

Mr BEANLAND: I just answered that there are a couple of million dollars in the budget for additional judges.

Mr FOLEY: But not in the staff positions.

Mr BEANLAND: There is additional funding in the budget. It is not up—

Mr FOLEY: So are those—

Mr BEANLAND: I am answering the question. We do have the term of the Government within

which to honour the commitment. I have indicated previously that I never said they would necessarily all be permanent appointments. In fact, I indicated quite clearly that there might be some temporary appointments.

Mr FOLEY: After the election you indicated that.

Mr BEANLAND: No, I indicated that prior to the election.

Mr FOLEY: Not in your press release.

Mr BEANLAND: And I indicated that publicly to the media prior to the election. If you go back to the media comments at that time you will see that very statement made, because a journalist did ask me whether they would all be permanent or some temporary. I indicated that that would depend upon the mix of cases coming before the courts. This varies all the time. At that time the Government had a considerable backlog, and I was desirous of moving in relation to some of the backlog. Since coming to office, we appointed one additional magistrate prior to the end of June, bringing the number from 71 to 72. That was the first appointment for some years. Secondly, there has been an appointment since the Budget. I stand to be corrected, but I think that since the Treasurer brought down the Budget there has been the appointment of two additional District Court judges. Because there is some funding there for additional appointments, there may be some temporary appointments over the coming year. There may be other judicial appointments, depending upon the Governor in Council decision in this area.

Mr FOLEY: Mr Hoffman, can you tell the Committee what the implications are of the budget cuts and the consequent winding up of your office for good regional and town planning and for good local government in Queensland?

Mr HOFFMAN: The answer to your question depends by and large on what assessment is given by the Government as to the need for future reviews of local government structures. The process that this office has operated under requires, firstly, a reference to be issued by the Government before any review is conducted. The office does not have a unilateral right to conduct reviews. However, the situation that confronts local government at this time suggests that there are pressures afoot to suggest that further review of local government structures is needed. That is not something of my creation; it is a result of views expressed by a number of people. The Commission of Audit, for one, has in recent times identified the possibility of further reviews of local government structures in this State where benefits could be identified to property owners, ratepayers and residents. The Federal Minister for Local Government suggested in May that the nation had too many local government bodies and review was needed of that. The Department of Natural Resources, with which we have been discussing problems over the past six months, has identified instances of probably 1,000 cases where properties are split by local government boundaries, and that creates problems for not only Government but also local government.

In the four years that our office has operated, some 40 requests or suggestions were made as to the need for reviews in some 21 local government areas. None of those have been yet addressed. They were not matters that we could address. I referred those inquirers to the Minister of the day. So perhaps that indicates that there are issues out there that are coming to the fore that are identifying the need for continued review of local government structures.

Ms SPENCE: My questions concern the Office of Consumer Affairs. The Office of Consumer Affairs is suffering significant cuts to corporate affairs. What services will be lost as a result of those cuts?

Mr BEANLAND: The Office of Consumer Affairs has received some additional funding. Could you point out which page you are referring to, so that I might be able to answer the question? The Office of Consumer Affairs has, in fact, gone through the process of having a number of regional offices established around the State, which will be operational over the coming weeks. There has been additional funding allocated to assist with the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registry Office. We are looking at relocating the Births, Deaths and Marriages Office. Whilst there might have been some savings made in the area of corporate services, nevertheless in the area of client services, we are certainly expanding that role where the Consumer Affairs Office is concerned. The \$600,000 to relocate the Births, Deaths and Marriages Office is contained in some of those figures on Consumer Affairs.

Ms SPENCE: Minister, I am specifically referring to the cuts in community affairs corporate services, which are mentioned on pages 1-30 and 1-31. On page 1-30, you can see that the budget has been reduced down from is \$1,456,000 to \$705,000. I am specifically interested in what services will be forgone as a result of those cuts.

Mr BEANLAND: I will ask the Consumer Affairs Commissioner to answer that, because we have rearranged a number of operations in the Office of Consumer Affairs to give more client service.

Mr LAWSON: I am Neil Lawson, Commissioner of Consumer Affairs. We have achieved savings of some \$633,000 through a rearrangement in the office, including a cutback in some support positions. Can I say that, in terms of the actual staff employed within the office, there has been no reduction in terms of people employed, except in the case of one temporary employee whose contract was due to expire in October, anyway. What we have looked at is to see how we could rearrange our structure, particularly to improve our investigation services, and we have been able to eliminate some layers of management within the Office of Consumer Affairs, in particular, three senior positions. Instead of having some eight people reporting to me, I now have five. I have been able to combine, for example, the investigations, trade measurement and consumer safety areas together into one new branch. There are considerable synergies in doing that, particularly in terms of field work that we think will bear fruit.

Ms SPENCE: That leads me to the next question. I understand that recently there was a KPMG review of the Office of Consumer Affairs. What was the cost of that review, please, Minister?

Mr BEANLAND: There has been no KPMG review that I am aware of—not in my time.

Ms SPENCE: Was a review undertaken by Ms Jan Taylor of the Office of Consumer Affairs?

Mr BEANLAND: There was a review of the client services area—an upgrading of those, which was undertaken by Ms Taylor. I think the figure was \$10,000 to do that particular task.

Ms SPENCE: I turn to the issue of workshops conducted by the Office of Consumer Affairs. In the past, the office has undertaken valuable trading workshops to the community to provide advice on basic consumer or trader rights and responsibilities. The office has also provided officers to talk to community groups. What money has been allocated for this purpose this year? Is that a reduction of the amount allocated last year? Can you confirm that your officers will no longer be available for after-hours educational work due to budget cuts?

Mr LAWSON: This was work previously done by the Education and Marketing Branch within the Office of Consumer Affairs. What we have done is to move the people who were in that branch out into other service delivery areas within the office, using approximately 50 per cent of the salary budget from that branch to service the education and marketing needs of the office as a whole. Some of that money will be going towards workshops, which in the past were conducted by internal staff. We can either choose to use existing staff or engage others to conduct workshops. Particularly in terms of servicing regional areas, we think that that may improve our productivity, because we may be able to engage local people—therefore avoiding travel and accommodation costs—to actually conduct the workshops on our behalf. So we are optimistic that we will be able to produce more services regionally by doing that.

In terms of the speaking engagements, certainly community education through addressing community groups is an important part of what we do. What we are doing is to be fairly selective. We are conscious that considerable time can be taken up by groups which, from our point of view, may not be strategic or may not have a reach within the community which is particularly relevant for what we are trying to do. So we are being more selective in terms of agreeing to accept speaking engagements but, if we do accept one, we will choose someone from the most appropriate branch to go along. Rather than having a group set aside to do that, we will go into the direct branch. So if it is a matter on associations incorporation, business names or fair trading compliance, then we'll get someone from that particular area to address that group.

The CHAIRMAN: The time allocated for questions for non-Government members has now expired.

I ask the Minister a question in connection with MPS page 1-1, which deals with the expenditure on

courts. I ask: how long has the video conference link between the courts and Arthur Gorrie Correctional Centre been operating? How effective has that link been in reducing costs, security risks and delays in hearing bail and remand applications?

Mr BEANLAND: Perhaps I might get Mr Read from the department, who might be able to answer that more explicitly than I would be able to do so.

Mr READ: My name is Barry Read from the Courts Division in the Department of Justice. The department jointly with the Queensland Corrective Services Commission funded the installation of this video conferencing link between the Supreme and District Courts and Magistrates Courts and the Arthur Gorrie Correctional Centre at Wacol. The cost of that project was \$400,000 in total—\$200,000 from each agency. It includes the partial installation at the Sir David Longland Correctional Centre. The system became operational in three courts on 11 June this year, and it will be evaluated after 12 months' operational use. It is used to hear and determine bail and remand applications from persons who are in custody. It can also be used to hear pleas, hand-up committals and to take evidence from remote witnesses both intra and interstate and also overseas, if necessary.

The CHAIRMAN: In connection with the training of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander justices of the peace—does that come under your area, too?

Mr READ: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: In regard to the training of Justices of the Peace, Magistrates Court, from Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities, has that occurred and in which communities is training yet to be completed?

Mr READ: The majority of the training of Aboriginal JPs has been completed. There are only three more communities requiring completion and we expect to do that within the coming months—at Mornington Island, Doomadgee, and I just cannot recall the third one. There is another third community in the north. There are only three to go. The vast majority have been completed. We expect to train about 50 JPs in those three communities.

The CHAIRMAN: These are operating quite successfully?

Mr READ: It is operating reasonably successfully in some areas. A lot of it is to do with the attitude towards the community council and the Aboriginal elders on the communities to utilising the JPs. Can I just correct that? There are not 50 to do with this; there was a budget of \$50,000 this year. I would like to correct that. There was a budget of \$50,000.

The CHAIRMAN: For training?

Mr READ: For training. That was just to complete the training of the Aboriginal JPs. That will then have completed all of the Aboriginal communities and each of the island communities—the Torres Strait island communities.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: Mr Lawson, you mentioned you have modified your public commitments to meetings, or restricted it to groups who may not be strategic, that is, they have not got enough community reach. Have you calculated the dollar savings that that restriction will generate and also the impact on rural Queensland?

Mr LAWSON: In terms of the impact as far as what the cost savings would be, I have not got a precise figure for you. What we were experiencing was that officers would normally be involved with out-of-normal hours meetings with community groups—briefing them on what was involved with consumer affairs, what was involved in terms of consumer protection. That usually meant that they would take time in lieu from the office in normal hours. This does cause us some difficulties in terms of providing the whole range of services that we do.

In terms of the selectivity, the sorts of criteria that we would look at would be the composition of the group—as to whether they would be a target group. For instance, we know that we have to do more work with the elderly because they are particularly prone to being exposed to various types of rip-offs perpetrated on them. So we are sensitive to addressing groups that might involve those. We are sensitive to targeting people in the school-age groups and providing education efforts at school level, particularly close to the Year 12 level where people are getting on to their first major purchases, for instance, the purchase of motor vehicles. So again we are sympathetic to groups like that that we could address.

In the regions—there are nine regional offices. They have very large geographical areas to maintain but they do become directly involved themselves in providing speech engagements to local groups, including schools.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: Thank you very much. I have just one question to the Minister. The previous Government instituted a greater use of the private bar by the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions. Has that proven to be a cost-saving mechanism and/or an opportunity to expedite hearings? Is the Government intending to continue with that?

Mr BEANLAND: That is largely a matter for the Director of Public Prosecutions Office. He might like to come forward, or one of his officers, and answer that for us. I can give the broad parameters of it. The situation is, of course, that at times the courts will have a range of criminal sittings. So if there is a large number of criminal sittings allocated against a civil sittings, there is a need for people in the Prosecutions Office to have enough prosecutors to prosecute that range of cases. There might be a drop off at some other stage. So in those situations the Director of Public Prosecutions has the choice of whether he has sufficient officers, putting on temporary staff, or, in fact, giving out briefs to outside barristers to be able to do this work. It is a matter which he has to manage and juggle within his system, within his budget—which he does—and it varies.

As to the benefits that flow from it one way or the other, I would have to ask him to come forward to indicate his views in relation to that. Perhaps if the director could come forward and indicate further? Mr Michael Byrne in that case is coming forward to be able to answer your question in some detail in relation to the figures that they might have.

Mr BYRNE: If I can give some background to what happened in the last financial year? In that period, 71 barristers at the private bar accepted briefs from the Director of Public Prosecutions Office. The budget for that year was half a million dollars. That was exceeded by some \$0.279m. The reason that was exceeded was the greater trial listings in the District Court over the financial year. There was an effort made by the court to cut the backlog and more judges were put into crime. Hence the overflow could not be handled by staff of the Director of Public Prosecutions Office. So more briefs were put out to private counsel.

The overflow in budget was offset against administration expenses within the office and a total of 1,088 cases were briefed over that period. The advantages are that it allows the office to have access to a pool of experts in the criminal justice area. The staff within the Office of Director of Public Prosecutions are all specialist criminal advocates but where there is extra pressure put on, it is a very useful adjunct to our service to be able to give the overflow to private counsel to handle that.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: On the basis of cost benefit, it is a mechanism to cut the backlog?

Mr BYRNE: Yes, it is.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: Thank you.

Mr CARROLL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I would like to go on from the area of criminal justice at page 1-18, which the member for Gladstone touched upon, over to page 1-23 of the document and look at the Legal Services budget. In view of the obvious reduction planned in this financial year of some 35 staff in the Government Legal Services Division, is it your intention to brief out more matters to the private bar there?

Mr BEANLAND: Thank you, Mr Chairman. This issue has got somewhat to do with the commercialisation of the Crown law office, which has been around for some time. The work flow to the office rises and falls. There could very well be work put out to outside practitioners, but it probably has more to do with the type of work that is most likely to be carried out.

I will ask the director-general to give a more specific answer for you in relation to that because, as you will see, last year I think there were one or two big cases which in fact blew the budget out considerably. This year, it is still more than what was in fact budgeted for last year, but it has to do with this whole commercialisation process as well.

Mr MARTIN: Yes. Thank you, Minister. The department faces a particular problem at the moment in relation to the Crown law office. Previous policy was that a process of commercialisation of the Crown law office was due to commence as of 1 July of this financial year. One of the issues that arose

when that commercialisation process was considered by the incoming Government was that no provision had been made as part of the agreements and understandings and policy developed to that period of time as regards the obligations upon line departments to whom the budget of Crown law was to be devolved to in actual fact refer matters back to the Crown law office so that the funds being devolved for commercialisation purposes would revert back to the Crown law office to pay their staff. There was a very real and genuine worry that, certainly within a relatively short period of time, there would be a mismatch between the revenues being earned by the Crown law office from the bills that were sent to line departments and the fees that would come back from the line departments to the Crown law office. The question then arose: who would be responsible for the shortfall in revenue? Would it be the department, the Crown law office, or what?

Discussions took place with the Treasury Department in relation to the consequences, and also with the acting Crown Solicitor and his senior officers, in an endeavour to try to ascertain how these issues were to be resolved. Indeed, those discussions are continuing and the issue of commercialisation and/or corporatisation, which was a model advanced in the Commission of Audit Report to the Government in relation to Crown law, is still under active policy development and consideration at the moment. The budget which has been allocated to Crown law is based upon the concept of providing sufficient moneys to pay for the permanent staff in the Crown law office. One of the consequences of the commercialisation policy which had been previously pursued was that the Crown law office, over the last 18 months or so, has employed a significant number of what were termed "section 34" employees, that is, temporary employees brought in on contract for whom no base provision has been incorporated in the base funding for the Crown law office. They have been paid for by one-off grants, by scratching around and by receiving money from departments for specific purposes, or specific cases as the Minister has indicated. Unfortunately, there was no increase at all to the base funding to provide for the permanent employees of the Crown law office. We now find the situation where something like 50 or 60 of the staff currently employed within the Crown law office fall within this temporary section 34 contract position. Therefore, we have a real dilemma at the moment.

The matter is the subject of discussions with Treasury. It is also a matter that will have to be approved in the light of what policy decisions are made by the Government as regards commercialisation or corporatisation of the Crown law office, depending upon the model which is used. Whether it is the existing GOC models or whether some alternative model—and that is a matter upon which we have advanced certain views to the Government and the GOC unit—will be adopted is yet to be determined. All this will impact upon the office.

So far as briefing out is concerned, one of the consequences that flows from the commercialisation

approach is that line departments will obtain a capacity to determine whether or not they will brief particular matters to the Crown law office or brief them out to outside firms of solicitors. One of the real policy issues that needs to be considered is a determination of what matters are what you could term "core" matters that are matters concerning the Crown and the right of Queensland which need to be considered by the one legal agency responsible directly to Government, and what matters are "non-core" and could be briefed out to ordinary, competent solicitors. Certain work was done under the previous commercialisation model in that area. However, there are still matters of debate and dispute arising from that core/non-core distinction. These also have to be addressed in determination as regards the corporatisation/commercialisation model that will be eventually adopted. It is a very complicated area that requires an enormous amount of work. The acting Crown Solicitor and myself are in constant discussion in relation to it and we are reporting to the Minister all of the time, and also to the Treasury.

Mr CARROLL: I have a brief follow-up question and then I have a couple of questions in regard to legal aid. This question probably requires only a one-word answer, and perhaps the director-general might answer. Is it not the case that, in the present economic environment, cost savings can be effected by briefing out work to members of the private Bar who demonstrate appropriate experience?

Mr MARTIN: That is a very debatable issue given the fees charged by certain members of the private Bar of \$5,000-plus a day, and I have to say that, from my perspective, that is an exorbitant fee. However, that is a fee that is charged and paid for by members of the private profession to members of the private Bar.

Mr CARROLL: I did preface my comment with reference to the current economic climate.

Mr MARTIN: There are negotiations continually going on between the Crown, Crown agencies such as legal aid and the private profession, with the Crown seeking to get the maximum legal services for the minimum amount of dollar being spent. I think it is fair to say that it is a very dynamic market.

Mr CARROLL: I might ask a question which will probably require the Director of the Legal Aid Office to answer. What percentage of the budget for legal aid services is applied to the defence of criminal allegations or criminal matters?

Mr HODGINS: Of the total budget of \$46m, approximately 50 per cent is devoted to criminal defence work. That relates to what we call "proscribed crime", that is, the serious matters in the Supreme Court, and the "non-proscribed crime", that is, the summary trial work and pleas in the Magistrates Court.

Mr CARROLL: Minister, in view of the increase of some \$2.6m to that budget this year and in view of some allegations by judges and practitioners to the effect that sometimes legal aid funds are alleged to

focus on criminal matters well beyond the point where a competent lawyer might advise a client to plead guilty or, if the advice will not be followed, then to bail out of the case, can the director assure us that every attention will be paid to obtaining value for dollar for the public in regard to defending people charged with criminal offences?

Mr HODGINS: Given the level of fees that operate in crime, there is certainly value for dollar. The fees are well below market rates. The other point is that, in relation to proscribed crime, there is not a merit test. Therefore, if an accused wants to put the Crown to proof, and under the current regime that is possible, we have a system in place that encourages the matters to be resolved early and for pleas to be funded early, and the money that then goes to trial is limited.

The CHAIRMAN: Referring to Ministerial Program Statements at page 2-11, in connection with the joint roll arrangements with the Commonwealth, what steps are being taken and/or what is proposed to ensure that the integrity of the rolls and their manipulation through bogus enrolments does not occur?

Mr BEANLAND: I will ask the Electoral Commissioner to come forward and answer that question. I think he would be the appropriate person, Mr Chairman.

Mr O'SHEA: There have been two significant developments in relation to electoral roll keeping over the last 18 months. The first one is the creation of a national Joint Roll Council which was an initiative of the Commonwealth Parliament. It is constituted by the Electoral Commissioners from each State of

Australia and a number of Commonwealth electoral officials. This has led to a large degree of cooperation between States, which keep rolls in different ways. I think the benefit of developments in South Australia and Western Australia has assisted in formulating some policies that will lead to better roll keeping methods.

The second significant issue was that the Australian Joint Roll Council engaged a firm of consultants to look at better roll keeping methods. The traditional way of keeping the roll by the Commonwealth authority depends largely on a doorknock held biennially to take people who have left their address off the roll and to test the accuracy of the roll as it stands. This way of monitoring the roll will continue. Simultaneously, and as a result of the consultants' recommendation, there will be a move towards continuous roll update and other sources of information as to peoples' movements will be monitored. The roll will be updated, as they are able to, from these other sources.

There is a pilot study in Queensland at the moment in conjunction with Australia Post. The information it obtains in relation to people's address changes will be used as a basis for updating the roll in the State. That pilot study will last six months and decisions will then be made as to what other options are available to update the roll on a continuous basis, rather than a point in time every two years.

The CHAIRMAN: The time allocated for questions for Government members has now expired. The time allocated for the consideration of Estimates of the expenditure of the Department of Justice has now expired. I thank the Minister and his officers for their attendance this morning.

MINISTER FOR POLICE AND CORRECTIVE SERVICES AND MINISTER FOR RACING

IN ATTENDANCE

Hon. T. R. Cooper, Minister for Police and Corrective Services and Minister for Racing

Mr S. Macionis, A/Director-General

Mr I. Stewart, A/Deputy Director-General

Mr P. Rule, Director, Corporate Services

Mr B. Peng, General Manager, Finance and Administration

Dep. Comr W. Aldrich, Acting Commissioner of Police

Mr R. Warry, Corporate Services

Mr R. Carson, Administration Division, Corporate Services

Mr J. Just, Finance Division, Corporate Services

Mr D. Gill, Human Resources Division, Corporate Services

Asst Comr G. Early, Assistant Commissioner (Metropolitan North)

Asst Comr J. Banham, Assistant Commissioner (South Eastern)

Asst Comr K. Scanlan, Assistant Commissioner (Southern)

Dr R. Mason, Director, Office of Racing

Mr J. Paterson, Manager, Racing Services Unit

Mr M. Tolhurst, Executive Officer, Office of Racing

The CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, the next item for consideration is the Queensland Police Service, the Office of Racing and the Queensland Corrective Services Commission. The time allotted is three hours. For the information of new witnesses, the time limit for questions is one minute, and for answers it is three minutes. A single chime will sound a 15-second warning, and a double chime will sound at the expiration of the time limits. Any extension of time may be given with the consent of the questioner and, thereafter, the presiding member's consent after every additional interval of two minutes has elapsed. The sessional orders require that at least half the time is to be allotted to non-Government members.

I ask departmental officers to identify themselves before they answer a question so that Hansard can record that information in the transcript. I declare the proposed expenditure for the Queensland Police Service, the Office of Racing and the Queensland Corrective Services Commission to be open for examination. The question before the Committee is—

"That the proposed expenditure be agreed to."

Minister, is it your wish to make a short introductory statement, or do you wish to proceed with questioning? If you do wish to make a statement, I limit you to five minutes.

Mr COOPER: Mr Chairman, I thank you and the Committee. I take it you know Deputy Commissioner Bill Aldrich, Dick Warry, John Just and quite a few of the people behind me. Yes, I would like to make a short introductory statement.

In its law and order election policy, the coalition stated its belief that the first priority of Government is a safe, secure society and that, to meet the obligations of this acknowledged priority, a well-resourced and properly empowered Police Service is critical. Law and order was high on the Government's agenda for change when it took office. In this first coalition Budget, the Police Service has received funding to increase the number of police over the next decade by 2,780. This increase will be supported by a program to reduce the number of administrative police at headquarters and increase the civilianisation of some positions currently held by police in order to increase the numbers of operational police.

In 1995, the Police Service developed its strategic resource planning document Towards the Twenty-first Century—Resource Priorities for the Queensland Police Service. This plan was based on the need to ensure that any increase in police numbers was supported by the infrastructure required to allow them to operate effectively. In its law and order policy, the Government adopted this planning document as a basic minimum response to the needs of the service.

Five new initiatives reflect the Government's commitment to the personnel and infrastructure needs identified by the service. The Police Staffing Plan, which has been allocated \$4,180,000, is a new initiative. The primary object of the Police Staffing Plan is to provide increased operational policing services to the community. In support of the staffing plan, the establishment of a north Queensland campus of the Queensland Police Academy has been funded through the allocation of \$3,516,000. The campus will provide the Queensland Police Service with the ability to train up to 80 recruits each year.

The capital works program has provided a \$5m new initiatives allocation to fund a number of projects that have been given high priority by the Government. These include starting work on developing police stations at Palm Beach and for the Centenary Suburbs, as well as a replacement of the district headquarters and watch-house at Gladstone. The initiative also includes commencement of the program to replace the Brisbane City Watch-house. The fourth new initiative that reflects the Government's support for Towards the Twenty-first Century targets improvements in information technology—\$5m—in particular two significant projects, Phoenix and Polaris. The last new initiative which relates to Towards the Twenty-first Century provides for the replacement and upgrading of equipment.

The Government identified three other priority areas in the new initiatives program. An amount of \$6.2m has been allocated for the purchase of 15 speed cameras, processing systems and implementation costs. The introduction of school-based policing was one of the Government's election

commitments. The Police Service and the Education Department are working together to develop this program. Finally, \$454,000 has been allocated to the police training required to implement the Government's revised Juvenile Justice Act. The Government is also implementing the national uniform firearms controls agreed to with the Commonwealth and other State and Territory Governments. This will be costly, and negotiations are still taking place with the Commonwealth Government over aspects of its funding. In order to ensure that resources are not wasted, the Government will require the service to make savings to improve its administrative efficiency.

Queensland Corrective Services Commission. In spite of difficult economic circumstances, the Government has fulfilled its commitment to maintaining a safe and secure society, in line with its law and order policies. In Corrective Services, funds have been made available to meet the demands of a rapidly expanding prison population and greater use of non-custodial options. When we left office in 1989 after I had implemented the Kennedy report, Queensland had all prisoners in single-cell accommodation. During the past six years, forward planning was neglected, leaving the Corrective Services Commission to employ stop-gap measures to address serious overcrowding, including double-ups. In order to recover lost ground and meet future challenges, the total budget allocation for Corrective Services had to be increased to \$283m, which includes \$41m for the added responsibility of juvenile detention centres. Much of this increase will go towards upgrading the custodial system, although community corrections responsibilities have not been ignored—far from it.

More than \$100m will be invested in correctional centre capital works over the next two years—spending that will go a long way towards resolving overcrowding problems. High on our priorities is a south-east Queensland prison to replace the outdated and costly to run Wacol and Moreton Correctional Centres. In a very tight budgetary context, we have managed to get an additional \$27m for capital works this year, \$10m of which will get this high/medium-security centre, now designated as SEQ1, under way. This will supply 600 new cells to replace the 400 cells at Wacol and Moreton. While some critics keep suggesting coalition policies will cause a massive blow-out in prisoner numbers, the fact is that there has been unprecedented growth in prisoner numbers over the last three years. The construction of Woodford does not address this growth factor. This budget allocates a future \$30.1m to finish Woodford and to have it operating by next April. With this and the forward planning for SEQ1, we are well on track to restoring single-cell occupancy and addressing overcrowding. The Government hopes to have SEQ1 completed and operational in 1998, following an investment of \$64.5m—\$10m this financial year.

So far, I have dealt with the big-ticket items to address overcrowding. Other capital works initiatives to deal with the issue include: \$6m to start a major cell expansion by up to 200 cells at Lotus Glen in the far north; \$1m for a 25-bed low/open-security annexe for female prisoners at Numinbah; \$1.2m for a 50-bed

facility for fine defaulters at Palen Creek; and \$200,000 to complete a new youth wilderness camp for up to 20 young offenders, also at Palen Creek. Women make up about 5 per cent of the State's prison population, and their numbers in the system have been steadily increasing over the past couple of years. As a result, the Brisbane Women's Correctional Centre is inadequate. Planning will start immediately for a new—

The CHAIRMAN: Have you almost finished?

Mr COOPER: I have, Mr Chairman, but I am in your hands.

The CHAIRMAN: It was for five minutes, unless we agree to an extension of time.

Mr BARTON: Thanks, Mr Chairman. My first—

The CHAIRMAN: Wait a minute. I had just better go through this. Thank you, Minister, for that statement. The hearing will commence with questions from the non-Government members.

Mr BARTON: My first question is to the Minister. I refer to the unavailability for today's Estimates committees hearings of the Police Commissioner, who is also the chief executive of the Racing Department, the Director-General of Corrective Services—and I understand that both of them are overseas—and the failure of two senior Racing Department officers to attend: Dr Auer, who is at the races, and Mr Graham, who I was advised yesterday by letter is attending a vocational education meeting in Melbourne which was arranged a few weeks ago. As the date for these Estimates committee hearings was set several months ago, does this not demonstrate a lack of commitment by this Government, and your department in particular, to its revised and allegedly more open Budget Estimates process?

Mr COOPER: No, it doesn't demonstrate a lack of commitment at all. In fact, I believe we have got the personnel perfectly adequate to be able to handle the questions you have. It is quite obvious, as you said, that the Commissioner is over in Nauru, and the director-general, Mr Hamburger, is away at this time. You have said it all. They are away, but the people who replace them, I have every confidence in.

Mr BARTON: Given that the increase in the funded strength this year of 139 officers is part of your broader 10-year commitment to increase police numbers, how will you be able to realise your stated commitment when the separate intakes for the Townsville and Oxley academies for the 1996-97 and 1997-98 years are inconsistent with the total number of recruits for those years? For example, 1996-97 has 216 from Oxley and 38 from Townsville—a total of 254—yet the total identified number of new recruits for that year is 244, and 1997-98 has 254 from Oxley and 38 from Townsville for a total of 292, yet the total identified number of new recruits for that year is 392—100 less than you need. Does this mean that, two years from now, your 10-year plan will be at least 90 officers behind your target, or if the 1997-98 figures for the Oxley and Townsville academies are mistakes, what are the correct figures for those academies?

Mr COOPER: Thank you for the question relative to police numbers. The increase for 1996-97 will be 139; for 1997-98, 252. From July 1998 to August 1999, 409. That is a total of 800. The total of new recruits for each year, including replacement of attrition as well as growth are as follows: 1996-97, 244; 1997-98, 392; July 1998 to August 1999, 626. The total number of rejoiners for each year, including replacement of attrition as well as growth, are as follows: 1996-97, 166; 1997-98, 117; July 1998 to August 1999, 108. From the two academies: Oxley academy in 1996-97, 216; Townsville academy 38; in 1997-98, Oxley academy, 254; Townsville academy, 38; from July 1998 to August 1999, Oxley academy, 550; Townsville academy, 76, and the new recruits for north Queensland, as far as the numbers are concerned, that is what we have.

Mr BARTON: As the current actual strength of the Queensland Police Service is 6,406 officers, as recently reported by yourself, and the predicted separation rate for 1996-97 is between 3.5 per cent and 4 per cent—meaning between 224 and 256 officers are expected to leave in the 1996-97 year—is it not the case that instead of your predicted 6,563 by the end of the current financial year after an increase of 244 recruits, the actual strength of the Queensland Police Service will only, at best, be 20 more than the current 6,406 and, at worst, 12 officers less than the current actual strength?

Mr COOPER: We have the estimates for June 1997 at 6,552, for June 1998 at 6,803 and for June 1999 it would be 7,140. I mean, we can play around with figures all the time.

Mr BARTON: They do not add up though, do they?

Mr COOPER: We obviously have the intention of meeting these targets.

Mr BARTON: But the figures you have provided to us do not add up. With a best case scenario of 20 more actual officers over the course of the entire 1996-97 year—not even two a month—are you reverting to your previous levels of performance when you were last Police Minister in 1987-88 when you provided only a net 13 officers for that entire year? In light of your comments that Labor, in the 67 months to June 1995, had only provided an average monthly net increase of a paltry 15 officers—that was in the Parliament on 14 November—how will your efforts that amount to less than two additional officers per month in 1996-97 be judged by the people of Queensland?

Mr COOPER: Again, it is a case of being judged on performance. If you look at performance in the last six years, it is not all that bright.

Mr BARTON: It was a lot better than yours.

Mr COOPER: What we have inherited—the Police Service strength has remained almost static since the coalition took office because it is still dictated by recruitment levels put in place by the Government that you were a part of.

Mr BARTON: But you have cut recruit levels.

Mr COOPER: The coalition inherited a half-empty academy. In February 1996, immediately after

being sworn in as Minister, there were only 115 recruits in the academy in two classes—the product of Labor's decision to limit growth in 1995-96 to only 60 extra police; that is about five a month. This necessitated the Queensland Police Service reducing basic recruit intakes from about 140 to only 63 in October 1995 and 52 in January 1996, the latter being the smallest recruit class for many years. The first impact of the coalition's decision to increase the strength of the Queensland Police Service will not be evident until November 1996 when the May 1996 intake is sworn in. Thereafter, there will be a steady increase in the police strength every month and every year to at least the year 2005. The additional strength in the various police districts will then become a visible reality.

We are aware that numbers—it does take time to get them going. Once you get on a roll and the recruiting gets under way and it increases at Oxley from around about 420 now—I think it will be going up to about 540—and in Townsville around about 80, you are looking at 600, 620, which is a vast increase in what you people were doing, not forgetting that from June 1993 to June 1995, your numbers actually fell by 79 when you were there. Over the period of time you were there you increased by around 17 a month, at a guess. With population increasing by about 4,000 a month at least, your record is not all that good. What we have to do, of course, is make up for that and get this program into place. That is why we need a 10-year plan and that is why we need to gear it up, and we are gearing it up, immediately.

Mr BARTON: You got off to a poor start by cutting the July intake out altogether. The new funded police strength for the 1996-97 year is 6,563 officers. Given that you recently advised the current actual strength as 6,406, when can Queenslanders expect to have full strength protection on our streets and how can you achieve full strength protection with an increase of only 139 officers, given the current actual strength of 6,406, and does this not really prove that your entire 10-year plan to increase Queensland police numbers is fatally flawed?

Mr COOPER: No, it is not fatally flawed at all, in fact it is—

Mr BARTON: Just a poor start?

Mr COOPER: It is an extremely good start, especially when you get funding increases in the plan that has been adopted by Cabinet for that 2,780 increase over the next 10 years. Your planned increase was 1,420—

Mr BARTON: But we were actually delivering, not cutting.

Mr COOPER:—which is about 140-odd a year. You are probably aware that, in the 10 years previous, from about 1995 backwards, there was an increase of around about 1,496, so you cannot even keep pace with the increased population for the next 10 years. That was what you were offering. So we are about 1,360 up on that, which I think the people of Queensland will be extremely pleased to know about.

Mr BARTON: This morning, the Chairman of the CJC, Mr Clair, advised this Committee that there

was evidence of significant corruption in the Police Service at a relatively high level by criminal elements involving drug activities which requires an urgent public hearing. Are you aware of this evidence? What action do you intend to take regarding it and will you provide full support for the role of the CJC to openly investigate this serious police corruption issue?

Mr COOPER: Yes, I have only just heard of these allegations this morning when Mr Clair apparently had made them. I can only assume that the Commissioner of Police, Mr O'Sullivan, was given the courtesy of this information prior to it being announced and similarly, the Deputy Commissioner, Mr Aldrich. I assume that he, too, as the second most senior officer in the service, was apprised of this information. I, myself, as Police Minister, was not. Quite frankly, I would be—

Mr CARROLL: Could I just ask for clarification, when you said you were surprised, are you surprised at the accusation? Your answer is just unclear on that point?

Mr COOPER: I was surprised by I guess both, but as far as the announcement was concerned, I would have thought that the commissioner would have been informed, perhaps he was, the deputy commissioner would have been informed, perhaps he was, who could then have informed me. As for cooperation, when it comes to any form of corruption within the Police Service, of course, that is what the CJC is there for and they will get full cooperation from me as a Minister of this Government.

Mr FOLEY: So the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice did not inform you, Mr Cooper?

Mr COOPER: As I say, whoever made the accusations, and I assume it was the Chairman of the CJC—Mr Beanland quite obviously has not had a chance to inform me, I think he has just found out himself, but the main thing is that if the allegations are there, then they have to be cleared up and cleared up very quickly.

Mr FOLEY: But he furnished an answer to a question on notice to this Committee yesterday indicating that the reduced level of resources to the CJC would put under threat a proposed public inquiry into significant corruption of police by criminal elements. The Attorney furnished that evidence to the Committee yesterday. Are you saying that the Attorney did not draw that to your attention?

Mr COOPER: I am saying that the first I have heard of these allegations of so-called corruption in the Queensland Police Service I learned of today.

Mr BARTON: Turning to another matter, Minister—I refer to the repeated references in the Budget papers and the Ministerial Program Statements on the introduction of speed cameras. This shows an increase in traffic fines of almost \$15m in 1996-97—and I can give you the references if you wish to have them all—of which over \$11m will be attributed to camera detected offences. This indicates that most of these tickets will be as a result of the introduction of speed cameras and will occur

in a six month to seven month period. This means speed camera revenue in a full year will be approximately \$20m. Is this not a very clear indication that the use of speed cameras by the Police Service is for primarily revenue-raising reasons, not road safety, and that this financial year approximately 150,000 additional Queenslanders will be booked to swell Treasury's coffers with a far higher number in a full year of operation of speed cameras?

Mr COOPER: It is an interesting subject—speed cameras. I guess we are all going to be affected—those who drive. The decision was not taken lightly. As you know, speed cameras operate in other States. I will give you a run-down of the briefing and then I will talk to you about it. It is part of a comprehensive Speed Management Strategy. A sum of \$6.2m has been allocated to the service for the purchase of 15 speed cameras, processing systems and implementation costs. Speed cameras will be introduced from December 1996 following a review of all existing speed limits to ensure that they are consistent and appropriate across the State. That is a very important factor for us all. The existing speed limits have to be realistic, because sometimes you find that they are not. Whether they go up or down, nevertheless they have to be consistent and realistic.

In December 1995, the former Government approved the use of 15 speed cameras within Queensland. A project team was established on 5 February 1996 to develop the program. Because of uncertainty about the intentions of the incoming Government, the team was disbanded on 21 June 1996. It was re-formed on 5 August 1996 after the Government announced its support for the program. The Queensland Speed Management Strategy contained the key aspects of education, engineering and enforcement, with the introduction of speed cameras being one aspect of the strategy.

I have said that a review of speed limits is currently being undertaken. A public education campaign is also being developed by Queensland Transport. The procurement process for the speed cameras and infrastructure for processing of detections commenced in August 1996 with advertisements appearing in national newspapers. The following is an estimation of proposed time lines for the implementation of speed cameras: speed limit review finalised on 14 April 1997; camera acquisition suppliers selected by 9 December 1996; sites selected, Stage 1, by 11 December 1996; scheduling system for cameras developed by 11 December 1996; legislation finalised by 19 December 1996; speed cameras trialled from 17 December 1996; public education, ongoing but primarily from 28 February 1997; and full implementation of 15 speed cameras on 14 April 1997. As far as revenue raising is concerned—I am fully aware of the concern that exists with you, with me and, I guess, all of us, because it will affect people. There is no doubt about that. And do not forget the points that will go with it. That will cause some anxiety. I know that.

Mr BARTON: Particularly when you are booking people at the rate of an extra 150,000

Queenslanders per year. That is a lot of people for a lot of points.

Mr COOPER: It is a lot. No-one denies that at all.

Mr BARTON: Registration revenue is going to fall dramatically. We will not be driving cars.

Mr COOPER: What we have to do also is make sure that we look at the other side of the coin and balance it up—a fair few people in hospital, dead or dying or pretty well beaten up; and the cost to the community of that health care. Health-care costs and the costs of post-accident care are astronomical. We have to look at that side of the equation. If we can cut that and save some lives into the bargain, then I think we have to make decisions like this.

Mr BARTON: In the first part of your answer on speed cameras you seemed to be implying that the previous Government made a decision to introduce them. That was certainly not the case. There was no formal decision by the Goss Government to introduce speed cameras.

Mr COOPER: As I was not there and you people were—

Mr BARTON: I just wanted to clarify that, because your answer seemed to imply that the previous Government had approved them, and it had not.

Mr COOPER: I will read it again. In December 1995, the former Government approved the use of 15 speed cameras within Queensland. A project team was established on 5 February 1996 to develop the program.

Mr BARTON: I was a member of the Cabinet, and there was no such decision taken.

Mr COOPER: Okay. We will agree to disagree.

Mr BARTON: With regard to the Estimates figures for retained revenue by the Police Service—they are detailed on page 1-4 of the Program Statement in a table titled "Key Inputs". That retained revenue has increased slightly from an actual in 1995-96 of \$6.294m to an estimate for this financial year of \$6.35m. The footnote to this item advises that this is under the revenue retention agreement with Treasury. What is the basis of this minuscule increase, particularly when Budget Paper No. 2 on page 197 advises that traffic fines will increase from an actual of \$31.62m to an estimate of \$46.617m for 1996-97? Does this not further demonstrate that revenue being generated at a high level by the Police Service is simply being retained by Treasury, not by the Police Service?

Mr COOPER: I will allow the Executive Director, Corporate Services, Mr Dick Warry, to answer that.

Mr WARRY: The figures under retained revenue in that particular table refer to revenue that comes to the service from the Criminal Justice Commission in respect of police salaries for police that are there. That is a reimbursement to the service. The money that goes from the traffic matters that you referred to—they are not covered by that particular annotation. They are dealt with separately.

That money goes directly into consolidated revenue, not to the Police Service.

Mr BARTON: So none of those traffic offences are retained by the police at all?

Mr WARRY: No.

Mr BARTON: It is an even bigger bite by Treasury, is it not?

I refer to the inquiry into drugs in Queensland's correctional facilities. I refer also to the reference to the comprehensive drug strategy for correctional centres which is being implemented in conjunction with the Police Service, with the costs in 1995-96 being \$1.4m. What are the estimated costs for this comprehensive drug strategy in 1996-97? What is the purpose of the ministerial inquiry into drugs in Queensland prisons—the Mengler inquiry—if a comprehensive drug strategy already exists and is being implemented? What is the estimated cost of the Mengler inquiry for 1996-97?

Mr COOPER: Firstly, I will give you the brief as far as Mr Mengler is concerned. You will probably recall that, when we came in, we did have a policy that there would be an inquiry into drugs in prisons. We appointed Mr Carl Mengler, the former Assistant Commissioner of Police in Queensland, to carry out that inquiry. I guess I could say that inquiry is three parts completed. It has been quite successful. Obviously, I will not be divulging a lot to do with it. However, I can give you a reasonable brief on it as to why it was necessary and what good it will do. Then I will give you some of the figures and so on as far as the QCSC and their drug strategy is concerned, because both work hand in glove and are supportive of each other.

I think you would agree that drugs in gaols is a major factor. Quite obviously, any Government should do all it can, knowing darned well that it will never stamp it all out but should go a long way towards trying to. Our election commitment was to conduct an independent inquiry into the entry and use of illegal drugs in Queensland's custodial centres. That commenced on 11 June 1995. Carl Mengler has had 40 years' policing experience. He was considered to be ideal for the job. The investigative team assembled is headed by a detective inspector, together with detectives specifically selected for their expertise and knowledge in both the drug field and the prisons system. All correctional centres, except Rockhampton, have been visited by Mr Mengler. General managers have been advised to provide full cooperation, and they have. I am just skipping through this so I can come on to the rest. The inquiry has been widely advertised in the press, and it has sought public support. There has been a free call hotline set up, and approximately 100 calls have been received.

As far as the costing is concerned—the estimated cost of the inquiry is \$300,000. Although that is not insignificant, the cost needs to be weighed against the human trauma and financial cost that flows from the drug trade in prisons. The inquiry is running to budget, with no anticipated over-budget expenditure in the near future. Monetary and

administrative aspects of the inquiry are being managed by an administrator provided by the QCSC. As far as the QCSC drug strategy is concerned—the following initiatives have either been introduced into the trial centres or progress is well under way: establishment of discrete rosters for visits, training of staff and behavioural observation. Do you want me to go through all that or do you just want costs?

Mr BARTON: I am interested in the overall cost. The point I am making is that even your own documents say that you already had a comprehensive drug strategy in place before the Mengler inquiry began. Why are you still counting?

Mr COOPER: Both go hand in hand. Going back to Mr Mengler—the random sampling of inmates and urine analysis to determine the level of drug usage within individual centres and correctional centres as a whole. Preliminary search formula should determine level of usage. No final figures are available, although it is demonstrated that it is going to be pretty high. A number of persons are to be prosecuted as a result of inquiry investigations and other investigations are ongoing. Quite obviously, I cannot go into all that, except to say it is being effective and here is the drug preventative side of things. I have mentioned all the various programs. They are there for your use, but the expenditure for 1995-96 is \$1.5m and that comes into salaries—do you want me to read them all out?

Mr BARTON: What about the Estimates for 1996-97 for the drug strategy?

Mr COOPER: For 1996-97—looking at about \$561,000.

Mr BARTON: That is the QCSC's strategy?

Mr COOPER: Yes.

Mr BARTON: So it is a significant drop from last year?

Mr COOPER: Yes. You see, there is quite a bit that's been done. It was funded by your Government; nevertheless, it was \$1.5m—

Mr BARTON: I am conscious of that. We were already addressing it and did not need the Mengler inquiry.

Mr COOPER: I guess that is a matter for our decision.

Mr BARTON: It appears that the funding has been diverted from the Corrective Services Commission's activities on drugs to the Mengler inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The time allocated for that block of questions from the non-Government members has expired.

Mr BARTON: That was a question, Mr Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: I call the member for Mansfield.

Mr CARROLL: My first question is in relation to paragraph 2 on page 1-24 of the Ministerial Program Statements. I ask: when is it expected that the new Beechcraft aircraft will be in use?

Mr COOPER: Dick Warry will answer that.

Mr WARRY: That aircraft has now been acquired and was formally commissioned into service just a couple of weeks ago. It has now commenced its operations with the Police Air Wing, basically on the run between Brisbane and Cairns and back.

Mr COOPER: That was the KingAir you were referring to?

Mr CARROLL: I am referring to the new aircraft mentioned at the top of page 1-24. I am sorry, it replaces the Beechcraft. What is the new aircraft?

Mr WARRY: It is an improved version of the same aircraft, the Beechcraft Super KingAir. The aircraft that was replaced was somewhat aged and well beyond its economic flying life. The new aircraft is relatively young; in fact, from memory, it had only 1,000 hours air time. It is a larger aircraft in terms of passenger capacity, cargo capacity, more powerful engines and it has a longer range. We think it is a very valuable asset.

Mr COOPER: I flew in it a couple of days ago. I am told it was about five years old. It is a new model rather than a new aircraft. I think the cost came in then—correct me if I am wrong—around about \$3m. A new one is worth about \$5.8m. It can hold 13 people versus about 8 in the other one.

Mr CARROLL: On the same page of the document, you have a very heartening report of the outcome of the Crime Stoppers initiative. I ask: is that initiative still going to be given high priority by your department?

Mr COOPER: The short answer is: yes. I do not know if you are aware, but when I was Minister last time in about 1989 we began Crime Stoppers then. You may recall we had the Broncos involved and got off to a good start. It is still going extremely well. I will give you some background. The self-funding reward scheme is administered by the Crime Stoppers Board, which is an independent body. Crime Stoppers coordinates information supplied by the public by telephone and disseminates this information within the police network. Crime Stoppers enables the public to provide information on a confidential basis to police, to assist in the detection and investigation of crime. There are seven police officers and one staff member position in the Crime Stoppers Unit.

In 1995-96 the Crime Stoppers Program contributed to a number of successful operations from which 2,699 charges have been initiated for offences against the Drugs Misuse Act. Drugs to the value of \$422m have been seized in those policing operations. Since its inception in August 1989, 1,839 persons have been charged with 5,787 offences as a direct result of Crime Stoppers' information. With a record like that, we will obviously be continuing it.

Mr CARROLL: If we turn to page 1-19, I see that there is a report about the number of charges resulting from operations by the Drug Squad. I ask: what assistance in regard to those arrests was provided by the CJC?

Mr COOPER: That is fairly sensitive information, but we'll see what we can do. We do not have any reference to the CJC's actual involvement. We can give you information as far as the Drug Squad's activities are concerned and their performance. The Deputy Commissioner would like to answer.

Dep. Comr ALDRICH: The figures and statistics relating to the Drug Squad arrests of the QPS are those only effected by the QPS. The only involvement the CJC would be likely to have would be in the normal course of the exchange of information and/or intelligence. The CJC and the QPS, through the operation of the Joint Organised Crime Task Force, have had a number of drug arrests and they are recorded on the CJC figures because the task force operates out of the CJC. So the figures that you're referring to, sir, are QPS entirely.

Mr CARROLL: I have a similar interest to that expressed by Mr Barton in the question about fines or penalties that might be brought to Treasury as a result of work by the Police Service. I want to see if you can help me come to a conclusion about the total of fines, forfeitures or penalties that result from Police Service work. I have had a look at page 20 of the Treasurer's Annual Statement 1995-96, where there is mention of fines. But I do not think that that relates to fines arising from Police Service work. Looking at pages 20 and 73 of that document, am I right in concluding that the fines, forfeitures and penalties arising from Police Service work amounts to about \$73m?

Mr COOPER: I will get you a proper figure. I do not want to take guesses.

Mr CARROLL: In coming to that conclusion, I have looked at a line figure, just over halfway down page 70, of some \$13.968m and a line figure in the second last line on page 73 of just under \$59m.

Mr COOPER: Are you happy with Mr Warry answering?

Mr CARROLL: Yes, thanks.

Mr WARRY: Without wishing to pass the buck, that is a question that you would really have to address to officers from Treasury, I would suggest, because the Queensland Police Service does not see any of that money whether it is generated through the traffic fines system or, indeed, through the courts. Clearly, a police officer can issue a ticket for a traffic infringement. It can be paid in the normal way or it can go before the courts. Really, the involvement of the Police Service ceases once that matter has been either paid for by the person who committed the infringement or, in fact, has been dealt with by the courts. So the detail and the reconciliation that you are looking for, I think, really would be a matter for an agency other than the Queensland Police Service.

Mr CARROLL: If it were \$73m, does that sound high to you?

Mr WARRY: I am really not in a position to hazard even an estimate about that, I am sorry. Mr Just might be closer to it; he has been the Director of Finance in the Police Service for some time. Again, I think we would probably take refuge in the

comment that you would really have to direct the question to Treasury.

Mr JUST: I really cannot answer it, either. We could get you the answer from Treasury by Monday, which is the closing date. The only other thing I would like to add is that any forfeitures that come through the court which are not money, we cannot get any money returned to the Police Service. But if it is property such as motor vehicles that the Police Service can use in its operations, then at times the judge does allocate that property to the Police Service. For funds that we generate through either traffic or through the courts, we would have to get from Treasury.

Mr CARROLL: Could I then put a question on notice to seek the answer to that? Mr Minister, Mr Barton referred to the claims made by Mr Clair to this Committee earlier today and perhaps slightly understated them because, as I understand it, Mr Clair was alleging that these allegations of corruption, or the reports of them, are accelerating. You have indicated that you have not heard these reports. May I ask Deputy Commissioner Aldrich—

Mr FOLEY: Mr Chairperson, a point of order. With respect, I think that the honourable member is putting the question on a false premise. As I recall Mr Clair's evidence, he clarified that point and said that there was evidence that it was ongoing rather than accelerated.

The CHAIRMAN: It is there, anyway. I think we agree on that.

Mr COOPER: What is the question?

Mr CARROLL: I ask the Minister—and perhaps Deputy Commissioner Aldrich might provide the answer—has Deputy Commissioner Aldrich heard any such reports of serious or increasing allegations of police corruption at a high level?

Dep. Comr ALDRICH: There has never been a time—in my service as a police officer over 37 years—that there has not been some allegations of police corruption. I am not aware and nor is the commissioner of any specific issues to which Mr Clair may have had in mind when he made his statement this morning. I only know what I have been told by the media outside and in this room what those statements may have been. There are and have been for the six years that I have been in Queensland at any one time an allegation of corruption in some area. But as far as specific allegations of any magnitude—and certainly no-one has been able to clarify with me the definition of "high level"—without any advice, which I will be seeking this afternoon, I cannot answer it any more clearly than that. Whether it is a general statement or whether it was referring to a specific instance, I have no knowledge of and we had no advance notification—"we" being the service—had no advance notification. Arguably, if it is as significant as it is being made out to be, nor should we, although I would have thought had it been going to be made in public, we might have been given some advice.

Mr CARROLL: Also this morning, Mr Clair said that he did not want to see his budget cut because he saw it as an important part of the CJC's job to

continue monitoring reforms and leading reforms within the Police Service. If the CJC is doing that, would you not be in regular contact with Mr Clair or officers from the CJC and in the course of communications would not this kind of serious accusation be put to you?

Dep. Comr ALDRICH: Almost certainly, yes. For that reason, without some explanation or clarification, I am somewhat suspicious of the context in which his statement is being taken at this time.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: Just a clarification first: you said that wages of the officers seconded to the CJC are repaid to the department. Is that wages in full plus on costs? The second question: are there any other police officers seconded to other departments and, if so, is that on a similar cost-recovery basis?

Mr JUST: The officers at the CJC are funded by the Police Service in the first instance through our payroll because we have a unique payroll system. So we pay the officers at the CJC and then those funds are repaid to us. That includes any allowances, overtime, etc., that they earn.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: All on costs?

Mr JUST: The normal costs of the Police Service. There is no administrative costs that we hit them for. Other police are also in areas like railways—the Railway Squad. They are on our payroll and they are ours, anyway.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: But they are not reimbursed?

Mr JUST: They are not reimbursed because they are police officers working for the railways.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: How many other departments would use the police without a reimbursement?

Mr JUST: They are all our police officers and they are classed as Queensland Police Service employees.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: Right.

Mr JUST: The ones at the CJC are unique in that the full salary and allowances comes back to the Police Service.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: I would like to move to page 1-31 of the Ministerial Program Statements and to the implications of the proposed Weapons Amendment Act. The statement is made—

"The Weapons Licensing Branch will be expanded to incorporate the responsibility for the new firearms registration system."

It refers to "significant resource implications" attached to the Weapons Amendment Act.

I would like to pursue some questions along those lines. Firstly, it is my understanding that the Weapons Licensing Branch will be increased, and I think the early figures were something like 13 officers to 38 officers.

Mr COOPER: Something like that.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: Has the specific increased cost to the department been assessed?

Mr COOPER: Yes. Can I go into that?

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: Yes, please.

Mr COOPER: Thank you. If I can give you a background brief for a start, Mrs Cunningham, and then I will be happy to talk more about it. It is a subject that we have been talking a fair bit about in the last four or five months.

The requirements for firearms control to be implemented by all States were finalised on 17 July. I think we have been through all of that. The new controls require shooters' licensing—similar current requirement; firearms registration—new requirements. These impose the need to establish new information systems, expand the Weapons Licensing Branch of the Queensland Police Service to meet the major new workloads, both transitional and ongoing. The actual figures—Mr Carson might be able to—is it 38 or 40?

Mr CARSON: Thirty-eight.

Mr COOPER: That is an increase of 38 or to 38?

Mr CARSON: It is to 38.

Mr COOPER: It is 38. That, obviously, is going to require a lot of funding. You are probably aware that we have put in a bid from Queensland to the Commonwealth regarding this funding for administrative purposes and so on. The compensation scheme is totally separate—that is the Medicare levy of \$500m. The administrative side of things, I will just give you a brief run-down: the national register is \$470,000 this year—year 1; year 2, it is \$135,500; year 3, the same; the equipment and set-up, \$658,000 this year, \$68,000 next year, \$68,000 the year after; implementation and registration of weapons, that is \$5.365m this year, \$2.233m next year and \$1.883m in year 3; project management, \$340,750; buy-back scheme, that is \$7,920,000, and I will get elaboration on that shortly; the media public education program is \$3.5m. That adds up to \$18,253,750 this year and almost \$2.5m next year and about \$2m plus the year after.

Those funds, as far as we are concerned, should not have to come from Queensland taxpayers. We entered into an arrangement on those 11 resolutions, and the costs, we know, were going to be high. This information was imparted very definitely to the Federal Attorney-General as well as the Prime Minister. I think they have made a bid or put in an offer of around about \$10m-plus and that is quite short of the \$18m we require. To that end, I will be going with the other States for yet another APMC meeting on Monday week, I think, to again try to get that funding in full.

The CHAIRMAN: We will have to break it there. The hearing is now suspended.

Sitting suspended from 1 till 2.30 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: The hearing is now resumed. I call on non-Government members for their questions.

Mr BARTON: Before lunch the Minister made some comments about the costs of the introduction of the Weapons Amendment Bill when it is finally passed. You have also repeated what has been said

in the media in recent days about there being a shortfall in costs of \$8m. If, in fact, there is still an \$8m shortfall after you have attempted to get it from John Howard—if you are not able to convince the Federal Government to meet the full costs of implementation—how will the Police Service fund that \$8m shortfall, because it is certainly not in your budget documentation from what I can see. I am hoping that you are joking when you talk in terms of it simply not taking place if, in fact, the Federal Government does not come good with that \$8m. How do you intend to fund it?

Mr COOPER: The course is set as far as the firearms legislation, the buy-back scheme, the compensation scheme and all that is involved with the 11 resolutions are concerned. There is no doubt about that.

The actual funding of this administration, as I have said, is in excess of \$18m. \$8m is a lot of money. It would not come from the Queensland Police Service budget but would come from Queensland Treasury or, failing that, then the administration of the scheme itself, the buy-back scheme and all of that may have to be downgraded to some extent. We may not be able to do it as well as we possibly can. It is as well that we do it as well as we possibly can, because enough angst has been caused in the community. People are expecting it to be done efficiently and effectively, and we would like to do that. It means that the shortfall would make it difficult for us to do it as well as we would like. I have not given up on the Federal Government yet. I am going down on Monday week for another Police Ministers Conference with all jurisdictions, I understand, because they are in the same boat. We are going to hold out for everything that we can get.

Mr BARTON: I turn now to the Police Department capital works. I refer to the table, Appendix 1, page 1-38 of your Ministerial Program Statements. Firstly, could you advise of the amount of the total new moneys allocated for capital works, excluding moneys previously allocated for the 1995-96 Budget year and not rolled over from 1995-96? How much of the 1996 capital works budget allocation has been rolled over from 1995-96 as a result of the freeze on capital works spending instituted by your Government?

Mr COOPER: Before I hand over to Mr Bob Carson, who is the Director of the Administration Division—property services and so on—I would comment on that. Firstly, we are continuing with a lot of the capital works programs that your Government started. The new Capital Works Program that we have embarked upon—and I am sure you will be pleased about it—includes the new city watch-house, which is a major factor. It has been a blight and a blot on Queensland society for a long time and that project has widespread approval. There is the Gladstone police/watch-house combination. There is Palm Beach and Centenary. Ferny Grove might have been on the cards.

Mr BARTON: That was committed last year.

Mr COOPER: They are some of the new ones that I am very pleased which we have on the books

and which are ready to roll. If you would like a more detailed answer, I will hand over to Bob Carson.

Mr BARTON: I certainly would.

Mr CARSON: The total amount of money being spent in the Capital Works Program this year is \$38.014m. In the past, the Queensland police capital works budget has generally had around about \$17m of new capital injection each year. The situation continues thereabouts, especially as the outstanding balance rolls over to fund the continuation of programs which may span several financial years. My estimation this year is that the new capital injection is about \$19m. It is roughly in the same order as has been the case in the past.

Mr BARTON: How much of unspent funding has been rolled over from the 1995-96 Budget to this year's Budget? What does that make the unspent portion that was budgeted for that has been rolled over?

Mr CARSON: The difference between \$19m and the \$38.014m.

Mr BARTON: So about \$19m was unspent and has been rolled over?

Mr CARSON: That is correct.

Mr FOLEY: Minister, in that Capital Works Program, have you or your department given consideration to the construction of a police beat shopfront facility at the Moorvale Shopping Centre at Moorooka in the course of preparing your budgetary provisions?

Mr COOPER: In your electorate?

Mr FOLEY: As a matter of fact, it is.

Mr COOPER: We will try to get the right information.

Mr FOLEY: There is a great deal of public interest in that.

Mr SCHWARTEN: The garden suburbs of Moorooka.

Mr FOLEY: Quite so.

Mr COOPER: I will leave it to the Deputy Commissioner.

Dep. Comr ALDRICH: The short answer is: no.

Mr FOLEY: Will you give some consideration to that in the course of preparing your capital works programs in the future?

Mr COOPER: I say to the good people of Moorooka, as well as to people around the State, that a lot of people will be interested in capital works programs for police stations, watch-houses or whatever. We will do our best to accommodate the people of the State.

Mr BARTON: While we are speaking about Moorooka, and this is probably a question for Deputy Commissioner Aldrich: is it still intended to proceed to introduce a cluster system in the region of Dutton Park, Annerley and Moorooka and close Dutton Park Police Station, or is the Police Service following, essentially, what the Bingham inquiry said and holding on to local police stations rather than

moving to cluster arrangements such as the one in The Gap, which has been a disaster since it was instituted?

Dep. Comr ALDRICH: I cannot accept that they are a disaster. Nonetheless, there is no intention at this stage to alter the structures of any police divisions or districts. What we do in that regard will be part of the way we implement the recommendations of the Bingham review.

Mr COOPER: The Bingham review, as you know, had a very heavy emphasis on community-based policing. You can draw some conclusions from that.

Mr BARTON: Which was the antithesis of the cluster systems that people are moving towards. Minister, you may wish to take this question or pass it to Bob Carson. I do not mind either way, although it is probably for yourself. Why has the Queensland Police Service abandoned plans to build a \$2m replacement police station and watch-house at Dunwich, a \$3.5m replacement police station and watch-house at Cleveland, a \$900,000 replacement watch-house at Pormpuraaw and a \$700,000 replacement watch-house at Roma? What was the greater demonstrated need for a replacement district headquarters and watch-house at Gladstone as opposed to the abandoned facilities at Dunwich, Cleveland, Pormpuraaw and Roma?

Mr COOPER: Before Mr Carson comments, I would say that even if projects or programs have been delayed, it does not mean to say that they have been scrapped or cancelled at all. Mr Carson might like to elaborate.

Mr CARSON: It is not true to say that Cleveland, for instance, has been abandoned nor have the others. Indeed, in the Policing into the Twenty-first Century document, a 10-year Capital Works Program was put forward which has been endorsed by both administrations in turn. There are different start times relating to different priorities. In respect of Cleveland, for instance, the difficulties there have been, as they often are, with the determination of a site. In fact, Cleveland has experienced lengthy delays for a number of reasons, one of which is that the procurement of land by both the Police Service and Justice was impeded by the desire of an elderly gentleman to remain in the house that was to be reclaimed until he passed away, and that wish was honoured.

In terms of Cleveland, for instance, the site selection is not a difficulty for police. We have a site in prospect. We have reserve funds for it in this particular budget. They are actually encapsulated in the overall \$8.3m set aside for land acquisition. Given that it's a watch-house, it has to be co-located with the court complex to minimise all of the on-costs of administration and the operational and safety aspects of prisoner transfer. We therefore co-locate as closely as possible watch-houses with courthouses. The difficulty in this case is Justice's satisfaction with its site. There has been extensive testing of the soils in what has been a fill area so that they can be certain that they are not going to buy an undesirable site. As soon as they decide on that—and I understand that

this could be in as soon as a couple of days—the police will go ahead with their procurement of the site as well.

Mr BARTON: Can you also advise why the land acquisition estimate for 1996-97 is at \$8.3m, which is more than 4,000 per cent greater than the 1995-96 expenditure? How much of that \$8.3m for land acquisition will be for the Brisbane watch-house site and how much is being spent on a Palm Beach site?

Mr CARSON: I will have to check some figures for the city watch-house to see where the land acquisition has been placed. But, broadly speaking, this year in particular we have aggregated land acquisition. Our approach to the 10-year plan that was developed in the Policing into the Twenty-first Century document has been to stage procurements in accordance with the priorities that we receive but also to try to have land acquisitions in advance of those decisions. So we have now designed a land acquisition program to support the development of that 10-year program. In doing so, we have aggregated land acquisition into a line item. There is a range of land acquisitions covered by that \$8.3m. At this stage, we are quite confident that we will achieve them. Some of those land acquisitions are very close to fruition right now. They do cover a range of issues, and I am advised that the Brisbane city watch-house land acquisition is included in that figure.

Mr COOPER: If I could just interrupt, I think it wouldn't be wise to stipulate a figure at this time, because we don't want to upset the market order.

Mr BARTON: It is still under negotiation? I take it you wouldn't be able to tell me where the site is for that reason, either?

Mr COOPER: No.

Mr CARSON: And that applies to a number of other sites, too.

Mr BARTON: They are commercially sensitive at the moment?

Mr COOPER: Yes.

Mr NUTTALL: Mr Chairman, I seek leave to appear before the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Leave is granted.

Mr NUTTALL: Minister, I would like to ask some questions regarding the Townsville police academy. Is this new academy to be established in Townsville to be known as the police and emergency services academy of north Queensland, similar to the title of the one here at Oxley?

Mr COOPER: The answer is "No." It is the Queensland Police Academy.

Mr NUTTALL: So it will be quite different from the—

Mr COOPER: The one at Oxley will not be for emergency services, either. They are police academies.

Mr NUTTALL: What is the start-up cost for the academy in Townsville, including the equipment that will be needed?

Mr COOPER: We have some figures here for what was allocated for the north Queensland academy. An amount of \$3.516m was allocated to the project under the new initiatives for the Queensland Police Service in the 1996-97 Budget. Do you want a further breakdown of that?

Mr NUTTALL: Yes, I would, please. Minister, I would like to know the costs for equipment—computers, furniture and so on.

Mr WARRY: Of that \$3.5m, there is approximately \$1.5m in relation to start-up costs, of which some \$750,000 relates to the refurbishment of the facility that will be leased. The remainder is, of course, equipment, fit-out and so forth. There is about \$2m for ongoing recurrent costs on an annual basis for the operation of the academy.

Mr NUTTALL: Could you tell me where the recruits will be accommodated in Townsville?

Mr COOPER: They won't be accommodated at the actual academy.

Mr NUTTALL: No, I know that.

Mr COOPER: They are making accommodation arrangements.

Mr WARRY: We have in fact sought tenders in relation to the provision of accommodation, and they are still being considered at this point in time.

Mr NUTTALL: Could you expand on that? What do you mean by "tenders"? Do you intend to build something, or put them in motels? What exactly do you intend to do?

Mr GILL: While we have the interim facility, it is our intention to contract out everything that is sensible to contract out, including the accommodation. In due course, we may decide to build an academy with our own accommodation, as we have in Brisbane, but at this stage we have gone to the accommodation market and we have got motels putting in bids to provide so many beds for a particular price.

Mr NUTTALL: So you intend to keep them all in the one place?

Mr GILL: Yes.

Mr NUTTALL: So we are going to have 40 recruits in a motel for a lengthy period of time; is that correct?

Mr GILL: They may not all be living in. But we have very strict standards of behaviour. They behave themselves in the Police Academy in Brisbane. We will expect them to do the same in Townsville.

Mr NUTTALL: When do you anticipate knowing where these recruits will be staying? When will you know?

Mr GILL: Within days.

Mr NUTTALL: Within days?

Mr GILL: Within days. From memory, my understanding is that we have got it down to about two potential providers of accommodation, and we are currently trying to improve the bids.

Mr NUTTALL: How much in the budget has been allocated for accommodation for the recruits?

Mr GILL: I don't have the individual figure for accommodation immediately in front of me.

Mr NUTTALL: Would you be able to supply that, please?

Mr COOPER: We'll do our best to get it for you.

Mr GILL: It's included within the figure that Mr Warry gave you.

Mr NUTTALL: Will that include meals, or is it just for accommodation?

Mr GILL: We left the tenders open for a combination. It probably will be accommodation and meals. There is the possibility that we might split the two. We are going to adopt whatever is the most commercially prudent approach.

Mr NUTTALL: I am mindful of the time, so I will ask only one more question. I did have others. With the intake of the new recruits at the academy in north Queensland, will the Brisbane Police Academy still be fully utilised, or will there be some vacancies there?

Mr COOPER: No, it will be fully utilised in time, just as soon as we can get the numbers up to that level. Roughly, the current accommodation is for about 420. You can get it up to about 540. Someone can correct me if I'm wrong, but it is around about 525 to 540 for Oxley, and about 84 for Townsville. So the idea, yes, is to make sure that they are both fully utilised in order to get the numbers out where we want them.

Mr NUTTALL: Minister, you may not be able to answer this question. Will the officers who will be conducting the training be transferred to Townsville? If they are not to be transferred, what budget costs have been allowed to cover the costs of sending officers to Townsville to conduct the training?

Mr GILL: There is a combination. We have created and advertised the positions. Some have been filled by people from Townsville, others have been filled by people from outside Townsville, particularly from the Brisbane academy. The removal costs and all normal costs will just be borne as a normal part of my budget for running the division.

Mr BARTON: Minister, I would like to ask some questions of the Corrective Services Commission between now and 3 o'clock. I will refer my question to you, Minister, first. However, you may wish to ask others to make some comment. I am referring to the Corrective Services Commission's budget for secure custody facilities, which is detailed in the table on page 2-10 of your Ministerial Program Statements.

Essentially, four factors impact on this budget and your estimates for it. The estimate for the increase in the number of prisoners in secure custody is only 241 compared to an actual increase in the last financial year of 426. The retained revenue is estimated as being higher than that not only the 1995-96 budget but also the actuals for 1995-96 due to a more competitive marketplace. The allocation of organisational support—in other words, the running

costs—are budgeted as being lower than 1995-96 actuals due to a yet to be determined number of cost savings. It is also my understanding that no account has been taken of additional prisoners due to the promised tougher sentencing legislation. I ask: isn't the basis of your budget for secure custody flawed and more than likely to blow out, as all four input factors are unlikely to be met?

Mr COOPER: I will take it first and get you some more detail on the actual figures. I do not believe that they are flawed, in that every effort is always made to get the forecasts right. Of course, forecasting is a bit like the weather. You can make a pretty fair go at it, but nevertheless you have to go as close as you can. Prisoner numbers in custodial corrections—that is, both secure and open custody—grew by over 23 per cent in the past year and have grown by a total of 71 per cent over the last three years. The commission's forecasts show that growth will not continue at this level indefinitely. Indeed, if it did, the day would soon come when we would have more people in prisons than people on the outside. Clearly, there will be a tapering off in growth. QCSC forecasts, on which their infrastructure plans are based, show a flattening in this growth during the 1996-97 financial year. Hence this has resulted in a projected total prisoner increase of 7.4 for the year and 8 per cent for secure custody. That is still a very high growth rate, and it is in the order of three times the forecast rate of overall population growth in the State.

Policy changes such as those relating to serious violent offenders can also increase prisoner numbers; we are aware of that. But the point is that we have made some pretty fair advances as far as allowing for growth—leaving aside the Woodford prison of 600 cells, which you people instigated after having closed Woodford as it was—in terms of the 600 cells at Wacol/Moreton, 200 extra beds at Lotus Glen and those other matters that I referred to at Numinbah and Palen Creek. Then, of course, the 10-year program is for a reconstruction of Rockhampton, and there will also be another what we are referring to as SEQ2 built before the year 2000. We are certainly looking at the issue of growth, unfortunately, but we are also looking very heavily at community corrections so that we can make sure that those people who do not go to gaol can at least have community corrections and be properly supervised—I think about \$1m extra went into that program this year—with an emphasis in that direction to try and cater for numbers. Do you want a little bit more detail on that?

Mr BARTON: If Stan can provide it. This budget is premised on four input factors that are all going in the wrong direction to achieve the outcome that you are estimating will occur.

Mr MACIONIS: If I can just address some of those other factors. The Minister has spoken about the estimates as being our best forecast, and certainly they predict that the 20 per cent or so growth will turn over during the course of this year and result in a net growth of about 7 or 8 per cent. The other area that it is premised on or that you have raised there, Mr Barton, is the revenue from prison

industries, where last year we got a total external revenue of \$6.73m. We forecast this year that that will increase to \$7m. That is if you add the secure and open custody external revenues together. That reasonably modest increase, we think, will be achievable because of a number of initiatives we are taking in industries.

I will just summarise those briefly. One of those is that during 1995-96 we closed two of our less competitive industries that were actually costing us money. That will improve the profitability situation with industries this coming financial year. On top of that, the Minister has commissioned the development of a code of practice for correctional industry business, which should further improve our position in terms of gaining additional business in conjunction with the private sector. We will be putting a senior person in place to help identify additional market opportunities. There is in fact some spare capacity in our existing prison industry infrastructure, and we are building additional industries/buildings also in this budget at Townsville and Lotus Glen. So we believe that that reasonably modest increase of \$6.73m going up to \$7m will be achievable.

In terms of the savings that are listed there, which are all in the Organisational Support Program—there is a total of \$2.44m worth of savings that we are aiming for in that program and that are apportioned across the other programs. Those savings are generally coming from a \$1.04m reduction in the size of central office. That has substantially occurred at this time and has come about through elimination of supernumerary staff in central office and closure of the corporate library, and we are putting other arrangements in place for that. We are looking at saving \$1m in overtime, and I can elaborate, if required, on the strategies for that. Perhaps our Director, Custodial Corrections, Kevin Corcoran, could add some more detail there. We are looking at \$0.1m—may I just finish outlining those savings?

Mr BARTON: Yes, please do. Consider it another question, if necessary.

Mr MACIONIS: The remainder of those \$2.44m savings come from \$0.1m from some rationalisation of transport and escort arrangements and, finally, \$0.3m which has already occurred through the closure of one of the community corrections regions. We ran on a five-region basis, and we have reduced that to four regions. So those savings in the Organisational Support Program translate to a small saving across the other programs.

The final point that was made there was in relation to juvenile detention. I might just say that the budget for juvenile detention is still subject to further finalisation. We have only taken that over as of 15 August. There has been a three-month review time allowed for finalising that budget and looking at what the exact requirements for that budget will be.

Mr BARTON: Could I follow on with that in the few minutes I think I have left in this section? My understanding is that the figure that is predicted for juvenile detention is \$2.79m lower than last year's actuals, even by the time you take into account that \$2.17m that went to the Department of Families for

the period up till 15 August. Can the Minister give an unequivocal guarantee that lockdowns of juvenile inmates at juvenile detention centres will not be used as a management tool to save costs rather than hiring additional staff or calling in staff—a practice which has already been occurring since the Corrective Services Commission took control of juvenile detention centres and which has led to one young inmate being very seriously injured and industrial disputation with the unions and the Corrective Services Commission?

Mr COOPER: Sure. The short answer is that it is not to be used as a tool to save funds. As to the 2.79 that you mentioned—you must remember that we have said that we will review this. We have only taken it over for about a month. So we have some things to work out over the next 11 months. There is to be a review of operations over the next three months. We do anticipate being able to make savings with improved work practices and the like. We recognise that it is a target that we are wanting to achieve, and we will be doing all that we can to achieve it.

As far as the lockdowns are concerned—as I have said, they are not being used as a management tool, and they won't be. There was a lockdown after the QCSC took over. That decision was taken by the supervisor at the centre in response to a temporary staffing shortage. The centres have since been directed not to use lockdowns to overcome staffing shortages unless all other staffing options have been explored, including the use of casuals or overtime. Since this time, there has been one further instance of lockdown which could not be avoided after all the avenues of providing minimum staffing presence were exhausted. It is not our intention to use them unless it is in the direst emergency.

Mr BARTON: It was certainly my information that they were used to save costs.

Mr COOPER: Well, we are saying that they are not, twice, and for the reasons given.

Mr BARTON: But one resulted in a very serious injury?

Mr COOPER: Sure. Again, it is not our practice; we do not want to do it.

Mr BARTON: Your guarantee is unequivocal, then?

Mr COOPER: You cannot give an unequivocal guarantee on anything.

Mr BARTON: I wish you could.

Mr COOPER: The aim is to make sure that we do not use lockdowns unless they are absolutely vital.

Mr BARTON: I am not asking you to not use lockdowns full stop. I am asking for a guarantee that they will not be used as a cost saving management tool.

Mr COOPER: Yes.

Mr BARTON: I appreciate they may need to be used on other difficult circumstances.

Mr COOPER: I understand where you are coming from.

The CHAIRMAN: The time allocated for that section has now expired. Minister, I will continue with the question on Corrective Services. I refer you to law and order, and reference to this is contained on page 2 of the MPS. Could you explain just how the budget for Corrective Services will address the issue of law and order in the Queensland community?

Mr COOPER: As far as we are concerned, the Government's law and order priorities include a number of matters which will impact on Corrective Services, and we recognise that. We have recognised the fact that serious violent offenders—we have as our policy that they are to serve 80 per cent of their sentence in prison before being eligible for any form of community release; remission will not be granted. Repeat and multiple murderers will serve a minimum of 20 years in prison. Escapees will be subject to harsher sentences. So we recognise that those policies, which they are at this time—they have not been implemented as yet—will need to be phased in on a sensible basis so that we do and will have the space in order to put people who will be spending longer in the Corrective Services institution.

We are mindful of a likely increase in prison numbers—possibly the estimate is in the order of 500 over a five-year period—that is, arising from such a decision at a time when numbers are at an all time high. Therefore, consideration is being given to phased implementation of these policies, as I have just said. We are mindful of the need (a) for strong law and order policies and (b) to make sure that we are able to have the space, the facilities, to be able to look after those people if they transgress.

The CHAIRMAN: In your opening remarks, you made a great deal about the overall increase in the QCSC budget over the year, that is, that it went up from \$235m to \$282m. Is this increase of nearly 17 per cent solely in the capital works area or have the increases occurred in other areas as well?

Mr COOPER: If you include juvenile detention, which is obviously a new player in this, you could say the increase from the 1995-96 budget, that is the budget figures, not the actuals, to 1996-97 went up about 20.2 per cent. So the increase has not only been in just capital works. If you look at page 2-11, you see the total current outlays have increased from \$95m to \$112m in secure custody, to page 2-17 where current outlays have increased from \$8.3m to \$10.8m in open custody, to page 2-22 where current outlays have increased from \$7m to \$8.7m, in community custody, to page 2-27, where outlays have increased from \$14.5m to \$15.9m in community supervision, and the similar category in juvenile detention. It does not represent a full year at this time, only from the middle of August 1996, so it is very difficult to give you comparable terms.

The CHAIRMAN: Media releases you have made recently have made mention of the possibility of an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander prison in north Queensland. Will the proposed cell expansion of Lotus Glen Correctional Centre, referred to on page 2-4 of the MPS, be that facility?

Mr COOPER: What we want to do there—we have set 200 beds, and \$6m has been allocated this year for that; I think it is a total of \$16m for the 200. The initial stage is to build 100, and that will probably be in the cluster style accommodation such as we have at Townsville Correctional Centre in conjunction with the Aboriginal and Islander people so that they have direct and absolute input as to what sort of design would be suitable for their people. I think 60 per cent of the population of Lotus Glen are Aboriginal and Islander people, so therefore we want to place an emphasis on that there. I think it is about 50 per cent over at Townsville and maybe 30 per cent down at Rockhampton—Robbie Schwarten will probably tell me that—but that is roughly the Aboriginal and Islander prisoner population. So, if we can start right up there where the population is greatest, then the next 100, we may be able to look at other innovative ways. It may not be at Lotus Glen as such; it could be out in the community somewhere, on the Cape somewhere, so that we do not have to transport people long distances to Lotus Glen; they can serve their time in different locations. That is the sort of thing that we are looking at.

The CHAIRMAN: The Aborigines who have come from Cape York down to Cairns back up to Lotus Glen—somebody has to be with them all the time. Is there a better way to be able to transport them from one area to the other? Could the community police—the Aborigines—be used to oversee that procedure?

Mr COOPER: There are examples of that right throughout the Cape on outstations. I will let Stan or Ian give a better rundown, but you are right, and that is certainly happening right now. We want to expand those programs because community justice programs and those outstations do seem to be working, and anything that is working—especially in that area—we want to foster. Stan, do you want to comment further on that?

Mr MACIONIS: I will just make a couple of broad, additional comments. We have been having a program, over the last two or three years, where we tried to increase the utilisation and participation of the Aboriginal communities themselves in managing offenders and we now have a number of outstations that we have put into place, as the Minister has mentioned, at Watheniin and Pormpuraaw, and we are looking at another two Aboriginal outstations at present. We have almost finalised the negotiation for an outstation at Palm Island, which will be managed by the local community, as are the other two outstations, and we are hoping that we can get another outstation at either Yarrabah or perhaps Kowanyama, but that requires some further consultation with the local communities.

We have also got community justice groups going at Kowanyama and at Palm Island, and that participation by the community themselves, in particular in the community supervision part of our program, has been very desirable. As far as actually sending offenders direct to those outstations, that has not occurred yet. They normally do go to prison first, and it is part of the reintegration program, but

that is one of the areas that we are in fact discussing with the Aboriginal community. There was a meeting with some, I think, 30 or more representatives of the Aboriginal community in October of last year between the board of the commission and those representatives, and a number of initiatives were put on the table that we are following up on to increase the involvement of the Aboriginal communities in management of Aboriginal offenders. I do not know whether Mr Stewart would like to add to that.

Mr STEWART: I do not think there is anything else.

The CHAIRMAN: I just want to follow up on that. The watch-houses in Cooktown, Lockhart River and Mossman, I think it is, are fairly substantial buildings. Would it be possible to utilise those areas more than they are being used at the moment?

Mr COOPER: One of the things you would have to do there—they are watch-houses, so if you were to utilise them as correctional centres, they would have to be necessarily declared as correctional centres.

The CHAIRMAN: I realise that.

Mr COOPER: There is nothing wrong with the idea.

Mr FOLEY: I was just wondering whether the commission is proposing, in connection with those foreshadowed initiatives, to employ any of the graduates of the Aboriginal and Islander justice studies program conducted through the South Johnstone TAFE? As you may be aware, there are a number of Aboriginal and Islander people who do a justice studies associate diploma there, some of whom have gone into the Police Service. I was just wondering whether in your recruitment of staff you are giving weight to the recruitment of Aboriginal and Islander people?

Mr COOPER: It sounds good to me.

Mr MACIONIS: I will just make a brief response to that. In terms of the outstations themselves, they are operated under contract to the commission, so the commission does not directly employ the people, we specify the outcomes that we are after from those outstations and the local communities actually provide the personnel. We do in fact directly provide a community development officer at Kowanyama, and I am not sure of the background of that particular person, but in more general terms the commission has a target for employment of Aboriginal and Islander staff and, currently, we are targeting for going up towards 10 per cent. We currently employ—approximately 5 per cent of our staff are Aboriginal and Islander people, and in particular in north Queensland where, as the Minister said, we have a very high proportion of Aboriginal and Islander offenders in the prisons, I am not directly aware of whether we target people with those qualifications, but we will certainly take that on board.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: As to the \$80m to administer the new weapons legislation—has \$10m already been committed by the Federal Government?

Mr COOPER: They have made that offer. They made the offer of about \$10.3m, and we have rejected it.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: That includes recurrent funding?

Mr COOPER: No, that is for the first year. The second year was about \$2.8m, and the third year was about \$2.3m.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: After that there is no undertaking to continue with recurrent funding of costs?

Mr COOPER: No, it is those three years. But by then the scheme should be part of the system.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: Can we move to the Juvenile Justice Program? On page 2-3 of your report it is stated that the commission will undertake a review of staffing levels, service delivery models and a rationalisation of programs within juvenile detention centres. Whereas I recognise that there are difficulties of transition and that some issues are not clear, I wonder if you could give me a general overview of where you are headed with the rationalisation of programs and what sort of savings you are looking at in that rationalisation.

Mr COOPER: The figure that we mentioned before as far as savings are concerned was about \$2.79m. That is the target that we have to aim towards. Through work practices, better management or whatever, we hope to be able to achieve that level. But as far as the review is concerned—we also want to make sure that we are introducing programs of a constructive and positive nature. So those matters will be part of the review. In that way, just as we do in the prisons system, we can give a more—without saying anything against the other department, I want to say that we take a great deal of pride in the programs that we have introduced into the prisons system. We will continue to improve those. We want to transfer some of those as well as we possibly can to the juvenile justice system and provide that quality.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: Does the review include staffing levels?

Mr COOPER: Firstly, the review of staffing and management structures within juvenile detention centres is for three months. It is pretty wide ranging. Following the completion of the review, the QCSC anticipates being able to firmly establish the number of staff required to efficiently and effectively operate juvenile detention within Queensland. The QCSC anticipates that some level of staff reduction should be able to be anticipated, but a precise number will not be known until the review is completed.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: Given the debate on the Juvenile Justice Bill and the concerns that were raised about the transition from Family Services, where there is a more caring attitude towards juveniles, to Corrective Services, where at least the perception is a more punitive approach, will there be built into that review an assurance that staffing levels do not predicate the need for lockdowns and other more punitive management methods?

Mr COOPER: I have given Mr Barton the assurance that lockdowns will not be used for savings—only in emergency situations. As far as the programs are concerned—I know you take a keen interest in this. I think you would be pretty pleased with the kinds of programs that we have introduced and will continue to introduce into Corrective Services. The juvenile detention centres will benefit as a result of those.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: Changing tack, if I may—deaths in custody is an issue that has been on the agenda for a long time. I have some answers to questions on Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal deaths in custody. What specific programs have you got, and what funding has been allocated, to address what is a high level of non-Aboriginal deaths in custody and the Aboriginal deaths in custody issue?

Mr COOPER: We might be able to give you the figures for both.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: In the answers to questions you gave me the numbers of incidents, but I am wondering what initiatives are proposed to address that level.

Mr COOPER: Are you talking about all people?

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: In your answer you said that the deaths in custody include deaths that occur in the arrest process. I am talking about once a person is actually apprehended and put into a detention centre of some sort—those deaths in custody. What new initiatives is the department taking to address that?

Mr COOPER: If we can take it from the police side of things—custody, of course, is Corrective Services. Custody is also watch-houses. I will get Stan Macionis to add to that from a Corrective Services point of view. The Australian Institute of Criminology collates statistics concerning both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal deaths in custody in accordance with recommendation 41 of the royal commission. These statistics are regularly published. I want to get onto the programs. Mrs Cunningham is asking about programs. I will leave that and get Stan to go into the programs.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: It says here "to continue to implement strategies to reduce deaths in custody." I want to know what those strategies are.

Mr COOPER: As you know, the royal commission into Aboriginal deaths in custody made quite a number of recommendations—well over maybe 200 or 300. As they pertain to Police and Corrective Services, each department has its area of responsibility. That is the difficulty we have had in working through those recommendations—to see just which ones have been fully and properly implemented. And whose opinion it is as to how well they have been implemented is rather an interesting question. But I will get Stan to go through some of the programs.

Mr MACIONIS: In relation to the programs that we have—if you would like some more detail, perhaps Alison Hunter, our Acting Director of Offender Development could add some detail. But as to the broad programs that we have introduced in

the Corrective Services side over the last couple of years—initially, there are procedures or programs that target identifying people who are at risk. We have implemented procedures which are called high-risk assessment techniques. In that procedure we have a particular battery of questions and an assessment by medical staff at the receiving centre to assess whether or not a person is at risk of self-harm. That was pioneered at the Arthur Gorrie Correctional Centre, which engaged an expert from the United States, Dr Joe Rowan. We have adopted some of those techniques at our centres.

We have various units at different centres to supervise people who are identified at risk. For example, at the Arthur Gorrie Correctional Centre they have what they call a night observation unit where, in the evening, they put people into an intense supervision situation. They quite often buddy them up with someone who is not at risk but who can help the person and look after the person who is at risk. The Corrective Services Commission has constructed a Crisis Support Unit at the Moreton Correctional Centre which was opened in June and is staffed by a number of psychologists and nursing staff. That can take up to 12 prisoners. People who are at risk are put into that unit, where they undergo intensive observation and treatment. They also receive some psychiatric attention.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: Recognising the time constraints, and without being rude, I would like to get that information. I have one last question so that the member for Mansfield may ask some questions. Is there any intention on the part of the department to have savings in the area of deaths in custody programs?

Mr MACIONIS: No.

Mr CARROLL: Minister, the issue of prisoner industries has received a bit of public comment of late. I note that at page 2-6 of the MPS you have reported that receipts for goods and services in 1995-96 are about \$2m below what was budgeted. Can you tell us the reason for that decline in revenue from prisoner industry?

Mr COOPER: Well, you have two kinds of revenue: one is external and one is internal. Quite frankly, the internal funding from prison industries actually went up this year. I would like to give the shortfall of external revenue collection, which was actually less than a million—the \$6.73m collected compared with a target of \$7.6m. Furthermore, the total external plus internal revenue collected in 1995-96 was \$9m compared with the target of \$8.6m. The internal revenue was certainly quite significant.

Mr CARROLL: Further on that issue, I think Mr Macionis said that you had closed two industries in the last year that were less profitable. What criteria were used to assess that profitability?

Mr COOPER: I will give you one off the top of my head: the River of Gold slate mine. The River of Gold slate mine up there in the Mareeba area was just losing money hand over fist. So we had to take that particular action. What was the other one?

Mr MACIONIS: They were both of a similar nature. The person whom we were in joint venture

with was not able to make the payments that were due to us because of the overall viability of the business. So we had to pull out of both of those ventures and we sustained a loss in the meantime.

Mr CARROLL: Will you continue to look at involvement in that kind of venture even though it might not be profitable for a private entrepreneur? Will you continue to look at that as a form of remedial treatment for prisoners?

Mr COOPER: Yes, we do want to look for more remedial industries or programs or whatever we can possibly do in that area. The thing is we can't go over the top, otherwise we get into trouble from Tom and Matt because we are losing money! So we've got to try to balance that out so that we can bring in a certain amount of income. We have trouble, of course, with some private industries. Recently, we had the bread makers from somewhere up there in because they were worried about the prison making very good bread, and whether they were eating into their market. So we had to have a discussion about that.

We appeal to industry—it doesn't matter whether it is the bread makers or those in the laundry areas or wherever—for a piece of the action, so that they can give something back in the area of social justice, so that the correctional service people do have the possibility of doing something useful, and most people would agree with that. If it steps right into the area of knocking someone's business over, then we are in trouble. So we need to work together. We have developed a code of practice just recently. I have been in discussion with the QCSC, as well as some industries. We have drawn up a code of practice so that we can proceed along the lines you are saying but so that we don't stomp on too many toes and we make sure that the industries understand that we do need a piece of the action and let us work together in doing it.

Mr CARROLL: I encourage you to do that because the WORC scheme has certainly been a success, has it not?

Mr COOPER: The WORC scheme is a great success. I was out at the women's correctional custody unit at Warwick the other day. That is the only one of its kind in the State. We do hope to get more of those. There are about 10 female prisoners out there in that. That is a resounding success. I think about 130, 140 male prisoners are involved in the WORC schemes right across the State. They have been generally well accepted.

Mr CARROLL: I take you to page 2-3 of the Ministerial Program Statements and mention the two new correctional centres proposed for Wacol. I ask: on what basis are they both to go into that Wacol precinct?

Mr COOPER: We said prior to the election that we would rebuild Wacol and Moreton. We said that we have got to rebuild Rockhampton. It is just a matter of time to get round them all. So Wacol and Moreton will be what we'll call SEQ1. Also, we will tack on a new female centre. The new women's will go there. Boggo Road will close as soon as we can. About 130-odd people are there. That's overgrown.

It has an 80-odd capacity. So we need to go and move and get rid of Boggo Road altogether as such on that site. That's why there is \$4m allocated for women's to start to move this year. Again, a lot of emphasis will be put on design practice so that we can get it right. You would probably be aware that there are very few female low and open security systems. Boggo Road is it. Virtually, that is high security. They don't have all the range of options that males have. So we intend to do that. The 25-bed annexe at Numinbah is one; Warwick is another; and the new design of women's at Wacol will be another. Similarly in Townsville—there are a number up there. The idea is to make sure that we can get the design right. The opportunity is there, so we'll do that.

Mr CARROLL: Will those new institutions have sheds or room on the property to include some place for prisoner industry?

Mr COOPER: Stan can answer that.

Mr MACIONIS: Yes, all the facilities that we're building, such as the Woodford facility—which will be used as the model—provide for prisoner industries.

Mr CARROLL: I would like to go back to the policing issue and in particular to the startling claim made by Mr Clair this morning about the alleged corruption in the Police Service. I ask you to recall for a moment the report completed seven weeks ago by Sir Max Bingham, which resulted from an extensive review of the Queensland Police Service undertaken over a three or four month period, upon which two of the committee members were Mark Le Grand and Dr David Brereton from the CJC. I ask: during the course of that review, were those allegations about escalating police corruption raised with Sir Max Bingham or that committee?

Mr COOPER: Not that I am aware of. I do not have the full text of what Mr Clair has said. I need to see that. I have expressed my disappointment at this stage as far as the Commissioner of Police is concerned, who was not aware that that corruption was there, if I could put it like that; neither was the Deputy Commissioner. So I have said that it is rather strange that those announcements were made, especially if it is high level—wherever it is, but particularly if it is high level. Why make a big public announcement? Those matters should have been dealt with, I am told, in a better practice. As you have mentioned, there was a very comprehensive review by Sir Max Bingham, and two of the CJC senior officers were represented on that review committee. To my knowledge, no matters of certainly a very serious nature were raised as far as police corruption was concerned; in fact, the emphasis seemed to be on how well the Police Service was going and how far it had advanced since those Fitzgerald days. So I just find it disconcerting.

Mr CARROLL: I want to ask a couple of questions about the arrangements whereby police officers are seconded to or called to work with the CJC. In today's *Courier-Mail*, about page 4, there was a statement by the Chairman of the CJC—which I understand to be an ultimatum—saying that, if the PCJC will not look into the allegations raised in Parliament here last Friday by Mr Grice, then the

CJC will itself conduct an investigation. So we have Caesar threatening to investigate Caesar. I ask: if State police officers are called into or seconded to that investigation, will you be told about that or know what work those officers will be doing?

Mr COOPER: I cannot answer that; I do not know.

Mr CARROLL: What is the usual practice in that regard?

Dep. Comr ALDRICH: The arrangement in place is that, where a complaint is made against an officer of the CJC, the Queensland Police Service conducts that investigation. By that, I don't mean Queensland Police Service officers attached to the CJC; I am talking about Queensland Police Service officers under my direction. They report to the Director of Prosecutions. That is the arrangement in place to ensure that both sides of the coin are covered, so to speak. On the occasions—and there have been a number—where we have conducted investigations on complaints pertaining to staff of the CJC, our investigation is monitored and our final report goes to the Director of Prosecutions.

Mr CARROLL: Have you received any brief to conduct such an inquiry into the allegations made last Friday?

Dep. Comr Aldrich: No, not since last Friday. There was an investigation some time ago of an allegation of leaks from the CJC and the result of that investigation was tabled at the Hanson inquiry.

Mr CARROLL: I have nothing further at this time, Mr Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: That concludes our block, anyway, as far as time is concerned. So we will return to the non-Government members. Mr Gibbs?

Mr GIBBS: Mr Chairman, I have a number of questions for the Minister in relation to the racing industry. I refer the Minister to note 3(b) on page 1-36 of the Program Statements, and I ask: why have the on-demand loans advanced to the Queensland Turf Club doubled from \$0.981m to \$1.823m this financial year? What is the purpose of these loans?

Dr MASON: Could you just give that reference again, please?

Mr GIBBS: Note 3(b) on page 1-36.

Dr MASON: Yes, on-demand loans advanced to the Brisbane Turf Club.

Mr GIBBS: At the bottom of the page, in fact.

Mr PATERSON: In fact, there is an error contained in that figure of \$0.98m. That figure, in fact, comprises an on-demand loan to the Brisbane Turf Club of \$0.786m.

Mr GIBBS: No, it is Queensland Turf Club, not the Brisbane Turf Club.

Mr PATERSON: The Brisbane Turf Club, I am sorry, and an on-demand loan to the Gold Coast Turf Club of \$0.195m, which gives the total of \$0.981m. The totals of the 1995-96 advance to the Brisbane Turf Club of \$0.786m and the \$1.823m in 1996-97 is the total of an approved Governor in Council on-demand loan of approximately \$2.6m for the reconstruction of the Doomben racetracks.

Mr GIBBS: Thank you. Minister, I note that there is no reference to outlays for either the reintroduction of harness racing to the Townsville showgrounds or the funding of a north Brisbane based greyhound racing venue, and I ask: can we take it then that neither of these projects will receive Government funding this financial year?

Mr COOPER: As far as Townsville is concerned—we will take the north Queensland harness racing first. That was an election commitment as far as getting harness racing going at the showgrounds in Townsville is concerned. Right now, a lot of work has been done on it with the North Queensland Harness Racing Association as well as the Harness Racing Board. They have been charged with the responsibility of putting together that scheme so that we can have that up and running as a trial starting next year and then moving through to the month of approximately August.

Mr GIBBS: I ask a supplementary question to that. Can you confirm to me whether that program, or that project, has the absolute support—"yes" or "no"—of the current Harness Racing Board?

Mr COOPER: I am aware that they are discussing the thing right now. I know what you are saying; on any of those matters when issues like that come up that they have to deal with, there will be differences of opinion. I would like Bob Mason to be able to give an update as far as where they are at right now.

Dr MASON: Thank you, Minister. As the Minister has outlined, the matter of harness racing in north Queensland is with the Harness Racing Board at the moment, and they are doing an analysis of the implementation of harness racing in Townsville. I understand there are some matters of debate within the board and it has been indicated to the board that they have to address the implementation of that part of Government policy within the budget given to the Harness Racing Board.

Mr GIBBS: Thank you. I note that funding for the Racing Services Unit has been cut by \$330,000 from \$895,000 to just \$565,000. Why has funding to the unit been cut? What aspects of its functions will be sacrificed to achieve this \$330,000 saving?

Mr PATERSON: The budget of the Office of Racing has not been cut; it is just a change of classification as we have moved between three different departments in the last financial year. What that \$565,000 figure for 1996-97 does not include is a corporate cost allocation charge of \$345,000, which is included in that note under that table. If you include that amount in 1996-97, the actual budget of the Office of Racing has increased by \$100,000 to \$2.1m from \$2m in 1995-96.

Mr GIBBS: I refer the Minister to page 1-37 of the Program Statements and the table outlining staffing levels. I note that you are planning to axe four technical positions at the Racing Science Centre. Can you tell me the positions which will be removed, the role they perform, how those functions will be continued, and what effect the loss of these positions will have on the centre's ability to ensure the integrity of Queensland racing?

Mr COOPER: As you know, the unit works to promote the industry's growth and development through sound, innovative policies and programs. You know the areas that it administers. You know the fact that it comprises eight staff and that—sorry, you are talking about the science centre?

Mr GIBBS: The Racing Science Centre.

Mr COOPER: Giving you the full staffing levels there—nine professional staff, four technical staff and four administrative staff. So as far as the reduction in numbers is concerned, I am not aware of any numbers that are being reduced.

Mr GIBBS: It is very clear in here that there are four positions to be axed. I reiterate the question: what effect do you envisage that they will have in terms of the integrity of Queensland racing? What are the functions that will be continued and what effect will that loss have on those positions?

Mr COOPER: Fair enough. I am quite happy to let Dr Mason answer it.

Dr MASON: Thank you, Mr Minister. The numbers of professional and technical administrative staff shown at the Racing Science Centre under the heading of 1995-96 as contrasted to 1996-97 have changed. There is one extra administrative staff going into the Racing Services Unit. The variations there revolve around some adjustments to the figures from last year in relation to people's qualifications. Some of the technicians have gained professional qualifications, so therefore they are designated professional staff rather than technical staff. The administrative staff of the Racing Services Unit is altered by one because one of the staff that was at the Racing Science Centre has been re-allocated to the Racing Services Unit. So the change is not reflective of any change of personnel; it is reflective of change in qualifications.

Mr GIBBS: So basically there is an overall loss of only one person; is that correct?

Dr MASON: Yes, there is an overall loss of one person—an administrative staff person who was shared with the Racing Services Unit.

Mr GIBBS: Minister, I note that the \$22.1m in advance is from the Racing Development Fund. Will you provide the full details of all clubs to have received funding via the RDF, the purpose of the grant, the size of the grant, when the grant was approved and whether the grant was recommended by the appropriate control body?

Mr COOPER: Which grant are you referring to?

Mr GIBBS: Please provide the full details of all clubs to have received funding from the Racing Development Fund, that is, an overall advance of \$22.1m, the purpose of the grant, the size of the grant, when the grant was approved and whether the grant was recommended by the appropriate control body?

Mr COOPER: You are referring to the full grant of—

Mr GIBBS: The full Racing Development Fund.

Mr COOPER: Do you want me to go through it all?

Mr GIBBS: I am happy to have it provided to me in writing if that would more appropriate.

Mr COOPER: It would take a long time to read through them all.

Mr GIBBS: I did not ask you to read through them all. I just made the point that I would be happy for them to be provided to me in writing.

Mr COOPER: Can do.

Mr GIBBS: In respect of the agreement or agreements, what is the nature of the agreement or agreements, and with whom has the Government made the agreement, in respect of funding of television? Has the Government entered into any arrangements with any pay TV operators which would impact on future Government revenue? What is the estimated income to Government from any agreement and which racing clubs are included in the agreement?

Mr COOPER: I think you are as aware as I am that pay TV is a very controversial issue at this time. We have certainly had a number of discussions in that area. Just as far as we are allowed to divulge whatever we can in order to assist you, I am happy for Dr Mason to give you a brief. However, you will be aware of how sensitive that issue is at this time.

Dr MASON: In regard to negotiations on pay television, the Queensland TAB has been asked to provide a technical working party to liaise with the racing industry, because it was decided that they had skills and expertise on staff at the TAB that could—

Mr GIBBS: Could you speak up a little?

Dr MASON: They had skills and expertise on staff already at the Queensland TAB that could do analyses of certain propositions and so forth. They are working with parties from interstate of the Australian Racing Industries Group that were analysing the implications for the introduction of pay television in Australian racing. This also impinges on the discussions or the possibilities of privatisation of TABs as well, because obviously the two are interconnected. Therefore, a working group is being formed with officers from the Treasury Department to look at the implications for privatisation, because there are noises being made in New South Wales about the privatisation of its TAB. Therefore, it is quite a big-ticket item for Australian racing at the moment.

Mr GIBBS: Mr Chairman, I will ask a supplementary question if I may. At this stage, what progress, if any, has been made in terms of race clubs which have refused to divulge the terms of contracts that they individually signed without reference to the Government with pay television operators? Has there been any cooperation reached with, for example, the Queensland Turf Club to make available to you as Minister the terms of the contract that it signed? Has any other club been prepared to divulge that? If not, what action are you prepared to take as Minister to ensure that those contracts which may have been signed without consultation with the

Government will not be detrimental in terms of the overall income from the TAB to other sections of the racing industry?

Mr COOPER: The whole issue of pay TV, privatisation and so on, is a very commercially sensitive area at this time. The availability of contracts certainly is commercially in confidence as well. I do not wish to canvass those matters here. I know what you are talking about as far as benefits to the racing industry in this State are concerned. However, as those matters proceed, be it pay TV or even privatisation, we simply cannot go any further than that in the course of these deliberations.

Mr GIBBS: At this stage, you have not taken any action as Minister to ask or call for those contracts to be made available to you?

Dr MASON: Could I take that on?

Mr COOPER: Yes.

Dr MASON: That subject has come up in discussion with the race clubs. The position is still held by the race clubs that the contracts or arrangements that they have are commercially in confidence. There is no way that the Government has been able to force that information from the clubs or to obtain that information from the clubs.

Mr GIBBS: In regard to the Harness Racing Board and the Greyhound Racing Authority, will you provide me with a full list of Government funding to both the control bodies and, in respect to control body members, provide a full list of all payments to members, a full list of expenses incurred by members, all travel and entertaining expenses, accommodation expenses and any other expenses paid for by the Government or the relevant control body? I do not expect that now. I am happy for you to provide that in writing.

Mr COOPER: Consider it done.

Mr GIBBS: Minister, I refer you to page 1-36 of the Program Statements, which include figures on program outlays from the Racing Development Fund. I note that outlays from the RDF have been cut by over \$3.4m from \$32.2m in 1995-96 to \$28.7m in 1996-97. How do you explain this cut? Which programs or projects will be affected? As the Racing Development Fund is committed to repaying the \$72m debt generated by the former National Party Government in the late 1980s, how much will be repaid for this purpose from the RDF this financial year? What is the total outstanding debt and when do you anticipate that the full debt will finally be repaid?

Mr COOPER: Thanks for the recognition of the debt incurred! I think the figure is now about \$30.1m. You had that extended out, didn't you?

Mr GIBBS: That is correct.

Mr COOPER: I think you went out to the year 2005?

Mr GIBBS: That is correct.

Mr COOPER: Therefore, you were not going to be up for such big payments had you not extended it out. When we came in—I want to get this figure right. I want to ensure that it is right. The RDF

expenditure back then was \$32.238m, representing a 12 per cent increase against the forecast 1995-96 expenditure of \$27.295m. The RDF budget estimate is normally based on the level of expenditure achieved in the previous year. Therefore, the determinant of actual RDF annual expenditure is the number and magnitude of grant applications received by 31 August and subsequently approved for funding. The \$4.943m increase in RDF outlays for 1995-96 principally resulted from: increased grant expenditure, \$2.882m; financing transactions representing on-demand loans made to the Brisbane Turf Club for the reconstruction of the Doomben racetracks and the Gold Coast Turf Club for the purchase of land, \$981,000; the establishment costs for the Racing Industry and Training Centre, \$657,000; and the purchase of two mass spectrometers for the Racing Science Centre, \$246,000. That is why the actual figure of \$32.328m was reduced to \$28.776m.

Mr GIBBS: I will ask a supplementary question, if I may. Bearing in mind that the figures that you have just given are correct and that under a Labor administration the debt of that fund was reduced from \$72m to \$32m, and the fact that in 1996-97 there will be something like \$28.7m outlaid out of the fund, how do you reconcile those figures with the fact that you have made statements in the Queensland Parliament to the effect that the fund is virtually broke or that it was non-professionally administered under the previous administration?

Mr COOPER: As far as the fund is concerned, we might dig those figures up. When we came in, you had a pretty high level of commitments. I think the figure was something like \$6.5m of commitments—

Mr GIBBS: Responsible commitments.

Mr COOPER:—over and above the capacity of the fund to pay. Quite obviously, we were not able to proceed with some of those commitments. We have very high recurrent expenditure in there. A lot of the projects that we would like to be done simply cannot be done. We have now had to issue a dictum, that is, only for safety factors, such as training tracks and running rails. Quite frankly, we have done a pretty good job in that particular area. There is recurrent expenditure of approximately \$24m. You have mentioned that the income is around about that level.

The flexibility of Government to implement new initiatives is presently curtailed by a large number of recurrent current funding commitments: Developmental Club Funding Scheme, \$5.5m; Racing Incentive Scheme, \$3m; Harness Racing Code Financial Package, \$2.5m; the Office of Racing expenses, \$2.1m; Greyhound Code Financial Package, \$1.5m; funding of the Queensland Principal Club operating expenses under the so-called first charge, \$1.25m; Queensland Winter Racing Carnival, \$330,000; and the Matilda. The total of these recurrent commitments is \$16.5m, or nearly 70 per cent of the total fund revenue. That means that those figures absorb an awful lot of the fund, and that limits the scope. As to what has exacerbated that—we have an inflation rate of around 3.7 per cent. The

growth of that fund is around about 0.2 per cent, and that looks like staying that way for the next two or three years.

Mr GIBBS: I can take it from those figures, though, that the fund is not broke?

Mr COOPER: The fund is strapped for funds. We have a hell of a lot of clubs putting in applications that once upon a time we might have been able to accommodate, and now it looks very grim for quite a number of years.

Mr GIBBS: They were never all able to be accommodated. That is incorrect. I refer to the Queensland Racing Incentive Scheme, and I ask the Minister: are you committed to ensuring that the Queensland racing industry scheme—

Mr COOPER: QRIS?

Mr GIBBS: QRIS—will continue under its current formula. If so, could you explain to me why there seems to be a shifting of moneys which previously had been allocated to the major racing centres in Queensland. I am referring, of course, to the Brisbane metropolitan area, which is the showpiece of Queensland racing, and to the major provincial tracks along the eastern seaboard. There seems to me to be an alarming pattern emerging whereby money is now being filched from those clubs and pork-barrelled into sections of the country racing circuit in Queensland, which in terms of its contribution through either TAB revenue to racing or to Government income plays a negligible role. Could you explain why that seems to be occurring with the QRIS money?

Mr COOPER: I am not aware of funds that are being filched from the \$3m in the QRIS scheme. My discussions with the QRIS subcommittee have been on the basis that, yes, the scheme continues; the scheme remains. If the scheme can be improved and enhanced in order to improve racing as such in Queensland, then that's in their hands.

Mr GIBBS: Mr Chairman, I have no further questions on that.

Mr BARTON: I would like to return to some police matters for the remainder of our time. The first question I would like to ask is to Assistant Commissioner Ken Scanlan. Assistant Commissioner, I refer you to the total increase of 139 police for the 1996-97 budget, and I also note that the Minister in answer to a question on notice advised that the commissioner hadn't yet looked at the allocations across the region. But of those 139 additional police, would you be prepared to indicate what number you believe you need in your southern region for the Police Service there to be able to perform its role effectively?

Mr COOPER: Do you want to take it.

Asst Comr SCANLAN: Yes, I can take it. Without some assessment of the current staffing levels, I'm afraid I couldn't give you a definitive figure there. But we do have an allocated staffing level at the moment, and with the growth of population and the growth in crime rate, which hopefully won't occur, we do need more staff. But I'm afraid I couldn't give you a figure just off the top of my head.

Mr BARTON: Roughly, what area does your southern region cover?

Asst Comr SCANLAN: It covers the police districts of Ipswich, Toowoomba, Warwick, Dalby, Roma and Charleville.

Mr BARTON: That is all I have for the moment.

Mr COOPER: Could I just interrupt for a moment?

Mr BARTON: Yes.

Mr COOPER: Of the 139, 102—as I think you have probably seen indicated—are earmarked for regional areas. A certain number of those will go to the various regions. As you know, there are eight regions out there. What happens after that is something that is a matter for the commissioner and the assistant commissioners to determine as to where they go in the police districts or the divisions.

Mr BARTON: I do not really want to be putting your assistant commissioners too much on the spot. Very clearly, there has been demand from all over the State, and particularly the southern corner, including some demands for figures as high as 150 for Logan and Beenleigh. That in itself is more than the total of 139. There may be some additional police released by civilianisation.

Mr COOPER: For sure.

Mr BARTON: I am simply trying to get some sort of indication of how many police these regions in this corner believe they need?

Mr COOPER: As you said, a certain number of police will be released by civilianisation, at least another 50, plus that 150.

Mr BARTON: But then some will be lost by attrition as well.

Mr COOPER: We have mentioned the attrition figure. When you're dealing with attrition, as you would realise, you've got to make up for that attrition by your recruitment. You cater for that going through the academy. Attrition has to be catered for and growth has to be added on top.

Mr BARTON: I would like to ask a similar question of Assistant Commissioners John Banham and Greg Early.

Asst Comr BANHAM: In response to your question, the region is currently three officers below the allocated strength. As is the case I believe with all the assistant commissioners, we argue on the basis of our needs. At this point in time, I have been assured by Mr Gill, the director HRM, that there will be two allocations from the next two intakes of 25 officers to the region. I don't have a definite figure, that I need X number of officers. That's an ongoing assessment. It's a consultation process between the commissioner and each of the assistant commissioners. But I will be arguing as strongly as I can for the south-eastern region.

Mr BARTON: Do you agree with the figures that were put forward by the Minister when in Opposition and the Police Union in the Logan/Beenleigh region that they need a minimum of 150 urgently?

Asst Comr BANHAM: No, I wouldn't agree as a bland statement that they need 150 officers. We do have some major problems down there. The 25 officers we have been promised within the next two intakes I believe will fill a lot of the gaps that we have identified down there. But, as I say, it's an ongoing process of negotiation.

Mr BARTON: Assistant Commissioner Early, do you remember the question?

Asst Comr EARLY: Yes. My region has about 873 strength plus public servants. At any stage, currently included, I have about 50 vacancies. Many of those are in the constable area. I rely on intakes coming out of the academy of first-year constables to offset against those vacancies. A lot of the people, my constables, are transferred elsewhere in the State. They also get into specialist areas. I cannot object to that, because I take a whole-of-service view. So if I could get more first-year constables to help fill my vacancies, I would be better off. If I could get up to 873, I would then assess the situation and then be able to answer your question. I could, as the Minister indicated, take advantage of civilianisation, because I have counters, property officers and roster clerks—three positions which currently Statewide are performed by police officers. If I could get, say, 16 civilians, I could release 16 more police officers to go onto the street.

Mr BARTON: Do you have—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr BARTON: I have a minute left, according to that clock.

The CHAIRMAN: We have run out of time.

Mr BARTON: Not by that clock!

The CHAIRMAN: The time allocated for questions by non-Government members has now expired. Could we have the Corrective Services people back again, please, Minister? I refer to the number of times Corrective Services have been reviewed, investigated and put under the microscope, which appears to be more than any other Government function in Queensland. I recall the Kennedy inquiry, the CJC inquiry, the joint Treasury/PSMC inquiry and the PSMC inquiry, an external audit and the recent Commission of Audit. In the light of all this attention, can the Minister put the QCSC budget in some context? By this, I mean: how does the organisation rate in comparison with other States? Are we getting value for money? Do you know the comparative costs for prisoners on a daily basis?

Mr COOPER: There are some interesting figures there in relation to comparative costs. Yes, we certainly have had a lot of reviews in Queensland. I do not say that we should resile from keeping those things going. Naturally, you do not want to keep reviewing things until they are reviewed out of existence, but we must keep trying to improve. That is what we have been doing. The first time I ever saw Boggo Road was an incident that shocked me, and I resolved to change the prison system from how it was then. That is when I instigated the Kennedy review, which largely received bipartisan support, or

certainly the Corrective Services Bill of 1989 went through with bipartisan support. I think it has been on a pretty good track since then, except for the doubling up, which has increased dramatically. I think we probably have 1,300 to 1,400 prisoners doubled up at this time, and when we left office in 1989 there was none—they were all single cells. So we have to rebuild and do the program all over again to try to get back to where we were as far as single cells are concerned, and that will take time.

As to the figures that you are looking for in terms of comparisons—the commission report revealed that areas where Queensland performed well include: \$98 per prisoner per day for secure custody in 1994-95 compared with the national average of \$131; \$39 per prisoner per day for open custody in 1994-95 compared with the national average of \$96; an escape rate of 1 in 1994-95 compared with the national average of 1.8; the highest average of out-of-cell hours—13.9 per day—of all jurisdictions, versus 11.4 per day average; the highest utilisation of community custody of all jurisdictions, at four times the national average; \$4 per offender per day for community supervision in 1994-95, compared with the national average of \$6; and the lowest prisoner recidivism rate reported in Australia in 1994-95. As to the down side—we still have problems with deaths in custody. The rate of such deaths has fallen each year since 1992-93 and is now comparable with the national average.

The CHAIRMAN: You mentioned single cells and the demand at various times for a dormitory type of accommodation. Are you addressing this at all in the new prisons or in the prisons—

Mr COOPER: Dormitory style?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes—well, some dormitory types of—

Mr COOPER: Yes. You were referring to it for all prisoners or Aboriginal—

The CHAIRMAN: No, there are some prisoners who apparently are more comfortable in a dormitory situation.

Mr COOPER: Yes. Firstly, the single-cell idea came about in 1987, when there is no doubt that the system was pretty bad—gaol rapes in the ablution blocks and those sorts of things were of horrific proportions. Some people referred to that move as putting people in motel rooms. It wasn't that at all. It was a case of limiting the opportunities for that so that they could be in single-cell accommodation and thus be saved from the horrific acts that were happening before. Now there are some differing designs. For example, at the Townsville Correctional Centre, they have cluster-type accommodation—the circular-type huts, if you like—where you have about half a dozen prisoners each. They are working well. We would like to continue that. As I said, we will probably do that at Lotus Glen for 100 cells and then look at other innovative ways. But we will go with whatever is working. That is working. We will not have huge dormitories and we will not allow a situation where you can have a lot of prisoners in an ablution block and no-one can do anything to control

it. We just have to get the balance right. This is something to be taken into account with the Aboriginal and Islander people, as to whether that is what they want—whether they want dormitory-style accommodation in order that they can look after each other in the particular way. We will be listening to them and remembering that none of that can be forced; it has to be something that they want to do and play a role in the design of. We must not forget also that tribal matters must be taken into account. Sometimes the tribes do not get on. You have to be frightfully careful about who you put together. It is something that has to be worked through extremely sensitively and in consultation with them.

The CHAIRMAN: Relating to WORC—Work Outreach Camps—the Minister will note from page 2-23 that this year the program has been allocated in excess of \$5m. Does this mean that additional WORC camps will be opened up and, if so, where?

Mr COOPER: It is planned to open an additional WORC camp in north Queensland out near Julia Creek and also one in the Dirranbandi area. We closed one. There was a temporary camp at Inglewood. That will be closed, and they will be moving out to Dirranbandi. The concept of WORC camps started in Charleville. You will probably recall the Charleville floods. That is where the whole idea came from for the establishment of WORC camps, because of the top job the prisoners did in cleaning up Charleville after those floods. It is interesting to note some of the districts where WORC camps actually take place. I opened one in Springsure recently. That district has accepted the fact very well.

Mr SCHWARTEN: It was a good idea of our Government, wasn't it?

The CHAIRMAN: It was before then.

Mr COOPER: I don't deny it for a second, Robbie. Take a bow! We did a few good things, too, that you kept going with, so let us keep it up.

People's reaction to WORC camps is interesting. Sometimes they can go into areas where people just draw down the shutters and say, "No way, we don't want anything to do with it." We say, "Okay. You don't want it, you don't get it" and we move away until we find an area where they are supportive. They have to be supportive, otherwise it does not work. The 10 existing camps—and it will be 11 or 12 with the new Julia Creek one and the other one—are working well, and we want to keep the program going.

The CHAIRMAN: Actually, it goes back for quite some time. We had them in Gympie back in the mid-eighties. They were not WORC camps, but they were sort of release-to-work programs.

Mr COOPER: Release-to-work programs have been going for a while.

The CHAIRMAN: That sort of thing worked fairly well. Such programs enable valuable work to be carried out in a fairly substantial area. It helps a lot.

Mr COOPER: It does. Take the women's camp at Warwick—or any other; they all work pretty similarly. If you see the showgrounds there now,

they are in fantastic order. Whereas they were pretty dilapidated before, they are in great order now. Ten of those people are restoring the old Glengallan homestead, and in five years' time we hope to have it up to National Trust standard. They are doing something useful, they know they are doing something useful, and those programs must be continued. I would also like to get into the juvenile WORC camp situations. We were talking about juvenile programs before. We would like very much to move into that area. I referred to the major wilderness camp that is going into Palen Creek under this budget.

Mr BARTON: Ideally, they need to be a bit further away than near a current correctional facility.

Mr COOPER: Ideally, Tom, you are right, because we did try, and that is when the community came down on us like a ton of bricks.

Mr BARTON: I understood that.

Mr COOPER: But you are right. What we need to do is encourage them out there.

The CHAIRMAN: I refer the Minister to the comment made in the Queensland Commission of Audit report that Queensland is a relatively efficient provider of corrective services. Does this imply that we get things on the cheap?

Mr COOPER: You are talking about the provider, be it corporatisation, be it run by the Government, by the State, or privatisation of the prisons system? That is what you are referring to. The National Competition Policy is one thing, but that Commission of Audit that was done—they both point to the need to have what they call a clear separation of purchaser and provider in relation to Corrective Services. As you know, Borallon and Arthur Gorrie at this time are private, the rest are all public. The idea came back—then again, it was Kennedy's recommendation that as there was, with the health system, both private and public hospitals, there are private and public schools, why not give some competition and see some public and private prisons and see how they work? So our idea then was to get them going and then to compare and to do an audit as to their progress and accountability and so on.

At this time, we have been asked to look at not necessarily privatisation, but certainly corporatisation, as everyone seems to be doing these days. But the idea is to see if it is going to be more effective and efficient without detracting from the sort of programs and service that we can give. So we are in that process now of assessing that.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: Could we explore the comments that you made about the WORC camps? You talked about WORC camps for adults and touched on the idea of outstations for juveniles. What work has been done—I know some work has been done with the Aboriginal community—because particularly the very north Queensland Aboriginal community would love to be re-established with the responsibility of correcting their juveniles who go off track. What work has been done to establish that program in far-north Queensland and what work has been done to establish perhaps work stations or

outreach type camps as early intervention for juvenile not petty crime—that is perhaps the wrong way of describing it—but mild forms of misdemeanour as opposed to institutionalisation?

Mr COOPER: We have mentioned outstations before, be it Baa's Yard, Pormpuraaw—and there are quite a number of those outstations.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: All for Aboriginal communities?

Mr COOPER: For Aboriginal communities, that is right. I am just trying to get an update. We have allocated funds for the implementation of two additional outstations within the remote Aboriginal communities, that is Baa's Yard and Pormpuraaw, and that is for a capacity of 20 offenders. I am going to get these fellows to fill in some gaps here soon, because I am going to cut out. Some \$44,000 has been expended in preliminary surveys as site examination for additional outstations and \$455,000 remains for the building of two outstations. We have just been up to Palm Island and talked to the community justice people up there, that was Pina Geia, and she is at the forefront of this community justice type program. They do have problems there in Palm Island and many other centres, but they are conducting their form of community justice. The number of cases that have been going to court and those that require police action has dropped dramatically by these people utilising their own community justice.

They are going to get an outstation over on Fantome Island, just across the way from Palm Island—we have seen the site. As far as the things you are talking about, Mrs Cunningham, yes, these things seem to be working and it is that direction we intend to pursue. On the issue of juveniles, I want Stan Macionis to give you a further brief.

Mr MACIONIS: In relation to the juveniles, the main initiative that we are putting into place now—and that will actually start on 7 October—is a wilderness camp, or was to be a wilderness camp, it is not quite as far in the wilderness as we had hoped, as stated earlier on, for the young offenders. That will be located on the Palen Creek reserve. That is associated with a program which will take in the order of 12 to 15 young offenders initially and put them through an outdoor, experiential learning program as well as other concentrated programs for these people and to try to get them out of the custodial system. These are people who would otherwise be in secure custody. That is going to be evaluated to see whether that in fact can be successful and can be successfully expanded beyond south-east Queensland.

In terms of the actual juvenile detention responsibilities themselves, we have only just taken those over and we are undertaking a three-month review. I should just perhaps mention the terms of reference for that review just to indicate the sort of things we are going to be looking at in relation to juvenile detention and how we might be able to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of it. The terms of reference we have set ourselves is to review the operational efficiency and effectiveness of the centres, including identification of core

responsibilities of staff and allocation of staff to key tasks, allocating any inefficient practices—would you like me to finish, Mr Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr MACIONIS: I will just very quickly summarise. We are looking at management structures, but we are also looking at the level and nature of the programs delivered in juvenile detention, and that is where we will be looking at whether those sort of opportunities for those wilderness programs could be introduced in juvenile detention as well, but we have to do that in conjunction with the Department of Justice, where we have joint responsibilities in relation to juvenile detention.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: And Palen Creek is a cross-cultural wilderness camp, is it?

Mr MACIONIS: It is a wilderness camp for young offenders, but they are young offenders who are actually in the adult correction system, in other words, aged between 17 and 21. So it is not part of our juvenile detention responsibilities which we have just taken over.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: I know the Minister's voice is failing, but so we do not have more musical chairs—there was a question on notice about the categorisation of racing organisations from developmental or strategic—the race tracks—and you said that much of the responsibility lies with the QPC. I just wanted a clarification. The QPC decides which clubs are development and which clubs are strategic?

Mr COOPER: The QPC was set up by an Act of Parliament. One of its main functions is to control racing as such in Queensland. As far as—I think I know where the question is leading, is it towards whether Gladstone is going to be upgraded?

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: No, it was going to be a generic question. I was going to get more specific outside this room.

Mr COOPER: Can I get Bob Mason to help you? I have had a little feeling something was coming.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: I will ask the second question and that might pre-empt your concern.

Mr COOPER: It is not a concern.

Mr FOLEY: It is about the Rocklea harness racing.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: In your dreams, Mr Foley. In your answer, you said that there is no specific budget allocation and that categorisations, developmental or strategic, are only relevant in the thoroughbred codes, where "developmental" refers to a category funded by the RDF and "strategic" refers to clubs directly funded from the TAB. It is the responsibility of the Queensland Principal Club, taking into consideration the recommendations of the regional associations, to assess the performance and categorisation of various clubs. That answer is fine, but given that the department has a clear responsibility, or assumes a clear responsibility, to fund through the RDF those development clubs,

surely the department also has a say in which clubs are deemed to be developmental and which ones are deemed to be strategic?

Mr COOPER: Yes, it is not as if it is all one way as far as the QPC is concerned. We do have input as far as a lot of the matters of racing is concerned, but nevertheless that is the industry body properly and duly elected. Obviously, you would want to take note of their recommendations, otherwise why have them. Do you want to add anything?

Dr MASON: I think the only thing I can add that may be of assistance to you is that, obviously, part of the departmental role is to ensure that the funds are available to fund the group of clubs that are funded from the developmental group. Currently, that makes up some \$5.5m of recurrent funding each year out of the RDF. So if you had the Queensland Principal Club willy-nilly, as it were, recategorising clubs, they could put pressure on finding that amount of recurrent funding each year out of the RDF. The reason that those clubs are funded from the RDF for a number of financially beneficial reasons for those little clubs to be funded from the RDF in that they get their money immediately after the meetings are run, whereas the clubs that are funded from the TAB profit—the strategic clubs—have to wait for three payments per year. The TAB distributes its money three times per year. So there are a number of intricacies in terms of managing and balancing the budget to allow the number of clubs in Queensland to be developmental or strategic.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: But in assessing which ones are going to remain developmental and which ones are going to be categorised as strategic, is there a comparison done, whether it is on the basis of equity—comparing like with like—that the clubs that are within each category are at least remotely reflective of one another?

Dr MASON: I think it is fair to say, as the Minister outlined before, the regional associations in the Queensland Principal Club are continually, if you like, monitoring clubs on a comparative basis such as you mentioned.

Mr CARROLL: Minister, I would like to return to the Racing portfolio for a moment. Can you tell me how many TAB agencies there are in Queensland?

Mr COOPER: Can we take a wild guess?

Mr CARROLL: Perhaps that can be a question on notice.

Dr MASON: Yes, I will take that on notice. I would not like to just take a wild guess at it. That is the responsibility of the TAB board.

Mr CARROLL: But it is within your ministerial responsibilities?

Mr COOPER: Yes. We will get the figure.

Mr CARROLL: How many of those agencies are in public hotels? Do you know a percentage?

Dr MASON: You would find the figures in the annual report of the TAB. Each year they publish the number of agencies and the number of PubTABs and ClubTABs that they have.

Mr CARROLL: I notice that, at page 21 of the Treasurer's Annual Statement, casino taxes totalled \$71.5m in the financial year just ended. That represents a 44.9 per cent increase over that category of revenue from the previous year. I notice also that gaming machine tax receipts amounted to \$90.8m. An answer to one of the questions given to you on notice revealed that, in 1994-95, the State Government earned taxes of \$79m from TAB operations. In light of tenuous suggestions in answers to other questions on notice that there might be privatisation of the TAB, what wider social considerations are taken into account before that kind of industry is allowed to grow to some extent uncontrolled—in other words, before it becomes a commercial enterprise of its own—in the light of claims by some people that the advertisement of gambling can lead to addiction and so on?

Mr COOPER: I suppose we are looking at a philosophical answer. The social aspects are taken into account, as you would realise, for poker machines or gambling generally. There is the Gaming Machine Benefits Fund, or whatever it is called, and Jupiters. They have a number of those schemes that are very useful. But especially when poker machines came into play, we knew that there would be people who would get hurt. So there are those social aspects that have to be taken into account in order to try to look after those people but also to get some benefit for sporting clubs around the State. Those funds are very useful. I am not sure whether I am answering your question—

Mr CARROLL: I will sharpen it a bit more. The soft sell around the edges, that is, to hand back money to kids' sporting clubs, perhaps disguises the fact or is intended to help sell those projects, particularly when you look at the fact that those three sources of revenue that I have just outlined bring in one-twentieth of the State's revenue from fines, taxes and penalties. But my question is: what control or requirement is there within the TAB, for example, to look at wider social considerations, such as the effect of this lumbering monster?

Mr COOPER: Again, I can only repeat what I said. It is a philosophy that those people who are going to get hurt from gambling as such do get some assistance and that some of the funds from gambling do go back into improving facilities for sporting aspects. That is about as far as I can go.

Mr CARROLL: So there is no-one there perhaps suggesting a curb on the growth of that particular commercial enterprise in light of those considerations?

Mr COOPER: No. I am just taking the TAB as an example. The idea of a TAB is to advance and promote itself and be as competitive as it can possibly be in the course of its job. That is what they have to do. They are charged with that. I dare say that other people with gaming machines or whatever are charged with a similar code. Nevertheless, I think it is right that there is this recognition of a social factor.

Mr CARROLL: Some comments coming to me certainly indicate that there is concern that there may not be that wider consideration, particularly when

you have an agency such as the TAB, which is highly professional and has an excellent radio station in 4TAB. They are doing all the things right to grow that enterprise, but there are those other things that one should be concerned about from a social point of view. Are you able to give some further consideration to that so that there can be a balanced viewpoint?

Mr COOPER: I understand where you are coming from now. I did not want to get back into this area. We have discussed privatisation. It is one of those things that have to be considered. At that time there were negotiations to ensure that an equitable level of benefit is maintained between the racing industry and the TAB. The implications and ramifications of a Queensland TAB privatisation upon the livelihoods of persons employed within the racing industry and the viability of race clubs cannot be understated. I will leave it at that.

Mr CARROLL: I understand the balancing interests there with the racing industry on the one hand. One of your answers claims that the industry has benefited enormously from the TAB. That is fine. That is a different problem from the one I have flagged as an issue. I have nothing further.

Mr BARTON: With regard to regional budget increases in Police—I am sorry to keep jumping around. I thought I was finished.

Mr COOPER: If we went in blocks this would not happen.

Mr BARTON: I refer you to the Departmental Overview in the Ministerial Program Statement which states that, along with the claim that the budget has been increased by 7.3 per cent, headquarters and administrative costs will be reduced consistent with the Government's focus on enhancing core service delivery. I refer you also to your answer to the question on notice with regard to regional budgets. Is it true that regional budgets for 1996-97 will be increased by less than 3 per cent on the previous year, 1995-96? How do you equate this with your Government's commitment to increase services to rural and regional Queensland? If indeed regional budgets have not benefited by the claimed 7.3 per cent budget increase or more, it would suggest that other areas have experienced a disproportionate rise in their budgets. Which areas are these?

Mr COOPER: That is a good question.

Mr BARTON: I thought it was, too.

Mr WARRY: I will make a few very quick points. The 7.3 per cent increase, as I think you would be aware, has a number of components and that includes some of those new initiatives that were previously mentioned in the discussion, for example, \$5m allocation to information technology, enhancement to capital works and the like. Clearly, that money is not in the first instance directed towards regional budgets. So the 7.3 per cent, while that is the true figure of the increase, includes elements over and above what you might say are the normal, general, ongoing operations of the service including regions.

The increases to the regional budgets—depending on which particular figure you want to use

as your base of comparison, either the 1995-96 budget or the 1995-1996 expenditure—range across regions, commands and divisions. In the case of the regions, with a couple of exceptions, those figures are of the order of 2 per cent to 3 per cent, 4 per cent. I think that probably reflects the increase that you would see also in the service's general operating base as distinct from enhancements that are targeted towards specific initiatives.

The CHAIRMAN: The time allocated for consideration of the Estimates of expenditure of the Queensland Police Service, the Office of Racing and the Queensland Corrective Services Commission has now expired. I thank the Minister and his officers for their attendance here this afternoon.

Mr COOPER: Thank you Mr Chairman and Committee members.

Sitting suspended from 4.30 to 4.40 p.m.

**MINISTER FOR EMERGENCY SERVICES AND
MINISTER FOR SPORT**

IN ATTENDANCE

- Hon. M. D. Veivers, Minister for Emergency Services and Minister for Sport
- Mr J. Hocken, Director-General, Department of Emergency Services
- Dr G. FitzGerald, Commissioner, Queensland Ambulance Service
- Mr R. Plastow, Executive Director, Office of Sport and Recreation
- Mr I. Whitehead, A/Director, Program Development, Office of Sport and Recreation
- Mr K. Rose, A/Director, State and Regional Development, Office of Sport and Recreation
- Ms W. Shakespear, Director, Academy of Sport, Office of Sport and Recreation
- Mr M. Kinnane, Executive Director, Support Services Division
- Mr G. Taylor, Director Finance, Support Services Division
- Ms M. Smith, Director, Human Resources, Support Services Division
- Mr M. Tiley, Director, Facilities and Asset Services, Support Services Division
- Mr B. Elder, Management Accountant, Support Services Division
- Mr J. Noye, A/Executive Director, Emergency Services Division
- Mr M. Hall, Acting Commissioner, Queensland Fire Service
- Mr D. Luxton, A/Deputy Commissioner, Rural Operations, Queensland Fire Service
- Mr A. Brunner, Director, Chem Unit, Emergency Services Division

The CHAIRMAN: Welcome ladies and gentlemen. The next item for consideration is the Department of Emergency Services and the Office of Sport. The time allotted is three hours less 10 minutes. For the information of new witnesses, the time allocated for questions is one minute and for answers it is three minutes. A single chime will give a warning at 15 seconds and a double chime shall sound the expiration of the time limits. An extension of time may be given with the consent of the questioner and thereafter with the presiding officer's consent after the interval of two minutes has expired. The sessional orders require that at least half the time be given to non-Government members. I ask departmental witnesses to identify themselves before they answer a question so that Hansard can record the information in the transcript. I now declare the proposed expenditure for the Department of Emergency Services and the Office of Sport to be open for examination. The question before the committee is—

"That the proposed expenditure be agreed to."

Minister, is it your wish to make a short introductory statement, or do you wish to proceed directly to questioning? If you wish to make a statement to the Committee, you are asked to limit your time to five minutes.

Mr VEIVERS Mr Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to make a statement to the Committee about the budget for the Emergency Services and Sports portfolio. I have to say to these gentlemen and lady that this portfolio is, in my mind and that of the coalition Government as a whole, a vitally important one for all of Queensland. There is not a city, town or a community in this State which is not affected by emergency service delivery and/or sport. The same can be said for sport and recreational activities, too. With an 8 per cent increased budget allocation from this coalition Government, I think that importance has been recognised.

In the coming year, my department will be looking at improved services to clients right across the State, a strengthened community focus and the continued provision of a first-rate emergency management service. The department has a vision statement that it wants to be recognised nationally and internationally as a leader in the delivery of emergency and disaster management services and the development and delivery of sport and recreation. I have to say, Mr Chairman, that that will not happen overnight and there is still much work—a lot more work—to be done but I firmly believe that, with the funding increase this year, and hopefully more next year, the department will move closer to achieving that vision.

Last year, we had firefighters marching on Parliament and unrest right across the State. Morale was low throughout the department and everyone knows that low morale leads to a reluctance by staff to perform to their best. If you cast your eyes behind me, you can see that these people are here to support me and I am here to support them. That low morale is being addressed and I am confident this Government is heading in the right direction. Increased staffing levels, increased funding, more emergency equipment, greater emphasis on service delivery and a back-to-basics attitude are all provided for in this budget.

In terms of sport and recreation, funding has also been increased. One thing I must point out: simply throwing money at sport and recreation groups is not necessarily the right long-term solution. The Office of Sport and Recreation is presently formulating a strategic plan—something it never had and was desperately in need of. Funding has also been allocated for the preparation of a 10-year plan to guide the development of international, national and regional sports facilities. When the coalition came to power earlier this year, we inherited a sports funding system which basically could only be described as a shambles. I think it would be fair to say that, in the past, the development of facilities in Queensland has occurred on an ad hoc basis. As a result we have ended up with some very good

facilities in the southern part of the State and very few elsewhere in the State.

As I said earlier, there is still more work ahead to achieve the desired improvements in my portfolio but I firmly believe that a funding increase in the budget represents a positive response by the State Government to the emergency service, sports and recreation areas.

Emergency services, as I said, is all about saving lives and protecting property. That is something each and every Queenslanders deserves and pays for. Sport and recreation are also integral parts of every Queenslanders' daily life and this Government is determined that all Queenslanders, no matter where they live, will have the best possible access to these types of facilities. I am very pleased that, in the current tough economic climate, the Government has been able to allocate additional funding to my portfolio.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Minister. The first period of questions will commence with the non-Government members. Mr Elder?

Mr ELDER: Minister, I refer you to page 13 of your Program Statements where it states under the heading "1996-97 Planned Performance" that the budget for the Queensland Facilities Development Scheme, Major is \$7.3m. I also refer you to page 16 in the notes for the subprograms for Sport and Recreation, which states that the carryovers for the Major Facilities Scheme is \$9.7m. What is the 1996-97 budget for major sports and recreational facilities including the \$9.7m in carryovers? What is the difference in terms of funding criteria between the Queensland Facilities Development Scheme, Major and the National Standard Sport Facilities Program? I will take an answer from anyone.

Mr WHITEHEAD: Perhaps if I can start off by defining between the Majors and the national standards. The former Major Facilities Development Scheme was exactly that: it was about the development of national to international standard facilities. Under a review of that program, it actually undertook a name change and became the National Standard Sport Facilities Program. The focus of that program is still on the development of national, international to State standard facilities within that area. When we talk about—

Mr ELDER: So it is basically a badge change—a name change?

Mr WHITEHEAD: It is a change from Majors to National Standard Facilities Program under those guidelines. With the carryovers of \$7.3m under the Majors as indicated on the Program Statements, page 13, the majority of that money—of the \$7.3m—is for the carryover of facilities such as the Queensland Hockey Centre, which was funded under that, the State Athletics Centre, Capricorn International Indoor Facility and the Mount Isa basketball facility. They are projects which were allocated under that particular program and are in carry forwards which we will allocate for the \$7.3m, which are due to be—

Mr ELDER: So what new funding then do we have under the National Standard Sport Facilities?

Mr WHITEHEAD: National Standard Sport Facilities has always been a \$10m program on a—

Mr ELDER: Straight out of the Sport and Recreation Fund?

Mr WHITEHEAD: Yes.

Mr ELDER: That answers my question. Turning to page 16 of your Program Statements, I note that there is a 10 per cent increase in the Program Executive budget for 1996 in actual expenditure and a further 20 per cent increase on that for 1996-97. In other words, there has been an increase right through on budget, on actual and now on your estimate in relation to the executive budget. How do you account for an increase of more than 30 per cent? Minister, while I am on that, I am sure that it is not due in part to your overseas trip to Atlanta but in relation to that trip, I would like—and you do not have to provide it today—a list of expenses incurred by yourself, your staff, your departmental staff and any person paid by the Government. I would like you to include air fares, accommodation, transport, entertainment, meals, gifts, daily allowances, dry cleaning, hotel charges and any other expenses.

Mr VEIVERS: Absolutely, I will take that on notice.

Mr ELDER: You will provide me with that?

Mr VEIVERS: Yes.

Mr ELDER: Can you outline the 30 per cent increase for me?

Mr WHITEHEAD: As far as the program executive goes?

Mr ELDER: Yes.

Mr WHITEHEAD: I have not got those details in front of me. I will have to take that on notice. Gary Taylor might be able to answer.

Mr ELDER: Sure, if you want to provide it to me, unless someone else can answer?

Mr TAYLOR: Gary Taylor, Director of Finance. The main reason for the increase is the fact that the previous program executive was split across the department which had tourism, sport and youth in it. Now that executive is split across the one program of sport. That is why there is an increase in the actual executive program.

Mr ELDER: Why would you have an increase? If you have split it across departments, why are you looking at an increase in this particular area when you have only one division and not three?

Mr TAYLOR: The reason is that you have a chief executive of the program plus a secretary which, instead of being split three ways, is now split only one way.

Mr ELDER: So there is growth in the SES area?

Mr TAYLOR: No, there is definitely no growth in the SES level. It is just that you are splitting that little group's salary over only one program instead of over three programs.

Mr ELDER: So it was offset previously across the portfolio?

Mr TAYLOR: You had one executive in charge of sport, youth and—

Mr ELDER: But I am asking whether or not those salaries were offset across the previous portfolio? You are telling me that there has been a substantial increase in this particular area and that you have reduced your program now down to one department, but I am looking at an increase in the budget. You are saying that it is basically because it is now consolidated. Therefore, my obvious question is: was it previously spread over the departments? Were there dual roles?

Mr TAYLOR: You are talking about a figure of only \$100,000 as an increase. It is not a major amount.

Mr PURCELL: I will pocket that for the year. That will be nice.

Mr TAYLOR: But that is the actual cost of the executive group to administer that program.

Mr ELDER: That is fine. I will debate it with the Minister on another day.

Mr PLASTOW: If I may—of that amount, \$80,000 is an allowance for us hosting the Standing Committee on Sport and Recreation conference. It is Queensland's turn this year to hold it. That will be occurring early next calendar year.

Mr ELDER: It is actually an allocation for that purpose?

Mr PLASTOW: Yes—\$80,000 of it.

Mr ELDER: I refer the Minister to page 14 of the Program Statements and the key outputs table. I notice that the number of leadership positions of State sporting organisations funded under the Statewide Sports Development Program has been cut by 16, from 267 last year to 250. Can you list the sports that will miss out on funding for those leadership positions? As outlined in your speech the other day, will they be high-profile sports?

Mr PLASTOW: That figure is an estimate, because at this stage the Statewide Development Program has not been announced. The assessment processes are still being gone through. At this stage, until the \$7m in that fund is dispersed, the actual number of positions will not be known. It will depend on the amount of money that is given to each of the State sporting organisations and what that purpose is for. There is no intention—

Mr ELDER: Clearly, someone will miss out.

Mr PLASTOW: No. The number could actually be higher, but at this stage—

Mr ELDER: If the number was going to be higher, why would you mention a cut? Why not just mention the status quo? Why mention that there was a possibility of a higher proposition coming from these discussions? It clearly states in the Program Statements that it will be cut from 267 to 250. Someone has to miss out on that basis.

Mr PLASTOW: The total amount of money available is still there. It depends on the applications, what the State sporting organisations allocate that money to and how it is approved. It will depend on

what they want and where the money is allocated to each of the associations.

Mr ELDER: So can I assume that we can assure sporting groups that there will be no cut?

Mr PLASTOW: If the State sporting organisations choose to spend their allocation, say, on junior coaching rather than subsidising their staff in the leadership area, then that is up to them. The amount of money will be the same. We are assuming at this stage that their applications will be about the same. It was just an estimated figure.

Mr ELDER: But at the end of the day we are telling them that leadership positions will be cut.

Mr PLASTOW: No. It will be entirely up to the State sporting organisations.

Mr ELDER: You said previously that some of them might like to change that to support a coaching subsidy such as junior coaching, in which case the funds will be available. That is what you just said. Therefore, I assume from that that it would come from giving up funding for a leadership position.

Mr PLASTOW: That will be a decision made by the State sporting organisations themselves.

Mr VEIVERS: Perhaps not everybody will reapply. They may not all reapply.

Mr ELDER: I assume that the same goes for the Community Sports Development Program, where funded community-based groups will be cut from 439 to 400. I assume that could go up or remain at the status quo, and that what I read in the Program Statements is not necessarily the case?

Mr PLASTOW: At this stage, we will be calling for applications for that shortly, so again the final figure will not be known. The total amount of money will be the same.

Mr ELDER: I guess the point I keep raising is that, if it is not going to be a cut, or it is likely to be the status quo, why call it a cut?

Mr PLASTOW: It is an estimate. That is the best we can do at this stage, because the applications have not even been received.

Mr ELDER: Minister, I refer to your answer to a question on notice relating to the infrastructure required for Queensland's bid for the 2006 Commonwealth Games. Should I take it from your answer that the Office of Sport and Recreation has no role to play in Brisbane's bid? Are you claiming that your department has not even looked at the new facilities for Brisbane when we need to stage this event? If your department has considered that new sporting and accommodation facilities will be required, can you list the infrastructure needed? In other words, have you done assessments, can you list the infrastructure needed and give me an estimated cost of each of those? What resources have been set aside to finance the facilities for the Games?

Mr VEIVERS: You asked a specific question about the Commonwealth Games in 2006 in your question on notice.

Mr ELDER: Yes.

Mr VEIVERS: You also asked how many of these facilities are currently catered for in Queensland and what facilities will need to be built to accommodate the sporting accommodation requirements of participants. As you know, the Minister for Tourism, Small Business and Industry is the Minister responsible for special events. The Commonwealth Games in 2006 is a special event and it comes under his hood.

If you heard my statements yesterday, you would know that I am presently in consultation with my ministerial advisory council, in conjunction with the QAS, to produce a plan to put facilities throughout Queensland into places where they are needed. We have had ad hoc development of facilities for years. We have four stadiums in Brisbane that really do not suffice for what we want. If you go north of the Brisbane River, the next tartan track is in Townsville, and that is a disgrace. I am not blaming any particular Government for it; it is just not there. I want to put these facilities in the correct place. In conjunction with Mr Davidson, I will be having an input into what's going on, naturally. But I can't interfere, basically, in Queensland's bid to host the Commonwealth Games in 2006.

Mr ELDER: No, but your answer to me was that it was Bruce Davidson's responsibility?

Mr VEIVERS: It is. When we win it—and it won't be "if"—

Mr ELDER: What you are telling me now is that the Office of Sport will have a role to play and you will be listing the infrastructure that is necessary?

Mr VEIVERS: But we can't make those decisions, and we will work together when it all eventuates.

Mr ELDER: No. Minister, you just said that you were putting together a team to actually look at infrastructure provision.

Mr VEIVERS: Yes.

Mr ELDER: I assume from your answer that you will be putting together that team, and you will be looking at the infrastructure that is needed?

Mr VEIVERS: No—just get this correct. I said for facilities to be placed in Queensland. That's a plan right now, whether we win the 2006 Commonwealth Games or not. I will be working after they decide—

Mr ELDER: What type of facilities would we be talking about?

Mr VEIVERS: I just explained: the tartan track, and I just had the pleasure of opening the hockey centre at Mackay, which is world standard. Having that centre in Mackay is good, because it's a central area for people to play that particular sport. We don't have facilities like that all up and down the east coast of Queensland.

Mr ELDER: So you will be looking at what types of facilities can be placed in regional Queensland by the department and actually working with Mr Davidson in relation to—

Mr VEIVERS: I am sure my advisory council and the QAS will be informing me of that.

Mr ELDER: I understand the Gold Coast City Council has been looking for a contribution to the funding of the Carrara stadium of some \$4m. I didn't see it in the Budget papers. In capital works, there was no reference to the \$4m. Can I assume that Carrara won't be getting any money at this stage?

Mr VEIVERS: Assume? We have said that we will be committing \$1m a year for three years, and that there will be \$1m, with \$333,000 coming from the Premier's Department.

Mr ELDER: How much from Premier's?

Mr VEIVERS: It is under negotiation. It is about \$333,000 a year, which brings that up to the \$4m.

Mr ELDER: Will that \$4m consist of \$1m a year over the next three years from the Department of Sport?

Mr PLASTOW: That's correct.

Mr ELDER: Is that topped up or subsidised by Premier's?

Mr PLASTOW: The additional \$1m from Premier's is still under negotiation. As far as the Office of Sport is concerned, the \$1m for each of three years is confirmed.

Mr ELDER: That \$1m a year is from the original application from the city council to upgrade the stadium?

Mr PLASTOW: That's right.

Mr ELDER: To what standard?

Mr PLASTOW: The initial plan that the council put up was for two different standards. One was a total of about \$13m; the other, I think, was about \$7m. I assume at this stage that negotiations with the council will continue, and that they, I believe, at this stage will be going for the \$7m option, with \$3m from the State.

Mr ELDER: What I cannot gauge from the Ministerial Program Statements is a list of capital works projects. I have an idea of what they may be, but I do not see a list. If you look at our Portfolio Program Statements from the previous year, you will see that there was a significant list. Some \$40m in capital works was outlined. The only capital works outlined in your Ministerial Program Statements are \$2.7m for recreational camps. I assume there has not been a \$37m cut in capital works programs. I would like a list of capital works across the State. I know that you probably do not have it here, but I would like that list, if I could, on notice.

Mr PLASTOW: There is a list that we can provide. Part of that list—the first \$9.2m—was allocated in February by the previous Government. That was already announced, and that was for 1996-97. In the intervening period, an audit of the accounts showed that approximately \$6m of non-allocated or non-acquired funds were available. They were being assessed at the time the Budget was put together. Just a total amount was actually announced in the Budget papers. But I can read out the ones that have been approved to date.

Mr ELDER: If you have got them, you can just give them to me later. You do not need to read them

out. That can be supplied later. It saves the time of the Committee.

Mr ROSE: The explanation for the capital works detail within the Ministerial Program Statements is that, by Treasury definition, the capital works moneys associated with recreation camps—

Mr ELDER: I understand that, but I am looking for further detail of its make-up. That is fine. Minister, I refer you to the three-quarters of a million dollars recently approved for the Toowoomba aquatic centre. I note that that grant was made under the National Standard Sports Facilities Program. Can you tell me when the application was received by your department? Why was the application approved when your department's own guidelines rule out funding for projects already under construction before the application is received? Why was funding approved when the project was not dependent on Government funding to go ahead? Again, that is contrary to your department's guidelines?

Mr PLASTOW: The initial application was received, I think, at the end of February/early March this year. That was the first time I had seen the application. The application was an exceptionally good one. The council was asking for no more than a 20 per cent contribution from the State. They indicated to the department that, while the project wouldn't be in jeopardy, it would enhance the project immensely. On that basis, I made a recommendation to the Minister that, even though the project had commenced, it was one that fitted in very well with the Office of Sport philosophy that self-help from the community was always looked for in projects where possible. This one was an extremely good one, where 80 per cent was being contributed.

Mr ELDER: Essentially, the reason I ask is that there was a statement made by council that there was not necessarily a need for a contribution from the State Government in relation to the project. I take your answer to me that it helped in terms of facilitating it. It just contrasts with the decision you have made in relation to the Riverview community recreational centre, where those grants for communities that are in desperate need of facilities have not been supported. Yet here is a situation where a council will fund a swimming pool and the Office of Sport is providing an assisting grant for it when it is not necessarily called for by council.

Mr PLASTOW: In the case of Riverview, there was a totally different situation. There was no backing of any proportion at all from the community. The council had indicated that it would not take over any sort of management of it. The group that had actually been approved the money initially was no longer in existence; it was defunct. Without strong backing from the council for ongoing management, it was perceived as a major risk. That project was very close to \$1m.

Mr ELDER: It was \$930,000.

Mr PLASTOW: To pour that amount of money into a project that appeared—

Mr ELDER: Are you saying that council wouldn't manage it if we had built it?

Mr PLASTOW: It wouldn't project manage it and it wouldn't guarantee ongoing management of it. It could have been a very good building with no management.

Mr ELDER: The council would not commit itself to manage it?

Mr PLASTOW: That's right.

Mr ELDER: And that was the response that you had from the council in relation to that project?

Mr PLASTOW: Yes. The initial reason for it was the fact that the organisation that was getting the money no longer—

Mr ELDER: I am happy with your answer.

Mr PURCELL: I would have liked to have seen you build it, because I am next on the list.

Mr ELDER: I refer the Minister to another major project recently announced but again not appearing in your capital works program, and that is the \$1m grant for the Caloundra indoor sports stadium. When was the latest application for funding for this particular project received by your department? Again, did you override advice from your department and insist on the project being approved? Did the application process follow the guidelines laid down by the department?

Mr PLASTOW: The initial application for a facility at Caloundra came from the Caloundra Basketball Association. That was for \$2.5m. That application was not approved, mainly because of the size of it and because of the lack of additional funding that was being made available. They were told that a more cooperative community approach to the project would enhance its chances. The council there responded by approving \$1m to the project on the proviso that the department matched it dollar for dollar. The Minister and I inspected the site. We told the council that, if they were going to put the money up, we would look at a proposal if it was put in—

Mr ELDER: When was that application?

Mr PLASTOW: The final application came in in August, after we had requested that a more detailed proposal, complete with the council promise of funding, be provided.

Mr ELDER: It was your advice through to the Minister based on the commitment from Caloundra council to the project?

Mr PLASTOW: That is right.

Mr ELDER: I refer to page 15 of the Program Statements and an estimated \$58.7m figure listed for the Sport and Recreation Benefit Fund. I note that that particular fund accounts for about 90 per cent of the sport and rec. budget of the department. As the Government has now formed a committee to review the taxing of poker machine turnover from hotels and clubs, which finances a vast bulk of the sport and rec. benefit fund, how did you come to this estimated figure? Is it not correct that any change in the taxation arrangements—and those arrangements are likely to be downward—in relation to poker machine turnover would have a massive impact on the sport and rec. benefit fund? So how do you account for an estimated \$10m increase when you

know that there is a committee under way to look at the impact of the hotel decision? How do you account for that \$10m increase over actuals from this year? I suppose, at the end of the day, how do you know you will have your hands on that fund, considering that the Treasurer was after it this year?

Mr VEIVERS: I will let Gary Taylor answer that.

Mr TAYLOR: Gary Taylor, Director of Finance. The \$58.7m is only just over \$2m different from last year's budget. The unspent funds from last year have been carried into that balance and, in addition, the estimate of the tax is given to us by the Treasury Department, so we have to rely on their estimate of what the gaming tax is going to be for the year.

Mr ELDER: Are you happy for me to continue in relation to that, Len?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr ELDER: So basically it is an estimate, and what happens in terms of Government policy happens, and if there is a significant taxation change, then you will have a look at that at the six-monthly review—

Mr TAYLOR: It would be part of the mid-year review.

Mr ELDER: The CBC mid-year review, and if the Treasurer decides to take the sport and rec. benefit fund next year you are not going to have it to concern yourself about as it stands, anyway. You put up a hard fight this year, Minister, I know, but I am not sure of your chances in the longer term, that is all.

Mr VEIVERS: I have had reasonable success at it, and I do not think I am going to—

Mr ELDER: I am sure you would not disagree with the Treasurer's wishes.

Mr VEIVERS: We have occasionally, I assure you, Jim.

Mr ELDER: I have a question for Ms Shakespear from the Academy of Sport. I refer to page 13 of the Program Statements, which states that expenditure for the Queensland Academy of Sport's athletes has been cut from \$2.1m to \$1.7m for 1996-97. Keeping in mind that Queensland athletes have only just returned from the Games and that they performed well, what programs or facilities are going to be cut in relation to that particular program in relation to that particular cut?

Ms SHAKESPEAR: Actually, the 2.1 refers to a payment last year for the Olympic bonus, which highly inflated the figures. The grants and subsidies simply identify parts of our budget. In actual fact, we are seeing an increase in our budget this year.

Mr ELDER: What you are saying is that it is supplemented in the budget elsewhere.

Ms SHAKESPEAR: Yes. So that is only part of our budget.

Mr ELDER: That is fine. But you are saying that that particular area has been compensated elsewhere in the budget for the QAS.

Ms SHAKESPEAR: Yes. In an Olympic year that particular area of the budget is overinflated because of the bonus grant payments.

Mr ELDER: Okay. Actually, I have two more questions if I may, Chair, and they are two short questions. I refer the Minister to page 17 of the statements and spending on rec. camps. I ask: are any recreational camps to be closed, sold or commercialised this financial year?

Mr PLASTOW: There are no plans at this stage to close any camps. We are preparing for the Minister a report on what we hope will be an enhancement of the programs that are run through those camps. At the present time, all we do is provide accommodation. We do not run any programs at all through the camps. What we are looking at is maybe enhancing that by actually running programs for groups that stay at the camps. We will look at each one camp by camp.

Mr ELDER: What I clearly asked, Roger, was that none will be closed, none will be sold and none will be commercialised.

Mr VEIVERS: "In the"—what did you say then after that?

Mr ELDER: This financial year.

Mr PLASTOW: There is an option that we could look at—and at this stage it is only an option—that some camps may be better utilised by other groups. That could include Education, because the majority of people who come to our camps are school groups.

Mr ELDER: No, just—

Mr PLASTOW: But there is no proposal—

Mr ELDER: The question was pretty straight. I understand that there were saving options put up by the department that amounted to some \$20m to close, to sell and to commercialise—privatise. I am aware that those saving options were put up.

Mr VEIVERS: There is an extensive review of the department's facilities in association with those managed by the Department of Education and the Department of Family Services and Aboriginal and Islander Affairs, and it has been undertaken over the past three years. Recommendations contained within the reviews of that have both financial and human resource implications for the department—and other departments, I might add. During 1995-96, approximately 180,000 camper nights were recorded at the department's recreation camps. The camps, as you know, provide low-cost accommodation and access to recreational facilities—from as little as \$4.50 per day per camper. Now, the department's recommendations regarding the continued operation and development of these centres will be completed by December 1996.

Mr ELDER: Do I take it from that that December 1996 is when you will make a decision?

Mr VEIVERS: You never say, "Yes or no, around 1996." When I see what has come in, we will make our decision.

Mr ELDER: Mick, the answer to my question then is not "no"; the answer to my question is, "Yes, and we will let you know at the end of 1996."

Mr VEIVERS: No. Just forget about "no" or "yes", and I will let you know in 1996.

Mr ELDER: Michael, that is not what your department is saying and it is not what your senior officers are saying. Your senior officers are saying that you are going to sell them, commercialise them, privatise them, and all I needed was a simple "yes" or "no", but I will take your answer.

Mr VEIVERS: There is always scuttlebutt around, but I am the Minister and I will tell you certainly in 1996.

Mr ELDER: In 1996 I can say that they will be closed, sold and commercialised.

Mr VEIVERS: No, you can say what I tell you.

Mr ELDER: I think I know what I can tell them, Michael. From that particular answer, I am sure they know where they are heading.

Mr VEIVERS: Trust me. I'm from the Government. I'm here to help.

Mr ELDER: I refer you to page 15 of the Program Statements. This is my last question. You will be pleased about that, I am sure.

Mr VEIVERS: No, I am quite happy.

Mr ELDER: I am talking about salaries, wages and related payments. I notice the payments have increased by over 36 per cent in this budget. Given that there has been no—not that I can see, anyway—overall increase in staff numbers, has there been a significant upgrade in classifications and salary levels? Maybe it comes back to taking three and dividing into one. Has there been any significant upgrade in classifications and staffing levels that account for that increase?

Mr VEIVERS: That was facetious, but I will let Gary Taylor answer that.

Mr ELDER: I thought you might flick it to Gary.

Mr TAYLOR: There has been some increase in staff positions. There are six additional positions in the Queensland Academy of Sport. There are also some positions—

Mr ELDER: But there have been offsets there as well, if I can go through the document.

Mr TAYLOR: There has also been parts of the department that were in the previous Statewide Services Program. The Public Education Unit has now been transferred into the Sports Program, and those positions are included in those salaries. There is the full year effect of the enterprise bargaining on all the salaries in the Sports Program and there is also that fact that I mentioned before, that the previous department was splitting the salaries of senior staff through three programs, now they are doing it one way.

Mr ELDER: You said before there was an increase in staff, but according to your own Program Statements, unless you can tell me things have changed since this has gone out, you are saying your actual, your estimate, for 1995-96 and 1996-97

does not change; 144 to 144. There is a 36 per cent increase in that area. It has nothing to do with increases in staff, not from what I can see, so it has something to do with reclassifications or other purposes. I am asking what are those other purposes, and staff increases is not one of them?

Ms SMITH: Margaret Smith, Director of Human Resource Management. To date, the only senior position in Office of Sport that we have seen any movement in is the actual appointment of the Executive Director in the Office of Sport. The restructuring in the Office of Sport program—we are actually at the moment just going through with the senior officers of Office of Sport. No positions within Office of Sport, other than the executive director position, have been upgraded to date or spilled to date or advertised to date. I would say that we would be expecting that within the next couple of months. Within this Sport portfolio, it is, as you would be aware, not just your traditional Public Service, there are a lot of Commonwealth funding positions and there have been a lot of temporary positions that were filled from people outside the departmental area. We are trying to maintain—

Mr ELDER: I understand all that. I just asked a simple question. There is 144 to 144 in terms of all of those things that you outline, in terms of the impact on sport, and a 36 per cent increase in payments. I just want to know where the extra 36 per cent was going if you have not increased your staff?

Ms SMITH: There is no increase in the overall staffing number.

Mr ELDER: No, I accept that. So no-one has yet answered my question about a significant increase in this particular area. Maybe we can put it on notice and the Minister can come back to me.

Mr PLASTOW: The payment of the final increment for the enterprise bargaining agreement resulted in a 4 per cent increase in costs, amounting to \$267,000. Payment of the increment allowance based on the outcomes of the performance planning and review amounted to approximately \$107,000. An increased number of positions at the Academy of Sport on a temporary basis for four years is approximately \$300,000 per year. The inclusion of the departmental communications unit—

Mr ELDER: But they have to be offset by reductions in staff that you have actually outlined elsewhere in your program?

Mr PLASTOW: There has been no reduction in staff at the QAS.

Mr ELDER: No, but you have across your programs, your recreational camp staffing, your State and regional development staffing.

Mr PLASTOW: With the recreational camp staff—the figure that is included in there last year on a reporting basis for some reason included some of the relief camp managers.

Mr ELDER: How about you send it to me in detail on notice?

Mr PLASTOW: We have not included a dual fee there; there are only the 12 camp managers.

Mr ELDER: I do not accept the answer; give it to me on notice.

The CHAIRMAN: I think I might have to cut it off there for the non-Government members. I will ask the member for Mansfield to begin the questions for the Government side.

Mr CARROLL: I am interested in the recreation camps. I notice at page 16 of your Program Statements that you have mentioned that you plan to spend \$4.553m this financial year on recreation camps, compared with \$2.045m actual last financial year, but I notice further down the page that staffing levels will drop from 16 to 12. What are the reasons for the jump in spending and the drop in staff?

Mr VEIVERS: Mr Whitehead might answer that.

Mr WHITEHEAD: The \$4.553m allocated under 1996-97 includes significant carryovers under the Capital Works Program allocated to us through Treasury. Each year, we are allocated approximately \$1m, and in organising that work with the public works and housing area, at times that gets delayed in calling for tenders and moving forward, so there is a significant \$1.7m worth of carryover in capital works funding within that program. So that is the bulk of the area where you are seeing an increase in expenditure in that carryover Capital Works Program.

In regard to the reduction in staff, as Mr Plastow just indicated, in last year's figures what was provided—at each of our centres we have what we call casual relief camp managers who assist our camp managers if there are back-to-back bookings. In other words, if they are required to work, say, a 10-day cycle or a 14-day cycle, we need to bring in a casual staff member to assist with that. Included in the previous year's figures were some four casual relief camp managers who are not permanent staff. That is why you see a reduction down to 12 in this particular year.

Mr CARROLL: There are 12 camps. Did I notice that figure somewhere else in the report?

Mr WHITEHEAD: That is right.

Mr CARROLL: Can you in a couple of sentences outline what is the purpose of the department having those camps?

Mr WHITEHEAD: Traditionally, the department has had these facilities for in excess of 50 years. Primarily, they have offered low-cost accommodation for community groups or sport and recreation groups or school groups to come in either on a week-long basis or a weekend basis to conduct programs for their own personal development and educational activities. The department's primary role has been, as I said, to offer low-cost accommodation.

As part of the review, we need to look at whether we actually assist in the delivery of programs. What is happening across the State is, with litigation and the need for accreditation in those areas, groups are now becoming reluctant to start to organise those sorts of activities, so that will form part of the focus. But traditionally we have offered low-cost accommodation to allow those school

groups and community based groups to access a very low-cost facility to run their programs.

Mr CARROLL: So are you indicating that you may next year be looking at embarking upon running those camps again? I think the department used to provide the teaching or the entertainment there, did it not?

Mr WHITEHEAD: Traditionally, the arrangements that were made is that some Education Department staff were based at those centres to run programs for the Education groups that came in. Over a number of years we have seen some of those staff actually withdrawn and returned to the established teaching ranks. What we need to do is to review the cost of providing program staff, and that would be a decision made by the Minister, as we would be prepared to subsidise that.

Mr VEIVERS: Just to add to that, Mr Carroll, the current funding programs were established following the publication of the report in 1990—the ministerial committee of inquiry. Clearly, the funding programs are out of date and in need of comprehensive review to ensure that they meet the current needs of Sport and Recreation in regard to those particular places.

Mr CARROLL: Could I take you to page 19? Just above the middle of the page a paragraph mentions new debtors and that accrual accounting systems will be developed to operate in this current financial year to improve review collection and debt management information. I have a couple of questions in that area. Firstly, what is the present level of debtors to your department, and does that include accounts owing for the provision of fire services and ambulance services?

Mr VEIVERS: This part is in corporate services. I will let Ian answer that, anyway.

Mr CARROLL: While that figure is being found, Minister, there is another question in the same area. I wanted to know how much is written off each year, or last year at least, in regard to fee for services rendered.

Mr VEIVERS: Do you want to get rid of the Sport people? Have you finished with Sport? I thought you were asking about Sport.

Mr CARROLL: I am happy to do that, but it seems the member for Gladstone has a couple of Sport questions.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: It was very difficult to hear earlier the discussion about the consideration the department is giving to selling, privatisation or closure of sporting facilities. Was your final position that you are reviewing the 12 facilities?

Mr VEIVERS: That is correct. I will start again. There has been extensive reviews of the department's facilities in association with those managed by the Department of Education and the Department of Family Services and Aboriginal and Islander Affairs that have been undertaken over the past three years. Recommendations are contained within the reviews of both financial and human resource implications for the department. During 1995-96, approximately 180,000—you heard that

before—camper nights were recorded at the department's recreation camps. The camps provide low-cost accommodation at \$4.50 per day per camper. I think that what you wanted to hear was: the department's recommendations regarding the continued operations and development of these centres will be completed by December 1996.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: All that means is that you are looking at the people, you are looking at the dollars, and you will decide at the end of the year?

Mr VEIVERS: We are looking at the overall situation where these camps can be utilised for people who are out west, or people coming from educational areas. We are looking at everything, I believe. The review is covering everything. I am being hypothetical here. I can talk only hypothetically. When I get it, it will be in December 1996.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: Is the review being done by departmental staff?

Mr WHITEHEAD: As indicated by the Minister, there have been reviews of these centres for about the past four years. As a result, we put up some recommendations to the previous Government, but no decision was made. An information paper went forward at that particular point in time. We were looking at a whole-of-Government approach. Since that time, we have looked at working with Education and Family Services to look at a whole-of-Government approach to each of the centres. But Education are basically continuing to run their outdoor education centres. Family Services will continue to run The Outlook. It took some considerable time to try to bring those departments together to look at resources and agencies. There has now been some assistance from an external consultant to look at the viability of each of our 12 centres and what sort of management and staffing costs we would need to look at in regard to the delivery of programs or even the maintenance of those centres. Some of our centres across the State have very low occupancy rates. That needs to be looked at as far as the financial viability of those centres goes. That is the sort of material we will put to the Minister.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: In looking at those—you have said that they have low utilisation and must be looked at on the basis of viability. Is there going to be factored in promotion, upgrading the facility and, therefore, enhanced use as opposed to disposal of facilities?

Mr WHITEHEAD: Certainly. All of those are contained as options and ways which we may go. The other thing is that we would like to balance that out. Even if some centres may not be economically viable, we need to look at the social benefit of having those centres in some of those areas. Those are the sorts of issues that will be presented. Then we need to find a balance between the cost of running those centres and the social benefit of delivering programs or having access to these centres for people to run programs.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: There is an allocation for upgrading capital works on these facilities. This is

more of a query than anything else. The previous department that was in here was Police and Corrective Services. They went through in some part a function of their department, namely, WORC groups. Has any consideration been given to a cooperative arrangement whereby the WORC groups from Corrective Services perhaps could do some of the work on the recreational centres? I am raising this because a statement was made about the community's sense of safety with some of the WORC groups. Some areas accept those WORC groups more readily than others. I know that, over time, the isolation of some of the recreational camps has been marginalised. However, some of those camps are still relatively removed, and there may be an opportunity to save some money and provide a benefit for Corrective Services and your department. Has that been considered?

Mr VEIVERS: That is a policy matter. I would not knock back that idea. It could be looked at in certain areas. I would not say in all areas, but it could be looked at in certain areas.

The CHAIRMAN: I refer you to page 14 of your MPS. I draw attention to the proposed development of the State Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Sport and Recreation Policy. Although such a policy may be a useful piece of paper for people to collect, what does the Minister propose to do with the Aboriginal and Torres Strait communities, and how do these communities support the continued development of these communities?

Mr VEIVERS: A strategic plan will be based on consultation with indigenous community organisations, mainstream sport and recreational bodies, ATSI regional councils, other relevant State Government agencies and the Australian Sports Commission. This plan will contribute to the complete strategic plan for the Office of Sport and Recreation. The plan will provide the framework for the modification of existing programs or the development of additional programs in line with the needs of these communities.

The Office of Sport and Recreation already administers the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Young Persons Sport and Recreation Development Program as a joint initiative with the Australian Sports Commission, with funding provided by the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission. This program aims to decrease alcohol and substance abuse and anti-social behaviour by indigenous young people through the provision of sport and recreation opportunities. Under this program, indigenous sport and recreation development officers have been employed in Cairns, Thursday Island, Mount Isa, Townsville, Ipswich and Logan. An additional officer will soon commence employment in Rockhampton. Additional positions will be established in the south-west and north coast regions, ensuring that the indigenous communities in each region have the support of an indigenous officer. The additional enhancements to this program are designed to ensure the establishment of specific infrastructure to support the ongoing development of sport and recreation activities within these communities. These enhancements include the development of an

accredited vocational education course to provide appropriate training for indigenous community recreation officers. This course is currently being conducted through the Far North Queensland Institute of TAFE.

The Office of Sport and Recreation is working in conjunction with the Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs to develop a strategy for the employment of these recreation officers in remote Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities. These officers will be employed to establish and implement community-based sport and recreation programs in remote indigenous communities in order to provide young people with alternatives to alcohol and substance abuse. That will not be easy.

The CHAIRMAN: It has been claimed in Parliament that funding for the Academy of Sport has been cut. But from looking at page 16 of the MPS, that does not seem to add up. Could the Minister explain the funding proposals for the academy and how the academy can fit into the departmental structure?

Mr VEIVERS: Funding for the Queensland Academy of Sport, as you said, has not been cut, as is clearly seen in the Ministerial Program Statements. Spending by the academy in 1995-96 totalled \$3.442m. This financial year, \$3.6m has been made available. It is true that, when the initial budget was being drawn up, a \$220,000 reduction was made from the base operating budget. However, it must be remembered that the academy outlaid several one-off amounts last financial year which did not have to be paid this year. These include Olympic bonus grants, which were \$330,000 greater than budgeted for, and almost \$57,000 for the refurbishment of the Queensland Academy of Sport information centre. It is therefore plain that, even though a reduction was made to the QAS base funding, that reduction was much smaller than the total of one-off expenses experienced the previous year. On top of that, we have allocated an additional \$300,000 per year until the Sydney 2000 Olympics for the employment of an additional six staff. Three of those positions will be in sports science areas and the other three will support the life skills, sports management and administration units.

The academy has requested the Australian Sports Commission to devolve more funding to the State-based institutes and academies. There is widespread opinion that those State-based bodies are preparing more athletes who are achieving greater international success than the Australian Institute of Sport—and you want to take note of that. There is no doubt that we are being presented with a unique opportunity by hosting the next Olympic Games in Australia. The Office of Sport and Recreation, and especially the vision of the Academy of Sport, will play an important role in developing a well-prepared, bigger-than-ever Australian team. The academy has already registered outstanding results, and those results are expected to improve as efforts are focused on the preparation of athletes for the Sydney Games.

The academy is a division of the Office of Sport and Recreation and is headed by a director who reports to the executive director of the office. Members of the academy's advisory board also play a very hands-on role in its overall operation.

The CHAIRMAN: I refer you to page 13 of the Ministerial Program Statement where it is indicated that the Office of Sport and Recreation will develop a strategic plan in consultation with the stakeholders. Would the Minister please elaborate on the rationale behind the development of the plan, the level of funding committed to such a process and the proposed level of consultation?

Mr WHITEHEAD: The rationale behind the development of the strategic plan was for the Office of Sport and Recreation to take on a liaison consultation with its key client groups to make sure that the level of services it was offering and the programs it was offering were consistent with their needs. It is something that the Office of Sport and Recreation has not done in the past. There was a need to establish a closer link with the peak agencies and the groups that we were working with to make sure that those services did match those needs. Funding has been allocated for the undertaking of that strategic plan and it is expected to commence in the near future.

The CHAIRMAN: I turn to a facility that was quite successful a few years ago, that is, the junior subsidy for junior sports clubs, which built up a lot of clubs particularly for the younger generation. Would you give consideration to putting that sort of program in place?

Mr VEIVERS: As a result of the Junior Sports Forum in 1991, a junior sports discussion paper was distributed for public consultation. As well as receiving written submissions, 12 public meetings were held in and around Queensland. The results of the consultation were completed in 1993, and they were absorbed into the National Junior Sports Policy released by the Federal Government in 1994. That is part of the background to what you want.

The key issues were that Queensland was faced with the challenge of developing specific strategies to ensure the implementation of the National Junior Sports Policy. Consequently, a strategy known as the Junior Sports Action Plan was developed using the information collated. The Queensland Junior Sports Action Plan has the support of the Queensland Parents and Citizens Association, all education systems, sport, tertiary institutions and lead agencies such as the Australian Council for Health, Physical Education and Recreation and the Sports Federation of Queensland. Cabinet endorsed the plan—I think it was in December 1995—and approved the formation of the Queensland Junior Sports Council.

The Statewide launch of the action plan was held at Suncorp Stadium in March this year. I had the pleasure of doing that. It is envisaged that the plan will be reviewed on a regular basis by the Junior Sports Council to ensure that it includes the latest information and is responsive to community needs and young people's community needs.

The CHAIRMAN: We will return to non-Government members. I think Mr Purcell wanted to ask a question on sport.

Mr PURCELL: I have a question on local sport. The Queensland Hockey Centre is in the Bulimba electorate at Colmslie. Has the Queensland Hockey Association applied for any extra funding to finish off that centre because of the extra funds expended when they were excavating the site? The council and community required them to move further away from the riverfront and, therefore, the association incurred a fair bit of cost because of excavation that it was not counting on.

Mr PLASTOW: An additional \$500,000 was allocated earlier this calendar year to that project to bring it up to \$5.25m. That was over and above the initial allocation.

Mr PURCELL: No other funds have been applied for?

Mr PLASTOW: Not since that time, no.

Mr SCHWARTEN: My question is directed to the Minister. In what capacity is Ms Lyn Staib currently employed in your department?

Mr VEIVERS: Right now, I believe she is employed as a consultant in the evaluation of the Ambulance Service.

Mr SCHWARTEN: I draw your attention to question on notice No. 341, which I asked on 15 May 1996, wherein you indicated to me that Ms Staib was put on for a period of 13 weeks on a contract for consultancy services. The reason for it was the genuine urgency and specialist nature of that consultancy service. Your director-general on that basis invoked Part A section 1 of clause 2.5(d) and (e) of the State Purchasing Policy. I ask: what was so urgent and special about that consultancy? I presume that the contract of 13 and a half weeks has elapsed since 15 May 1996 and that we are in another contract period?

Mr HOCKEN: The urgency associated with that was that the Government had decided that they wanted to have a different structure in the way it reported. It was to no longer report through the director-general. There were a number of issues—morale issues—that the Minister alluded to earlier that needed to be—

Mr SCHWARTEN: This is the Ambulance Service?

Mr HOCKEN: No. I am sorry, I am talking about the Fire Service.

Mr SCHWARTEN: No, I am talking about the Ambulance Service.

Mr HOCKEN: The Ambulance Service—because Ms Staib had a background in the Emergency Services Department and the contract that we negotiated with her could not have been, we believe, bettered by any other consultant, therefore it was appropriate for me to continue that contract on. Now, the problem that we have got, and the urgency associated with it, is that the place has been reviewed to death, as you would be well aware, and we needed to get stability as soon as we could. The Minister has said to me that as from 1 January 97

there are to be no more reviews; the place is to bed down.

The other urgent issue is that both the Fire and Ambulance Services will be statutory bodies. The second-reading has already been in the House, so hopefully that will go through towards the end of October. Before any board is appointed, it is appropriate for the new board, whatever that may look like—and, of course, the Minister makes the decision as to the people who will be on that board—it is appropriate for any new board to know what the issues are, financial, operational, and human when they first meet so they can make decisions fairly quickly to overcome the issues that have been identified. So that was the urgency behind it. It had a number of parts to it. One was morale, the other was turning it into a statutory authority and the third was to bed things down so that they could get on with life and do what they want to do, and that is to put out fires and educate people, or to pick people up from the road and treat our sick.

Mr SCHWARTEN: I thank you for your answer. In the first instance, I do not have any argument with the answer that I received on notice. However, I do have some problems in the awarding of a second consultancy to the same person when clearly the urgency was not there. Clearly, it was a different service and, clearly, there was an opportunity, I believe, for other consultants in this State to be considered. It would seem the reason for the urgency in the Fire Service did not run into the Ambulance Service. I wonder why it was that you did not consider other services of that nature and put it out to tender, which is the normal course of events?

Mr VEIVERS: Can I answer that?

Mr SCHWARTEN: Yes, sure.

Mr VEIVERS: Quite frankly, she did a magnificent job in the Fire Service and has been doing a magnificent job in the Ambulance Service. The key factor, Mr Schwarten, is that she does it so cheaply. You would not get a consultant for the price that she does the job.

Mr SCHWARTEN: How much has she been paid so far?

Mr VEIVERS: I will pass that to Michael Kinnane.

MR KINNANE: Mr Schwarten, in terms of your last question, the payment up to 30 June 1996 specifically for the Queensland Fire Service review is an amount of \$37,377. The contract cost for that contract was \$50,000 plus disbursements. At that stage, it was estimated at 125 days at \$400 a day.

The next—phase 2 of the QFS review—is from 1 July to 16 August and a contract for the Ambulance Service evaluations from 15 July to 27 September. I would point out to the Committee that under the State Government Purchasing Policy, under section 2.5—I think to which you have made a reference yourself—there are some exceptions which can be approved by the chief executive officer of the department. Clause (c) provides that there can be an exception provided for a consultant where the consultant is pursuing the second or subsequent phase of a multistage procurement process; and (d)

an authorised officer certifies that they are satisfied that a sole supply or limited supply situation exists. In this case, the department took the view, as the director-general has mentioned, that Lyn Staib has unique knowledge of the organisational management challenges facing the department and that there were some similar issues for the ambulance review as was faced in the Fire Services review.

Mr SCHWARTEN: So the answer is \$37,000 so far?

Mr KINNANE: \$37,377 to 30 June.

Mr SCHWARTEN: Which was some considerable time ago. I would hate to see what a dear one charges.

Mr HOCKEN: The going rate for a management consultant is somewhere between \$1,800 and \$1,500—and you can check that with most consultants around the place—per day. So you can check that with most of the consulting groups, the Australian Institute of Management or anybody else. So we have done extremely well in negotiating a rate for Ms Staib.

Mr SCHWARTEN: On that basis, what other perks such as an office, car, car parking, mobile telephone, travel and accommodation does Ms Staib receive? What is the annual estimated cost of those perks if, indeed, she does receive them?

Mr KINNANE: The total cost—I might add, this is an addition to the specific cost of the consultant, Mr Schwarten—the total cost of the review for the Queensland Fire Service is \$145,000. That is made up of salaries, wages and related costs, \$17,000; professional costs, \$37,000, which are the costs for Lyn Staib; staff expenses and travel costs, \$43,000; general expenses, \$13,000; equipment \$10,000; computers, \$25,000.

The QFS review cost a total of \$145,000, which was funded from the Fire Services Trust Fund. As I have mentioned, of that total cost, the \$37,000 was for professional costs paid to Lyn Staib. I might point out that the cost of equipment, of course, is retained by the department; that is not retained by the consultant. A large proportion of the total costs of the review went towards the staff expenses and travelling costs involved in consulting staff throughout the State.

Mr SCHWARTEN: So I get back to my original question: what perks? Is there a car provided? Is there car parking? Is there office space provided? Computers? Just what is provided? The point I am getting at is this: it is my experience with usual consultancies that consultants provide that sort of equipment and service themselves. I have checked this with consultants. It would seem to me that it is an irregularity to take a consultancy on the basis of them arriving, as it were, barebacked and working from within the resources of that department. I just seek some clarification.

Mr HOCKEN: No, consultants work in different ways. There are many consultants now, and more and more consultants, who are actually going in barebacked and expecting in particular the administrative support of the department, because it is there, to provide the report writing and so on.

The other side of this is that this is a contract for a particular person. As I said, the original contract that we negotiated with that person, rather than consultant, included those things. You will find many contractors for the last six years have been provided with telephones, cars, parking, etc. Keeping in mind there is a sunset clause on all of this: the Minister has said that after 1 January 97 there will be no more reviews, evaluations, or whatever, externally driven in our department. As part of our continuous improvement, then we will always look at the operations. Each of the commissioners and each of the executive directors are required to continually improve the operations of their programs. So while there will be continuous improvement and there may be internal reviews driven by the executive directors and commissioners, there certainly will not be any externally imposed reviews.

Mr PURCELL: I have just done a few sums on those figures. Over three months, \$145,000 works out at \$12,000 a week.

Mr HOCKEN: That does not go to the consultant or the contractor. That is including the costs of staff because we have an implementation team, as you know.

Mr PURCELL: But you have to employ the staff.

Mr HOCKEN: No, they are part of our staffing establishment anyway. Wayne Hartley, the assistant commissioner, acts as the major conduit for the fire review. Certainly we have some relieving matters associated with that because we have a person acting as the assistant commissioner in Cairns. In terms of the money in her pocket, it is \$37,000 and she gets the benefits of a car, a phone and so on. As Mr Kinnane mentioned, the office equipment, which amounts to \$35,000, and that will actually be kept by the department and used anyway. Therefore, the overall cost at the present time is \$110,000. I might pass over to Mr Matt Tiley, who is the manager of facilities and asset management.

Mr PURCELL: I have a supplementary question, and Mr Tiley may be able to answer it. Did you say that normal consultants charge between \$1,500 and \$1,800?

Mr HOCKEN: No, I said between \$800 and \$1,500.

Mr PURCELL: Would they be supplied with the same facilities or would they bring their own gear with them?

Mr HOCKEN: Normally they get an office and telephones. Sometimes they get a car, sometimes they do not. If I direct you to the consultancy activity in the Department of Transport, which ran for some three years under John White and Associates, they were given offices and all the support that was required to undertake that commercialisation program. If you do the costing between what happened in the Department of Transport over—

Mr PURCELL: We do not want to go into the mistakes that the Department of Transport has made over the last few years. I would stay away from that if I were you.

Mr HOCKEN: I suppose that we have learnt from that, and that is why we did it differently.

Mr TILEY: I reinforce what Mr John Hocken said. Most long-term consultancies actually work in-house and the organisations provide facilities for them. In relation to the personal equipment issues, Ms Lyn Staib essentially has two items of equipment. One is a motor vehicle, a Commodore Executive. Its lease rate is \$220 per month, which is an annual lease of \$2,650. Fuel and extra costs would normally be in the order of approximately \$1,000 to \$1,200, depending on usage. The main reason why that benefit was provided in addition to what would a normal consultancy is because of the amount of consultation and travel that was associated with the reviews.

Secondly, the mobile phone is actually Ms Lyn Staib's personal mobile phone. She submits disbursement cost requisitions to the project officer administering that contract, who identifies the calls related to the project reviews as distinct from her private calls. She is reimbursed on a disbursement basis relevant to those.

Mr SCHWARTEN: Has Ms Staib received any delegated authority from either the Minister or the director-general to conduct these inquiries and give instruction to permanent public servants?

Mr HOCKEN: As a contractor/consultant, she has no delegated authority. She certainly checks things out with me and lets me know what is happening. In terms of ordering people to do things, she cannot do that. We have had a number of discussions about that.

Mr SCHWARTEN: I notice that there is an absence of costings for the implementation of each of the recommendations in the report produced by Ms Staib. Is there any in-house compilation of costings? If so, how much do you anticipate each of those recommendations will cost to be implemented? What is their cost benefit?

Mr VEIVERS: I will get Mike Hall to cover that briefly.

Mr HALL: Implementation costs are fairly loosely forecast at this stage. Approximately \$2.5m has been forecast as the cost of the review implementation over the next two years. The main thrust of the report recommendations will be implemented within the existing Fire Service budget, which includes the recommended staffing changes. Approximately \$0.5m has been forecast for the establishment of an additional regional office in Brisbane. This amount will cover the cost of office space and equipment. A sum of \$130,000 has been allocated for the salary and equipment costs of the implementation teams. There is no more detail available than that at this point.

Mr SCHWARTEN: The implementation teams' cost is \$130,000?

Mr HALL: No. A sum of \$130,000 has been allocated for the salary and equipment costs of the implementation team. I am not sure if you heard the first paragraph. Approximately \$2.5m has been forecast as the cost of the review implementation over the next two years. The main thrust of the

report recommendations will be implemented within the existing budget, which includes the recommended staffing changes. Half a million dollars has been forecast for the establishment of an additional regional office in Brisbane. The estimated total cost over two years is \$3.13m.

The CHAIRMAN: I turn the questioning to Government members.

Mr CARROLL: Minister, I come back to the answer which everyone is waiting for on the present level of debtors of the department.

Mr KINNANE: I am eagerly waiting to answer it, too! From a whole-of-department perspective, I will answer the question in terms of debts written off, debts collected and debts outstanding for the 1995-96 financial year. The total debts collected last financial year amounted to \$9,014,000. The debts written off in 1995-96 amounted to \$4,097,000. The debts outstanding amount to a figure of \$5,604,000. The Department of Emergency Services raised debts for the following services: the Queensland Ambulance Services, fees for ambulance transport for non-subscribers; the Queensland Fire Service, fees for services not covered by fire service levies; the Emergency Services Division, for fees for aircraft charter; and the Office of Sport and Recreation, fees for recreational camps. The age of the debt of \$5.6m varies from 0 to 30 days of \$1.1m, to over 60 days of \$3.6m.

The department is pleased to advise the Committee that a number of steps have been taken and are planned, particularly for implementation this financial year in respect to the development of a new debtor system. We believe we will have an improved debt management arrangement, and will also be able to increase revenue collections. The proposed debtor system, which comes on-line within the next four weeks, will be a single, Statewide debtors and receipting system. It will replace a myriad of stand-alone systems which have operated in the past on each of the services. The realisable benefits include a reduction in fees paid to the collection agency, a target of 5 per cent improvement in the collection of outstanding debts and a 10 per cent target for a reduction in accounts raised in error.

Mr CARROLL: Has any thought been put into advertising the fact that these emergency services do not come out of thin air, but that they cost the public purse? In that way, we might achieve two objectives. One is to perhaps encourage a higher level of subscription to the Ambulance Service and, secondly, to encourage people to avoid getting themselves into situations where they need assistance from the Emergency Services.

Mr VEIVERS: We have to be very careful when we look at advertising programs, because the Opposition then says that we are promoting the Minister or promoting the party or promoting the coalition. I personally feel that we need to advertise to tell people what we are really doing and what we are about.

Dr FITZGERALD: The Ambulance Service does extensively advertise the costs of not taking out subscriptions—sometimes rather fearsomely, one

might think! However, those advertisements are effective. In general, when we run a set of advertisements we draw in about \$10 of new business for every dollar spent on those advertisements. They are very effective. We currently have about 61 per cent of the population of Queensland covered by subscriptions. But of the remaining 40 per cent, about a quarter to one-third are covered by alternative insurance programs such as health insurance funds, etc. The remainder we have difficulty attracting into any sort of insurance program at all.

Mr CARROLL: Minister, also arising from the paragraph that I read out earlier is the issue of accrual accounting. That was on page 19. How far has your department advanced in implementing accrual accounting systems?

Mr VEIVERS: I would have to defer to Gary Taylor. He is the expert in accountancy.

Mr TAYLOR: The introduction of accrual accounting has been successfully achieved. From 1 July this year, we have been operating on an accrual accounting system. However, because of Treasury requirements to also report on a cash basis, we are actually running dual ledgers for this financial year. We are in a position now to report on an accrual basis, which we will be doing from the first quarter, which is the end of September. That will go to each of the program managers so that they will be in a better position to assess the total cost of the program services they are providing. It also will help us identify things like the cost of community service obligations and the true costs of outstanding liabilities and asset usage.

Mr CARROLL: Minister, I notice that local ambulance committees were reintroduced late last year/early this year. What progress has been achieved in having those committees established for each local ambulance centre? What help is expected to be provided by those committees to the service?

Dr FITZGERALD: Local ambulance committees weren't re-established. Local ambulance committees continued in existence as of the formation of the Queensland Ambulance Service in 1991. The previous QATB committees, under the transitional provisions of the Act, in effect became the local ambulance committees for those locations. Over those subsequent years, the number of local ambulance committees has in fact increased. There were 96 committees at the formation of the QAS. A number of those committees ceased to exist and did not continue. I cannot give you the exact figures, but it is around about—

Mr VEIVERS: It has gone from 36 to 151.

Dr FITZGERALD: Yes, it has now gone up to 151 at the latest count. The role of those committees, in effect, is fourfold. One is that they advise the Ambulance Service in the locality about the particular nature of services required in that locality. Secondly, they are quality assurance committees, in effect, to tell the Ambulance Service whether the services that we are providing in the local community are meeting the needs of the people or not. Thirdly, we consider them advocates for the

service to try, in turn, to communicate to the community just what the Ambulance Service is trying to achieve and what the roles of the service are. Fourthly, they are fundraising committees. We estimate that we will receive about \$1.2m in donations from local ambulance committees in 1996-97, which is obviously a significant contributor to some of our redevelopment programs.

Mr VEIVERS: Hopefully, the LACs will have a tax deductible status. That is expected within the next financial year, I believe. It is most important to have that taxation status.

Mr CARROLL: I refer to page 33 of the MPS document, and I ask: what action has been taken to follow up the coroner's recommendations in relation to the deaths of two firefighters at Southport?

Mr HALL: The coroner who conducted the inquiry into the deaths of two firefighters which occurred on 11 February 1994 essentially handed down in his report dated 18 May 1995 11 primary recommendations. To go through each of those recommendations in turn and detail the action that has been taken about them would take a considerable amount of time. I will summarise very quickly what has occurred.

In reality, of those 11 recommendations, there is one only on which there has been no definitive action, because the depth and nature of the recommendation is one which the Queensland Fire Service, drawing on the experience of other fire services, both in Australia and internationally, has determined that it is unable to proceed with at this time. I refer in those comments to Recommendation 2 of the coroner, which states that the Commissioner for Fire Services investigate the feasibility of a computer-based register of commercial premises in each fire district, containing details of structures, including floor plans and other pertinent information such as the location of the key holder, the name of the security firm responsible for surveillance and security of the buildings, the type of firefighting equipment of the premises and such other details as may be of interest to responding firefighters.

Essentially, this is a recommendation, as I said, which is not achievable at present. Other fire services, notably the Western Australian Fire Service in Perth, have attempted a similar computer-based register of the type recommended and failed. There are essentially two problems with that: firstly, the sheer volume of information necessary to maintain such a register. As an example of that, the Southport Fire Safety Department alone holds in excess of 100,000 documents, which does not cover the whole of the area. The second problem is the impossibility of maintaining accurate and up-to-date information regarding alterations to premises. Experience has shown that the public will simply not keep the information current regardless of legislation. Relying on inaccurate information is more dangerous to the Fire Service than having none and operating with due caution. In terms of the 11 recommendations from the coroner, that is the only one which has not received any detailed action from the Fire Service.

In relation to Recommendation 1, break and enter equipment, that recommendation was dealt with by an internal working party which made some recommendations regarding additional equipment for fire appliances. Those recommendations have been taken up by the Fire Service and are either partially or totally complete. The only slight further delay is that with respect to the importation of American tools which will go on our fire appliances.

Mr VEIVERS: Mr Carroll, there are four or five pages of this. Mr Hall is doing well. Recommendation 6 is that all firemen have their name displayed in readily discernible letters on a prominent part of their clothing, for example, the front and back of their turn-out coats and overalls. Recommendation 7 states that the incident commander in charge of the fire incident wear a distinctively coloured and suitably labelled vest or tunic to allow ready identification of firefighters and other persons whose attendance at the fire scene may be necessary, such as police officers, ambulance officers, electricity board employees, and the building owner/supervisor. If the command changes, the vest is transferred with the command. There are many things. It might be better placed on notice.

Mr CARROLL: That certainly satisfies my inquiry. I just wanted some detail—

Mr VEIVERS: What you wanted to know is: are we doing anything about it? Yes.

Mr CARROLL: My next question, Minister, is in relation to any sites of large chemical storages and whether they are adequately prepared for incidents. We have seen some reports of major disasters, not in Queensland. I seek an assurance about precautions taken to secure such sites and to protect surrounding communities.

Mr VEIVERS: Mr Jack Noye would better answer that.

Mr PURCELL: I have a supplementary to that and on railway lines, too, Frank.

Mr NOYE: Jack Noye, Emergency Services Division. The department is about to issue some guidelines on major hazard facilities. These guidelines are being prepared in anticipation of the release of national standards for control of major hazard facilities. The release of these guidelines and the upgrade of emergency plans for all hazard facilities in the State will be the first stage in the implementation of a standard for Queensland. The Fire Service currently has legislative authority under the off-site emergency plan regulation to require facility operators to formulate emergency plans, and a seminar will be held fairly soon—2 October—to launch the emergency plan guidelines, to train operators in their requirements and to resolve any concerns of operators in emergency services in the community. These plans submitted by industry are reviewed by our CHEM Unit and the Fire Service. If you want any further details on that, I have the director of the CHEM Unit here to provide that for you.

Mr CARROLL: Minister, I was just going to ask: how many such large installations or sites are there in Queensland?

Mr BARTON: The same number as there are TABs.

Mr VEIVERS: Nearly the same as TABs. Could someone answer that for me, please?

Mr BRUNNER: I am the director of the CHEM Unit. There are about 25 sites which could be classified as major hazard facilities in Queensland. We would expect, as a result of our emergency planning strategy, that each one of those would have an up-to-date emergency plan within the next 12 months.

The CHAIRMAN: Could I ask a question supplementary to that? Is the amount of hazardous material being disposed of in Queensland increasing or decreasing? The reason I ask that is that it was coming out from Gurulmundi, and they made the comment that there was less waste going out into that area of Miles than there was a couple of years ago. Does that carry over to every other area?

Mr BRUNNER: I think the only thing we can say is that the cost of disposing of hazardous waste is increasing, and as a result those companies that are generating it are reducing the amount where possible. So because of the increasing cost there is a decrease in the amount being generated. But I couldn't give you any definitive numbers on that. That is really the Department of Environment's area.

Mr VEIVERS: I think, Mr Stephan, you should ask the Environment Minister about that. It is his area. He would answer it much more specifically.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: We were talking just a few moments ago about accrual accounting. You said that you have cash-based and accrual-based books. Can you quickly outline your philosophy on how you costed your depreciation and also your asset valuations? What was your philosophy?

Mr TAYLOR: We have a major asset management system called TAMS—Total Asset Management System—which lists all of our assets with their useful life, and the depreciation used is just a straight line based on the useful life of each of those assets. The percentage rates are based largely on the usage rates of those assets.

Mr TILEY: Matt Tiley, Director of Facilities. Could I just add to that? The department has just undertaken a fairly major project, which is costing us in the order of \$170,000, to revalue all of our assets. A fair proportion of the contribution of that cost has actually been put in by Treasury, because Treasury are actually subsidising departments to the tune of 75 per cent for the cost of valuing their fixed asset portfolio in terms of land and buildings. So we are only contributing about 25 per cent to that cost within the \$170,000 amount. All of those valuations have been done according to the valuation of non-current physical assets policy enunciated by Treasury, and that is using the deprival method of valuation. Those valuations are nearing completion. We have about 65 per cent of those valuations in, and all valuations should be at hand by the end of this month.

In terms of our other major items of fleet and equipment, mainly related to our assets of our fire and ambulance-type appliances as well as

aviation—we have categorised and grouped all of those assets and we have attained relevant market valuations from them or, indeed, valuations from the standing offer arrangements we have in place for the replacement of all of those items of fleet and equipment. We have assessed those clusters. We have assessed their depreciation and life cycles and applied the straight-line method across that life cycle.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: At the moment, as of your current assessment, what is your unfunded liability?

Mr TILEY: I wouldn't have that figure immediately at hand. We would have to accumulate that for you. I suppose the reason why it is not immediately at hand is that, in terms of the actual valuations from the land and building component—which has quite a large proportion of it, in the order of about \$400m of our assets—we only have about 65 per cent of them in. We are waiting for 100 per cent till we actually run them across the life cycle. So by the end of that month, I would be able to give you a quantitative assessment of that.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: A question to the Minister. There are two Bills before Parliament at the moment about the corporatisation, if you like, of the Ambulance and Fire Services. The theme of the current Government is back to basics. How do you see corporatisation enhancing that back to basics theme?

Mr VEIVERS: You have called it corporatisation. It is making these two particular services statutory bodies. In doing that, it gives both of them greater autonomy to do what they have to do, but also they then do not belong to the Minister or the Public Service. As such, they can get out there and fight in a consultancy way and earn money other than us having to levy both for fires and ambulance services. We can use both services as income-getting devices, and that is what we are going to do. An example is that hopefully in November or early December I am going to China, because China has shown a great interest in doing deals specifically with Queensland. They have said they would rather do deals with Queensland—don't ask me why. Probably because of the Minister!

Mr SCHWARTEN: Because of Tom.

Mr VEIVERS: I think maybe it was because I got on quite well with Mr Hua. He did say that Mr Burns did some things, too. But hey—you had six years to do something about it, and you sat on your hands, which made them quite flat. I have been in this business now only seven months—28 weeks—and we have already been able to enhance—

Mr SCHWARTEN: Put one over—

Mr VEIVERS: As long as I am making money for Queensland. You people seem to look on it as some sort of rort. When I go over there, it will be minus 8 down to minus 31. I am not really looking forward to those sorts of temperatures. What I am looking for is these services being able to sell their wares to China in certain ways. If you want an up-market talk about it, Mr Hocken might be able to add to that. But I am saying that we can earn money

which doesn't go to consolidated revenue, which it always does now. I have to be careful here. It will be coming to these specific fire services or ambulance services so that we can reinvest in them and expand and deliver not only a cheaper service but also a better service. That is the whole idea of it—private enterprise. But it is giving both these services, under the statutory authorities, the ability to do that. They are not allowed to do that now. You just can't do that. I am looking forward to things happening in leaps and bounds. Mr Hocken may be able to add to that.

Mr HOCKEN: I think one of the things that we have got to look forward to is competition for our services, and as we know in the United States, the ambulance services—most of them are private, and to be able to compete with those private providers, we need to get out of the umbrella of a lot of industrial practices, in particular under the Public Service Acts. We need to generate, as the Minister said, more revenue. An example of what the Minister was talking about, the Chinese Ambassador mentioned to us that most of the grazing lands in inner Mongolia had been burnt out. There will be massive loss of livestock coming up to winter, and while the Minister hopes it will be minus 8, they have told me it will actually be minus 20.

They are interested in copying our disaster planning. We can get aid agency funded programs to do that. The Country Fire Association of Victoria has recently stitched up deals with Fiji in both supplying systems, training and appliances. Western Australia are already into Indonesia, looking at supplying systems for rural fire protection in Indonesia. Malaysia is working at the present time with the Melbourne Fire Association. So we really have to get in there now and do it, and the way we can do it more efficiently and more effectively is through a statutory body because we have more control over the funds.

The second thing, as the Minister has already said, it depoliticises as much as possible, anyway, the operations of both those bodies because the most important thing is to provide a service which is based on need. Far from me to say that anything else than that has happened, but we need to make sure we look at the developments of the communities, what their needs are, where they have slowed down and make decisions based on the needs of all Queenslanders. That is one of the major reasons for turning it into a statutory authority.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: If that statutory body or when that statutory body—whichever you like—status becomes a reality, is the Government intending to retain any community service obligation within the funding structure?

Mr HOCKEN: As Gary mentioned before in the process of looking at those services that cost us money, exactly the same as rail had to do, looking at those rail lines that did not make money, and the Government has to make a decision then as to whether we keep those open. It is the same with a number of our fire and ambulance services. We need to know how much each one of those costs so that the Government can say, "Okay, we need to protect

our people", and we have more ammunition to go to Treasury particularly to say, "We need funding for that rather than the piecemeal block that we get now." So the short answer is: yes.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: What changes will the community see on the ground when that statutory body structure comes into play?

Mr HOCKEN: I would say—well, you have to look at both services and where they are going. I might let both Gerry and Mike support that. At the present time, we have focused our whole delivery of service in fire on suppression, and if we look at what is happening in some of the best Fire Services in the world—and the Minister and I were fortunate enough to look at what was happening in West Midlands, where seven years ago they had the worst death rate by fire in the United Kingdom, now they have the best, if you can have such a thing, and that was mainly because they changed their focus from suppression to prevention; in other words, education and getting out there with the community and teaching them the importance of safety. The Minister can talk about smoke detectors.

Mr VEIVERS: While putting that type of thing in—that is a stopper; it is a prevention. Rather than mopping up when it has all happened, the best thing is to prevent it so it does not happen, and that is what they did in the West Midlands. They are regarded as probably one of the better Fire Services in the world. Well, we are going to emulate that and beat them, because we cannot have the English being that good.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: I just wonder if in this document, given your answers about the fact that the cost of running each service will become clearer—I am from regional Queensland where the Ambulance Service is more than just somebody who transports patients or responds to emergency situations. They really have a social fabric responsibility, if you like. We see it as a responsibility, it may be that Government and Treasury will not. Has there been or will there be an allocation in the budget where a particular service is seen to be not financially viable? Will there be an allocation to ensure that that service remains, and particularly in regional Queensland?

Mr VEIVERS: That was explained to you before when he was saying about the rail.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: Well, use little words.

Mr VEIVERS: I will let Gerry tell you.

Mr FITZGERALD: I think the example that you raise, which is the small rural ambulance stations, is probably the best example of the community service obligation. In effect, we have been doing some research recently on the costing of various ambulance stations and, in essence, the sort of small stations that you are referring to, the funds raised from those local communities directly contributes generally about 20 to 30 per cent of the costs of running those stations, so in effect they are 70 per cent subsidised from outside. Now that is both cross-subsidy from the cities as well as from the Consolidated Fund contribution. So we are looking

to—after the flexibility given to us by statutory authority—in effect renegotiate the Government's contribution to be directly related to meeting community service obligations. So, for example, we would say a certain proportion of that is directly to subsidise and keep open those small stations and enable them to do the whole of community services, extended beyond the emergency response that you referred to directly.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: If the Government's community service obligation is evaluated at 30 per cent, is it going to be evaluated in that sort of percentage?

Mr FITZGERALD: I would think the other way around. The money coming from the local communities, about 30 per cent—roughly 30 per cent of the costs of running those little stations.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: So the CSO will be 70 per cent?

Mr FITZGERALD: That is the sort of position we will be taking. Obviously, that is pre-empting discussions with Treasury.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: I do not mind at all. Pre-empt it, because otherwise what is going to happen is that there is going to be a proportion of the operational costs for the emergency services—fires and ambulance—and the community, who are genuinely cooperative in fundraising—they work their tails off to fund raise for the local ambulance and local fire brigades—will be left with a higher than achievable requirement to fund raise, because the community can only provide so much money. So it is essential that those services in country Queensland do not deteriorate further. With respect, over the last few years, they have deteriorated or the services that they have been able to provide or have had the flexibility to provide have been seen to be diminishing. That includes renegotiation of awards and EBs, where historically the ambulance centre—the ambulance officer lived there and was available 24 hours a day, and accepted that as part of his community contribution. That is all changing and the officers are living off-station, the stations are open 8 till 4 and then the officers are on call. There is a marked shift in country Queensland from the services being provided. My concern would be that the statutory body changes did not deteriorate that service further.

Mr FITZGERALD: Could I just respond to that, if I may? I think the benefit of the statutory authority is that it actually gives you the greater flexibility to look after those particular issues as separate to standards which would ordinarily apply across Government. I suppose the position we have been in as a division of a Government department is that standards properly applying to public servants working in Brisbane have been applied to ambulance officers in small country towns, and clearly they are inappropriate to apply to people in small country towns. I believe the benefit of the statutory authority is that it will give us that flexibility to be able to say, "Let's deal with them in a different way and be able to be more flexible and imaginative in the way we deal with our staff in country towns."

Mr VEIVERS: Just to add to that, I think Mike Hall could balance it up by explaining about fire in the same regions.

Mr HALL: Certainly, I guess the same comments apply about the extent of community service obligations in the country, and that is a question for Government. Certainly, in terms of the country subsidy of fire services, if I can use that expression, you need approximately 2,500 to 3,000 people in a country town to pay for the fire service in that town. Any country town that has fewer than that number is subsidised. In particular, I would like to answer your questions about a deterioration of service in country areas from the Fire Service perspective. In fact, we found—and it is acknowledged both within the service and outside the service—that, over the last six years, the Fire Service has very dramatically improved the service that we provide in our country towns by better training and the better equipment that we have provided. Under statutory authority, this improvement can be enhanced only by allowing the people to have even more of a community and a local contribution into the development of their fire services locally.

The CHAIRMAN: This segment of the Estimates Committee discussion is finished for Government members at this time. I refer now to non-Government members.

Mr SCHWARTEN: I draw the Minister's attention to the coalition's promise prior to the last election when it was indicated by both the Premier and the then shadow spokesperson for Emergency Services, Mr Littleproud, that \$3m would be made available to be shared between the Capricornia Rescue Helicopter Service and the Mackay-based Rescue Helicopter Service. Try as I might in searching page 27 with a microscope, I cannot see any movement in the amounts there that would provide for that \$3m. Could you please enlighten me as to whether or not I am missing something?

Mr VEIVERS: Actually, it is \$1.5m to each over five years, which is \$300,000. That is what they are getting now.

Mr SCHWARTEN: That is certainly not the understanding that the Capricornia Rescue Helicopter Service has. That was a commitment made by the previous Government and, indeed, delivered upon by the previous Government. This is above that. I draw your attention to documentation that you provided to the Treasury that indicates that \$3m was needed to honour that commitment.

Mr VEIVERS: That is true, I suppose—not so much about promises, but you people wanting extra money up there. But we found a marvellous way to be able to do what we had to do without giving you extra money and keep everyone happy up there—obviously, other than yourself. That was that it was still \$300,000 a year, but it was done under wet leasing. I shall defer to Jack Noye, and he can tell you all about it.

Mr NOYE: The wet leasing arrangement overcame the initial up-front costs, which we estimated to be \$1.5m, to kick-start both the

helicopter services. The wet leasing arrangement, as you are probably aware, is whereby the community group contracts with a professional operator for the helicopter and usually the pilots for so much a month and so much a flying hour. The situation has been that that initial up-front cost was not required. The wet leasing arrangement overcomes that up-front cost.

Mr SCHWARTEN: You do not even believe this, Jack.

Mr VEIVERS: Yes, he does, and so do I.

Mr SCHWARTEN: You have to. He does not.

Mr VEIVERS: How come all the other services can do it, yet Rockhampton cannot? I will rephrase that—you think they cannot.

Mr SCHWARTEN: With the greatest respect, it was not our Government that made the promise, it was yours. I will table this document, if you like. I draw your attention to your admission of this to the Treasury Department in your second round of Sheldon's scissor attack upon your budget, whereby you state in the Coalition Election Commitments provision of 135 additional firefighters. I presume that is extra. Are we talking about extra there? The second one was the capital funding for helicopter rescue services at Rockhampton and Mackay. The third was State Emergency Services.

Mr VEIVERS: That was for a request, of course.

Mr SCHWARTEN: This is titled "Coalition Election Commitments". I can assure you, Minister, that you can fool some of the people some of the time, but you cannot fool me at all, nor can you fool the Capricornia Rescue Helicopter Service, who have been in touch with me today to make sure that this matter was brought up tonight and that the promise was there—that it was \$1.5m.

Mr VEIVERS: What you are saying then is that the Capricornia Rescue Helicopter Service receives the same remuneration under a wet lease situation as all the others up and down the coast of Queensland, and yet they cannot make a go of it? Can you tell me why that is?

Mr SCHWARTEN: No, but I certainly resent the implication that the hardworking people at the Capricornia Rescue Helicopter Service are not managing.

Mr VEIVERS: I am not saying that. I am saying that the people you represent up there should be getting behind this helicopter service if things are a little dodgy.

Mr SCHWARTEN: They certainly have indicated that they want to, but they also want your Government to live up to its promises, and it has not. In essence, the short answer to the question I raised is no, you are not going to honour the promise that Mr Borbidge made?

Mr VEIVERS: I will tell you what I will do for you. I will take that question on notice and see if I can appease you in that manner.

Mr SCHWARTEN: The second question is—surprise, surprise—about helicopters. This may

actually assist you to get out of the dilemma you now find yourself in. With regard to the Queensland Emergency Services Squirrel helicopter, which used to be in Cairns, why has this helicopter not been sold and the money thus raised put back towards the running of community-based helicopter services in places such as Rockhampton and Mackay? What is the hourly cost of running this helicopter? How many rescue operations has this helicopter flown since March?

Mr VEIVERS: You are talking about the Squirrel, are you?

Mr SCHWARTEN: Yes.

Mr VEIVERS: The twin or the single?

Mr SCHWARTEN: The twin. On how many occasions has this aircraft been used by the Premier, the Deputy Premier or other Ministers? What were their destinations? What was the approximate cost of each flight? Who was the authorising officer for this aircraft? For what purposes can the aircraft be used?

Mr VEIVERS: I will pass that over to Mr Noye.

Mr NOYE: We might go through the list there.

Mr SCHWARTEN: Yes. I can put them on notice, if you so desire, if it makes it easier for you. Firstly, why has it not been sold?

Mr NOYE: The twin Squirrel is up for sale at the present time. There have been a couple of interested parties, but they have not made a sufficiently high enough offer. The single Squirrel is being retained at the present time for other tasks, such as police and ministerial use, while its future is considered.

Mr PURCELL: Do those funds go back to Emergency Services? Do they charge them?

Mr NOYE: The Minister has directed that we put up a proposal to Cabinet that it be based on a user-pays basis for all other agencies, including Ministers. The proposal is that that will be charged out at about \$700 an hour so that it can self-fund.

Mr SCHWARTEN: So we are going to flog off the twin and keep the single now?

Mr NOYE: That is the Government's decision.

Mr SCHWARTEN: What is the hourly cost of running the single?

Mr NOYE: The hourly cost is in the vicinity of about \$400 of direct operating costs, not including salaries. So if we have to bring in a pilot, it takes it up to around \$700 an hour plus other overheads.

Mr SCHWARTEN: What state of repair is it in now?

Mr NOYE: The single Squirrel is in a very good condition. Both of them are. They have been maintained in very good condition over the years. The single is a very good helicopter.

Mr SCHWARTEN: I thought the single was the better of the two.

Mr VEIVERS: I have not had the pleasure of riding in either.

Mr SCHWARTEN: Neither have I, Minister, but I understand that Mr Borbidge has.

Mr VEIVERS: I thought you had; you were saying that it had a better ride. You are an expert in those helicopters.

Mr SCHWARTEN: Has either of them been used for rescue evacuations since coming here?

Mr NOYE: I couldn't give you the exact—there have been a couple of backup tasks done, but I couldn't give them offhand. I could give you them if you wish.

Mr SCHWARTEN: Yes.

Mr VEIVERS: It was used as a backup to go to Laidley when I declared the State of emergency.

Mr NOYE: It has been used for police tasks, as well: traffic surveillance and other surveillance activities, but only minor use.

Mr SCHWARTEN: How often is the single used by Ministers?

Mr VEIVERS: Not often.

Mr NOYE: It has not been used all that often, but I could give you the exact use later if you wish. I have the figures from 1 July 1995 to 30 June 1996 for the Government helicopters' overall tasks. I haven't got the specific single Squirrel stuff, but I can get you that information if you want.

Mr SCHWARTEN: I will take it on notice.

What is the process when Ministers want to use it? Who is the authorising officer and for what reasons is it used? Are guidelines established as to the use of it?

Mr NOYE: There are guidelines that we are proposing in the——

Mr SCHWARTEN: They have not been finalised yet?

Mr NOYE: No, the proposal for user charges will incorporate strict guidelines, which will go through the Minister's office for organisation. It will be similar to the fixed-wing tasking guidelines so that there will be a direct, accountable process to go through.

Mr SCHWARTEN: Again on helicopters, does the budget allocated for aviation services include an amount to repaint the internationally renowned QES helicopter in another colour scheme? What is the projected cost for this financial year to repaint the helicopters?

Mr VEIVERS: As the repaints come up to be done, that is when the new colours and new insignia will be put on. As for the costs of that, it would be the same cost as doing the——

Mr SCHWARTEN: You are not going to do the whole fleet?

Mr VEIVERS: Only as they come up to be done and repainted. In that way we keep the cost to the minimum. Of course, the insignia changes as they get the new dash of paint.

Mr PURCELL: I have a question on the State Emergency Service. I understand that the budget for equipment for volunteers last year was \$518,000. What is the proposed budget for 1996-97?

Mr NOYE: Could you be a little bit more specific please, Mr Purcell?

Mr PURCELL: The budget for equipment for volunteers last year was \$518,000.

Mr NOYE: Could I just get my director up for that, please?

Mr VEIVERS: There are a lot of volunteers in this, Pat.

Mr PURCELL: I know that. It is the equipment for the volunteers.

Mr NOYE: We are not sure where you are getting the figures from, Mr Purcell. Where is your figure coming from—the one that you quoted? What line?

Mr SCHWARTEN: They came from the Estimates last year.

Mr NOYE: What line are you addressing this year, though?

Mr SCHWARTEN: That is what we want to know. We cannot figure out where it is in this pakapoo ticket you presented. That is why we are asking those questions.

Mr VEIVERS: I think it is most unreasonable to call the hard work of these people a "pakapoo ticket".

Mr SCHWARTEN: Those same people presented it in a better form last year.

Mr VEIVERS: They have done a very good job.

Mr NOYE: Mr Purcell, we will put that on notice and we will give you a direct answer.

Mr SCHWARTEN: I refer the Minister to his answer to a question on notice concerning the training of ATSI volunteers wherein he indicated that funding for that program had been set at \$50,000 for non-labour costs and a possible further \$50,000 subject to further conditions. Is it not a fact that last year's allocation for that area was some \$312,000? On what grounds was the decision made to strip that funding from that program? What particular parts of the ATSI program will be cut to deliver those savings?

Mr NOYE: The situation regarding the ATSI program as it then was has changed this year. We have, at the Minister's direction, rearranged the reporting arrangements for the coordinator. He will now become a district coordinator for Torres Strait and Cape York.

Mr SCHWARTEN: We are talking about Graham Jonsen, are we?

Mr NOYE: Yes, we are. He will be responsible only for those units in that area and not the other five Aboriginal units. Mornington Island, Doomadgee, Palm Island, Woorabinda and Cherbourg will become part of normal, mainstream regional management. Whilst we are looking at how that is set up, \$50,000 has been allocated for non-labour costs for ongoing training. We expect that, in the next few months, we will have specific allocation for training in the Cape York and Torres area.

Mr SCHWARTEN: You must agree that that is a pretty horrendous sort of cut, even taking into account that there is going to be some five on the cape that Jonsen will no longer service. It depends on whether it is \$100,000 we are talking about or \$50,000, but in any case, taking it down from \$312,000 to \$100,000 or \$50,000 is a considerable drop in that budget.

Mr NOYE: That initial budget last year was a fair bit of set-up costs and we are looking at what it will take for the ongoing maintenance and allocation to the communities for facilities and other equipment.

Mr SCHWARTEN: So you do not have anything earmarked for equipment or training that you could compare with last year? You have just come up with that amount of money and the program will run on that basis?

Mr NOYE: That is the initial amount of money I have allocated so that we can get through a review on what's required in future training. Most of the equipment has been allocated to community groups. We will be discussing with the Fire and Ambulance Services in the future about how they would assist us with that training because, to date, Mr Jonsen and his assistant have been doing all the fire and ambulance training as well as the SES training. With the statutory authorities coming on board and more independence for the Fire and Ambulance Services we are looking at what they may pick up on the training costs as well.

Mr PURCELL: These questions may have to go on notice also. They relate to items that are very difficult to find in the Budget papers. Last year's budget allocated some \$70,000 for disaster research with projects in Cairns, Townsville and Macquarie University receiving funds from that allocation. Could the Minister advise what level of funding those will receive this year?

Mr B. ELDER: Mr Schwarten, those programs that were initiated last year are being maintained. The money is in the Emergency Services program. They are being maintained.

Mr SCHWARTEN: So the \$70,000 is staying there?

Mr B. ELDER: I think it is \$70,000. That is continuing again next year as well.

Mr SCHWARTEN: Great.

Mr PURCELL: How much has been allocated for the State organised training activities? I understand it was about \$74,000 last year.

Mr SCHWARTEN: We can put it on notice. You can let us know how much that was. My question is again to whoever can answer it. Mr Minister, further to your response, I refer to my question on notice No. 2 regarding the Rural Fire Division, and I ask: why has the Minister cut approximately \$1.6m from the Rural Fire budget, especially in light of recommendations from the Rural Fire Council that this budget should have been increased to \$10.5m? What items will be cut from the previous Government's—our Government's—program for the Rural Fire Division?

Mr HALL: The Rural Fire Division's budget has been reduced, but it has not been cut. The budget for 1996-97 again comprises the agreed base amount and the continuing amounts for the initiative of funding from the bush fire audit and the allocation from the DES indexed \$10m new initiative provision.

Scheduled reductions in the audit initiative of \$450,000 have occurred. The former Government's election promises of \$0.86m were unfunded and were unable to be included. The previous year's budget also included a one-off allocation from the Commissioner of Fire Services of \$378,000.

Mr VEIVERS: Remember yours was unfunded.

Mr SCHWARTEN: That is what you say.

Mr VEIVERS: Can you say any different?

Mr SCHWARTEN: What else would you say?

Mr VEIVERS: Can you say any different?

Mr SCHWARTEN: Of course I am saying different. We took rural fire services from the pathetic \$2m a year that you left it in to up to around \$8m a year. Now you have taken it back to \$6.3m, or something like that, and you are saying that is not a cut. It will do me until I get one.

Mr VEIVERS: Yours were unfunded. You can talk about what you did, but—

Mr SCHWARTEN: Even using that figure of election promises—how much was that?

Mr HALL: \$860,000.

Mr SCHWARTEN: I thought so, \$860,000. This is \$1.6m less this year that you will spend on rural fire services than was spent last year, and you are telling me that it is not a cut.

Mr TAYLOR: A lot of last year's was one-off capital expenditure that will not occur again this year. There were a lot of fire trucks purchased last year which are not required this year.

Mr SCHWARTEN: So we do not need any more trucks for the rural fire services?

Mr TAYLOR: I am not saying that we do not need them; I am saying that there were one-off expenditure items last year that will not recur this financial year.

Mr SCHWARTEN: The need will not dissipate for them.

Mr PURCELL: Can I ask a question?

Mr VEIVERS: Yes, you can.

Mr PURCELL: Over the last 12 months, how many officers in the SES area have been on alternative duties, off work on stress or sick leave, or have retired through ill health or stress-related difficulties? How does the percentage of these people within the SES compare with the percentages of people with similar problems in other services within the Department of Emergency Services? Do you know that, in the SES, you can kiss your stress leave goodbye when Santo fixes up the compo for you.

Ms SMITH: This is not going into the specifics, but we have had two ill-health retirements over the last—

Mr PURCELL: Sorry, I did not hear that.

Ms SMITH: We have had two ill-health retirements within the previous Counter Disaster Services area. We have got a number of officers—and I think it is approximately three—who are off on some type of stress-related condition. We have put in a very strong rehabilitation program—trying to move from dealing with the issues after they happen. One of the strategies within Counter Disaster Management—because we have identified within this particular division that the stress-related claims within this division are higher than the other public service areas—with the existing executive director, we are strengthening the total rehabilitation program within the Counter Disaster Services area.

Mr SCHWARTEN: That is a very good idea. You should be congratulated on that.

Ms SMITH: Thank you. We are also working with the senior management in the State Emergency Services area in putting in the employee assistance scheme and also putting in a peer support network so that colleagues working alongside their peers can also identify early indicators of any stress-related injury.

Mr SCHWARTEN: Do you have any idea why it is higher in the SES than it is proportionately in the Fire Service or the Ambulance Service?

Ms SMITH: I can give a comment off the cuff. Mr Ripper from the Counter Disaster area and I have had this discussion previously. I think it was in the initial recruitment and selection strategy that was in place a couple of years ago where we were getting a very traditional profile of officer joining State Emergency Services. They were ex-military, ex-Army, ex-police and I believe they had an unrealistic expectation of what the role was. They came in expecting a community service role and they did find when they joined the State Emergency Services that there was more administrative and there was more accountabilities. So what we have actually done is changed our advertising and changed our recruitment and selection so that people joining the Emergency Services have a real expectation of what the performance outcomes are for the position.

Mr SCHWARTEN: Thank you.

Mr VEIVERS: I will just take you back to the Rural Fire Division, which you said that we had cut. A contribution of \$378,000 was made by the Queensland Fire Service, Urban to the Queensland Fire Service, Rural in 1995-96. This contribution is unlikely to be repeated in 1996-97. That was just to add a little grist to the mill for what you were asking.

Mr SCHWARTEN: If you want to get back to rural fire services, I will ask you a question. Do you think that they are funded at a reasonable level or do you think the Rural Fire Council is wrong in what it is saying? They are there to advise you, are they not? They are telling you that the level of funding should be \$10.5m, and now that funding has gone back even further from last year.

Mr VEIVERS: I am going to say something here. They spend some absolutely astronomical amounts of money in New South Wales.

Mr SCHWARTEN: \$60m.

Mr VEIVERS: Yes, and their fire service—or that Rural Fire Service—is not any better than ours and I believe they have had to reintroduce fire levies to pay for their extraordinary sorts of actions and to keep from going down the tube.

Mr SCHWARTEN: A lot of theirs is not voluntary.

Mr VEIVERS: There you are, too. That is another reason for it.

Mr SCHWARTEN: The advices that you have seen yourself, which I have seen, and which come from people such as him is that it is a very low level. In fact, I saw one document from a fire officer in which it described it as almost contemptible. These are the fire officers who look after 98 per cent of the State, do they not?

Mr VEIVERS: They have reviews and they have their opinions about it. However, throwing fistfuls of money at it ad hoc is not going to fix that.

Mr SCHWARTEN: I am not asking you to throw fistfuls of money.

Mr VEIVERS: I think you are, actually.

Mr SCHWARTEN: Ten million dollars.

Mr VEIVERS: That is a fistful and a half.

Mr SCHWARTEN: In the overall context, you'd spill more than that at the races.

Mr VEIVERS: I will let Mike add to that.

Mr SCHWARTEN: He is an urban bloke.

Mr VEIVERS: That does not matter. He understands the rural sector.

Mr SCHWARTEN: I know. He is in charge of the whole shebang.

Mr HALL: I might add that, whilst the figures do show a reduction, and as we explained that is not a cut for the reasons that we explained—

Mr SCHWARTEN: And I did not believe you.

Mr HALL: That is still a fact.

Mr VEIVERS: I do not think that you believe anybody, actually.

Mr HALL: It shows a reduction of approximately \$1.5m. In fact, \$1.5m is the figure that is anticipated to be collected this year from the new rural fire levy, which goes directly to brigades to assist in the running of their local operations. If you add that back to the reduction, the figure available to be gauged is in fact the same this year as last.

Mr SCHWARTEN: What is the waiting list on fire appliances? You wanted to go back to rural fires; I wanted to get onto urban fires!

Mr VEIVERS: No, I am more than happy. We have appliances coming for these good people. Dave Luxton will answer the question.

Mr LUXTON: On our estimates—and I must answer this question truthfully—the waiting list for fire appliances has gone from three to four and a half years. The number of appliances supplied last year was 65. The number this year will be 37.

Mr SCHWARTEN: In other words, the demand is growing and the number being supplied has gone down, but we have not had a cut. I can believe that. Voodoo economics!

Mr PURCELL: The 1995-96 Budget figures indicate that Volunteer Marine Rescue training activities were allocated \$50,000. What is the budget this year?

Mr NOYE: Can we take that on notice, Mr Purcell?

Mr PURCELL: That is all right.

Mr SCHWARTEN: As Mr Carroll mentioned, following the Southport tragedy, if my memory serves me correctly, recommendations were made about training in realistic situations. Off the top of my head, I understand that the Lytton training centre is not quite up to scratch and is rapidly arriving—if it is not there already—at its use-by date. Was there not a proposal to do a joint venture with the RAAF at Amberley? I had some idea that \$1m was going to be allocated this year, \$2m next year and \$1m the year after that. I do not know where I got those figures from, so I may be wrong.

Mr VEIVERS: I mentioned this in the Parliament. Mike will answer that question.

Mr HALL: You are quite right: the Queensland Fire Service has identified the need for improved practical training facilities. This need was indeed reinforced by the coronial inquiry. In addition, the current training facility at Lytton is subject to resumption for a new Fisherman Islands port road in the next three to five years.

The search for a new practical training site commenced in 1994. At the time, the aim was to provide a combined emergency service training facility. However, no suitable property could be found close to Brisbane which would meet the needs of the Fire Service, mainly for environmental reasons. In early 1996, inquiries were made with the Royal Australian Air Force regarding the possible use of land on or close to the RAAF base at Amberley. The RAAF had secured a significant tract of land surrounding the base which is used as a buffer zone against jet aircraft noise. It will remain undeveloped. The RAAF is responsible for fire-related training of all ADF personnel and has a minor training facility at Amberley which is in urgent need of replacement.

The approach by the QFS came at an opportune time for both organisations. Discussions between the parties led to the signing of a letter of intent to cooperate in the development of a major world-class training facility. The RAAF is keen for the QFS to develop and manage the facility. The ADF is prepared to outsource its training to the QFS at this facility. The business plan has been prepared by both parties and provides for the development of the site over an initial four-year period on the basis of a 25-year land use agreement.

Subject to agreement by the RAAF, which is expected in October, development will be in five stages. Stage 1 is included in the 1996-97 capital estimates. The completion of an impact assessment study and detailed design and the tendering process for the buildings will cost \$1m. Stages 2, 3 and 4 go

through 1997-98, 1998-99 and up to the year 2000 and include an additional \$2m next year, \$2m the following year and \$1m in the year following that. At the completion of Stage 3, it will be possible to commence training of staff from outside organisations, including overseas fire services, in what we expect to be a world-class facility.

The CHAIRMAN: The time for non-Government members has expired. Minister, turning to page 36 of the Ministerial Program Statements, how is the commitment that was given to increase the number of firefighters going to be met? For instance, in my electorate of Gympie, the fire brigade looks after 70 or 80 kilometres of highway. Will you take that into consideration when you are looking at the manpower allocated to various fire brigades?

Mr HALL: As a preliminary point, the disposition of the additional staff committed to by the Government will be determined on the basis of a series of ongoing negotiations that have already commenced between the Fire Service and the Fire Service staff. The process essentially involves local consultation between regional management and station staff on the basis of estimating what the appropriate staffing for any particular fire station would be, based on the risk in the area in terms of fixed risk—the building risk, if you like—the anticipated growth of the area determined by accessing councils' five years strategic development plans for the areas, the ability of the Fire Service to provide a response from a time perspective, and an estimate and inclusion of such factors as special risks and motor vehicle accidents along the lines that you have mentioned. All of these things are being taken into account in what is really an ambitious project to reshape the Fire Service on the basis of community need and the results of the last five years of emergency response activity.

The CHAIRMAN: My next question is in connection with the Flying Doctor Service in north Queensland and the transfer of the King Air in Townsville to the RFDS. The independent aviation consultants who reported to the previous Government in 1994 on the deployment, suitability and replacement of Government aircraft recommended the transfer of the King Air to the Townsville Flying Doctor Service. Has this aircraft been transferred and, if so, what funding arrangements have been made for the transfer?

Mr VEIVERS: Yes. Just last week, we had the official handing over of the King Air to the Health Department and the Royal Flying Doctor Service. We presented them with the plane. Basically, the cost of the plane fluctuates, I believe, between \$500,000 and \$750,000. We have done that with no cost to Health. But the Health Department is going to upgrade that particular aircraft to top-class Royal Flying Doctor standards. And it will have a nurse on board every time it flies. One of our stipulations was that it remain in Townsville. It will offset search and rescues there but will still be used for the Royal Flying Doctor Service out of Townsville. It has enhanced that whole area. Maybe Mr Noye could add to that. A considerable amount of money was

needed to upgrade it, and the Health Department has said that it will do that.

Mr NOYE: The Royal Flying Doctor Service will start operating in Townsville on 2 December. The aircraft that the department now has there will go off to be refitted, repainted and so on. It will come back into service in late January. So the Royal Flying Doctor Service is spending about \$350,000 on a medical refit of the aircraft. In due course, it will pick up the \$660,000 for the engine overhaul. As the Minister said, the basic valuation—and it depends on when you put it on the market—fluctuates between \$500,000 and \$750,000. So the aircraft would be worth, once it is refitted and its engine overhauled, about \$1.5m. The Royal Flying Doctor Service will have a contract with the Health Department to do about 1,000 hours a year from Townsville. That contract is worth about \$1.5m a year. With the introduction of that RFDS service, it will balance the use of the Rockhampton RFDS aircraft and the Brisbane one as well, we think. So the hours used for those aircraft will settle down a bit more and the Townsville one will pick up and provide a better service across regional Queensland.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: You said that the plane was going off for a refit and that it would be back in service when?

Mr NOYE: Late January. But on 2 December RFDS will put a smaller replacement aircraft in Townsville until the King Air—

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: That will not diminish the service available over the peak Christmas period?

Mr NOYE: No, in fact it will possibly increase it. The aircraft—the C90—they will be putting in Townsville will be a better equipped aircraft for aero medical work. On the search and rescue side, RFDS is also putting in homing devices in order to be better able to do search and rescue work.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: I am not sure what incentives have historically been in place for fire officers. However, currently, rural ambulance officers' incentives are deteriorating under the guise of enterprise bargaining. I refer to things such as having the power paid for at ambulance stations where the officer is in residence. Under the new structure, will there be any recognition of that enhanced service? If an officer provides an extra service in a rural community, is there going to be any opportunity to recognise that through benefits, such as power being paid and so on? I have been smacked around the ear on this one and told that they should not get it paid, but I think they should.

Mr VEIVERS: We have a new remote area rural package that I introduced in the Parliament. That will be part of that. In respect of some of the towns west of the Great Divide it is difficult, I do believe, to say that they are disadvantaged if they are of a reasonable size. One of those was Charters Towers. That is an example. Personally, as the Minister, I feel that people who are in Charters Towers should be getting some benefit from that package. They are living in rural and remote areas of Queensland. There will have to be a very close

scrutiny of what you are talking about so that we can get these people to serve in these areas.

Dr FITZGERALD: The remote and rural incentives hopefully will encourage people to fill the vacancies that currently exist in rural and remote stations. The particular circumstance I think you are referring to has been a change that occurred some years ago, when officers who were in residences provided by the Ambulance Service were required to meet the costs of fuel and power for the private use aspect of those stations. I think the answer lies not only with the formation of the statutory authority, which gives us increased flexibility but also we hope that with the second round of enterprise bargaining we can actually start packaging up some of those entitlements again as part of their wages and salaries packages, and hopefully implement some greater flexibility to recognise the individual needs of particular communities.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: Thank you very much. Page 27 of the MPS indicates that the grants to local government to assist in running the SES are reduced

from \$458,000 to \$416,000. Will that be a continuing trend, or is there a reason for that reduction in this financial year? The role of the SES is increasing, I think partly because emergency situations are increasing but also because people's awareness of the role of the SES is improving. The demand on SES services is increasing.

Mr NOYE: That has decreased this year due to the review of what we are providing to the ATSI communities. So the grants to other local governments have not decreased. The ATSI grants are being reviewed at this time. The decrease is just because of the ATSI program.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think we have enough time to ask another question. That brings us to the end of the Committee's hearing. That concludes the Committee's consideration of the matters referred to it by the Parliament on 3 September 1996. I declare this public hearing closed. Thank you very much for your cooperation throughout the day.

The Committee adjourned at 7.28 p.m.