

**FRIDAY, 24 MARCH 1995**

Mr SPEAKER (Hon. J. Fouras, Ashgrove) read prayers and took the chair at 10 a.m.

**ASSENT TO BILL**

Assent to Freedom of Information Amendment Bill reported by Mr Speaker.

Mr Veivers interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! That is outrageous! I warn the member for Southport under Standing Order 123A.

**AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORTS**

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have to advise the House that today I received from the Auditor-General the following reports: one, audits of Aboriginal councils and island councils performed for 1993-94; and two, audits for local governments performed for 1993-94.

**MATTER OF PUBLIC IMPORTANCE****Proposed Debate**

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, this morning I received a letter from Mr Gilmore, the member for Tablelands, submitting a proposal for discussion of a definite Matter of Public Importance under Standing Order 137. I will quote the sessional order agreed to by the House on 23 February 1993 relating to Friday sittings. It states—

"Pursuant to Standing Order 26, the House shall meet for the dispatch of business, in addition to the days agreed to pursuant to the sessional order of 5 November, at 10 a.m. on the Friday of each sitting week, on which days Government business shall take precedence of all other business."

Under the provisions of this sessional order, the proposal by Mr Gilmore is therefore out of order.

Mr BORBIDGE (Surfers Paradise—Leader of the Opposition) (10.02 a.m.): I move—

"That so much of sessional orders be put aside so that the matter raised by the honourable member for Tablelands can be debated forthwith."

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member will resume his seat. The member knows the Standing Orders. He may seek leave to move

a motion without notice when I call, "Any other business?"

**PETITIONS**

The Clerk announced the receipt of the following petitions—

**Royal Queensland Bush Children's Health Scheme**

From Mr Mitchell (33 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will (a) immediately remove the board and executive staff of the Royal Queensland Bush Children's Health Scheme and appoint an administrator as an interim manager; (b) immediately reopen the Townsville and Yeppoon homes and retain all homes in their coastal communities; and (c) ensure that community input is sought, as a funding requirement, prior to any proposed future changes in administering the scheme.

**Police Staffing, Stanthorpe**

From Mr Springborg (149 signatories) praying that police officers on transfer from Stanthorpe be replaced with officers of equal seniority, so that no change is made in the ranking and total number of police officers currently employed at Stanthorpe Police Station.

Petitions received.

**PAPER**

The following paper was laid on the table—

Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development (Mr Hayward)—

Marine Incidents in Queensland—Bi-Annual Report for the period 1 July to 31 December 1994.

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENT****Port Authorities**

Hon. K. W. HAYWARD (Kallangur—Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development) (10.05 a.m.), by leave: I am pleased to announce that Cabinet has endorsed proposals to reconstitute the remaining five of the State's eight port authorities as Government owned corporations effective from 1 July. The five port authorities are located at Bundaberg, Rockhampton, Mackay, Townsville and Cairns.

On 1 July last year, three of the largest port authorities of Brisbane, Gladstone and the Ports Corporation became GOCs. The transition of these five port authorities to, and their operation as, GOCs will occur through the implementation of corporatisation charters. I now table these five charters.

The tabling of these documents is the culmination of a reform process which began some five years ago. In 1990, the Queensland port system was the subject of a major review, which resulted in the implementation of a set of Government-endorsed recommendations, which were consistent with the then emerging concepts of corporatisation. There also have been State Government investigations into port pricing and pilotage and conservancy charges. During this period, there has also been the Industry Commission's review of port authority services and activities which supported corporatisation.

The charters of all eight port authorities address three significant areas, namely—

- strategic issues, such as core activities, land holdings and strategic direction;
- commercial disciplines, including commercial rate of return targets, capital structure parameters and payment of dividends and taxation; and
- accountability matters, notably performance monitoring, pricing and market-based asset valuations.

These issues were the subject of extensive analysis and consultation with port authorities, industry and Government departments in relation to the three charters prepared last year.

In addition to these generic issues, each of the five charters contains recommendations which are specific to each port authority. Consequently, the corporatisation process has simultaneously addressed the need for consistency across all port authorities on generic policy matters, while acknowledging that differences among ports requires a consideration of issues unique to a particular entity.

Queensland continues to earn a reputation for competitiveness and efficiency in its ports, and corporatisation is an integral factor in continuing that trend. Corporatisation of ports has increased accountability, improved the planning process and ensured that projects are properly evaluated for commercial viability. Corporatisation has also ensured that infrastructure is demand driven and based on accurate evaluation and forecasts. In that sense, everyone wins under

corporatisation as port infrastructure will be provided to meet port users' needs. Corporatisation also provides the planning discipline which leads to better coordination between different forms of transport. This Government has made every effort to ensure that charges would not rise because of corporatisation. With this in mind, the charters confirm that all existing contracts between port authorities and port users will be honoured, rate of return requirements will be phased in, prices will be monitored and genuine user-funded assets will be excluded from the asset base in deriving rate of return targets. Furthermore, the Government has given a commitment to significant reductions in its own pilotage and conservancy charges over the next three years. These reductions, of the order of 50 percent, will be funded from increases in revenue to Government from corporatisation.

The charters which I have tabled today will not only aid the transition of the ports in becoming GOCs, they will also form the basis for these entities to apply the principles of corporatisation in their ongoing operations. As was the case with the port authority corporatisation charters tabled last year, the charters tabled today take a consistent approach to corporatisation policy, yet have been developed in a consultative manner taking account of the individual circumstances of each of the five port authorities.

#### **MINISTERIAL STATEMENT**

##### **Auditor-General's Report on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island Councils**

**Hon. A. M. WARNER** (South Brisbane—Minister for Family Services and Aboriginal and Islander Affairs) (10.09 a.m.), by leave: I am pleased with the Auditor-General's report this year on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander councils. While there are continuing issues to be resolved, the framework for successful resolution of those issues has been established, and this is clearly acknowledged in the report.

As I have said on many occasions, responsibility for achieving satisfactory audit outcomes rests with the councils themselves. While the Government can assist—and I believe we are doing everything possible to assist—the outcomes achieved will largely depend on the actions and attitudes of councillors. I believe that councillors are now accepting responsibility for improvement, and I congratulate the councils which have achieved an improved audit result. Since the election of

new councillors in March 1994, there has been an emphasis on improved accountability, and I agree with the Auditor-General that this emphasis will have a greater impact in the 1994-95 and 1995-96 financial years.

**Mr Connor** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I inform the honourable member for Nerang that it is generally out of order for members to wave their arms in the air.

**Ms WARNER:** I also take the opportunity to thank the Aboriginal Coordinating Council and Island Coordinating Council for their efforts in assisting their constituent councils to improve their level of accountability.

**Mr Lester:** What about the people who have not been paid?

**Ms WARNER:** If the honourable member listens to the statement, he will be wiser.

**Mr Lester** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the member for Keppel under Standing Order 123A.

**Ms WARNER:** In fact, specific comments about improved council performance appeared in no less than 14 reports. I note that the Auditor-General draws a number of conclusions after an assessment of the overall performance of the councils.

**Mr FITZGERALD:** I rise to a point of order. I refer to the report to which the Minister is referring. It is a report that has just been tabled, and it is a letter to the honourable member. That means that the Honourable Minister is explaining the Auditor-Generals's report.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! There is no point of order. The honourable member will resume his seat. The Minister may make ministerial statements on areas pertaining to her portfolio.

**Mr FITZGERALD:** Mr Speaker—

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! There is no point of order. The honourable member will resume his seat. I warn the honourable member for Lockyer under Standing Order 124.

**Ms WARNER:** For the illumination of the members opposite, who have been in Opposition for so long now that they cannot remember the process, I point out that the Auditor-General sends a copy of the report to the relevant Minister prior to its being tabled in Parliament. From my perspective, we can examine the progressive improvement of

individual councils. The number of councils that are gradually improving is most encouraging.

In view of the length of this statement, I seek leave to have the remainder of it incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

Aboriginal Councils

While significant numbers of councils had qualified reports, some of the comments made by the Auditor-General on the individual audit reports, which have not appeared in his overall report, bear repeating:-

Doomadgee "All involved in achieving this remarkable turnaround are to be commended."

Porpuraaw "Council has shown an overall improvement in its financial management performance".

Lockhart River "If things go along as they have been, the situation for 1994/95 could result in no qualification".

Hope Vale "The financial management procedures have improved since the previous audit and the current council is committed to improvement in this area".

In addition, Yarrabah, Cherbourg, New Mapoon and Napranum continued to receive unqualified reports, and Kowanyama has progressed from a qualified to an unqualified report.

However, there continue to be some areas of concern. Wujal and Injinoo continue to have significant problems with accountability.

While I am prepared to make further efforts to assist these councils, I cannot do so indefinitely. I note that Injinoo has provided a comprehensive response to the Auditor-General foreshadowing an improved performance for 1994/95 and I expect Wujal to do likewise. However, I have instructed the department to carefully monitor the performance of these councils.

The third council of obvious deep concern is Woorabinda. Despite legal advice that we had a very strong case for the dismissal of the council, this was not upheld by the court.

One of the main reasons for this failure was the fact the council, at the time dismissal action was contemplated, had been in office for only a short time. That is no longer the case.

I appreciate that the council has taken action to recruit a financial controller and chief executive officer. However, the task facing the council and its officers is enormous.

Following legal advice, I have written to the council setting out my expectations on the restructuring of council finances and associated corrective action in relation to its financial administration.

Everyone who has a legitimate claim against the Woorabinda Council can expect to be paid, and the council has a responsibility to ensure that this happens. Accepting the fact that the council successfully challenged the appointment of an administrator and has taken alternative action, I must allow that action to take its course.

I will be reviewing the situation at Woorabinda after the council has had time to plan the necessary corrective action. I believe both the State and the Federal Governments would be prepared to assist the council provided they can be assured that the financial restructuring plan is viable and the situation will not recur.

State assistance will not be in the form of a grant which enables the council to proceed happily along its previous path.

Woorabinda Council presented particular difficulties. Up until the 1993/1994 financial year Woorabinda had received unqualified audit reports and was regarded as a model of sound financial administration.

As members would be aware the Government approved a financial administration support package for councils in the latter part of 1994 and this has been outlined in the report of the Auditor-General. As part of that package, Aboriginal councils are able to

- employ suitable qualified financial personnel
- access internal audit services.
- access and receive advice from a committee comprising the Aboriginal Coordinating Council, the Department of Family Services and Aboriginal and Islander Affairs and the office of the Auditor-General.

Of course, as the Auditor-General has observed, the impact of this strategy will not occur until the 1994/1995 reporting period and beyond.

#### Torres Strait Councils

The Auditor-General's report indicates that five (5) island councils had complied with the requirements of the Act in relation to the passage of budgets. Research undertaken in relation to 1994/95 budgets indicates that at least twelve (12) island councils adopted budgets before 31 August, 1994. Once again, substantial positive progress is being made.

The trust funds of each of the island councils were solvent at 30 June, 1994. There were many reported instances of overdrawn projects within those funds, however, it appears that strategies have been developed by most councils to clear the overdrawn balances.

In most cases where material losses were noted, councils have reported those matters to the Queensland Police for investigation. In two of those cases, charges have been laid and the alleged offenders are awaiting court

appearances. Two other active police investigations are continuing at present.

At present, there are nine (9) island councils who employ a permanent full-time accountant/financial controller. Four (4) of those positions were created directly as a result of the Auditor General's findings at the time of audit in 1994.

As part of the State Government funded financial accountability project, which is managed by the Island Coordinating Council, an internal audit service is being provided to every island council at least twice yearly. This commenced in November 1994, with the first round of audits almost complete.

Additionally, professional financial services and/or administrative services are being provided to eight (8) councils. Much of this service is being provided to those councils who presently do not have an accountant/financial controller.

The financial accountability project is operating efficiently and effectively with some obvious results. As an example, the internal audit program has alerted many councils to serious problems which are now being addressed through the various support mechanisms available to councils through this project.

The project is being managed in a structured way by the Island Coordinating Council. This is achieved through a three person local audit committee representing the Island Coordinating Council and the department and Torres Strait Regional Authority.

This committee manages operational functions in the Torres Strait and evaluates compliance by councils with relevant legislation.

Early indications from internal auditors and other support personnel are that there will be further improvement evident in the performance of most councils in the 1994/1995 year.

It is confidently expected that substantial improvement will occur in the ensuing year, as the financial accountability project becomes more streamlined.

A steering committee has been established to provide advice to the Minister and to monitor and direct the project. Membership of the committee includes high level representation from the Island Coordinating Council, the department and the Torres Strait Regional Authority. Representatives of the Auditor General and Office of Cabinet have observer status with the committee.

#### General observations

I am particularly pleased with the Auditor-General's report because as most members would be aware the State Government funded financial improvement program commenced after the close of the financial year now being reported upon.

Additionally, new councillors were elected in the last quarter of the 1993/1994 financial year.

These facts, accompanied by comprehensive amendments to the community services acts which will be introduced into Parliament before the end of June, will provide a framework to enable councils to improve and maintain sound financial accountability.

#### Trust accounts

The Auditor-General has drawn attention to problems with the management of the trust funds of councils which primarily consists of Commonwealth funds. This is useful information and reflects a situation which has existed for a number of years. There will be variations in the trust fund balances from time to time to reflect the receipt and expenditure of Commonwealth funds.

Given the general absence of long term debt in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island Councils periodic fluctuations in the various funds should be relatively easy to manage. However, it is important that councils and the Commonwealth ensure that projects are correctly managed within trust funds.

I am conscious of the problems that councils face in this area. Most Government agencies endeavour to ensure that the progressive release of funds accurately matches project needs.

Regrettably, on many occasions, councils find themselves in a situation where the realisation of funds is late and they are obliged to draw on other funds to meet on-going project requirements such as weekly wages payments. Inevitably, they draw on other credit balances to meet these payments.

The technical breach of the regulations which is now occurring by virtue of constant transfers between funds will be eliminated when the regulations are amended to reduce the number of funds from four to two, with one basic operational account.

The other account would accommodate limited funds of a true trust nature.

However, this will require councils to be extremely vigilant in the management and accounting associated with each individual project.

What the Auditor-General is pointing out, and I agree, is that councils must ensure that they do not over-commit themselves in pursuing worthwhile projects. The most prudent form of management would ensure that each and every project is financially viable in its own right.

However, once again, many Government programs are designed to contribute certain amount of funds to a project with an expectation that councils will make a contributions from their own resources, i.e. the principle of joint or matching funds. Extreme

care is needed in the management of these projects.

I thank the Auditor-General for his observations in this area and the department will work with councils and ATSIC to ensure sound financial management of individual council projects.

#### Business enterprises

The Auditor-General has identified the control of enterprises as an on-going problem.

As every member of the house would know, there is not a single business enterprise in Australia that does not suffer some form of stock or cash shortage at some time or other. People shoplift, employees pilfer, breakages occur. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities are no different. Furthermore, as members of the House who have visited Aboriginal communities would know, the management of these enterprises are even more difficult in these locations.

The other reality of life is that the operation of enterprises is often seen by councils as a means of maintaining employment and subsidising worthwhile activities, rather than simply generating a profit.

I have never accepted that councils are the appropriate body to administer enterprises. Business activities require a different acumen and a different set of operational rules.

The eventual creation of alternative governing structures in communities will address this issue.

However, enterprises which are run by councils for the public benefit must observe basic accountability requirements, and the requirement to produce monthly trading statements is a sound management tool.

One reason for seeking alternative management arrangements for enterprises is the cost of meeting public sector accountability requirements.

A case which illustrates this point is the Pormpuraaw cattle enterprise. Neither my department nor its predecessors were capable of profitably managing this enterprise. Straight accounting wisdom indicates that annual musters are a necessity.

The reality is that the cost of compulsory annual musters far exceeds the most optimistic estimates of potential profit from the enterprise.

#### Summary

This is the most positive Auditor-General's report to date.

The Auditor-General has outlined the framework that has now been put in place to improve the standard of accountability in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Councils.

Clearly, as the Auditor-General has intimated, such a framework would be fundamentally

flawed if it did not have the support of individual councillors. That support is clearly in place in most councils.

Perhaps the most encouraging feature of the report is the commitment of the Auditor-General to finding solutions to the difficulties. The acknowledgment of the actions taken by Government, his willingness to personally discuss issues with councillors and the genuine desire to work co-operatively with my department and others is genuinely appreciated.

However, it would be remiss of me if I did not ensure that a few facts were placed on the record:-

- There will often be greater losses than profits in bank and post office agency operations. If the reverse was the case, the banks would be out there providing the service. It is a high risk, no profit operation.
- Few trading enterprises will ever operate without cash and stock losses. This is no less a reality in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Communities than anywhere else in the country.
- The operation of the Commonwealth CDEP schemes involve massive numbers of employees coming and going, often working irregular hours. The best system in the world could not avoid some problems in the documentation associated with payment of wages.
- People supplying goods to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Communities expect to be paid. They would not accept the absence of supporting documentation as a reason for not being paid. Isolation, carelessness, the absence of appropriate approvals, expediency and a desire to ensure continuing supply means that payments are sometimes made Without the total supporting documentation being in place.

I believe that the Government is correct in demanding high standards of accountability in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island Councils, and I am pleased that this approach is supported by the Aboriginal and Islander councillors.

## PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE OF PUBLIC WORKS

### Report and Transcript

**Ms SPENCE** (Mount Gravatt) (10.12 a.m.): I table the following report from the Parliamentary Committee of Public Works: the *Development of the Teemburra Dam and Associated Irrigation Areas*. I also lay upon the table the transcript of evidence from the public hearing held in Mackay on 5 December 1994.

The Teemburra Dam, now under construction some 70 kilometres west of Mackay, will provide additional irrigation waters to cane farms within the Pioneer Valley. The dam will provide a regular supply of water and will decrease the impacts of future prolonged drought. The dam will also provide water for industrial development, including a bagasse pulp processing plant for paper production and a yeast factory.

The committee has been generally impressed by the project and the manner in which it has been developed. However, the committee has made a number of recommendations in regard to improvements to the project implementation process, the use of demand management and the public access and use of the dam when it is completed.

As I have mentioned before in this House, the decision to inquire into the project was motivated, in part, by the committee's belief that it is important for all areas of the State to be involved in the parliamentary process. The committee was particularly pleased with the high level of local public interest shown in this project, which was evidenced by attendances at the public hearing.

Finally, the committee recognises the very high level of professionalism and commitment demonstrated by the officers of the Department of Primary Industries in their approach to the development of the project. The committee appreciates their efforts in providing comprehensive briefing materials and other assistance which enabled the committee to fulfil its responsibilities to the Parliament and to the people of this State. I commend the report to the House.

### LEAVE TO MOVE MOTION WITHOUT NOTICE

**Mr BORBIDGE** (Surfers Paradise—Leader of the Opposition) (10.14 a.m.): I seek leave to move a motion without notice.

**Question**—That leave be granted—put; and the House divided—

**AYES, 34**—Beanland, Borbidge, Connor, Cooper, Davidson, Elliott, FitzGerald, Gamin, Gilmore, Goss J. N., Grice, Healy, Hobbs, Horan, Johnson, Lester, Lingard, Littleproud, Malone, Mitchell, Perrett, Quinn, Rowell, Santoro, Sheldon, Simpson, Slack, Stephan, Stoneman, Turner, Veivers, Watson  
*Tellers:* Laming, Springborg

**NOES, 47**—Ardill, Barton, Beattie, Bennett, Braddy, Bredhauer, Burns, Campbell, Clark, D'Arcy, De Lacy, Dollin, Edmond, Elder, Fenlon, Foley, Gibbs, Goss W. K., Hamill, Hayward, Hollis,

Mackenroth, McElligott, Milliner, Nunn, Nuttall, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pitt, Power, Purcell, Pyke, Robertson, Robson, Rose, Smith, Spence, Sullivan J. H., Sullivan T. B., Szczerbanik, Vaughan, Warner, Welford, Wells, Woodgate *Tellers:* Budd, Livingstone

Resolved in the **negative**.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Honourable members will resume their seats. South Australia is 1 for 6.

**Mr FitzGerald:** I advise the Government that there will be no quorums called by the Opposition.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### Factional Membership

**Mr ARDILL** (Archerfield) (10.20 a.m.), by leave: This morning, I was named in the *Courier-Mail*. That report was wrong. Mike Kaiser is wrong again. I am not and have never been a member of the SL. The only faction of which I have ever been a member is Labor Unity, and I still have considerable support within that faction. Even during his time, strong man Jack Egerton did not expect blind subservience to the faction as Mike Kaiser's faction apparently does, and the Governor-General can attest to that.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Under the rules for Personal Explanations, the honourable member must show how he has been personally misrepresented. The honourable member is not allowed to debate a matter. He is allowed only to state how he has been misrepresented.

**Mr BORBIDGE** (Surfers Paradise—Leader of the Opposition) (10.21 a.m.): I move—

"That the honourable member be further heard."

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! That is out of order.

**A Government member** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The score is now 2 for 6. I wish I had the power to adjourn the House so that we could go and watch TV. Do I have the power to do that?

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

### Aboriginal Councils

**Mr BORBIDGE** (10.29 a.m.): I refer the Premier to the Auditor-General's report that was tabled in the Parliament today and to the fact that, under his Government, 21 out of 31 Aboriginal councils in Queensland have

received qualified audits—which continues a sorry tale of chronic mismanagement—and I ask: does the Premier endorse the Minister's support for this totally unacceptable and pathetic level of accountability of public funds? Does he still endorse his Minister's managerial competence?

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** There are two parts to the member's question. The answers are "yes" and "yes", but I should also say that I have not read the report, which has just been tabled this morning, so I will certainly—

**An Opposition member:** I understand the Minister has.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** That is because the Auditor-General sends it to the Minister. Is the member so far out of touch with Government that he forgets how it works? I will certainly have the report reviewed, and if I need to add anything to my answer I will communicate directly with the member.

## Minister for Minerals and Energy

**Mr BORBIDGE:** I refer the Premier to the deliberate misleading of this Parliament by the Minerals and Energy Minister in question time on Wednesday in relation to the frequency of mine safety inspections at the Moura No. 2 mine. I ask: what disciplinary action does the Premier intend to take against a Minister who, in any other Parliament, would by convention be expected to resign?

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** I thank the member for the question. The facts are that, in relation to inspections, there were two inspections in August 1993, and they were in fact on consecutive days.

**Mr Borbidge:** What about his misleading the House?

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** If the member is genuinely concerned about this issue, he will listen. In September there were two inspections; in October there were two inspections; and in January there were in fact six inspections. In February of last year there were three inspections; in March of last year there were two inspections; there was one inspection in April; there were two inspections in May; there were two inspections in June; and there was one inspection in July, about two weeks prior to the tragedy that occurred. Those are the figures that were supplied to me by the Minister's office this morning.

As a Government but also as a Parliament, if we are genuinely interested in the issue of mine safety and not simply in exploiting a tragedy for political purposes, then

we should be looking to the inquiry and the results of the inquiry to see what, if anything, needs to be done or can be done to ensure that this sort of tragedy does not occur again. I have also been supplied—

**Mr Borbidge:** That's not the argument. Your Minister misled the Parliament.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** Obviously, the Leader of the Opposition is not interested in the answer. That just shows how genuine he is. One would have thought that there would have been a little bit more decorum when it comes to a tragedy like this.

**Mr BORBIDGE:** I rise to a point of order. I find those remarks offensive, and I ask that they be withdrawn.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** I withdraw the words that the member may find offensive. However, I would say again that question time can always do with greater decorum, and there are some issues to which that particularly applies. I am just disappointed—

**Mr Borbidge:** Particularly when Ministers lie to the Parliament.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** I take a point of order. Is that language parliamentary?

**Mr SPEAKER:** The word "lie" is unparliamentary, and I ask the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw it.

**Mr BORBIDGE:** I withdraw and substitute "particularly when Ministers mislead the Parliament."

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** I was trying to refer to the issue of safety when I was consistently the subject of snide interjections from the person opposite.

As to injury frequency rates, accident incidence rates and accidents per million tonnes or average lost time—there are a range of measures in relation to this particular industry. I think it may be helpful or illustrative to members who have a genuine interest in this matter, of which I am sure there must be some, if I table these particular documents, because what they show, importantly, is that—and I think members will be reassured by this to some extent—over the past 10 years or so, at most times there has been a steady decline in terms of injury and accident incidence rates in our mining industry. I table that material.

I turn now to the question that was asked on Wednesday of this week. It is important that the Minister's answer be understood in the context of the question that was asked. The question was—

"I ask the Minister for Mines and Energy: will he now undertake to employ a full complement of mines safety inspectors as a contribution towards ensuring that no further disasters of this kind occur?"

In other words, the member for Tablelands was asking a question that was quite specifically directed towards the issue of the number of inspectors and the amount of work carried out by them, not the frequency of inspections. I will not read the whole answer out, but the Minister went on to talk about the recommendations and his preparedness to act on them.

He answers the question in terms of the current complement of inspectors positions in the branch being 13. He makes the point that there is one vacant position which is being advertised right around the State and he makes the point that an offer had been made for the vacant position of a mechanical inspector at Rockhampton. He said that position was being advertised right around the State. He gave a detailed and satisfactory answer to the question. To add to his answer—it was not a point in respect of which he was questioned—he went on to address the issue of the number of inspections, of which, as I have said before, there were about 23. He said—

". . . from August 1993 to July 1994, there were 23 inspections at the Moura No. 2 mine by the various inspectors."

That is the key point and that is right. He went on to say—

"On average, that is one inspection every two weeks."

That is clearly an illustrative comment by him.

**Mr Gilmore:** It is an attempt to mislead this Parliament and you know it.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** It is not an attempt to mislead the House because the issue, and if the member is genuine and honest, which we will see as we observe his performance later in question time, would know—or if he does not, he should know—that the issue of inspections is one that is based on the policy. I was advised this morning that they are not a regularly scheduled practice. It is not the policy or the practice to have—

**Mr Gilmore:** Eleven weeks with no inspection in that mine.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** Is the member complaining about the fact that there were six in January? He is not genuine.

**Mr Gilmore** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the member for Tablelands under Standing Order 123A.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** I am advised this morning that the practice is not to have regularly scheduled fortnightly inspections, but the practice of the inspectors is to inspect as required, and, furthermore, to follow up as required when they may have recommended that some action be taken, or to inspect when something is drawn to their attention. That means that the frequency varies.

In some mines there will be more inspections in a particular fortnight or monthly period than in others because it is as required and as determined by inspectors. It is the judgment of the inspectors that counts. This is not an issue of Government policy, that is, there should not necessarily have been fortnightly inspections. If the Minister had been asked a question on the policy, that would have been different.

**Mr Borbidge:** Where is he so we can ask him?

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** He has commitments in Mount Isa.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** With respect, there are two Opposition front bench seats empty. Opposition members should be honest.

**Mr Borbidge:** He goes home every Friday.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** He has commitments in Mount Isa today.

As I was saying, it would be different if the Minister was answering a question on the policy of having fortnightly inspections and he asserted that there was such a policy and that it was being strictly complied with. I think that the member for Tablelands has made a cheap point that is unworthy of him. I believe that the Minister, in answering the question, has acted properly.

#### **Queensland Strike Statistics**

**Mr LIVINGSTONE:** I ask the Minister for Employment, Training and Industrial Relations: can he inform the House of the latest Queensland strike statistics?

**Mr FOLEY:** I thank the honourable member for the question. It is important to note that the strike statistics have been published in a context in which industrial action in Australia has hit a 35-year low, that is, that the ABS statistics indicate that, in 1994, throughout Australia there were only 556

disputes, resulting in a loss of 497,400 working days. That is very important for our international reputation, because to international investors the great turnaround in this country in industrial relations has been very positive. It is significant that those were the lowest figures since 1959.

Under the Goss Government, the average yearly strike rate, that is, the working days lost per 1,000 employees, to December 1994 was 110.47 working days lost—lower than the national average yearly rate of 174.76 during the same period. In contrast, the previous Government experienced a yearly average strike rate not of 110.47 but of 246.23 over a six-year period to December 1989—worse than twice the strike rate. Since December 1989, the strike rate has not exceeded 153, with Queensland experiencing its lowest strike rate in nine years in September 1992, with a rate of 55.

I was puzzled to read the reference in the *Courier-Mail* to a claim by Mrs Sheldon that Australian Bureau of Statistics figures showed that in 1994 Queensland lost 41 days for every man, woman and child. Australian Bureau of Statistics figures show that the June population of Queensland was 3.2 million. If Mrs Sheldon's arithmetic were accurate, in 1994 Queensland would have had to lose 132 million working days. According to the ABS, 130,100 days were lost. That is, Mrs Sheldon's figures are inaccurate by a factor of roughly 1,000. Being lectured by the Liberals on industrial peace is like being lectured by Christopher Skase on financial management.

#### **Queensland's Economic Performance**

**Mrs SHELDON:** In directing a question to the Treasurer, I refer to the comments on behalf of the Evatt Foundation published in the *Australian Financial Review* this morning. The foundation, which is a Labor organisation, rated Queensland last of all States in the delivery of services such as health, education and welfare. In January, another national think-tank—the Institute of Public Affairs—rated Queensland's economic performance second last among Australian States. I quote the article in today's *Australian Financial Review*—

"Organisations such as the Institute of Public Affairs assume that all differences are due solely to efficiency, while the Evatt Foundation starts from the premise that differences in performance are due to policy. The answer must lie somewhere between."

I ask: where does Queensland lie—last according to the Evatt Foundation or second last according to the IPA?

**Mr De LACY:** Or first according to cricket? I am interested in all of the reports that people bring down about Queensland. The IPA is not happy with Queensland's performance because we are increasing spending in the important social areas at a much faster rate than are all of the other States of Australia. The IPA is never happy when any State increases spending. The Evatt Foundation seems to use some of the same statistics but comes to a different conclusion. It says that the Government is not increasing spending fast enough.

The only conclusion one can draw is that it is hard to keep everybody happy all of the time. I can say without fear of contradiction that, if one were to make an objective assessment of the performance of all the States in Australia and rank or give appropriate weighting to the important measures of performance, such as financial management, economic performance, and increasing expenditure in social areas, there is no way that one could come to any conclusion other than—Queensland first and daylight second.

### Tertiary Places

**Mr BUDD:** I ask the Minister for Education: has he seen a media release by the Victorian Minister for Tertiary Education and Training, Mr Storey, in which he states that Victoria has a far greater need for tertiary places than does Queensland? Would it be a travesty, as Mr Storey claims, to reallocate university places away from Victoria to Queensland, and can the Minister explain what action the Queensland Government is taking to pursue Queensland's interests?

**Mr HAMILL:** I have read the comments made by the Liberal Minister from Victoria, who is part of a Government that launched an educational apocalypse in that State with the closure of 159 schools and the sacking of about 2,500 teachers and 300 other educational workers, and who now tries to deny young Queenslanders the opportunity of obtaining their fair share of higher education places. It is an important issue on which the Queensland Government continues to apply pressure to the Commonwealth to ensure that young Queenslanders get their fair share of higher education opportunities.

I had a very close look at Mr Storey's press statement. I find it most instructive that

Mr Storey's own figures showed that more young Queenslanders per thousand population were applying for higher education places in this State than there were young Victorians per thousand applying for higher education places in Victoria. However, even more telling is the fact that, last year, although approximately 90 people in the 15 to 24 year age group per thousand got a place in higher education in Victoria, in Queensland the figure was only 76 per thousand, yet more young Queenslanders per thousand were seeking places.

Although we have 17.7 per cent of the population, this State has only 16.6 per cent of the nation's higher education places. If we were to get justice on our own per capita entitlement, an additional 6,000 higher education places should be available to young Queenslanders. If Queensland had parity with the per capita rate of Victoria, Queensland would have 7,000 additional higher education places. If we are to keep pace with the population growth in Queensland, we need an additional 900 places each year.

The Queensland Government is making and will continue to make strong representations to the Commonwealth. I hope that coalition members also have the intestinal fortitude to stand up for young Queenslanders and not go along with the line that is peddled by their interstate comrades and say that Queensland is some sort of educational backwater and that Queenslanders do not deserve opportunities in higher education.

For Mr Storey, I have a simple message. Mr Storey must feel a bit like Peter trying to plug the hole in the dyke, arguing for more higher education places in Victoria while that State's population is moving to Queensland. I wish that they would bring their tertiary education places with them.

### Safety Inspections in Queensland Mines

**Mr LINGARD:** In directing a question to the Premier, I refer to reports today that frequency of safety inspections in Queensland mines may be as little as once every 11 weeks and to further claims of undermanning of the mine safety inspectorate, and I ask: has he discussed those concerns with the Minister for Minerals and Energy, and what action does he propose to take?

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** On arriving at the office this morning, I sought from the Minister's office clarification on the article in the newspaper and the question that was asked

and answered earlier in the week. Earlier, in answer to the question from the Leader of the Opposition, I provided the House with the information. I have given honourable members details of the inspections carried out in various months during the relevant period. I know that it does not suit the honourable member's argument—

**Mr Lingard:** You've disguised the facts yourself.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** The honourable member is talking nonsense as usual. He is such a stranger to the truth.

**Mr Lingard:** There was no-one there for 11 weeks.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Beaudesert has asked his question.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** It is quite wrong and deliberately untrue to make that suggestion. I have read from the number of inspections sheet that I was provided with by the Minister's office. Earlier, I told honourable members that there were two inspections in August, two in September and so on. I did not suggest that there were any in December or November, because I am not advised that. I said that the practice and judgment of the inspectors is the relevant—

**Mr Borbidge:** That's if there's enough of them.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** In response to an interjection from the member for Tablelands, I mentioned what the complement of inspectors was and said that, as I understand it, there was a full complement, apart from one position which was being advertised.

**Mr Gilmore** interjected.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** The question that was asked previously by the member was answered, according to my information, accurately and honestly by the Minister. The member cannot go changing the goal posts now. In fact, while the members opposite have never been known for their literacy and numeracy, the facts are that 23 inspections over the course of the year is, if one wants to average it out, approximately once every three weeks. However, that is not the policy and the member knows it. There can be only two explanations for the statements of the member for Tablelands in the newspaper today: either he knows that the policy is to have inspections as required and not fortnightly and he is deliberately concealing that from the debate to make a political point, or, alternatively, he is ignorant of the policy and, therefore, he should do some more work to get up to speed in his job.

## Police Resources

**Ms POWER:** Given claims of inadequate police resources by the Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the Liberal Party and the shadow Minister for Police, could the Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services outline to the House whether there have been any improvements in police resources in the electorates of Surfers Paradise, Caloundra and Crows Nest?

**Mr BRADDY:** That is an interesting question in the context of today's question time when the Leader of the Liberal Party asked a question relating to a particular roster having only two, three or four officers—whatever the figure was. We have to view that roster in the overall context of the Caloundra area and the Sunshine Coast. I have examined the figures for Caloundra, Crows Nest and Surfers Paradise to see the difference between what our Government has done and the paucity of resources that was supplied before we came to power.

In relation to the police district covering the Caloundra electorate, in 1989, that electorate was covered by 148 police. The figure is now 248, which is an increase of 68 per cent. In addition, in the general Sunshine Coast area we are about to supply a new \$180,000 Water Police boat. We have supplied permanent police shopfronts in the Sandcastles complex at Mooloolaba and in Sunshine Plaza at Maroochydore. A beat-only version of the program commenced in late 1994, which brought regular foot patrols to Hastings Street and Noosa Junction. If we have supplied 68 per cent more police to that area, honourable members can be assured that there are many more police on patrol than when the lot opposite were in power.

Similarly, in relation to Toowoomba and Crows Nest—in the two police districts that cover most of the Crows Nest electorate, in 1989, under the National Party those districts had 277 police; they now have 391 police, which is an increase of 41 per cent. In addition, ATSI liaison officers have been assigned to Toowoomba and we have established a permanent shopfront in the Village Fair shopping centre at Toowoomba.

As to Surfers Paradise—under the National Party, in 1989, when Mr Borbidge was a Minister, the police district that takes in Surfers Paradise had only 319 police; there are now 483 police in that district, which is an increase of over 50 per cent. At the Surfers Paradise station, we have doubled the police numbers and supplied a massive new headquarters and Surfers Paradise Police

Station. We have a permanent Police Beat shopfront at Cavill Mall and Australia Fair shopping centre at Southport and there have been regular visits to the Pacific Fair shopping centre by the modular version of the program.

The Opposition knows that this Government has delivered the police numbers. They carry on and try to mislead the community.

### Queensland Strike Statistics

**Mr SANTORO:** In directing a question to Minister for Employment, Training and Industrial Relations, I refer to his answer to a dorothy dixer in question time and to his assertion that Queensland is doing better in terms of industrial disputations. In doing so, I remind the Honourable Minister of the figures that were released by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, which show that Queensland, per capita, has the highest number of days lost through industrial disputations.

**Mr Nuttall:** Ask the question.

**Mr SANTORO:** I am referring the Minister to figures that relate to a question. Those figures are 41 per 1,000 head of population compared with 28 for the Australian average, 37 for New South Wales, 19 for Victoria, 12 for South Australia, 16 for Western Australia and Tasmania, 9. I now ask the Minister: in view of those figures, which are the highest in Australia and which have been consistently high for the last seven months, does he really expect this Parliament and anybody listening to it to believe that, for the past seven months, we have done better than anywhere else in Australia?

**Mr FOLEY:** I am delighted that the honourable member for Clayfield at least concedes that the rate is 41 per 1,000 and has abandoned the hapless Leader of the Liberal Party, who claimed yesterday—

**Mr Santoro** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the member for Clayfield under Standing Order No. 123A.

**Mr FOLEY:** He has abandoned the Leader of the Liberal Party, who claimed that the figure was 41 for every man, woman and child.

**Mr Hamill:** He is undermining his leader again, is he?

**Mr W. K. Goss:** It's so unlike him.

**Mr FOLEY:** The honourable Ministers may well be speaking the truth. It is so hard to discern what goes on in the mind of the

members of the Liberal Party. What the honourable member flees from is the simple truth—the truth for the international community to recognise—that Australia generally has hit a 35-year low in disputation. He seizes on the statistics of a few months and he runs from the figures of the past decade and the figures of the performance of the previous National Party Government. He will not be able to flee from those. He will not be able to distort the truth with statistics, because those facts speak well and truly for themselves.

Under the previous Government the yearly average strike rate was 246.23 over a six-year period.

**Mr SANTORO:** I rise to a point of order. My question was very specific.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member has asked his question. Under no Standing Order can he demand the answer he wants.

**Mr SANTORO:** I rise to a point of order. Under Standing Order No. 70 I can ask the Speaker to consider the relevancy of the Minister's answer to the question that has been asked. I ask you to rule accordingly.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The member will resume his seat. I understand the Standing Orders. I call the Minister to answer the question.

**Mr FOLEY:** That is a familiar tactic of the honourable member for Clayfield who, when confronted with the unappealing truth, seeks to deflect attention away from the sad fact of the performance of former Governments of the National and Liberal Parties. He does not like the fact that the average strike rate over the six-year period ended December 1989 was more than twice as bad as the average yearly strike rate to December 1994 under the Goss Government. That simple fact should be driven home to the honourable member. Under the crowd opposite, we saw industrial confrontation. We saw a climate in which cooperation between employers and employees was destroyed, in which they rejoiced in sending the police in to confront trade unionists as they did to confront students and other protesters.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister is now starting to debate the question.

**Mr FOLEY:** I will come to a conclusion. The point I would urge upon the honourable members and members of his party—

**Mrs Sheldon** interjected.

**Mr FOLEY:** The honourable Leader of the Liberal Party complains of patronising

advice. Some people need advice, and the honourable Leader of the Liberal Party plainly needs advice because, if she is continuing to hold by her figures, which were out by a factor of a thousand, she is guilty of invincible ignorance.

### **Joint Fire/Ambulance Facilities**

**Mr BENNETT:** I ask the Deputy Premier and Minister for Emergency Services: what decisions have been made about a joint fire/ambulance facility at the Boyne/Tannum Fire Station and what consultation has taken place?

**Mr BURNS:** I thank the honourable member for the question. In recent days, I have been talking to him about the proposal for joint fire/ ambulance facilities in many areas throughout the State. I start by saying that no final decision has yet been made in relation to a joint fire/ambulance facility at the Boyne/Tannum Fire Station. My department has been considering the practicalities of joint facilities at that station and a number of others as a cost-cutting exercise and to maximise the benefit of the existing facilities.

The station is a fine one and it is underutilised. In September 1993, the assistant fire commissioner for the central region initiated investigations to look at the possible opportunities for the Boyne/Tannum area. We have consulted with the assistant commissioner of the Queensland Ambulance Service, the local district commissioner of the Queensland Fire Service, officers of the Queensland Ambulance Service, auxiliary firefighters and the mayor of Calliope Shire Council. During the consultation process, considerable resistance came from a number of auxiliary firefighters, as they are reluctant to share the facility with members of the Queensland Ambulance Service. Their perception is that they will lose control of their station. Of course, the station belongs to the people of Queensland and, if the local people can benefit from a joint facility, the proposal has to be given serious consideration.

There are a number of points in favour of a joint centre. The station has two bays and one pumper. There is room for two Queensland Ambulance Service vehicles. The Queensland Ambulance Service would locate two permanent officers on a rotating roster at the station. A concept proposal is under consideration and, as I said, the premises are currently underutilised.

If the proposal for a joint facility was not implemented, the current fire station would be

underutilised. A point that warrants additional consideration is that security would be greatly increased night and day. We would have a permanent QAS officer at the station, or at the adjacent residence. So I have asked for sketch plans for a joint facility to be drawn up by the assistant commissioners of the QAS and the QFS to ensure that neither service is disadvantaged. They will both have an opportunity to have a say. Advice is also being sought from Q-Build in regard to the feasibility of alterations or extensions and the cost estimate for it. Once that is done, the proposal will then be given further consideration.

The point to note is that it is still only a proposal. If there are any real, genuine concerns—and I know that the member is talking constantly with the people of the Tannum and Boyne Island areas about this matter—and if anything makes the proposal impractical, the member should draw that to my attention.

### **Minister for Minerals and Energy**

**Mr GILMORE:** I refer the Premier to the misleading statement to this House on Wednesday, 22 March of his now currently absent Minister for Minerals and Energy, which was crafted deliberately to cover up the detail—and I stress, the detail—of the Government's failure to maintain regular mine safety inspections, thereby blatantly misleading Parliament. Further, I refer the Premier to events in April last year when the same Minister was clearly in contempt of the requirements of the Members' Register of Interests by initially failing to disclose earnings of some \$2,000 as a director of the Queensland Country Credit Union, thereby demonstrating a history of deceit in this place. I ask the Premier: in view of his Minister's blatant disregard for the Westminster conventions of this Parliament on two occasions, does the Premier still consider the Minister to be a fit and proper person to remain in his Cabinet?

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** The short answer is, "Yes." The longer answer is that, if the member is to be an effective Opposition spokesman in this area, he needs to do some homework. The issue that he purported to be concerned about on Tuesday and, I presume, purports to be concerned about today, is the issue of mine safety. He says that the Minister seeks to cover up the Government's performance in respect of mine safety. I urge him to have a look at the graphs that I tabled this morning that show a consistent improvement in mine safety performance in this State.

Since tabling that material, I have also been given a note, the contents of which I should relate to the House because they are very instructive in terms of mine safety in recent years, particularly under this Government and Minister McGrady. I am advised that, in less than 10 years, the lost time injury frequency rate—which I understand is the relevant measure—for underground coalmines in Queensland has more than halved. In 1984-85, the rate was 200.

**Mrs Sheldon:** What's this got to do with the question?

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** If the Leader of the Liberal Party had listened to the question, she would have heard the member make the assertion that there was an attempt to cover up the issue of the performance of the Government in relation to mine safety. I know that the Leader of the Liberal Party has a very short attention span, but that was the question.

If anybody on the Opposition side is interested, I point out that the lost time injury frequency rate for underground coalmines in 1984-85 was 200. By 1989-90, it was reduced to 160. It is now less than 80. I am further advised that a recent international study showed that Australian mines were the lowest in the world for fatal accidents per million tonnes mined. The number of accidents per million tonnes of coal mined in underground mines in Queensland in 1985—10 years ago—was 130. Currently, the figure stands at 30, and it is on a downward trend.

I understand—and I think that this is a reasonable assertion for the Minister and his department to make—that the reduction is a direct result of effective inspection and encouragement of the use of modern technology and mining systems, such as breaker line supports and long wall mining. The record shows that under this Minister and under this Government and, in fact, over the last 7 to 10 years or so, Queensland has been seriously and substantially improving its performance in mine safety, particularly in relation to underground coalmining, and it performs very favourably when compared with the mine safety performance of other States.

Moura is a tragedy. We have an inquiry. Let us see what comes out of that inquiry. Let us see what help it can give us as a Government and what help it can give the mining industry as an industry to improve safety wherever we can. If there was any scope for a bipartisan approach, I would have thought that it was in areas such as mine safety and tragedies such as Moura. If there

was any genuine bipartisan capacity on the part of the member who asked the question, he would be prepared to acknowledge that the truth is that the performance in respect of mine safety under this Government and this Minister has improved dramatically. I will not descend to the depths to which the member has descended by comparing this Government's record with his party's record when it was in Government.

### Indy Carnival

**Mrs ROSE:** I ask the Minister for Tourism, Sport and Racing: can he inform the House of the success of the new management structure at this year's Indy carnival?

**Mr GIBBS:** When I look across to the Opposition front bench, I am reminded of the theatre after John Wilkes Booth had performed. It is amazing! During question time, the Opposition has six vacancies on its front bench.

Certainly, I would like to mention the performance of the management team at the Indy Grand Prix. The reality is that people such as Andrew Craig, who is the international president of CART, which is responsible for the overall supervision of Indy, have described it as the most professional management that they have struck at any Indy event on the circuit. That viewpoint has been shared by owners and drivers. When I say "owners", I am talking about the international owners and all competitors who were present at the weekend.

An interesting observation that I would like to make is that, having related that high commendation about the management at this year's event, the Leader of the Opposition earlier this week said that he was going to release the Opposition's policy in terms of the management of the Indy car race. That was on Monday or Tuesday of this week. It is Friday, and we still have not seen it. I challenge the Leader of the Opposition to put forward his management plan for the Indy, because this Government would certainly be very interested in seeing it.

I will tell members why the Leader of the Opposition has not put it forward thus far: he ran into dreadful problems at his party room meeting during the week. I understand that there were very bad problems in his party room meeting during the week because people such as Mr Veivers, who does not come out publicly and support his leader in bashing the event because, privately, he supports it, and Mr Grice, who is absent for

question time but who actually competed in the event at the weekend—

**Mr Hamill:** He's probably still going around the track.

**Mr GIBBS:** I would not say that he is still going around the track, but his head is still probably spinning. In fact, Mr Grice, who competed admirably in the event at the weekend and who actually won one of the feature lead-up races, also supports the event. At the party room meeting during the week, there was a great deal of division. Those members advised Mr Borbidge not to release the management plan.

**Mr BORBIDGE:** I rise to a point of order. For the benefit of the Minister, I point out that it was never raised at the party meeting. The two honourable members that the Minister is quoting helped me to write it.

**Mr GIBBS:** I know differently. Two members from the Opposition's back bench told me about this. The reality is that they did not—

**Mr Connor:** Name them.

**Mr GIBBS:** It was the honourable member. He was one of them. He was telling everybody the other day.

**Mr CONNOR:** I rise to a point of order. I have been maligned. I have not spoken to the Minister for Tourism, Sport and Racing.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I cannot hear a word. The score is 4 for 38. We should keep question time going; it must be having an effect.

**Mr GIBBS:** The member for Toowoomba, who this week supports the event so admirably, said that every penny that had been spent on the event so far should have been spent in his electorate of Toowoomba. There is incredible division among members of the Opposition about this event. Is the Leader of the Opposition afraid to release his management plan for the event? If he is not afraid, he should put it up or come on side with the event and give it his unequivocal support.

The other nonsense that I understand has been doing the rounds—for example, the Opposition saying that, yes, it would release the management plan but to the *Gold Coast Bulletin* only—is not acceptable. If the Opposition is going to release its plan, it has to be available for everybody to see.

**An Opposition member** interjected.

**Mr GIBBS:** Of course it is not acceptable to me. We have become experts

on the event, unlike the novices opposite. I want the opportunity to be able to go through the Opposition's management plan to pick it to pieces. We will be able to tell the people of Queensland the true story about what the alternative would be if honourable members opposite ever got their hands on the event, that is, they would destroy the greatest international event that the State of Queensland has going for it.

### Police

**Mr JOHNSON:** I ask the Minister for Police: as rumours are rife that the complement of four police officers based in Blackall and Winton will be reduced by two at each centre, will he confirm or deny these rumours?

**Mr BRADY:** The question will have to be placed on notice. I have no information available to me now.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! As we now have a different cross to bear, the Minister may decide to write to the member. We cannot place questions on notice in this situation.

**Mr FitzGerald** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! That was not accepted by the House.

**Mr FitzGerald** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! We debated that the other day. We will have question time today.

### Transport Infrastructure Development Scheme

**Mr BREDHAUER:** I ask the Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development: can he outline to the House this Government's recently introduced Transport Infrastructure Development Scheme, and in particular how this program helps communities in remote areas such as Cook?

**Mr HAYWARD:** I thank the honourable member for his question, because I know well of his interest in this matter. The Transport Infrastructure Development Scheme was one of the major new initiatives introduced by this Government as part of the 1994-95 Budget. It is a \$32m Statewide scheme which provides funding for a range of new initiatives and picks up discontinued programs, such as the black spot program, which would otherwise have ceased. Whereas funds were previously targeted for road projects only, this scheme has been expanded to include works on

airstrips, boat jetties, traffic safety works and other minor works, such as bus stop signs.

A key component of the scheme, which is of particular interest to the member for Cook, is the Remote Community Access Package, which targets isolated communities that require an increased level of transport access. About \$4m has been allocated for assistance to remote communities, basically targeting Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community transport needs. Of course, as the member for Cook is aware, a little over \$2m of that has been allocated to far-north and north-west Queensland Aboriginal communities to upgrade and seal access roads and local streets. It is important to detail some of those projects in the Parliament.

There has been \$115,000 to the Aurukun community for road upgrading and access road maintenance; \$110,000 to the Yarrabah community for access and road upgrading; \$180,000 to Bamaga for access road maintenance and paving and sealing community streets; and \$95,000 to the Injinoo community for community road maintenance and sealing. Not only do these projects provide improved access during the wet season, there are obvious health benefits to the whole community as a consequence of the reduction of dust during the dry season.

It is also important to note that this program incorporates some of the Schoolsafe Program introduced by the Government, and allocates \$6m for the continuation of the Safe Bikeways Program. Overall, the Transport Infrastructure Development Scheme provides local councils with funds to undertake a wide range of important works, something that I and this Government believe is essential to the provision of more efficient and effective transport in this State.

### Health

**Mr HORAN:** I ask the Minister for Health: does he have a regional hospital rebuilding advisory board and, if so, who is on that board?

**Mr ELDER:** I do not have those details. I will write to the honourable member and give him that information.

### TAFE Funding

**Mr BARTON:** I ask the Minister for Employment, Training and Industrial Relations: is he aware of a Queensland Teachers Union media campaign about TAFE funding in Queensland, and could he advise the House

about changes in the level of this funding and how it is being utilised?

**Mr FOLEY:** I thank the honourable member for the question. I am aware of the Queensland Teachers Union media campaign about TAFE funding in Queensland, coinciding incidentally with a membership drive by that union. I am aware also of the State Public Service Federation which, as the other interested party in the membership drive, has also taken an active interest in this matter.

I am pleased to inform the House that funding for TAFE institutes and colleges in Queensland has increased by 75 per cent since this Government was elected, providing an extra 17,100 places for students. There will be approximately 388,000 full-time and part-time places in the public TAFE system during 1994-95, including 101,000 adult education places. Looked at another way, there has been an increase of 63 per cent in funding for the whole of TAFE's operations. The increase of 75 per cent refers to the funding used specifically by institutes and colleges, and does not include funding for central administration and corporate services.

By 1996-97, student contact hours are targeted to reach 57 million, more than double what they were in 1989 after the long decades of neglect by the National Party and the Liberal Party, who treated vocational education very much as the poor country cousin and neglected it very seriously. More than \$224m has been spent on upgrading TAFE facilities from Thursday Island to Applethorpe.

The most interesting part of the Teachers Union campaign was its reply when confronted with these statistics. I cite a *Sunday Mail* article of 19 March in which the Teachers Union spokesperson, Mr Mackie, was quoted as saying—

"The Labor Government has increased TAFE funding but this increase has been accompanied and largely nullified by a dramatic increase in student contact hours and in the range and complexity of services TAFE has been expected to supply."

He accuses this Government of using the increased funding to provide more training and a better range of services. I am afraid that is a charge to which I have to plead guilty.

### Green Levy; Small Business

**Mr CONNOR:** In directing a question to the Minister for Business, Industry and

Regional Development, I table a Brisbane City Council letter being distributed to thousands of small businesses such as panel beaters, mechanics and printers. Lord Mayor Soorley is trying to con business owners by pressuring them to sign a blank cheque for the green levy without reference to the costs involved. I ask: given that businesses such as the ones I mentioned will be required to pay up to \$700 a year and others will pay up to \$20,000 a year, does the Minister endorse this fraudulent advice being offered on his behalf by the Lord Mayor, and when will he move to inform small business properly?

**Mr PITT:** It is very pleasing to see the member for Nerang out of the blocks so quickly and asking questions of me in my new role. When I went back through the records of the past couple of years, I discovered that he asked hardly any questions of the previous Minister. He has now asked two questions in two days. The member is improving in quantity, but not quality.

Local governments throughout Queensland are being called upon to provide information to small businesses and businesses in general regarding the proposed environmental licence. The member for Nerang has been running around the State talking about 50,000 businesses being trapped in the so-called levy net. Our information and the information supplied by the Local Government Association is that only 5,000 businesses will be involved. That information is based on the premise that only those businesses that may have some difficulty in meeting pollution impact requirements will be affected. That is where the member for Nerang falls down. He is running around madly looking for large numbers of potentially affected parties in order to justify his agenda.

We will ensure that only those businesses that have an environmental impact will be subject to the licence. The manner in which the Brisbane City Council goes about the business of assessing those businesses that might be affected is its business. To offset council costs, we have granted a 12-month period of grace in respect of the licence for small businesses, to the tune of \$2.7m. It is probably in the best interests of some councils to buff up the figures a little bit so that they can obtain a larger share of that \$2.7m.

#### **Local Government Mergers**

**Mr ROBERTSON:** I refer the Minister for Housing, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Rural Communities to

statements by the Opposition spokesperson for Local Government and member for Callide, Di McCauley, that the writing was on the wall for mergers of a series of local governments throughout Queensland and that the references for those mergers went to the Local Government Commissioner in March 1993. I ask: can the Minister advise the House of the situation in relation to those references?

**Mr MACKENROTH:** I have a copy of the statement that the member for Callide released yesterday in which she claimed that the references would bring about the merger of a number of councils. She went on to name those councils. That statement just goes to show the way in which the Opposition deals in deception and the way in which it tries to mislead the people of Queensland. I find it hard to believe that the member for Callide would have been involved in that press release, so I can only assume that it was prepared for her and sent out by the Leader of the Opposition's office.

The Opposition spokesperson has tried to create the impression in a number of areas throughout Queensland that the Local Government Commissioner is going to look at merging them with other councils. Nothing could be further from the truth. If the Opposition spokesperson had read the references which were tabled in the Parliament, she could have presented the true picture. There is a range of references, but I want to quote from the one that relates to the Shire of Duaringa and the Shire of Bauhinia. In it, the Local Government Commissioner has been asked to look at—

" . . . changing the external boundaries of the area of the Shire of Duaringa by excluding from that area that part of the area known as 'Rockland Springs' (namely lot 8 on Ht219, Parish of Ballamoo) and including that part in the area of the Shire of Bauhinia."

That reference relates to one parcel of land. If the member knew the Local Government Act and the way the system works, she would be aware that the Local Government Commissioner can look at that one parcel of land only. He cannot look at anything else. He cannot recommend a merger. He cannot do anything other than come back to me and recommend that that one block of land be taken out of one shire and placed into another shire or that it should not be moved. That is the only power that the Local Government Commissioner has.

In her statement, the Opposition spokesperson is trying to lead the people of

Duaranga and Bauhinia to believe that the Local Government Commissioner is looking at merging their shires. I do not think that such statements do the member for Callide any service. I have a great respect for the members of local government in Queensland. I am sure that all the councillors in those shires would know exactly what the reference involves. Although some of the people within those areas who may hear the member's statement may believe it, she will gain no respect from local government by releasing statements such as that. It just goes to show the way in which the National Party works.

There is one National Party council in Queensland which EARC did not recommend be amalgamated or even looked at, which PEARC never recommended be looked at or amalgamated and which the Government has never even considered for amalgamation; but almost every second week the mayor of that council talks to representatives from the local newspaper and says, "The Government is looking at us for amalgamation." I am referring to the Mayor of Pine Rivers, Yvonne Chapman. Every second week, someone from the local newspaper rings me and says, "We hear the rumours again." I say, "The rumours are not true." The only people who are spreading those rumours are the National Party members serving on the council. This week, I said to that person from the newspaper, "If those councillors want to keep making this up and if they want us to have a look at them, they should write us a letter and we will do it." We have no intention of looking at the Pine Rivers Shire. That was never a recommendation of PEARC or EARC. However, some people want to try to politicise the office of the Local Government Commissioner by saying those sorts of things.

I suggest that the Opposition spokesperson look at all those references. If she wants to talk about them, she should tell the truth. I know that that is a very difficult concept for members of the Opposition, but that is what the member should be doing.

### **Brisbane Bears; Gabba Cricket Ground Lighting**

**Mr DAVIDSON:** I refer the Treasurer to the fact that the Brisbane Bears are scheduled to play their last two games of the season at the Gabba under lights—round 21 of the AFL draw on Saturday 26 August against the Essendon Bombers, and round 22 on 2 September against the Melbourne Demons. Many Queenslanders believe that the Brisbane Bears will make the AFL finals this

year, and those last two home games will be sell-outs if that is the case. I understand that Ministers and Treasury officers were aware of the need for lights to be installed at the Gabba before those two games were scheduled in the AFL draw. I ask: can the Treasurer give a commitment to Aussie Rules fans, Robbie Walls and his boys that the Brisbane Bears will in fact be able to play those last two games at the Gabba under lights in August and September?

**Mr De LACY:** I am a bit reluctant to give an unequivocal commitment, but—

**Mr FitzGerald:** Would you like to take it on notice and reply to it tomorrow?

**Mr De LACY:** No, I do not want to take the question on notice. Tenders have been let for the supply of the lights. Tenders have also been let for the erection of the stands on which the lights will be placed, and it is proposed that they will be constructed and operating for the last two Bears games this year. That has always been the proposal, and I would expect that that will be the case. I will certainly be doing everything in my power to ensure that that is realised.

I agree with the comments made by the member. I wish the Bears all the very best for this year. It will be a bit of an unsettled season for them, because the major northern grandstand is under reconstruction; but they have accepted that. One cannot have a major redevelopment—and I mean a major redevelopment—of a cricket ground without causing some distress to those who use the ground.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The time for questions has now expired.

## **TRANSPORT OPERATIONS (ROAD USE MANAGEMENT) BILL**

### **Second Reading**

Debate resumed from 23 February (see p. 11059).

**Mr JOHNSON** (Gregory) (11.29 a.m.): The Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Bill before the House will be applauded by most members. It is a rationalisation of transport legislation by the amalgamation of the following six Acts: Carriage of Dangerous Goods Act, Motor Vehicle Control Act, Motor Vehicle Safety Act, State Transport Act, Traffic Act and Transport Infrastructure (Roads) Act.

This legislation is part of the Transport Planning Coordination Plan, and I congratulate the Government on bringing it to

reality. We see before us now a condensation of all the legislation, bringing together some 22 Acts, which will make things more manageable.

The issues in question here deal mainly with road user charges and the implementation of the national road transport concept as of 1 July 1995. This legislation raises many issues, but I would like to refer firstly to road corridors, on which departmental officers again gave briefings this morning. Over the last four or five years, road corridors seem to have been the source of a great deal of controversy in this State, especially under the guidance of the former Minister.

That controversy is due to a lack of consultation and a breakdown in programs. The general community is not being consulted. The people that the corridors affect have valuable assets of which they are proud and for which they have worked hard over a number of years to try to upgrade and retain for their latter and retirement years. There is the eastern corridor, the airport motorway, the Camira bypass—the list goes on and on. My colleague, the member for Clayfield, highlighted the anomalies associated with the airport motorway. He brought to the attention of the general public the Government's exact intentions in relation to that motorway. When the Government has under consideration resumptions and projects that are going to affect people's lives, livelihoods, assets, and quality of life, the consultation process has to be exhaustive. That means that everyone within the community has to be part of that consultation.

The eastern corridor concept has been a real nightmare for the people who live in that region. The Government has tried to please everybody and has ended up pleasing nobody. All of those communities on the south side and towards the Gold Coast are totally off side because nobody knows what the Government will do tomorrow—whether the corridor will be moved again to please somebody else, which will dissatisfy somebody else. There has been very poor management of these arterial roads. The Government should either build that corridor or scrap it. To date, it has not been able to decide.

**Mr Szczerbanik:** Well, we're going to do it.

**Mr JOHNSON:** The member says that the Government is going to build it, but from day to day the corridor is moved. People cannot plan for their future. They cannot go to a bank and say, "We want to borrow money to upgrade our farm", or, "We want to improve

our home." It seems that we are playing politics with this corridor—the Government is playing politics with it, we are not. The Opposition's policy is the upgrading of existing resources. We will utilise existing resources and we will consult with the people in question—and departmental officers will enter into those negotiations. Our policies will be clear so that the people in question will know what is going on. They will find out about changes by reading the newspaper, listening to the radio or watching the television in their living rooms. That is the way that we, as politicians, should act. That is the platform upon which this Government came to power—honest, open and accountable government. That process has been severely hampered by the Government's attitude to the negotiations on some of these corridors.

Chapter 3 of the Bill, which deals with road-user performance and compliance, is very important in that it addresses the issues of quality control of driver fatigue management, which process has been in place for some time now, thanks to the Road Transport Forum. I must congratulate that body for its initiatives and its understanding of road safety, better driving conditions, better transport conditions and, in general, better safety conditions for all the users of the road—not only the heavy transport industry, but also the people who use the family car of a weekend. As one of the departmental officers said in the briefing given to me, 80 per cent of the people who use the roads are fair dinkum, responsible, sound citizens who understand the need for road transport reforms. It is only 20 per cent—and in some cases it is only 5 per cent or 10 per cent—who from time to time cause problems. There needs to be an education program to educate that small percentage of people to ensure that the provisions of this legislation will not suffer from their irresponsible attitudes.

The legislation mentions fatigue management, driving hours, log books and the health of drivers. That is a very responsible part of the legislation, which will make driving conditions in Queensland in particular something of which we can be proud. As I said at the outset, I congratulate the Government for introducing this piece of legislation and for working with the National Road Transport Commission in trying to bring about uniform driving laws and rules and regulations across Australia, which will give us an understanding of the needs of the other States. If we have the same rules and regulations in Queensland, we will understand the laws across State borders.

However, I am disappointed that the New South Wales Government has not agreed totally with the NRTC's concept of the implementation of these programs.

**Mr Ardill:** It will after tomorrow.

**Mr JOHNSON:** The member for Archerfield has a very good understanding of road issues, especially road safety, including numerous other matters that other Government members do not understand. As the member says, yes, as of tomorrow, the New South Wales Government will be re-elected and I believe that it will conform with the other States on this subject. Maybe there is some part of the legislation that that Government does not understand, but I hope that, after the weekend's election, the New South Wales Government will introduce similar legislation, which will lead to uniformity throughout the nation.

Chapter 5 of the legislation relates to vehicle and road use fees. Again, this State is on the verge of adopting the National Road Transport Commission's recommendations. That is another issue that has been adopted by ATAC members. I hope that will be beneficial to this State. The Opposition totally supports that concept. Part 2 of Chapter 5 relates to vehicle operations and road rules. I believe that these have to be uniform across the nation.

I would like to mention the issue of log books used in heavy transports, which is an issue that has been very contentious for a long time. Again, I will refer to the cowboy element, who tend not to care about being on the road for 18 hours or 20 hours without a rest break, meal break or maintenance check. They seem interested only in getting the job done as quickly as possible. Our high road tolls result from that element of society that drives in that manner on our roads. I assure honourable members that the Opposition will support the Government in every way possible to eradicate that element from Queensland roads. When the uniformity comes into being, I hope that the rest of the nation's roads also will be rid of that element.

I turn to the question of driving hours. I believe that Cabinet has discussed that matter. I was told that a minute went to Cabinet in relation to the manifests that consignors of goods give to drivers. For example, if a truck with a load of produce leaves the Rocklea markets tonight and the produce is transhipped to, say, Cairns, there is no doubt that that truck cannot reach its destination without the driver having a break. Many operators do not fill in logbooks showing

the appropriate breaks. If they were to do that, they would not be able to reach Pindi Pindi north of Mackay in the specified time.

I understand that the department and the Government are considering a proposal that the consignor presents to the driver of a vehicle a manifest that will show the transport inspectors or the police, if that vehicle is pulled over, exactly what time the driver left and what time he should arrive at his destination. The Government should introduce more of those measures to bring some credibility and sanity back into the operation. Big players in the industry have spent countless hundreds of thousands of dollars upgrading their operations to make sure that they are reliable, responsible and profitable businesses. Therefore, they will not tolerate that cowboy element. All 89 members of State Parliament must ensure that the laws are upheld to get rid of that element totally. I will do everything in my power to make sure that it happens.

The department referred to the issuing of drivers' licences under the NRTC program. That is a great concept which will provide Australiawide uniformity. We are all proud of that. Those with licences issued before this date will not be disadvantaged. Under the new form of licensing, people who obtain a licence for a truck are also licensed to drive a car or a lesser vehicle. The new structure will enable people to more easily understand what the licences represent.

The issues addressed by the legislation are of major importance to the State as a whole. Chapter 5 covers vehicle and road use fees, vehicle operations, vehicle management and driver management. I covered that topic fairly well when I referred to the NRTC concept and State Ministers attending the ATAC meetings. The legislation will ensure that those issues are addressed.

I turn to road funding. It is appropriate to speak about the review of road funding because funding is fundamental to the subject matter of the Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Bill. It is no use having good driving laws, good vehicles and good quality everything else if the State does not have quality pavements on which those vehicles can be driven. The Western Australian Minister for Transport, the Honourable Eric Charlton, put forward the concept of "Fix Australia, Fix the Roads". I hope that the Minister and the Queensland Government will support that concept. It has a lot of merit.

The concept is Commonwealth driven, and it is up to the Commonwealth Government to provide the funding. Mr

Charlton stated that the Commonwealth Government should—

"Provide capital works funding for special road expansion programs and special road projects—major urban and rural projects".

Funding should be provided not just for urban projects. In this nation, the needs of rural areas are as great as those in urban areas. Goods that are produced in rural areas and usually processed in urban areas generate value-added benefits to rural areas and to urban areas in export earnings.

Those special road projects should include the elimination of black spots and the provision of tourist roads. I hope that the Minister takes notice of that and reintroduces the black spot program. That program had a lot of merit and provided many benefits for this State. Because of the enormous size of this State, the roads are not easy to manage and maintain.

In this State, tourism is the growth industry. In time, it may be the State's leading industry. It is good to see the former Minister for Transport in the Chamber. A moment ago, I paid tribute to him for some of the initiatives in the legislation. I applaud Mr Hamill for it. I know that we did not always agree, but we agree on this one.

**Mr Hamill:** Mr Johnson, I am now working more in the area of super-highways—information super-highways.

**Mr JOHNSON:** Yes, the Minister can talk about super-highways and super-classrooms. Later, we will talk about some education issues in the Gregory electorate and in the north-west region, but I must return to the legislation before the House.

The Commonwealth Government should also set a road-user charge as a fixed proportion of the Federal fuel excise and allocate that revenue for roads. Over the past three years, the Federal Government has cut considerably the road funding to the nation as a whole. It has been reduced from \$1.2 billion two years ago to \$1 billion last year and \$850m in the current financial year. That is a totally unacceptable figure to allocate to the road maintenance and road-building program that must be implemented every year.

The Queensland component of \$170m is a totally unacceptable figure. When this year's Budget is brought down, I trust that the new Minister can extract considerably more money from the Federal Government. This nation will rely heavily on Queensland roads. In the past few years, this State as a whole has made a

major contribution to the income earnings of this nation.

I suggest also to the Minister that the Commonwealth Government should continue to provide untied funds to help the States fund recurrent road expenditure. That issue is applicable to our local authorities, which form a very important part of the road-building and road-maintenance program of this State. Many people think that local authorities exist only to provide for garbage, water, power and whatever else services. However, they play a very responsible role in road maintenance, and I trust that that is recognised by the Government. I hope that the Federal Government continues to provide untied road funds to help the States to fund recurrent road expenditure.

The provisions of the legislation raise numerous issues, some of which I will address at the Committee stage. We must make sure that the legislation will be beneficial to the whole of the State, not just the south-east corner. The legislation should address driving rules and the condition of road pavements, whether it be in Brisbane, Bamaga, Mount Isa or wherever, so that the State can be proud of its road transport system. I urge the Minister for Transport to take up with his Federal colleagues and his State counterparts the important role that the State of Queensland is playing in the Australian economy. I believe that this State deserves more money for its roads so that the existing pavements can be upgraded and new ones built, because that is absolutely vital to the future wellbeing of the State.

I shall touch briefly on the issue of volumetric loading of livestock transport vehicles, which for many years has been a plus for this State. I thank the Government for maintaining that system, which is absolutely vital to the livestock transport industry in this State because of the huge distances our livestock hauliers have to travel when hauling stock from western and northern Queensland to the markets. A new avenue is now open to the livestock industry—especially the cattle industry—which is exporting huge numbers of livestock through the ports of Darwin and Karumba. If the Minister has not already visited that area, no doubt in time he will understand what the magnitude of that project will be, especially when the Norman River at Karumba is further upgraded to enable further exports from that centre. Those ports are vital to the livestock industry in the north.

Returning to the subject of volumetric loading—it is paramount that we have full

retention of that system. I understand that the South Australian Government has now introduced volumetric loading into its law. That will be beneficial for that State, because Queensland has common boundaries with South Australia. Road transport vehicles do travel from Queensland to South Australia, especially down the Birdsville Track to Moree. Western Queensland cattle are taken to the market in Adelaide because it is closer than the Brisbane market. It is beneficial for producers in the western part of the State to take advantage of markets—whether they be in Adelaide or Brisbane. It is very gratifying that the South Australian Government has introduced volumetric loading.

I understand that the Department of Transport is investigating the upgrading of volumetric loading of B double tri tris, and I believe that is on trial. I trust that the Minister sees merit in that system and that it will not be too long before volumetric loading of B double tri tris is legalised. That is absolutely vital to the livestock industry around the downs, Kingaroy and central Queensland, where one sees many of those configurations in line. I believe that it is only a matter of time before that does become law. I hope the Minister can expedite that process, because that system would be beneficial not only to the operators but also to the cattle industry, and the benefits would flow down the line. I hope that concept will become reality before too long.

I would like to speak to numerous other parts of this legislation, but Opposition members will cover those at the Committee stage. The Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Bill condenses six other pieces of legislation into one strategy. I particularly mention the awarding of contracts to contractors from outside a locality. That is a subject about which I want to talk to the Minister at a later date.

In relation to road contracts that have been let to contractors from other areas of the State, for some time I have pushed for local authorities to be given the opportunity—whether it be under their own quality assurance or under the supervision of the Department of Transport—to carry out some of those projects, because it is paramount to keep the money for those contracts in the western and northern regions so that those centres can benefit from the roadworks or other projects. One particular project comes to mind. In the next couple of weeks, many members will drive to Winton for the centenary of *Waltzing Matilda*. They will witness the work that has been carried out by the Department

of Transport at Jessamine Creek at Winton. Much of that work has been performed by contractors who live in that region and whose work has been overseen by the Department of Transport. They have done a super job. I believe we have to keep local expertise working on those sorts of jobs so that the local authorities remain operational and viable. When those sorts of contracts are awarded, it is paramount that locals be allowed to do those jobs if they submit a tender that is reasonable when compared with those of outside tenderers. We are about keeping this State operational and viable. Some western and northern centres deserve their fair share of those projects.

**Mr T. B. Sullivan:** What percentage tolerance do you think should be given if it is not the cheapest quote? What tolerance should be given to the locals?

**Mr JOHNSON:** That is a very good question. The honourable member has been a member of the Public Works Committee, and I think he inspected that project at Winton. I believe that a tolerance of 10 per cent or 15 per cent would be realistic. The Government needs to consider where the money will be spent when those projects are completed.

**Mr Elliott:** And the quality of the job.

**Mr JOHNSON:** Absolutely! Returning to the honourable member for Chermside's question—I believe that we have to be realistic about this matter. If a local tender were half a million dollars higher on a project that was estimated to cost \$8m or \$10m, I believe that those locals should be given a fair chance to have a go at that tender. I believe that the Government and the Department of Transport will be responsible in this matter, because the expertise to carry out that work exists in those areas. The honourable member for Chermside knows that the contractors who worked on the Jessamine Creek crossing at Winton did a super job. That project is equal to the best in Queensland.

**Mr T. B. Sullivan:** And maybe the day labour from the local authority could be used for some of the contract work.

**Mr JOHNSON:** Absolutely! That is what it is all about—keeping some of those local authorities operational and viable. I will not speak any longer to this piece of legislation. I thank the Minister for allowing the Opposition a briefing on this legislation. In particular, I thank Mr Neil Doyle, Mr Stuart Nicol, Mr Arthur Diack and Mr Paul Blake from the Department of Transport for their briefings to the

Opposition. Those briefings were in-depth, open and accountable. I thank the Minister and his department for them.

**Mrs EDMOND** (Mount Coot-tha) (11.58 a.m.): I rise to support the Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Bill 1995. The Bill provides the administrative framework to allow for the implementation and successful enforcement of nationally uniform transport laws as part of the national road transport reform agenda. One of the first sets of nationally uniform regulations to be introduced will be the mass and loading regulations which will provide for the management of vehicle weights and safe loading requirements. It is this latter issue which I would like to elaborate on today.

The practice of overloading and inadequately securing vehicle loads not only jeopardises the safety of road users but also costs the Government millions of dollars every year in damage caused to road infrastructure. Industry efficiency is also severely affected by damage to equipment and delays. Every year we see tragedies and near misses occurring on the road because of inadequate loading and inadequate restraints.

Last year I drew the attention of Parliament to tragic circumstances surrounding one such accident that involved a young constituent of mine. In that incident, pieces of broken brick fell from a truck and smashed through the laminated windscreen causing shocking injuries to the passenger's face. The bones around her eyes, cheekbones and nasal bones were smashed, necessitating ongoing surgery to refashion her face and minimise disfigurement. She also needed extensive dental work to her badly chipped and broken teeth. Obviously, if the driver had been hit by the brick and similarly knocked unconscious and severely injured, there would most likely have been a double fatality car crash.

In this particular case, the bricks had been packed and secured by a common method, that of using steel tension straps on a pallet and pallets stacked on a truck without any covering material or truck sides for ease of loading and unloading. The steel straps frequently seem to cause fractures of the bricks and, once a brick is broken or dislodged, the tension strap is no longer effective in holding the bricks together and increasing numbers of bricks are loosened and can fly out.

Not long after this terrible accident, I read of the similar tragedy that caused the death of Bunny Pearce, the Rugby League player. In

that case, a two-metre length of angle iron smashed through the windscreen and hit him in the chest after falling from a truck. I have since read of similar serious and fatal accidents in other States caused by non-secure loads.

I would like to say that these are isolated incidents and that they came about because of unusual circumstances. However, this is not the case. I regularly hear complaints from motorists and residents about debris or goods falling from poorly secured loads. Motorcyclists and pedestrians have particularly complained about gravel and dirt flying at them from uncovered quarry trucks.

While some transport operators do comply with traffic regulations and ensure that loads are so arranged, contained, fastened or covered that neither the load nor any part of it will fall or otherwise escape from such a vehicle as stipulated in the traffic regulations, other carriers show minimum concern. Existing provisions under the Traffic Act and the Transport Infrastructure (Roads) Act have been inadequate in dealing with the appropriate restraint of loads. Certainly, it would appear from observing truck loads that, to the operator, the relative importance of safe loading is in direct proportion to the value of the load. Electrical goods, for example, are packed with all care, Cheap loads, such as bulk quarry materials, are packed with a minimum concern that approaches negligence.

Operators have excused this carelessness on the grounds of time efficiencies and saving money without any regard to the very high costs involved in an accident and, of course, the immeasurable human costs. The cost of prevention by either plastic binding, tarpaulin coverings, truck sides and tailgates would be minimal. One of the difficulties has been the lack of clear guidelines for the safe carriage of loads, and this has been addressed by the development in Queensland of the national load restraint guide, which the Minister jointly launched last week, or the week before, with Senator Neil O'Keefe. This guide will become law in Queensland under the provisions of the Bill before the House today, and I recommend it to all members of this House. I draw their attention to it because it does clearly set out appropriate measures for load restraints.

This Bill will provide transport inspectors throughout Queensland with the necessary authority to effectively enforce the safe loading aspects of the mass and loading regulations not only as they relate to heavy vehicles but

also to private motorists. It is important to reinforce the message that even private motorists on their way to the tip need to be just as aware of the importance of safe load restraints as commercial transport operators.

The broadening of the powers of transport inspectors to include the authority to enforce load restraint regulations is considered to be vital if the new national code is to be effectively implemented. The two key elements of the Government's approach will be to, firstly, supplement existing police enforcement activities in this area; and secondly, through ongoing education and awareness campaigns, provide the public with a greater awareness of the road safety implications of driving insecurely loaded or overloaded vehicles. I really commend those moves to improve the safety of loading in Queensland. In the past, I have indicated and I will continue to stress to the Minister that I believe that the fines for having insecure loads are totally inadequate, and I will be urging that those fines be reviewed and increased. I cannot stress just how strongly I feel about this issue and I totally support the steps taken in this Bill.

Another important matter addressed by the Bill involves improvements to the management of disabled parking. In 1994, this Government introduced a revised disabled parking scheme, which addressed many of the concerns which had grown up surrounding the previous arrangements, including provision for two-tiered permits and the introduction of temporary permits. Public consultation at the time called for changes to the relevant legislation to ensure able-bodied motorists did not abuse parking bays provided for the disabled. Amendments to the Traffic Act embodied in this legislation fulfil the promises that the Government made to improve this situation. I commend this Bill to the House.

**Mr LAMING** (Mooloolah) (12.05 p.m.): It gives me pleasure to speak to this Bill and to reiterate what other speakers have said about the importance of infrastructure planning for operations. The green Explanatory Notes referred to the importance of public consultation, and no-one would disagree with that. It is most important because it is the people in various areas outside Brisbane, particularly those a considerable distance away, who are most concerned and perhaps have a lot of input to make on suggested improvements to our road infrastructure system. Consultation is very important. Recently, in common with everyone else in my electorate, I received a brochure from the

department that outlined some of its plans for the future. Over the last couple of years, this broader consultation process has been relatively good. There is just one aspect of it that I would like to draw to the attention of the Minister and that is that when public meetings are being held in members' electorates, that the members be advised in good time. Actually, one meeting is scheduled to take place next Monday night at Maroochydoore. I queried the other four members who represent the Sunshine Coast, and none of them were aware that this meeting was to be conducted. Earlier this week, an advertisement notifying people that the meeting will be held appeared in the *Sunshine Coast Daily* when we were all down here at Parliament. Had I not had the advantage of having that advertisement faxed to me, neither the other members nor I would have been aware that that meeting was to be held. There might be those members of the Government who would say that that is of no concern to members, that it is public consultation and that the Government is going through that process. However, as I have said before, particularly at meetings about the SEQ 2001 process, it is most important that members know when public meetings are being held in their areas, because those public meetings are ostensibly to address the concerns of the public.

When members of the public have concerns about State Government activities, State Government resourcing, State Government capital expenditure, State Government services, who do they ring in the first instance? I am sure that Government members will agree with me when I say that they ring their local member. It is not only embarrassing but also it is counterproductive to improving services in Queensland if the local members are not advised of those meetings and, if possible, either attend those meetings or send a nominee. I am anticipating an interjection and I will accept it.

**Mr Hollis:** How do you get the public to attend these meetings?

**Mr LAMING:** The interjection was not what I expected. How do we get the public to attend? I think the process of advertising is a reasonable approach. Unfortunately, members of the public have a degree of apathy about these matters. They leave them to their elected representatives and expect their elected representatives to take them up on their behalf. I thank the member very much for that comment. It makes it even more important that the elected representative is advised of those meetings. I will not thrash

that point to death. I think that it has been made adequately. Certainly, I will be attending the meeting next Monday even though it means that I have to travel to the coast and back. However, it is important. I feel very strongly about public transport, and I certainly think I should be at that meeting.

Last year, I had occasion to conduct a public meeting on public transport. I take the opportunity to express my thanks to Mr Greg Goebel for attending that public meeting. Public transport is an emotive issue, and most people are critical of it. Public transport is not terribly good in Queensland and, for a variety of reasons, on the Sunshine Coast it is perhaps even worse than average.

**Mr Johnson:** We'll make it better.

**Mr LAMING:** I take the interjection of the shadow Minister; we intend to make it better. Mr Goebel fielded some quite difficult questions from the people at that meeting. The Minister might pass on my thanks to him when speaking to him next. At meetings such as these, it is necessary to talk about long-term planning. This is particularly important for the Sunshine Coast so that we avoid the mistakes that have been made in the past. Because Queensland is growing so rapidly, we have to project our long-term planning.

My next subject is one that I have raised before. Predictably, I have brought it up again. I refer to the need for a new arterial road into the Sunshine Coast to duplicate the Nicklin Way. The Transport Department is looking at this issue, but it is being delayed somewhat by the considerations of the SEQ 2001 process. One planning process is perhaps getting in the way of another planning process. I suspect that the Minister might respond in exactly those terms. I do not think there is any doubt that we need an extra arterial road.

Once again, I repeat my call for a rail link to the coast. Although my call might seem early—and I am talking about the next two or three years—I suggest that we at least set aside the corridor now, because there is no way in the world that we will not have a rail link to the coast early in the next century, if not before. If we do not have a corridor, it will create difficulty and frustration for the people who will suddenly have to be bought out. Additionally, it will also be more expensive. We should try to avoid those problems.

The same problems have been experienced in relation to the new road to the south coast. In particular, in semirural areas people buy a place in the expectation that

they will never be bought out or have a road or a railway very close to their homes. However, people would not mind as much if they were told about these things in advance.

**Mr Hollis:** Have you read this?

**Mr LAMING:** I cannot quite read it from here.

**Mr Hollis:** It is the discussion paper called Towards an Integrated Regional Transport Plan.

**Mr LAMING:** Yes.

**Mr Hollis:** Do you know what it says in that?

**Mr LAMING:** I want to get through this.

**Mr Hollis:** It says "other possible areas on the north coast"—the Sunshine Coast.

**Mr LAMING:** Okay, I will accept the interjection. However, the point we are making is that the people who own the land along the corridor have not been advised. I believe now is the time to do it. It is okay to state that in the brochures, but we need to make that happen.

More and more, the Sunshine Coast will become a residential area. A lot of people already commute to Brisbane, in particular those on the southern end of the Sunshine Coast. More people will be commuting between the coast and Brisbane and we will have to avoid congestion on the roads. At the moment, at times the traffic on the Bruce Highway is slowing down to a crawl. The problem is not far away.

The other aspect is that we need to avoid pollution by motor cars. In spite of the change to unleaded fuel, we cannot assume that we are not polluting the atmosphere. That fuel has some problems and to an extent causes pollution. We need to look at the pollution angle. That is my three-pronged argument in support of a rail link to the Sunshine Coast.

Often, I have spoken about the toll road debacle on the Sunshine Coast. I have written to the Minister about this issue. I will not take up too much of my time reiterating the old arguments, suffice to say that the conditions on the Sunshine Coast are not suited to a toll road. I know we can say that the former Government introduced it. I had the same point of view at that time, and it has not changed. The fact of the matter is that the road structure on the Sunshine Coast, which is very well engineered, is used by people in their normal, daily business. Some people have to go through toll plazas six or seven times every day—going to work, school and they will soon be used to attend university. People use the

roads to take the kids to preschool and to pick them up and take them to football—backwards and forwards. I cannot get from my home to my office without travelling on the Sunshine Motorway. Of course, I can avoid the tolls, which I do, but that is not the point.

**Mrs Woodgate:** You mean thing.

**Mr LAMING:** I take the interjection from the member for Kurwongbah. Is the member saying that the majority of people on the Sunshine Coast are "mean things"? When the honourable member next visits the Sunshine Coast, she should not tell her neighbours that we are mean things, because that would not be very neighbourly.

I would like to bring another matter to the attention of the Minister. I do not believe that the Minister is aware that I have been approached by the Sunshine Coast branch of the SES. Unlike other emergency services, the SES is unable to utilise the toll road without paying a toll, in particular during emergencies. An exemption is available to the police and the ambulance, but not to the SES. The usage of the roads by the SES is not very high. SES vehicles are not used for private transport; they are used only during training exercises and emergencies. At this stage, they attract a toll. I am reliably informed that on one occasion SES members were turned away from a toll plaza because they had no money. They had to turn around and find an alternative route. If it were not so serious, it would be humorous.

I have written to the Minister for Emergency Services about this issue. For the assistance of the Minister for Transport, I will table those letters. I have heard that there may be some changes to the emergency services legislation. However, I was not prepared to wait, because it would be a tragedy if we had a calamity on the Sunshine Coast and the SES ran into this problem again. I wrote to the secretary of the Sunshine Motorway Company, who said that during emergencies SES vehicles would be able to use the motorway without attracting a toll. I thank him for that. However, considering the number of times the motorway would be used, I would like the Minister for Transport to intercede so that that privilege and courtesy can be extended to SES vehicles during training. As is the case with football, during emergencies people play as they train. SES officers should be able to train exactly as they would operate during an emergency.

**Mr Beattie:** Let's hope that applies to cricketers today.

**Mr LAMING:** I was not aware that it was an emergency.

**Mr Beattie:** It will be if we lose.

**Mr LAMING:** Yes.

In relation to the motorway, I wish to discuss road noise. This issue arises in other areas, but I am aware only of the instances in my electorate. There is a lot of noise from main roads where traffic moves along at 80 kilometres per hour or 100 kilometres per hour. Similarly, this is the case with the Sunshine Motorway. I understand that there are two levels of noise permissible on roads in built-up areas. The first applies to cases in which the houses were there before the road, and the other applies when the road was there before the houses. Although the department has to have some guidelines, I question whether it is fair to categorise two levels of annoyance.

If people are caused annoyance by having road noise in their street—and that is understandable and acceptable—does it make any difference whether those people were living there after or before the road was built? I know that the debate goes along the lines of, "They knew the road was there", and so on. Although that might be so, I am sure that we can find other examples of where the legislation is even-handed, even in cases of pre-existing nuisances. Again, I have written to the Minister on this matter, as I will do again. I believe that people have a right to be heard. They have the right to have this policy of setting two levels for decibel readings for prior and later residents to be reassessed.

I turn to passenger safety and, in particular, the safety of standees on school buses that travel on open roads at speeds above 80 kilometres per hour. That issue was investigated by the Travelsafe Committee, and it made certain recommendations. The committee report states—

"A Federal project using simulated crash testing is under consideration. Queensland Transport may participate in this project, but in any case will have access to the results."

I ask the Minister: did the Government participate in that project, or not? Either way, are any results yet available? Recommendation 9 of the committee was that standees not be permitted on vehicles travelling at speeds greater than 80 kilometres per hour. The report stated that that issue will be examined in the light of safety benefits as well as safety risk. I find that unacceptable. I am most concerned about school students standing in buses that travel at 100 kilometres

per hour. I am aware that this issue affects many students on the Sunshine Coast, particularly those at Mooloolah, who have to travel all the way to Beerwah on the old Bruce Highway, which is not a safe road. I consider that to be an unsafe practice. I ask the Minister to provide the latest information on that issue. In the case of buses travelling at high speeds, the issue needs to be addressed with some urgency.

Public transport is an important issue, particularly on the Sunshine Coast. I am aware that new provisions for public transport are to be made, but I understand that they may take five years to implement. I ask the Minister to indicate when we will start seeing improvements in the public transport facilities available to residents of the Sunshine Coast. Five years is a terribly long time. I understand that the contracts for those services have either just been let or are about to be let. I have two specific questions. Firstly, will the Government subsidise a level of service that will be acceptable to the people, because if we do not have—

**Mr Nuttall:** Did you blokes do this while you were in power?

**Mr LAMING:** Government members always talk about looking forward. I am looking forward right now. I ask: will a level of service be introduced that will encourage people to use public transport? We have to break the current cycle. If the service is not of a particular standard, people will not use it; and if people do not use it, the service cannot be improved. At some point, that cycle has to be broken, and I believe it is the responsibility of Government to do so. I believe that the Government also has a responsibility to undertake a massive public education campaign to encourage people out of their vehicles. I am aware that that is the intention of the department, but I ask the Minister to outline the way in which that campaign will be conducted and whether it will be full blooded.

I turn to the issue of disabled parking, which was mentioned by the member for Mount Coot-tha. It appears to me that the new system has been a disaster.

**Mr Johnson:** It works against the disabled.

**Mr LAMING:** It actually works against many people and has caused many problems. There might have been a very good case for two levels of permit, but that system has been implemented very badly. In addition, the application of a \$10 fee has annoyed many people, and many people have not paid that

fee. The time limit has now expired, and many people do not intend to pay. That is very sad. Disabled people have enough to put up with, and the imposition of such a fee is extremely unfair.

**Mr BEATTIE** (Brisbane Central) (12.24 p.m.): I rise to support the Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Bill, which represents the most fundamental reform of road use and traffic law in Queensland since the Traffic Act was first implemented many years ago. When the Traffic Act was first passed into legislation, motor cars shared the roads with horses and horse-drawn vehicles in great numbers. High-speed private car travel, reliance on the road freight industry to keep the economy moving and the extensive use of buses for passenger services were developing trends on which the law-makers of that time only speculated.

Over the years, our road transport law has served us well, responding to growing concern about road safety, growing numbers of vehicles and drivers and different environments and road-use activities. As we now reach the middle of this decade and look to the year 2000 and beyond, it is time to put in place a legislative framework that will serve us well into the next century, as the Traffic Act and its related legislation have done in the past.

This legislation is all about taking us into the next century, and it will achieve that objective. It will provide for a strategic approach to managing road use into the next century and, most importantly, will enable us to deal with the many challenges and issues that confront us. Those challenges include the present excessive reliance on private vehicles. We need to encourage more people to use public transport such as rail. Traffic congestion is a particular problem on roads in my electorate. For example, Kelvin Grove Road was widened only three or four years ago. At that time, it more than adequately handled traffic volumes, but already the road is congested. We also must grapple with vehicle pollution and greenhouse issues. Because of the geography of the south-east corner, those issues present specific problems, and I will return to them later.

Other challenges include: the safety of high-risk road users; mobility and access difficulties for some community members; improving the efficiency of the road transport industry; population growth; and the opportunities offered by new technologies. I am not suggesting that we can resolve those challenges overnight—and we will not—but we

do need this modern, performance-based legislation to enable us to address adequately these modern-day issues. This Bill will allow comprehensive policies to be developed in each of those areas and then enable an effective management regime to be put in place through regulation. One important aspect is the strategic planning framework set up within this legislation. To achieve this, the Bill provides for the development of road use management strategies, the preparation of implementation plans for these strategies on a regular basis, improved consultation and development of these strategies and programs and guidelines to assist the Honourable the Minister and the chief executive in making decisions under this legislation.

Importantly, this legislation provides for accountability by requiring road use management strategies to be tabled in this House and implementation programs to be made available to the public. In addition, the annual report of the Department of Transport will include a report on implementation of the road use implementation program for that year as well as a report on how effect has been given to the guidelines applicable to the Minister and chief executive in developing and implementing policies. I am certain that all honourable members will appreciate the significance of these initiatives in providing accountability in relation to the strategic directions for the management of road use in Queensland. This process will provide valuable information to this Parliament and the public on the strategies to be employed by the Honourable the Minister through the Department of Transport in responding to current and future challenges for the road system. This is a good example of open and accountable Government, to which this Government is committed. In due course, I look forward to consigning to the archives the horse-and-buggy legislation which this Bill replaces.

Roads are a quality-of-life issue in my electorate of Brisbane Central. When I talk to my constituents, amongst the most important issues they raise are public transport, the use of vehicles and where roads will go. It is my duty in this House to represent those concerns and issues in debates on legislation such as this. As members would be aware, I am a member of the Minister's legislative committee, and I regularly raise these issues at that level.

The State Government recently launched a discussion paper on the Integrated Regional

Transport Plan in which the transport implications of our population explosion are canvassed. Some of the data makes fascinating reading but also rams home the concerns that residents in my electorate hold and the concerns and challenges that confront Government in the next 10 to 15 years and beyond. We should examine some of those statistics. In 1991, the population of south-east Queensland was about 1.94 million. In the year 2011, the population is expected to be 3.05 million. The projected population increase will lead to an increase in the number of car registrations by as many as 500,000—that is, half a million more vehicles—and an increase in transport trips of more than 80 per cent, which means that the number of kilometres travelled by motor vehicles in the region could more than double by the year 2010.

When looking at these daily trips—it is very disturbing that 76 per cent of daily trips in the region are made by car, while only 6.5 per cent are made by public transport. That gross situation is totally unacceptable. We need to increase the number of daily trips made by public transport. If daily car trips are combined with an expected population increase of 60 per cent in the next 16 years, it is obvious that we are heading for serious social and environmental problems if we do not change our ways—that is, a commitment to public transport—and we do not do something about the problems that currently exist.

Because of south-east Queensland's climate and geography, the potential for air pollution is greater than in most other cities in Australia. This is another problem of concern to people in my electorate. The seriousness of this problem is underlined by the fact that motor vehicle emissions are responsible for 45 per cent of all air pollution and 34 per cent of contributions to greenhouse gasses. South-east Queensland's climate and geography create a greater potential for air pollution than in most other cities in Australia, and unless there is a shift towards public transport, the region will be confronted with extremely serious air quality problems, with pollution and greenhouse gas emissions doubling by the Year 2011.

**Mr Johnson:** There's more to Queensland than the south-east corner.

**Mr BEATTIE:** Of course there is more to Queensland than the south-east corner, I just happen to represent a very important part of the south-east corner, and I intend to represent the views of that area here.

**Mr Johnson:** You haven't recognised it yet. When are you going to recognise it?

**Mr BEATTIE:** The member does not need to tell me how big this State is; I grew up in north Queensland. When the member was running around the city, I was a bush boy.

**Mr Johnson** interjected.

**Mr BEATTIE:** The member might learn something if he listens. He should sit back and relax; it will be good for him. As I said, the seriousness of this problem is underlined by the fact that motor vehicle emissions are responsible for 45 per cent of all air pollution and 35 per cent of contributions to greenhouse gasses. Contrary to what the Opposition spokesman has said, because of the geography and climate, the south-east corner faces particular problems. That is why the south-east corner needs particular strategies to resolve them.

Past Governments have failed miserably in public transport planning, and many city and shire councils in the seventies and eighties too eagerly allowed semi-rural development to occur without any adequate social infrastructure planning. That is the problem we are confronted with today. That is why from time to time there are suggestions made about putting roads through my electorate, about which neither my constituents nor I are terribly excited. That is why this Bill is so important; that is why this legislation is so important.

We are tackling those long-term planning issues which coalition Governments did not do for 32 years. That is the problem. Had the National Party introduced legislation like that introduced by the Minister and had long-term planning, the sorts of difficulties being experienced in my electorate, and indeed in the south-east corner, would not be happening.

**Mr Johnson:** I will take that point. That is constructive. But the other point I make is: we've got to get it right now. We're not addressing 20, 30 or 40 years; we're addressing 100 years here.

**Mr BEATTIE:** I accept the need for long-term planning—that is a positive contribution—but we need this legislation to do it.

**Mr Johnson:** I agree with you.

**Mr BEATTIE:** I appreciate the member's support for the legislation; it should be acknowledged.

The State Government has the responsibility to deliver the infrastructure and

facilitate the transport services that we need to accommodate the growth and to ensure our quality of life for the future. In other words, it means ensuring that our residential population, as well as the 1,000 people a week who are moving here and future generations, have an opportunity to find employment or go about their lives with the freedom provided by an effective and efficient transport system. It means that existing industries can expand and be competitive both at home and abroad without destroying the quality of life of the people who live in the south-east corner.

The Government's solution to some of the problems that I have outlined is based on an integrated, coordinated transport network and options for commuters. That, of course, is important. It involves building some new roads, but upgrading existing infrastructure, building new railways and improving other public transport, in particular, buses and encouraging bicycle use.

As I have said on previous occasions, roads alone are not the total solution to our transport needs and, in one view, by no means the main solution. That is one of the reasons why this Government has spent an enormous amount of money on rail services. It has spent a massive \$340m on an expansion program which will connect Helensvale later this year, and Robina in 1997, with the Citytrain network. The train will travel at speeds of up to 140 kilometres an hour and the journey will take less than an hour.

**Mr Johnson:** How much are tickets?

**Mr BEATTIE:** That will be worked out, but it will be quite reasonable. It will probably be around \$10. That is quite a reasonable amount of money to pay for that trip. In conjunction with the expansion of the Helensvale line, there is expansion to the Citytrain network. In a \$142m project, Queensland Rail is excavating four additional tunnels which will allow QR to increase its capacity by a massive 80 per cent, and also build the inner city rail link, I would hope, which would provide for an extra station at Normanby, extra facilities and a station to service the Royal Brisbane Hospital, all of which my local residents and the nearby institutions would be delighted to see.

The Government has also recognised the growing interest in cycling by commuters with the expansion of the bikeway network. Since 1989, the Government has spent millions on the upgrading of bicycle tracks in the inner city area and in the region generally. The Safe Bikeways Program has encouraged some

commuters to leave their vehicles at home and take up pedalling to work and recreation, especially children, whose cycling safety has been enhanced between home and school. An 80 kilometre network now exists and provides an environmentally and healthy alternative to commuters.

This Government has also made significant advances in the area of public transport. Our reforms in the bus industry at the Gold Coast have resulted in more services, particularly in off-peak hours, and an expansion of present services. Our goal has been to revitalise the system, thereby delivering more frequent and better services. It is an initiative that aims to encourage more people out of their cars and into buses. That has to be, and will be, the central focus of the strategy.

It is worth mentioning in some detail the upgrading of rail services because this has particular ramifications for reducing pollution, it is environmentally friendly and looks after the constituents in the inner suburbs; and it reduces the demand for extra roads. The inner city quadruplication works completed to 31 December 1994 are extensive. For example, they include: tunnels between Central and Brunswick Street, contract cost \$22.2m; retaining walls and tunnel portal at Gipps Street, contract cost \$2m; tunnel portal at Creek Street, contract cost \$800,000; formation of the widening of Brunswick Street to Bowen Hills, contract cost \$2m; site clearing of old Roma Street goods yard site; provision of passenger information display systems at three inner city stations; foundation strengthening of two buildings, contract cost \$2m.

The major inner city quadruplication contracts, which commenced on 1 January 1995, include: construction of two tunnels between Central station and Roma Street and bridgework at Roma Street. That contract was awarded in September 1993, with completion anticipated in March 1995. Excavation of both tunnels was completed in July 1994. Lining of the arches of both tunnels is complete, which had a contract cost of \$15.9m. The contract for reconstruction of Roma Street station was awarded on 11 November 1994, for completion in 1996—contract cost \$28.4m. Contracts for supply of lifts and escalators for inner city stations and three Gold Coast stations were awarded in October 1994—contract cost \$5.2m. Contract for provision of power signalling for the inner city area was awarded on 31 August 1994 for completion in mid-1996—contract cost \$15.8m.

Consultancies for design and documentation for upgrading concourses at Central and Brunswick Street and additional platforms at Central station are under way. There are material supply contracts for train indicator equipment, track materials and overhead traction equipment. Tenders have been called for telecommunication equipment and installation. Additional quad tracks are targeted to be operational from Christmas 1995, with overall completion by May 1996. Heritage investigation of the original Roma Street station building for preservation and restoration is complete and detailed design is under way. Total project expenditure to the end of November 1994 was \$61m. So this Government is tackling these issues head-on and putting its money where its mouth is.

There are problems which remain, such as the Brisbane City Council's inner city bypass, which involves the upgrading of Gilchrist Avenue to Breakfast Creek Road and associated work. That is a Brisbane City Council project. I am pleased to see that the local community has come up with a plan for the Bowen Hills area. That is a very imaginative plan and I congratulate the two local community groups involved and the local residents for it. I will be supporting it where I can. That type of community consultation has delivered where it has been asked to. They have come up with some very good ideas. Problems do exist. There are now delays at the Gilchrist Avenue, Bowen Bridge Road and Campbell Street intersections. Over a period, they must be sorted through. We must reduce traffic movement, including heavy vehicle movements, through the inner city. No doubt, that will happen.

I conclude by making a general comment that attitudes towards public transport must be changed. We must be much more supportive of it than we were in the past. I was interested to read a couple of comments made by conservative politicians overseas which show what we must avoid here. We need a totally opposite approach to that reflected in those comments. One comment was made by the British Minister for Transport, Steven Norris, who had the poor taste to say that a lot of smelly people travel on public transport in London. That is a disgraceful attitude.

He said—

"Let's be honest—people do smell. And a lot of people generate a lot of smells. The aroma of a morning rush-hour crowd, the amalgam of the scent, of soap, of fresh sweat, of stale sweat, of dry-cleaned clothes, of dirty clothes and

strap-hanging armpits, can be an off-putting start to any day."

That is the worst attack on public transport that I have ever heard in my life. It came from the British Minister for Transport—a gentleman named Steven Norris.

**A Government member** interjected.

**Mr BEATTIE:** He is a tory, exactly. We must discourage people such as him expressing those types of views. That was not all. The British Department of Transport also employed a gentleman named Roger Freeman who, a few years ago, said that, come rail privatisation, there would be a whole range of travel classes, from the luxurious business class right down to cheap and cheerful services for typists. That represents a condescending approach to public transport. Those are attitudes of yesterday. We need much more progressive attitudes for the future. I know that the Department of Transport and people in Queensland certainly do not have those archaic British attitudes.

I congratulate the Minister on the introduction of the legislation. I am delighted that it has been introduced. I know that it will be supported by all members.

**Mr SANTORO** (Clayfield—Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party) (12.42 p.m.): Before commencing my speech, I congratulate the Minister on his promotion to the Transport portfolio. I am pleased to see him there. I look forward to working with him, particularly as some very sensitive transport matters are current within my electorate.

Today, I will talk about an exercise to plan road-use management on the north side of Brisbane. I refer in particular to the Brisbane Inner Northern Suburbs Transport Study that is currently being conducted by Ove Arup & Partners, a firm of consultants appointed by the Queensland Transport Department. Honourable members would be aware that that study was instituted by the department under instructions from the Goss Labor Government following the scrapping of plans to develop the now infamous airport motorway.

Many within the communities that I represent in this place have come to regard that transport study and the consultation process associated with it as a charade and an attempt by the department and the Government to safely carry the issue of major roads through my electorate past the next election date, which is expected some time between July and September. That view is developing within my electorate not because

my constituents are deliberately cynical about the way in which Governments and politicians operate but because of the way in which the Government has gone about its business of planning and announcing major road projects, such as the airport motorway, within my electorate and because of the way in which the transport study is being conducted.

Given the limitations that we as members placed on ourselves today and given that the issue has been widely canvassed and debated within the Parliament and, equally importantly, within my local community and throughout greater Brisbane, I will not revisit to any great extent the issue of the leaked airport motorway plans. However, members and the general public will appreciate the leaking of the motorway plans by a conscientious whistleblower and the significance of the Government's denial of the plans detailed within the leaked pamphlet and the eventual revelation through FOI documents that the Minister and other Labor politicians, including Labor politicians on the north side of Brisbane, knew all along and for many, many months prior to the leaking of the pamphlet of the Government's dastardly plans about the motorway.

That is one reason for the cynicism about the Government's transport plans within my electorate. The experience clearly shows that the Government and its members simply cannot be trusted when it comes to telling them the truth. The other reason relates to the perceived and real deficiencies that exist with the Brisbane Inner Northern Suburbs Transport Study. Before detailing those deficiencies, I pay a tribute to the members of the Airport Motorway Action Committee, a genuine, hardworking, community group of local people who came together shortly after the airport motorway pamphlet was leaked to spearhead the community's opposition to the Government's airport motorway plans.

That hardworking committee, ably led by Mr Nick Allen, has been meeting week after week since the airport motorway plans became public. Not only did they stop the motorway, but they are now also coordinating community input into the Brisbane Inner Northern Suburbs Transport Study. The members of the committee and the many other members of the local community and the public who attend the meetings of the committee have sacrificed many an hour that would otherwise have been spent with their families or in their businesses—and all of that to look after the public and community interest. On behalf of the community within the

electorate of Clayfield, I thank the members of the Airport Motorway Action Committee for the valuable work that they have already performed and for the hard work that they continue to perform.

Recently, AMAC made a submission to the consultants conducting the transport study and expressed what I thought were many well-founded reservations. I wish to detail briefly those reservations and to ask the Minister to instruct his senior departmental advisers to look into those concerns, for, as a result, it may come to pass that the Minister and perhaps his department may come to appreciate what I perceive will be the real need to assess the conclusions of the study in the light of those concerns and the deficiencies of the study.

One of the main community concerns about the transport study relates to the type and range of options that the firm conducting the study is asking the community to consider. I wish to quote directly from the submission by AMAC to the transport study, within which those concerns are very constructively—I stress, constructively—expressed. Within its submission, AMAC stated—

"There is significant concern in the community at the very superficial nature of the Options that have been presented and the fact that only 'supposed' Transport Advantages and Transport Disadvantages have been considered. In the particular case of the Road Based Options, there is a perception that they concentrate on problems that the modelling does not show to exist, while no option has been offered for problems which have been mentioned in the Working Paper such as the capacity of the Nudgee Road and Kingsford Smith Drive intersection. Having identified a potential problem such as this, surely it is your role to propose options to cope with it rather than to merely forecast that it will result in 'rat-running' through alternative routes."

The Airport Motorway Action Committee, which comprises many people with specific expertise, went on to address the very specific issues of the road-based options. They made particular mention of the option which incorporated what are commonly referred to as the east-west links, the Shaw Road connection and the inner city by-pass. I agree totally with AMAC when it says in its submission—

"There is considerable disquiet that the road based options identified in the

Working Paper are largely 'major' in scale and that other combinations or minor treatments have not been presented. Given that it is predicted that the study area itself is anticipated to be subjected to negative, if any growth, there is a strong resentment of major developments that may be proposed to accommodate demands resulting from through traffic. Such feelings are particularly strong in the case of any developments which do not follow existing road alignments as would be the case with the East-West Link to Junction Road and with development of the so-called Northern Arterial Corridor. These are seen by many in the community as 'An Airport Motorway by Another Name'."

The Minister can see that there exists within the community real concern about the intentions and possible hidden agendas of the Government. I must admit that I share those concerns and again say to the Minister that the communities of Eagle Junction, Woolloowin and Kalinga will, for what I hope the Minister finds understandable reasons, not accept a major road-based solution that may result from the study. That is not because they are selfish and are disregarding the needs of greater Brisbane, but because they believe that the solution to the current transport problems of Brisbane should be equitable and the burdens shared by the broader community.

That is why the people in my electorate welcome the recent release of the Queensland Transport discussion paper titled Towards an Integrated Regional Transport Plan for South East Queensland. However, some of them share my view that it is a bit cynical of the Government to release that document, which is laudable in its intent, so close to an election. The discussion paper outlines several fundamental principles. In view of the restrictions that I mentioned earlier, to which I am very happy to subject myself, I will cut down on the number of items that I will extract from the paper.

The issues paper states—

"If new roads are needed, they must only be considered after there is maximum consultation and community input, especially having regard to the environmental, social and economic impacts and benefits of any new developments."

The issues paper then defines another fundamental principle when it states—

"All transport planning must take account of the social impact of any proposed changes and allow for community input at all stages of the process. This includes giving the community a say in long term planning which determines what sort of transport system we have."

Further, under the heading "Minimising the Impact of Transport on the Environment" the discussion paper states—

"The population growth predicted for South East Queensland means that current transport patterns are not environmentally sustainable. We need to build an environmentally responsible transport strategy today for tomorrow's generations."

Of course, those principles are supported not only by me but also by many constituents who are always prepared to be constructive in the case that they present to the transport study and to this Government. In fact, within their submission to the study they comment and put forward public transport-based options, including the reinstatement of the Eagle Junction-Pinkenba rail line. Surely, they ask, in order of preference, rail would come before any form of road-based transport.

As to the call for the establishment of an airport railway line—AMAC believes that there is a strong feeling in the community that a rail link to the airport should be developed from the Pinkenba line. AMAC claims that this would eliminate any impact on Kalinga Park and the problems associated with the development of a flood-free, grade separation at Sandgate Road. The submission refers to express rail services. I hope that the Minister studies this option. In relation to that option—I quote directly from the AMAC submission, which states—

"The suggestion that all trains run express from Toombul to Bowen Hills has been ridiculed! Apart from the fact that there are a number of schools that are serviced by Eagle Junction and Albion Stations, we reiterate that surely in order of preference, rail would come before any form of road based transport.

Further, as it is a committed project, the benefits of the quadruplication of the rail line to Northgate should be taken into account. One of these benefits should be the ability to schedule additional express services over that section of the rail network without having to deprive passengers who catch trains from the

stations in between Toombul and Bowen Hills."

The community that I represent is very genuine in its attempts to come forward with solutions. Members have spoken extensively about solutions. In the interest of brevity, I will not outline them again. The biggest problem that the community I represent has with the study relates to the consultation process. This issue has been raised extensively by the shadow Minister and the member for Mooloolah, so I will quote only briefly from the AMAC submission. It states—

"A significant number of the community have expressed to the AMAC executive their dissatisfaction with the community consultation process. A probable reason for this is that the scope of the consultation has not been consistent with the community's perception of the need for participation."

That is the key word—"participation". The submission continues—

"It is likely that this has come about because of the meaningless exercises in which the participation of the community has been sought at the workshops, they being the establishment of the criteria to be used by the consultants in assessing options and then the categorising of those criteria into strategic and project categories. This is being seen by a good number of the participants as an exercise in reinventing the wheel, as such criteria have already been well-defined in terms of reference from any impact assessment study. This dissatisfaction has been exacerbated by the widely held view of the inadequacy of the options that have been put forward to date."

That particular sentiment has been expressed not only by AMAC but also and, more importantly, by at least three dozen constituents who have rung me. Many of them have also formally written to me expressing reservations about the conduct of that study. If the Minister has had his ear to the ground—and I understand that his officers have consulted with some of the locals—he will appreciate that I have deliberately refrained from condemning in any way that particular study or the way that it has been conducted, because I wanted to make sure that the community did not take a lead from me and not participate. I wanted maximum participation. However, I need to be fair and represent the views of my constituents. The expressions of criticism of that study have been many. I have written directly to the

compilers of that transport study about some of the more strident criticisms that have been put to me.

Recently, I received a submission from an organisation called New Ways Not Freeways. When I mentioned to one of its members that this particular Bill was on the table of Parliament, that person was very surprised and was unaware of this. I do not say that in any carping, critical way. However, I suggest that the Minister keep that group in mind when introducing legislation of this type, because that group seems to be sincere and well intentioned. It gave to the Opposition a series of points that are critical of the flaws in the original legislation. I am pleased to note from what the shadow Minister has told me that some of that criticism has been addressed in amendments to the legislation. I commend the Minister for that. I believe that the Minister would do everybody a favour if he made legislation available to that group, because it is composed of a great number of people who have specific expertise in transport issues. The Government and the community generally would benefit from that expertise. I thank publicly the members of that group for making those points available to Opposition members and, through us, to the Minister.

I could discuss many aspects of the Bill, including the modelling deficiencies that are contained within the transport study. I will table part of the letter that the Airport Motorway Action Committee forwarded in relation to the transport study. I had intended to quote extensively from that letter, but I will not. Instead, I invite the Minister to consider it.

I conclude my remarks by stressing the enormous damage that this issue is doing to real estate values in my electorate. Much of the uncertainty that exists in the affected area arises from the issue being unresolved and people's belief that it will still be unresolved beyond the next State election. I urge the Minister to take into consideration the views of the large number of people who have undoubtedly written to him. I am in possession of letters that have been written to the consultants conducting the transport study, the Premier and the Minister. I intended to quote from those letters in order to add a human dimension to the concerns that have been expressed to me and the Government, but all I need to say is that the Minister is aware of what I am talking about.

A hiatus in real estate transactions exists in my electorate; people fear a decline in real estate property values. Some people want to move into the area, and others want to move

out and get on with their lives. I urge the Minister—whilst exercising caution through consultation and consideration of the community view—to get to know what that community view is and act accordingly to restore certainty to real estate values and transactions in my electorate.

I thank the House for its indulgence in allowing me to present the concerns of people in my electorate. I commend the Minister for the positive contents of the Bill. I support the shadow Minister and look forward to the Minister's reply to the points that I have raised—if not in his official reply in this House, then through correspondence.

Sitting suspended from 12.58 to 2.30 p.m.

**Mr FENLON** (Greenslopes) (2.30 p.m.): I rise to support the Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Bill. In so doing, I would like to highlight the important initiative embodied in this Bill that implements a performance-based approach to regulating road use. Queensland is at the forefront of reform in the management of road use, particularly in implementing a performance-based regulatory philosophy for the transport industry. That philosophy emphasises the results that the Government wants to achieve and provides flexibility in how the required level of performance is achieved. For too long the approach to regulations in the road transport industry has been to prescribe a range of compliance requirements on the industry in relation to vehicle standards and operations to ensure that safety standards have been achieved. Regrettably, meeting compliance requirements such as vehicle inspections and limiting driving hours tends to become the standard in substitution for the outcomes sought originally. Instead, the important outcomes of operating vehicles in a safe condition at all times and not driving whilst fatigued are overshadowed by the need to meet the tangible requirements to pass annual vehicle inspections and operate within driving hours limits.

The progression in this legislation to a performance-based approach that clearly states the outcome the Government requires will focus the attention of industry and Government alike on the safety standards that vehicle owners and operators are required to meet. The Government has also moved to address the issue of vehicle safety through a greater emphasis on random vehicle inspections. This approach is an effective monitoring and compliance mechanism to support the performance-based approach,

because it tests vehicle safety when vehicles are in operation rather than at a static annual inspection.

I am very pleased that the recommendations of the Travelsafe Committee—of which I was a member—in relation to annual vehicle inspections were adopted by the Government. That committee's philosophy is continued in this legislation, because the committee gave great consideration as to whether or not to adopt annual vehicle inspections or random vehicle inspections.

Essentially, the approach that is now followed in Queensland tends to try to change the behaviour of motorists. I am sure that all members are supportive of the change that has occurred in people's attitude towards drink driving. Emphasis has been placed on changing people's attitudes and behaviour so that they comply with the law and have respect for it. People's attitudes have changed, and they now know that if they do not comply with the law, they have a chance of being caught and fined. They have also adopted a broad social conviction not to drink and drive. In the case of this legislation, people's behaviour is more industry specific; it is a modern and advanced approach which, ultimately, will be foolproof. We cannot have inspectors looking over people's shoulders throughout their lives ensuring that they comply with regulations. Good government is about minimising regulations and achieving broad social compliance with all sectors of the law. This legislation is consistent with that overall philosophy.

One important aspect of introducing performance-based standards is that this enables industry to have some flexibility in demonstrating that the required standard has been met. Queensland is actively pursuing opportunities to assist the industry to achieve efficiencies in how compliance with standards is achieved and demonstrated. That will have a number of benefits, including improving the efficiency and competitiveness of the transport sector, with a flow-on benefit to Queensland's international competitiveness. So we are certainly ensuring that what is being done is consistent with the overall economic objectives of the State. Further, it will reduce the cost to industry of compliance, thereby making industry in this State more competitive. As I indicated before, it will also reduce the degree of regulation and burden and ensure that Government resources can be utilised more effectively, including targeting areas of non-compliance, thereby creating a greater

chance of achieving higher levels of compliance with the regulations.

Queensland is at the forefront of developments in implementing a performance-based approach to regulating access to the road network and reducing the plethora of permits and licences required to operate a road transport business. The last thing that people in the industry want is to be immersed in regulations and requirements. They want to get on with their job without the daily requirement of obtaining permits to undertake specific trips. That is especially evident in the progressive approach taken towards managing access to the road network for large vehicles such as road trains and B doubles. For some time, those vehicles have used an approved network of roads and contributed towards an improvement in the efficiency of the transport sector, particularly in relation to serving rural industries and people in remote areas.

Until recently, all operators of vehicles were required to obtain annual permits to operate over approved routes. That proved to be a time-consuming and expensive process for both industry and Government. Recently, the Transport Minister implemented a gazettal system whereby vehicles registered as road trains or B doubles are able to operate over approved routes in accordance with established conditions without the need for a specific permit. That system, which is referred to as an as-of-right access, provides for substantial penalties for travel outside the conditions or off the approved routes. That ensures that the safety of all road users is maintained. The publication of the approved routes and conditions in the *Queensland Government Gazette* will make the required performance standard clear and readily available to industry and Government. That will lead to improved outcomes, including the safe use of roads by all road users. That approach is a positive example of the benefits to industry and Government alike from adopting a performance-based approach to regulation that will be progressed under this Bill. I support the Bill.

**Mr HEALY** (Toowoomba North) (2.39 p.m.): The Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Bill is a unique piece of legislation. Basically, it appears to put the finishing touches to legislation which has been passed in this House during the term of this Parliament and which covers a wide variety of transport issues. Apart from minor changes to the Marine Safety Act and some additional miscellaneous provisions within the proposed

amendments, it appears that the main thrust of the Bill is to bring Queensland into line with the recommendations and provisions in relation to national road reform and national regulations as adopted by the NRTC model and subsequent ministerial council recommendations. As other Opposition members have said, the Opposition has no real problems with that procedure.

This afternoon, there are a couple of things on which I would like to comment fairly briefly. I would like to bring to the attention of the House, and in particular the Minister, the transport issues in my electorate that stem from provisions contained in this legislation.

Over many years, Toowoomba has steadily become a real transport industry centre. In particular, the western side of my electorate and the electorate of my colleague the member for Toowoomba South have become home to many successful and quite large intrastate and interstate transport industry businesses. I refer to companies such as Hiles, Neil Mansell Transport, Lill and Alexander, Marrs, Simons, John Kelly and Sons and many more, which have their major base, if not their only base, located in the Toowoomba area. By their expansion into the Toowoomba area, they have demonstrated their belief that Toowoomba's future is very secure as a transport industry facilitator. I am sure that the names that I have just mentioned have been seen on highways right throughout Queensland and interstate by members of this House.

I also note that one of the regular users of major highways in the south-east corner that emanates from the Toowoomba area is Higgins Thoroughbred Transport, which regularly transports some of Queensland's finest thoroughbred racehorses from the Toowoomba area—and Toowoomba is rich in terms of thoroughbred racehorses—to the racecourses around south-east Queensland. Companies and operators such as these will benefit from the recommendations of the NRTC and the National Transport Forum—NTF—and from the provisions enshrined in this legislation.

In particular, I refer to the sections of the Bill that will be of benefit to the industry. After receiving a fairly comprehensive briefing from departmental officials this morning, I think there are sections that will be of benefit to the industry, particularly those in relation to alternative compliance and road user performance.

I make special mention of the Fatigue Management Program. Under initiatives such

as alternative compliance, if a transport operator is prepared to do the right thing he may be rewarded with a form of self-regulation in relation to those regulations. For any business, be it in the transport industry or any other industry, there is nothing worse than being completely bogged down in red tape in fulfilling obligations that Governments in general impose on them. However, with alternative compliance, it may be the case that for successful operators the use of logbooks may be bypassed in view of some sort of self-regulation. This will necessitate the company doing the right thing by the Department of Transport and by its own employees—for example, in relation to driver safety, vehicle inspections and driving hours. That is one provision in this piece of legislation and in the other pieces of legislation that it blankets that will probably please most people within the transport industry.

I would like to refer also to the provisions of this Bill in relation to road use and vehicle management, in particular those concerning the identification of vehicles. This morning, in the briefing that we received from Transport Department officials, I was surprised to learn of some statistics in relation to certain types of vehicles which show that they are not as dangerous as we would probably perceive. This morning, I raised the issue of mopeds. Most members would realise that anyone who wants to ride a moped can do so on our roads with a normal driver's licence. Riders are not required to hold a motorbike licence. In some areas of Queensland, mopeds appear to be quite dangerous. Interestingly, statistics are showing that this type of vehicle is not as prominent in road statistics and crashes as we might think. They look pretty dangerous. Maybe it is the accidents they cause when other vehicles try to avoid them that is the problem. Maybe the statistics would shed some light on that. If mopeds are identified as being in the same class as other vehicles on the road—and under this legislation they can be—that is probably good.

Another provision in the Bill attempts to quite rightly address the concerns of members on this side of the House which were aired last year in another debate concerning the powers of authorised Department of Transport officers when it comes to inspections, seizures of vehicles and random roadside checks. This legislation perhaps goes some way towards addressing the concerns that members on this side of the House expressed in that debate last year. If we are to have inspections by Department of Transport officials, it is important that those officials are able to be

identified, that they are uniformed and that they do, and are able to, show identification. When conducting inspections, their vehicles should be clearly identifiable. Those were the concerns that were aired last year. Under this Bill, those concerns have been addressed. I appreciate the fact that the Government has listened to those concerns and addressed them to some degree.

Road use in my electorate and in electorates surrounding mine have been in the news of late, particularly since the Department of Transport is making further headway into plans for the location of the second road crossing of the Toowoomba Range. In the lead-up to any future announcement, I urge the Minister to examine the representations that were made by certain interest groups to the previous Minister. No doubt the same approaches will be made to this Minister. I have aired this very important subject before in the Parliament. The second range crossing will be a massive project, and it will hopefully reduce the number of transport operators that need to use the centre of the city to transport their produce to the port of Brisbane or into Brisbane itself. Hopefully, it will also reduce the number of carriers from Melbourne and Sydney going through Toowoomba. After passing through the city, they must then negotiate the fairly treacherous Toowoomba Range.

The Minister would be aware that the member for Crows Nest, the member for Gregory and I aired our concerns about the consultation process with various interests groups. Those groups aired their concern about the department's announcement of its final and narrow band of interest in relation to where this highway will go. Since we raised this issue in Parliament, I believe that of the seven or eight interest groups that showed concern, at least seven have had their concerns looked at and have perhaps been satisfied with the consultation process. One group, the Northern Action Group, has put forward an alternative to the Queensland Department of Transport's alternative to the Toowoomba Range crossing. I urge the Minister to give that group a fair hearing. I also urge the department to continue with the consultation process, and not just with this group.

If the decision is made that this crossing is not the one that the department likes and it chooses to go back to its original concept, I hope that it will continue to consult with that interest group, because it is important. Those people will live fairly close to where the new highway will be. The department must be able

to advise these people of what sorts of innovations, initiatives and proposals the department has, not only now but also for the next 10 or 15 years, in relation to, for example, sound buffers and road surfaces. It will be a major road crossing the Toowoomba Range. Traffic will be coming from all sorts of areas, including from the grain belt areas of the Darling Downs, Melbourne, Sydney and elsewhere to get into the port of Brisbane. It is an important issue and I certainly hope that the department is in the position in the not-too-distant future of being able to identify that corridor and also to take into account the very good submissions that have been put forward to the department not only by the Northern Action Group but also the other interest groups that have aired their concerns.

I know that there are some provisions in this Bill that will continue to try to achieve uniform standards in the transport industry right around Australia. If we can have standardised parking regulations and rules right around Australia, it certainly would be very helpful for people who travel interstate. I have to point out the problems that are being caused by the Queensland Government's disabled parking initiative, in particular the red and blue permits, about which there have been complaints. I would think that members from both sides of the House have received complaints from elderly people, people suffering from emphysema or cerebral palsy and others who find it difficult to acquire the red and blue permits for disabled parking. Many people have complained that they cannot afford the \$10 charge that now attaches to the issue of permits. Even though that is a one-off charge, I understand the point that those people are making. I congratulate the Toowoomba City Council, which has enacted its own parking laws and is allowing both red and blue permit holders to park in certain regulated parking areas in the city. I am aware that other local authorities have enacted similar laws. Perhaps more local authorities will take similar measures to enable those with disability parking permits to access more parking.

Most members receive plenty of complaints about people parking in disabled car spaces at private shopping centres when they are not entitled to do so. I know that the Government cannot do too much about that practice; it must be controlled by shopping centre management. I have suggested to the assistant commissioner of police in my area that the police undertake an annual campaign named "lock it or leave it" in which, if the police find unlocked cars in shopping centre car

parks, they leave a little note to remind people that their car could be stolen. In the course of that exercise, the police might also do something about people parking illegally in disabled car parks. The police could leave a note on the windscreen of such cars to inform drivers that they have been caught doing the wrong thing. The Toowoomba police have indicated to me that they will consider that suggestion. I think that it could be a useful exercise, and it would certainly reduce the number of complaints about such non-legitimate parking.

I have been fairly brief with my comments. I reiterate that the Opposition has no major problems with this Bill. I thank the officers of the department, Mr Doyle, Mr Blake, Mr Diack and Mr Nicol, for their very comprehensive briefing earlier this morning.

**Mr ROBERTSON** (Sunnybank) (2.52 p.m.): I rise to support the Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Bill. In doing so, I would like to highlight two key initiatives presented in the Bill—implementing national road transport legislation and reforming road use legislation. The legislative framework to be established by the Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Bill places Queensland firmly as a leader in the delivery of the benefits of micro-economic reform and national uniformity to the people and transport sector of this State. This Government has undertaken a comprehensive review of transport legislation that has seen the development of an integrated legislative structure for transport established under the Transport Planning and Coordination Act 1994. The Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Bill when enacted will become one of the four pieces of legislation dealing with transport services.

This Bill extends the reform process to road use management and addresses the implementation of national road transport law being developed as a result of agreements by the heads of all Australian Governments—an issue in which I know that my friend the member for Mansfield has taken a vital interest. An important outcome of the reform process has been the establishment of a performance-based regulatory philosophy for managing road use. These outcomes are reflected in the purposes of the Bill, which are: to provide a legislative framework for implementing national road transport legislation; to provide the opportunity to reform existing Queensland road use legislation; and to establish a framework for managing road use in Queensland which takes into account

national and international benchmarks and best practice.

This Bill provides the vehicle for Queensland to implement national road transport law as it becomes available from the national process being managed by the National Road Transport Commission. The commission reports to the Ministerial Council for Road Transport, which is composed of Transport Ministers from all States, Territories and the Commonwealth. The development of national road transport law is being progressed as a series of modules. This approach has been taken to allow the complex maze of legislative and policy issues across eight jurisdictions to be tackled in manageable subject areas or modules. There are some important benefits to be gained from that approach.

The modular approach has resulted in modules being available for implementation by jurisdictions ahead of the final national law envisaged by the original plan of attack. This means that benefits to the transport sector and the community will be able to be delivered as early as possible in the national uniformity process. The first of these modules is now available for implementation, and this Bill will allow Queensland to progress this important initiative and provide a positive message to the transport industry that Queensland is serious about national uniformity and is meeting the spirit of the heads of Governments agreements.

In conjunction with other States and the National Road Transport Commission, Queensland has made substantial progress towards the development of nationally uniform legislation. National legislation covering heavy vehicle charges, vehicles and traffic and dangerous goods has been approved by the ministerial council, and two Acts have been passed by the Commonwealth Parliament, namely the Road Transport Charges (Australian Capital Territory) Act 1993 and the Road Transport Reform (Vehicles and Traffic) Act 1993. In addition, an Act for dangerous goods is currently before the Commonwealth Parliament.

Queensland has also taken a leading role in developing regulations under these Acts, with the ministerial council having approved regulations for heavy vehicle charges; heavy vehicle standards, including heavy vehicle roadworthiness; mass and loading, including safe restraints of loads; and bus driving hours. The national process continues at a strong pace, with work well advanced on regulations for oversize and overmass vehicles, restricted

access vehicles and light vehicle standards and roadworthiness. Queensland is committed to implementing national legislation, and this Bill puts that commitment into action. Part of that commitment is to introduce uniform national heavy vehicle charges and to implement common mass and loading standards for heavy vehicles from 1 July 1995.

The heads of Governments agreements for light and heavy vehicles require the States and Territories to repeal or amend existing transport legislation that is replaced or affected by national regulation. Consequently, one of the more significant issues in progressing the implementation of national road transport legislation is managing the transition from the existing legislative structure. The Bill provides for the implementation of national transport regulation of heavy vehicle charges, vehicle operations and traffic, registration and driver licensing. The next stage of this legislative program will enable the implementation of nationally consistent legislation for the road transport of dangerous goods. This next stage will also address transition of existing road use legislation not covered by the national scheme.

Legislation affected by this Bill includes the Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Road Act 1984, the Motor Vehicles Control Act 1975, the Motor Vehicles Safety Act 1980, the State Transport Act 1960, the Traffic Act 1949 and the Transport Infrastructure (Roads) Act 1991. This existing legislation will be repealed as significant modules of national road transport legislation are developed and implemented and reviews of Queensland-specific provisions are completed. It is the intention of the Government to have this process completed as soon as practicable.

This legislation, including the Traffic Act 1949, will progressively be repealed and replaced with modern legislation more appropriate to the transport and road safety needs of today and the future. The Government is keen to ensure that this important legislative reform is achieved in a timely manner, and has included provisions in this Bill for this to happen within two years of the commencement of this legislation. The progressive repeal and replacement of the Traffic Act 1949 with modern legislation under this Act will be significantly advanced in this period. However, the complex issues involved make it prudent not to put a specific end date on the repeal process, so that these issues can receive the full and careful consideration that they demand. I look forward to the culmination of this process and the

establishment of a single integrated piece of legislation that will provide road use management requirements for the people of Queensland in a simplified, logical and consistent way.

I shall use some of the time available to me to alert the Minister to a number of issues that are of concern to me and my constituents. I introduce these comments by praising the previous Minister for his initiative in releasing the discussion paper titled *Towards an Integrated Regional Transport Plan for South East Queensland* and the public consultation process that is currently under way. One of the privileges of being a member of Parliament is that, in addition to involving oneself directly in the consultation process, one can use the forum of this Chamber to put forward some of the ideas that result from it.

When I was in my room listening to the speeches of the member for Gregory and the member for Mooloolah, I could not help thinking that the Opposition has a very confused view of transport infrastructure issues. In particular, the member for Gregory, Mr Johnson, reiterated his party's policy with respect to the eastern corridor—the planned road to the coast. I have spoken about this matter in this House on a number of occasions. In its very cheap and tawdry grab for votes on this vital and very difficult issue, the National Party is in fact condemning yet another section of the population—just like those people in Underwood, in whom I am vitally interested—because its alternative policies would result in increased traffic from the upgrading of the Pacific Highway.

A large group of residents in Underwood currently experience six lanes of traffic less than 50 metres from their back doors. These residents finally have some relief from the noise and disruption that such heavy traffic flows cause by virtue of the installation of noise attenuation barriers, to which I will return later. The National Party's solution is no eastern corridor but further expansion of the Pacific Highway. That is not going to work. The National Party's policy condemns my constituents to further intrusions into their properties and lifestyles by virtue of allowing more traffic to go past their back doors.

**Mr T. B. Sullivan:** Didn't Mr Borbidge support a 12-lane expansion of the highway? That would be disastrous.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** That just indicates what poor policy managers those opposite are. If that is their only solution, then they will stand condemned by me and the people of Underwood who have already suffered.

**Ms Power:** And Eight Mile Plains.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** And Eight Mile Plains, as the member for Mansfield reminds me. There is no way in the world that I will allow my constituents in Underwood to be subjected to some crazy, poorly thought-out scheme that has been peddled by the National Party in its very cheap attempt to grab a few votes around the place.

After Mr Johnson had tried to do the allegedly environmentally responsible thing by saying, "We don't need another road", the real hypocrisy of the National Party was confirmed by the words of the member for Mooloolah, who said that what is needed on the Sunshine Coast is the duplication of the Nicklin Way. I am not too sure whether that is part of National Party policy, but it seems to me that the Opposition does not want to duplicate a road to the south coast but it wants to duplicate a road on the Sunshine Coast.

**Ms Power:** It is the Liberal Party's policy.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** It is the Liberal Party's policy; it must be—

**Ms Power:** The National Party's policy is to spend more money in the electorate of Gregory.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** I thank the member for Mansfield for explaining that to me because, yet again, I was becoming very confused about the coalition's policy. This indicates what shallow environmentalists they really are. It is all right to not put a road down in one direction, but as soon as they get the chance to get some votes up on the north coast, what do they promise—another major road.

**Mr Springborg** interjected.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** The member is known around the place as a bit of a wit, but with comments like that, he is in danger of harming that reputation.

**Mr Hollis:** That road was without any noise. That is the other part of it.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** I thank the member for Redcliffe for reminding me that what members opposite want is a silent road. Clearly, they do not have a realistic, workable transport infrastructure policy. The member for Gregory can be assured that I will be letting my constituents of Underwood know that, as part of its alternative to the eastern corridor, the coalition really wants more traffic travelling past their back door.

**Mr Johnson:** You won't have to worry about the residents of Underwood because you won't be there to represent them.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** Just like the honourable member's policies—in your dreams.

I turn now to some local issues that arise out of the discussion paper towards an integrated regional transport plan. The first issue that I would like to raise for the Minister's consideration is the issue of Park & Rides. My electorate has five railway stations along the Beenleigh rail line and I know that the Park & Ride facilities at those stations are chock-a-block. Clearly, if one of the strategies is to get more people on to public transport, then we need to provide additional space than that which has already been set aside to allow people to leave their cars at railway stations. In particular, the Altandi Railway Station at Sunnybank is one which, as a result of it being full every day of the week with commuters' cars, causes significant problems for parents of children who go to the Our Lady of Lourdes Primary School. Departmental officers have looked at that situation and we are hopeful that as a result of that we will be able to utilise some additional land to perhaps alleviate some of the pressure that occurs at Altandi station.

Arising out of the issue of additional land for Park & Ride facilities is the issue about which I spoke to the Minister yesterday. Having attended a meeting of the Kuraby Neighbourhood Watch recently, I am aware that one concern about Kuraby station is station security. I am aware that the department already has a strategy in place to upgrade security measures at a whole range of railway stations throughout Brisbane, but one that has not yet made it to the list is Kuraby Railway Station. It would appear that one of the problems being faced at Kuraby station is the theft of commuters' motor vehicles that have been left there during the day. I would like to see a situation similar to that which exists at Sunnybank, where part of the Park & Ride facility is actually locked off for commuters. That facility works well at Sunnybank station where the Park & Ride is fenced off and locked up by the stationmaster. A car can be removed only with the permission and, obviously, cooperation of the stationmaster. I would like to see that at Kuraby Railway Station. I am sure that, if we can get some positive results on that, that would make the Kuraby Neighbourhood Watch very happy. Another issue of concern is security measures on the platform at Kuraby Railway Station. I know that the Minister is aware of that concern. Hopefully, we will see those improvements put in train, if members will pardon the pun.

Those are just a couple of issues that arise out of the discussion paper. By making our railway stations more accessible and safer for commuters, I think we will be well on our way to achieving some real innovations, and we know the benefits that that will bring. With those few comments, I reiterate my support for the Bill currently before the House.

**Mr ARDILL** (Archerfield) (3.09 p.m.): This Bill does not issue edicts on the transport industry; it provides the head of power for regulations to regulate the industry. It supersedes all road transport operation Acts, except the Traffic Act, to bring Queensland into line with the Commonwealth laws and those of all other States, except New South Wales. Of course, that may change tomorrow if justice prevails and a Labor Government is elected.

By eliminating thousands of words in 13 Acts and providing some important changes to the Traffic Act, this Bill will greatly simplify the road transport operator's dilemma of adhering to the law. It will be simpler but it will impose self-discipline on the trucking industry. There will still be cowboys out there, and after this legislation and the consequent regulations are assented to and gazetted, the Government will need to provide sufficient policing and spot checks to stop the activities of the cowboy drivers and, more importantly, the fleet owners who direct some of these cowboys to ignore the law by giving them impossible riding instructions such as driving from New South Wales to north Queensland in 24 hours. Under the Bill, that will clearly be illegal. Most reputable firms will observe the rules and set the standards. Others will still have to be subject to spot checks to prevent the present practice of filling in logbooks from interstate at Mackay to indicate that drivers started from that city. That is happening now and has happened for a long time. That practice means that, after 24 hours on the road, drivers can continue as if they have just started from that point. It means that very sleepy or bombed-out drivers are on our roads.

The Bill will provide for interstate compliance schemes to be approved in Queensland. Again, in the interests of simplicity, nationwide standards are being adopted. The director-general or chief executive will also have the power to cancel that authority for lack of compliance. In some circumstances, the police will have power of arrest for blatant offences when summonses would be ineffective. The Bill also provides a head of power to enable the Government to resume communication corridors and pipeline corridors, which can then be franchised out.

Under the Bill, standard coach driving hours will also be nominated, and that is certainly a great improvement. The Bill also will encompass new regulations, as set out in the National Standard Load Restraint Guide launched by Neil O'Keefe at Eagle Farm about a fortnight ago, which will make our roads safer. It is interesting to note that many national road safety initiatives are being launched in Queensland—which indicates respect for the professionalism of the Queensland Department of Transport.

I would be remiss if I failed to pay due credit to former Transport Minister David Hamill for bringing together the disparate sections of the Transport Department under one director-general and one new, large department. He should be credited with making that great change, which will make transport operations in Queensland and throughout Australia much simpler.

The Bill will also enable signs that denote parking for disabled persons other than on public roads, such as in shopping centres and other private properties to which the public has recourse, to be enforced. That is a positive change. We continually hear complaints from people about drivers who are well able to move further afield but do not do so. The force of law will now come down on those drivers to ensure that they do not park in parts of public places under private control where signs indicate that people other than disabled drivers cannot park. I support the Bill.

**Mr ELLIOTT** (Cunningham) (3.14 p.m.): I support the main thrust of this legislation, that is, uniformity throughout Australia. Over the years, many of us have worked towards that goal. For a long time, I was chairman of the transport committee in the former National Party Government, and lack of uniformity was always one of the bugbears. One of the aims that we were working with the other States to achieve was uniformity with respect to heavy vehicles.

There are immense problems in the industry. Having operated trucks at one stage, I have some knowledge of those problems. When trying to run a trucking operation, regardless of whether it is large or small, owner operated or a large company operation, there is nothing worse than driving from Queensland—being perfectly legal—then driving through New South Wales—not necessarily being legal—and then driving into Victoria and being illegal. The great bulk of truck drivers operate through those three States. The average bloke who runs a trucking operation does not study the Act every five

minutes. He has a fairly reasonable general understanding of the rules. However, in terms of the fine print of legislation and regulations, operators know the laws in their own States better than they know the laws in other States. When the rules keep changing and are not in unison, it is an absolute nightmare for those operators to keep track of exactly what is required.

I watched with interest the proceedings of the Estimates committee. I felt that the former Minister, the Honourable David Hamill, had a pretty good grasp of what was going on and that he was trying very hard to do something about the problems. I say that in a bipartisan way.

As the member who has had the most experience in working out how to handle the over-dimension and off-standard aspects of transport regulations, and having had a lot of experience in the past in trying to achieve some uniformity, I stress how important it is that, when considering matters such as over-dimension and excess width and height of vehicles, one must keep in mind the practicality of being able to operate those vehicles. People who live in cities or in relatively close proximity to the south-east corner of Queensland or similar parts of other States do not have a full appreciation of the problems involved in loading some of those over-dimension loads onto road transport vehicles and moving those loads and vehicles. Australia is a huge continent, and it is serviced mainly by the road transport industry, especially in the carriage of over-dimension loads. It is not practical for the Government to say that it will build larger tunnels on all the railways so that those huge loads can go through them. We all know that that cannot be done. Hopefully, many railcars will eventually have double decking, which will mean that loads of greater heights can get through the railway corridors.

**Mr Ardill:** You've got to replace them.

**Mr ELLIOTT:** Yes, I know.

**Mr Ardill:** You have to build new tunnels.

**Mr ELLIOTT:** That is right. That will not happen in five minutes. From an industry point of view—particularly primary industries—it is absolutely essential to remember that all that produce must be moved. That does not mean that people in primary industries want to see how many problems they can create for the Transport Department or the police by moving that weird and wonderful equipment on our roads and, in particular, on rural, local and

minor main roads rather than national highways. If it is possible to move equipment on other than our national highways, obviously that is the best thing to do. Transport operators from all States travel on the national highways. Having watched those drivers, I realise that many of them do not understand the difficulties involved in moving headers and other agricultural equipment on roads. It is desirable to keep that equipment and machinery away from national highways and, where possible, to put it onto rural local roads, which are much less busy, because operating on those roads presents fewer hassles.

Most of the people who travel on those roads expect to see big, wide agricultural equipment coming at them. In the United States of America, the roads in some of the States have a sign. We have a similar sign, but unfortunately it does not go quite far enough. In the Gatton area and in the Lockyer Valley, a sign clearly tells motorists that they will encounter two things: firstly, planes flying across the roads spreading fertiliser and carrying out other agricultural procedures and, secondly, wide machinery. The sign reads "Beware of Wide Machinery". Some of the signs in the United States of America go further and state that horse riders and horse-drawn vehicles have absolute right of way on the roads because animals are much harder to control than motor vehicles. We used to have that law in this country. Such signs would simplify many of the problems that are experienced here.

Obviously, we want people who are moving equipment to have the signs and flashing lights only to the degree that is necessary to warn other drivers. The average Joe who is driving along in his vehicle, the old lady who is going for a Sunday drive or young drivers—it does not matter if they are male or female—who are on the road for the first time are not always on the alert for those vehicles. It is essential that those people are warned that a non-standard vehicle is approaching. There is no better way to alert people than through the use of flashing lights. Operators of the equipment can attach all the signs they like to those vehicles but, quite frankly, those signs do not mean much. I know that those signs are required by law, and most people have them attached to their vehicles, but flashing lights are probably the one thing that people associate with emergency procedures. Flashing lights are used on police and ambulance vehicles, at roadworks and on excess-dimension vehicles. I do not think anybody has an argument with the use of those flashing lights.

However, I believe we should cut through the red tape and not create problems for the people who manage, own and operate much of this equipment. A terrible tendency exists that is not the fault of the owners. Because of their skills, coordination and better eyesight, younger people are largely the ones who operate headers, cotton pickers or any other machinery that honourable members could name in the contracting field across Queensland. We who have kids know that they can be a little gung-ho when they first start driving vehicles. I will give honourable members an example of that terrible tendency. The owner of an operation, who I will call Farmer Bill, says to two young guys, "When you move the machinery from that paddock to the next along the road, you must have the pilot vehicle in the front, flashing lights and the sign that says 'oversize'." Operators can still use their old signs but they must blot out the word "danger" from them. Farmer Bill can tell those young guys to follow those rules until he is blue in the face but in reality they will be like many young people. They will finish in one paddock and they will be in a hurry to get to the next because, for example, Farmer Bill has told them, "The crop is going down and it is going to storm tonight; get there as quickly as you can." There will be a terrible temptation for those young drivers to jump in the header, take the comb off, shove it onto the comb trailer and whiz down the road without attending to those finer details.

Those vehicles always have their flashing lights because they are attached to the top. I cannot think of too many people who have bought headers in the last five years who have not fitted those flashing lights to them. That is usually part and parcel of the purchase deal. It is important to look at all the possibilities to ensure that our approach is practical because, if people are doing the right thing and driving along the road using their commonsense, they will see that machinery. In a many of those areas, drivers can see four or five miles in a straight line up and down the road. Anyone who runs into a tremendously wide, high vehicle that has flashing lights and signs on it is some sort of idiot. Yet, unfortunately, I have seen cases of that happening and I have had first-hand experience of that. It is definitely a problem; there is no question about that.

I fail to see why we need to institute laws that put so much onus on the operators and no onus on the other drivers on the road. Eventually we have to say, "We can go only so far to protect people—particularly people who do not have much commonsense—from themselves." When all is said and done, if

those people are going to run into a huge vehicle in broad daylight, they are going to do so whether or not that vehicle has a flashing light—which it will almost certainly have—or a sign that says "oversize" or "wide load". No matter what that sign says, I do not believe that it will make one iota of difference. I understand that we must standardise and that that is the purpose of this legislation. I am right behind that concept. However, I believe we have to look very hard at the legal onus that it places on the operators and particularly on the owners of the machinery. The owners can try as hard as they like to follow the rules with their magnificent equipment, but young guys will drive onto the road and not have the sign properly attached. Sometimes a bloke will go up the road to grab a packet of cigarettes from the store, or buy a bulb for the header because he is going to be working that night and he will leave the header where he should not. That happens and it is no use saying that it does not.

Why do we want to make it more difficult for those operators, particularly when it involves country which has visibility for miles? Specific areas should be designated in which pilot vehicles are not necessary, as has been done in New South Wales. Although that State is not playing the game as well as it might in terms of overall Australian cooperation, it has seen the need for commonsense regarding this matter in western areas. Drivers in the western zone of New South Wales are not required to have a pilot vehicle to move agricultural equipment on a road. The driver must only use commonsense, flashing lights and signs because most of that western area is wide, open flat country. A pilot vehicle should not be necessary. The suggestion that two pilot vehicles should be required is nothing short of idiocy. It is total madness! That is adding cost to the overall operation. Every day of the week, we hear the Prime Minister and State Government Ministers saying that we have to compete with Asia and, in the grain trade, with America. How can farmers compete with one hand tied behind their backs by stupid regulations?

It is a nonsense to suggest that two pilot vehicles are needed to shift a 15-foot wide piece of machinery driving on a wide, open road in black-soil country in the west of Queensland or New South Wales. I ask the new Minister to consider that aspect and respond to it because many people have misgivings about that matter. I know that there have been working parties comprising people from the Graingrowers Association, the UGA,

the Cattlemen's Union and officers from the Transport Department. There are tremendous people in the Transport Department. I have had much to do with many of them over the years. They are practical, sensible, good people with whom one can sit down and have sensible conversations. Unfortunately, somewhere in the middle of that process there are people who are terrified of reducing the level of bureaucracy and regulation in case something happens and somebody says to them, "This is your fault. You are the ones who said we do not need to have two pilot vehicles to move those headers."

They do not have those pilot vehicles in the west of the designated line in New South Wales. The Minister should examine the statistics to see what has happened since that line has been designated. I would be absolutely amazed if there has been a change in the statistics. In fact, I would be surprised if there have not been fewer accidents on the western side of that line than on the eastern side where pilot vehicles are required. That zone begins at Bonshaw at the Queensland/New South Wales border and continues past Orange to the Victoria/New South Wales border. East of that line, people are not allowed to move large equipment on the road without pilot vehicles, which is fair enough because much of that country has hills, sharp bends, lots of trees and poor visibility.

In circumstances of poor visibility, we need to have pilot vehicles. Let us be quite practical about this: all we need for a pilot vehicle is a guy in a vehicle with a flashing light and, in particular, a two-way radio. It is the two-way radio that provides the safety factor. If a guy is behind or in front of the load and he has a two-way radio, he can say, "Look out, here comes a caravan. Give them room." I can tell members that when I see caravans from Victoria coming towards me, I give them 500 yards' room. I get right off the road. Usually, the truck drivers are not a problem because they are good drivers. Often it is the people who tow caravans only during Christmas time who provide the biggest problem. They have no idea—they will race other drivers to a bridge that is wide enough for only one vehicle to cross at a time.

**Ms Spence:** You are taking your full 20 minutes.

**Mr ELLIOTT:** I am sorry, but this is a terribly important matter. I would like to be watching the Sheffield Shield as much as anyone else, but I would be derelict in my duty in representing an electorate that has many

primary producers if I did not mention this. Lots of people keep asking me why we do not sort out these problems, and I think that it is essential that I say this today.

I commend the department for what it is trying to achieve. I merely urge it to go that little bit further. Let us sit down and get some commonsense into the regulation of over-dimension vehicles.

**Mr HOLLIS (Redcliffe) (3.32 p.m.):** It is my pleasure to support the Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Bill 1995. As members would know, prior to coming to this place in 1989, I operated a transport business and a warehousing business. It is pleasing to see legislation of this type, which relates to the future of transport rather than the fractional legislation that we have seen to date in Australia. During his speech, my colleague the member for Brisbane Central referred to the discussion paper titled *Towards an Integrated Regional Plan for South East Queensland*. Of course, other members have referred to that paper. However, the member for Brisbane Central referred to the doubling in the number of cars on our roads by the year 2011. Another important part of that discussion paper refers to road freight. It states—

". . . it is estimated that the regional freight task will double by 2011."

If that is to occur, it is particularly important that we plan for the future. I commend the department not only for this very worthwhile discussion paper but also for the Bill.

In my speech, I am going to focus on alternative compliance and, in particular, the alternative compliance in the Fatigue Management Program. This Bill is the first piece of road transport legislation in Australia to provide an explicit and comprehensive framework for what is known as alternative compliance. Alternative compliance means allowing industry to find new ways of demonstrating that it is meeting the objectives of legislation rather than focusing on the detail of the process. It is not a relaxation of standards. By spelling out clearly the results for which an operator is accountable and requiring the operator to demonstrate delivery of those results, it actually sets a higher standard. The Minister, in his previous role as the chairman of the PAC, would have heard those same words spoken about the Public Finance Standards, which replaced the Treasurer's Instructions. Exactly the same thing happened: people no longer had to comply with every single dot point of the

Treasurer's Instructions; they were allowed to work within a framework. This Bill provides exactly the same thing.

However, alternative compliance requires the industry to make a culture change from the focus of not getting caught towards ensuring that management systems and policies deliver the intent of the legislation. It is a focus on safety outcomes rather than inputs. Of course, it is entirely consistent with other management philosophies, such as total quality management systems, which have been adopted by progressive transport companies.

The Queensland Government is promoting alternative compliance as a mechanism for maintaining and raising levels of safety and infrastructure protection while allowing greater flexibility for the operators in the industry. That flexibility for operators is achieved because alternative compliance means that the Government specifies what results are needed to be achieved, particularly in terms of road safety, and allows the operator to determine how best to achieve them in the context of his or her own business. Of course, there is some cost involved in implementing such schemes, but the Government is well aware that operators will participate only if the benefit is large enough and the system is kept relatively simple. That is a challenge for those involved in developing and testing such schemes.

Queensland is leading Australia in its thinking on alternative compliance and in the implementation of alternative compliance schemes. Of course, a good example is what I am going to talk about today, which is the Fatigue Management Program that is currently being piloted in conjunction with the industry. Traditionally, we had regulated driving hours for drivers of heavy vehicles. However, that is not the outcome that the community is interested in; it wants driver fatigue managed with positive safety outcomes. The control of driving hours is just a means to that end. Although it is a simple system, it is also very inflexible and does not take into account the variations between drivers and different types of operations. It is a very poor way of managing driver fatigue.

I have personal experience of this because when I was operating a warehouse, trucks would turn up at the door in the early hours of the morning—sometimes at 6 o'clock—to unload. The guy would get out of the cab and he would be either half asleep and too tired to unload the truck or he would be jumping around like a clown in a circus.

One would think that he had spent half the night at a nightclub and had then been at the session at the Brekkie Creek. Of course, quite often such drivers were hyped up on pills. This legislation is trying to prevent such things happening in the industry.

Another good aspect of the Fatigue Management Program is that it is going to be for the whole of Australia. It is no good having a system such as this only in Queensland when interstate drivers, who are not complying with the program, are bringing goods across the border. However, the crux of the matter is that when owner/drivers are contracted to large transport companies, those large companies do not tend to worry about what that owner/driver does as long as he gets that freight to a certain point at the lowest cost to the company.

One of the big difficulties that we will experience—and it is going to take a very hard-headed approach by all Transport Ministers throughout Australia—is in making the larger transport companies in this country of ours comply. They have to be made to look at the situation and look at what they are doing to the drivers. They are not only causing a lot of financial hardship to owner/drivers and causing them to be away from their families for very long stretches at a time but they are also killing other people on the roads. Quite often, after drivers have been working all day picking up things in the city, the company then puts that driver in a semitrailer and says, "Right, you are off to Cairns or wherever tonight." I do not think that those large companies have the concern they should have for the other drivers on Australian roads. One of the very important aspects of the Fatigue Management Program is that if major companies accept it, then there will be much safer conditions for all people on the roads, not just for truck drivers.

The management program consists of documented assurance systems, policies, procedures and records that demonstrate that management evaluation systems are in place to ensure compliance with the agreed fatigue management standards. Of course, the outcomes we are looking for are heavy-vehicle drivers less fatigued and fit to drive safely on the roads when working under an accredited FMP rather than a prescriptive regime; no increase and, if possible, a decrease in fatigue-related heavy vehicle accidents; and enhanced utilisation of transport resources, that is, productivity improvements for transport operators. It is a known fact that if operators improve the productivity and wellbeing of their drivers, as time goes on those operators will do better.

Other States have now embraced the concept of alternative compliance and, through the National Road Transport Commission, they are developing a national heavy vehicle accreditation scheme. Queensland pioneered this approach and is a key player in this process. The module of this scheme covering driver fatigue will be based on Queensland's work.

Alternative compliance also requires a changing role and culture for those in Government. The Minister and his department deserve credit for challenging the traditional way of doing things and embracing an approach that will produce better outcomes for both the community and the industry. In the future, I hope that people will take on board an all-Australian approach to the problems, particularly those in the heavy transport industry, and work out ways to produce a safe transport system for the people of Australia. I support the Bill.

**Ms POWER** (Mansfield) (3.40 p.m.): I rise to support the Bill before the House. As I am aware of time factors, I will try to keep my remarks brief. However, it would be remiss of me not to take time to comment on the Bill and the effect that it will have, in particular on an electorate such as mine. As the Premier has been wont to say—all roads lead to the electorate of Mansfield, and I would have to come to the fore on any list of experts on roads. My electorate takes in Logan Road, or the old Pacific Highway, the Mount Gravatt-Capalaba road, the South East Freeway, the Southern Bypass, the Gateway Arterial Road, Newnham Road and, soon, the south coast motorway.

**Mr Ardill:** You've got them all.

**Ms POWER:** As the member for Archerfield says, I have got them all. I note the comments made by the member for Cunningham and appreciate his recognition of the need for road infrastructure. That just goes to show that, if one stays in this place long enough, one does take a balanced approach to many issues. I only hope that some of the member's comments rub off on the members for Gregory, Mooloolah and Clayfield.

**Ms Robson:** Unlikely.

**Ms POWER:** That is probably unlikely. However, they could learn a bit from the honourable member's approach to this legislation. As my colleague the member for Sunnybank said, members opposite are a bit confused about what they want, and they give out the wrong signals to people. Unfortunately, they have used people in my electorate as

political guinea pigs. I find it offensive that members opposite say, "We won't build a road here" or "We wouldn't do that", when they know full well that the choice is not to be made by individual politicians.

**Mr Johnson:** What, are you worried about your seat? I would be, too, if I were you.

**Ms POWER:** The honourable member has been exposed in my electorate for his cheap shots—that is, telling those people that he would just fly in for it. He will be seen for what he is.

My electorate has been called "Spaghetti City". This road usage legislation will give some relief to my electorate after the way in which former Governments left it. Roads were built in my electorate just to service traffic; no analysis was done of where that traffic was going or what type of road we might need. I would appreciate all of this being considered in the Transport Planning and Coordination Act.

Daily, somebody telephones me or writes to me about road use problems—for example, where crossings are put, whether there should be zebra crossings or an overpass, or whether there should be a crossing that has a central isle and fencing that protects people from passing trucks. Other issues of concern include the speed and nature of traffic—that is, cars or trucks and so on. Then there are the roadworks that go with any road system. As I said, given the number of roads in my electorate, road maintenance crews are a constant source of residents' complaints. I also get complaints about pollution—both noise and visual. People ask, "When am I going to get my sound buffer? Could you make the bitumen better so that the traffic noise is quieter?" I also get complaints about house valuations. The list goes on. Other members have mentioned disabled parking, school zones and so on. All those issues will be addressed in part in some of this legislation.

I do not suppose that we will be taking an easy road—pardon the pun—in trying to address some of these issues when we have allowed our roads to be developed in an ad hoc fashion. I am pleased with some of the work that is being done. I could not honestly stand here and say that I am always grateful for the work of the Transport Department. However, we are starting to put in place a strategic plan, and we are addressing individual issues and trying to put them into various baskets of concerns—for example, road safety and environmental issues. We are putting into place a program to address those issues in the long term.

It is unfortunate for an electorate such as mine that while that is taking place people in my electorate have to suffer. I feel for those people. In fact, I am one of them, because I live close to the Mount Gravatt-Capalaba road and the Gateway Arterial Road. I constantly assure people that, at the end of the day, they will start to see some positives. Those people who live on the Mount Gravatt-Capalaba road have started to see some positives, with the widening and straightening of the road, the sound buffer in the centre and the extra lighting. But, of course, there is still more to go. All I can say to them is that they will need to be patient. As a Government, we are committed to addressing these issues. But, of course, that will not happen today or tomorrow, and it will not be an easy process to follow.

I commend the former Minister, the Honourable David Hamill, for his vision. I am sure that the present Minister will follow in his footsteps. I support the legislation.

**Mr T. B. SULLIVAN** (Chermside) (3.46 p.m.): I rise to support this Bill. I will confine my comments to the concerns raised by some residents in the Kalinga/Wooloowin area and the members of AMAC—the Airport Motorway Action Committee—who have contacted me. While I am only too happy to provide this information and to have it on the public record in *Hansard*, I have some reservations about how these concerns are being generated. It appears that the member for Clayfield, Mr Santoro, provided copies of the Bill to a number of people, including Ms Pitt, a coeditor of the *Bugle*, a suburban newspaper that circulates to households within Mr Santoro's electorate of Clayfield.

It is only proper that members of Parliament make copies of legislation available to their constituents. However, it worries me that some of the questions raised by Mr Santoro, Ms Pitt and others seem to be based on wrong or incomplete information. A great deal of fear has been generated amongst local residents because an AMAC committee was told that some disastrous changes would supposedly occur under this legislation. Residents have been told that the Director-General of the Department of Transport is to be given extended powers to resume any householder's land and that the Government would pay only the compensation determined by the Department of Transport. Further, residents were told that there are no appeal mechanisms in the acquisition process apart from an appeal to the High Court, which would be out of the financial reach of most

residents. Let me state quite clearly that, although there is some truth to the first part of that claim, there is absolutely no truth in the rumours being spread about the process of acquisition and compensation. This is yet another example of the member for Clayfield telling only part of a story simply to create anxiety in the community. As well, Mr Santoro is prepared to use any community group or individual to promote his own political agenda. If Mr Santoro were truly genuine in his concerns, he could easily have found out the true details from the Minister for Transport or the Department of Transport. If he had concerns, why did he not ask the Minister for clarification of the matter?

As well, if the coeditor of the *Bugle* envisaged problems with the new legislation, she could have done what any other journalist would have done, namely, contact the Minister's press officer. If journalists from the *Courier-Mail* or Quest Community Newspapers had a concern about the proposed legislation, those competent journalists would have pursued the matter with the Transport Minister and the department until they had researched the story thoroughly. I hope the *Bugle* will follow these basic principles of journalism and be an accurate reporter of the news.

In a general sense, there is a danger in our modern technological society when members of the media see themselves as news makers rather than news breakers. Some media personnel want to put themselves in the spotlight rather than throw light on public issues so that readers and viewers can draw their own conclusions.

When local residents in Kalinga raised these concerns with me, I did what any member of Parliament should have done—I asked the Minister. I requested information on the process of land acquisition and asked what changes were proposed in this legislation. I have received written responses to the questions that I raised with the Minister, and I seek leave to have those responses incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

QUEENSLAND TRANSPORT  
ACQUISITION OF LAND PROCEDURE  
(As set out in Acquisition of Land Act 1967)

Instructions from District Director through his Executive Director to resume an area of land for public purposes.

A Notice of Intention to Resume (NITR) is issued to the owner. This sets out objection processes and the date of the objection hearing. (same for leasehold/freehold)

Objections are heard by District Director (6 weeks from NITR). Negotiation between the parties can lead to a different decision on the area of land to be taken.

Recommendation is made by the District Director through the Regional Executive Director through Director-General to Minister, to proceed or otherwise.

Minister then recommends to Governor-in-Council.

Governor-in-Council approves or otherwise issuing a Proclamation (Resuming). This converts owners interest from ownership to a claim for compensation. The claim can be agreed, or could go to the Land Court, if disputed. (about 1/2% go to Court).

Title is corrected.

#### RESUMPTIONS OF LAND

In regard to the issues raised by Mr Terry Sullivan MLA concerning the resumption of land,

1 *What appeal mechanisms are available to a person wanting to challenge a resumption notice and have they changed in recent times?*

The Acquisition of Land Act 1967-88 gives parties who have been issued with a Notice of Intention to Resume, the right to object to the proposed resumption. (See attached procedures). Judicial Review has established an avenue for further review of administrative process.

2 *Are there any proposals in the pipe line to alter the resumption powers of the Director-General, ostensibly to give him greater control over the resumption process and reduce current avenues of appeal?*

There is no proposal by Queensland Transport in the pipeline to further alter the resumption powers of the Director-General or to reduce the capacity for an owner to appeal or object.

3 *Did the resumption powers of the Department change through the introduction of the Transport Infrastructure Act, and if so how?*

The resumption powers did not change through the introduction of the Transport Infrastructure Act 1994.

4 *Could the proposed amendment to the Infrastructure Act 1994 - to be introduced in the Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Bill at the Committee of the Whole stage later this week - be interpreted as an attempt to broaden the resumption powers of the Director-General?*

The resumption powers of the Director-General are broadened as a result of these amendments, to include resumptions for common user transport corridors and to allow the granting of interest in property to persons other than government or statutory. This is

required to facilitate gas and slurry pipelines projects.

5 *Are you aware of any proposed legislation (from a whole of government perspective) which would alter the resumption powers of the Director-General in any substantive way?*

The Department of Lands is currently proposing that the land resumption powers of all agencies be centralised under one Act.

At present, the Chief Executive (of Queensland Transport) is able to resume land pursuant to a power given by the *Transport Planning and Coordination Act 1994*. The Department of Lands' proposal would see the Chief Executive's resumption power being removed from the Act. However, it is envisaged that the Chief Executive would still be given the ability to resume, but only under a delegation from the Minister for Lands pursuant to the *Acquisition of Land Act 1967-88*.

The Department of Lands' proposal is currently being discussed with that Department. At this stage, it appears to be unlikely that the Chief Executive's power will be removed (if at all) from the *Transport Planning and Coordination Act 1994* until the Department of Lands completes its review of the *Acquisition of Land Act 1967-88* later this year.

**Mr T. B. SULLIVAN:** When those responses are read, it becomes evident that the land acquisition procedures have basically been the same since 1967. As well, the broadening of powers to include resumptions for pipelines and other common users of transport corridors are powers that can currently be exercised by the Parliament. This legislation locates that power in specific legislation. If any constituent of my electorate or fellow resident of Kalinga wants to know more about this legislation, I would be only too willing to assist them in the appropriate manner.

Two earlier comments by the member for Clayfield need a response. The first concerns who knew what about the airport motorway and when they knew it. Let me tell the member for Clayfield that no-one I have spoken to accepts his assurances that he knew nothing about the Thiess proposal until it was leaked in the *Bugle*, which, coincidentally, came into existence about the same time. Mr Santoro promotes himself as a hard-working local member who knows what is happening in his electorate. He has told us how proud he is of his close contact with the business community; yet he wants us to believe that he knew nothing about that massive project of which dozens of business and community leaders in the inner northern suburbs of Brisbane were aware.

I almost feel sorry for Mr Santoro as he languishes in his futile quest to convince people that he knew nothing about the airport motorway proposal. Time will tell and truth will out, and I am certain that in time we will have definite proof that Mr Santoro did know that Thiess was working on the airport motorway proposal.

**Mr Santoro:** Haven't you got it now? In time we will have proof—so let's slander Mr Santoro.

**Mr T. B. SULLIVAN:** I take that interjection.

**Mr Santoro:** Come on, you slime bag. Have a go.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Palaszczuk): Order! The member for Chermside will resume his seat. The Chair finds the term used by the honourable member for Clayfield unparliamentary and asks him to withdraw it.

**Mr SANTORO:** I withdraw.

**Mr T. B. SULLIVAN:** Mr Santoro is the person in the Chamber who is probably the most prone and most willing to bucket members of this House, members of the Labor Party, public servants or anyone else who shows any affiliation to a philosophy other than his own. It is interesting that, the first time he cops a small whack around the ears, he cries foul. That is typical of the fairly narcissistic approach that this gentleman takes in which, looking at his own reflection, seeing the perfect visage of a member of Parliament, he can give but he cannot take. Even one of his strong supporters in the local area said, "Yes, we believe we have the evidence that Santoro knew about the Thiess proposal, but until we can get something confirmed, we will not be able to publish it." I wait for that time.

It is unfortunate that Mr Santoro's actions have already meant that he has dug his own grave. He is an avid self-promoter who opens his mouth frequently, but more often than not he actually puts his foot in it. I was not going to raise this issue, but I will now. A few weeks ago, Mr Santoro was in here saying that we cannot possibly have the high-usage airport rail line going along the Pinkenba route, because that would go through the Ascot/Hendra area of his electorate. Mr Santoro wanted it to go through Toombul. In answer to a question, the Minister for Transport informed us that, if that were to occur, because of the height separation that would be needed for the railway line near the eastern end of Kalinga Park, Jackson Street houses would have to be resumed. The very

houses that the member for Clayfield purported to be defending by opposing the airport motorway would be the very set of houses that would have to be resumed if that rail proposal went ahead.

The residents of that area have now become aware of what would occur if Mr Santoro's wish came true. What did we hear earlier? We heard Mr Santoro now saying that, instead, we ought to do the Pinkenba line extension. That may be a possibility.

**Mr SANTORO:** I rise to a point of order. I never said any such thing today. Those comments are untrue.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! There is no point of order. The honourable member for Clayfield is debating the issue. I suggest that he cease interjecting.

**Mr T. B. SULLIVAN:** I do not have the full details of which rail route would be better and what would be the time frame or the cost in order to link the airport to the major metropolitan road system. I am not aware of the full details of whether the Pinkenba line, although it may be cheaper in its construction, would in fact be used less because it is significantly longer, or whether there needs to be a rail link following the Schulz Canal route to link up near Toombul. I am not sure of that, and I would look to significant input from the local community and discussion by experts who know about the planning of these matters. But what I do know is that I and many other members of Parliament will make up their minds when we have the facts on the table. Unlike Mr Santoro, we do not shoot from the hip and then find that we have to backtrack.

**Mr Budd:** He shoots from the mouth.

**Mr T. B. SULLIVAN:** He does that, too.

The comment by the member for Clayfield about the falling real estate prices also needs a response. He claimed that the uncertainty about the future road usage is having a detrimental effect on real estate values in the area. I know of a few individuals whose house sale was adversely affected when Mr Santoro leaked the airport motorway material, yet I find it hard to believe that house prices in the area have been affected generally.

Just four days ago, the *Courier-Mail* published a list of land valuations in Brisbane. Changes in valuation reflect a rise or fall in the actual sale price of houses in an area. The *Courier-Mail* list shows that the suburb of Kalinga, which would have been very

significantly affected by any road use in the area and will still be affected if major road developments proceed, had one of the highest increases in land valuations. Its 15.3 per cent increase was the seventh highest in a list of 171 locations. Other nearby suburbs of Clayfield and Wooloowin had increases of 14.84 per cent and 8.52 per cent respectively. I table that document.

I would need to hear more than just the scare tactics of Mr Santoro before I am convinced that real estate prices in these suburbs generally are suffering as a result of any action by the Department of Transport. As I said, I do know of individuals whose house prices have been affected. A member of the local ALP was due to settle the family home on the very day that Mr Santoro released the airport motorway documentation.

**Mr Santoro:** Aren't they happy that I did that, too?

**Mr T. B. SULLIVAN:** I am not sure about that, because the sale of that house fell through. That family will have to bear the entire cost of advertising and other associated costs.

**Mr Santoro:** Who should we blame for that?

**Mr T. B. SULLIVAN:** Mr Santoro asks a very good question.

**Mr Santoro:** Who is the Government? It's an ALP Government.

**Mr T. B. SULLIVAN:** Mr Santoro asked who is responsible, and I would like to answer him if he would just draw breath and let me answer. Let us paint the scenario. What we have been asked to believe is that a concerned public servant, very high up in either Transport or some other department, had access to what was supposed to have been very confidential information. Because of the great significance of that information, that person released it to whom? The *Courier-Mail*? No. The *7.30 Report*? No. That person released it to the *Bugle*! Do members remember the story that we heard? On Sunday morning, Mr Santoro just happened to be sitting in his office when that document was released to the *Bugle*.

**Mr JOHNSON:** I rise to a point of order. I would like to know what this has to do with the legislation.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! There is no point of order.

**Mr T. B. SULLIVAN:** If the member for Gregory had listened to the contribution by his colleague, he would be aware of the relevance

of this issue. Apparently, the member for Gregory did not even listen to Mr Santoro's contribution.

**A Government member:** Why would he?

**Mr T. B. SULLIVAN:** I take that interjection—why would he listen to him?

I will paint the picture again: a nice, quiet Sunday morning out in the Clayfield electorate, and very sensitive material is leaked to the *Bugle*. It is not leaked to the *Sunday Mail*, the *Courier-Mail*, the *Bulletin*, the *Australian*—not to the *7.30 Report*, *This Day Tonight*, Channel 7, Channel 9 or Channel 10; it goes to the *Bugle*. That paper receives a fax saying, "This is about to happen tomorrow", and Mr Santoro just happens to be right by his phone so that the *Bugle* can phone him. What I would like to know is: was it the fax in Mr Santoro's office that faxed this material to the *Bugle*? I think it may have been. I think it may have gone from Mr Santoro's office to the *Bugle* with a message saying, "Send it back to me." Anyway, we will find out in due course. Mr Santoro has given us a whole series of stories that we are supposed to believe.

Along with fellow Government members and members of the Liberal and National Party opposite, I support the legislation.

**Hon. K. W. HAYWARD** (Kallangur—Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development) (4.01 p.m.), in reply: I take this opportunity to thank all of the speakers for their support for this Bill. It is an important Bill and a milestone for transport legislation in Queensland.

I know that time is getting on a bit, but there are a couple of issues that I wish to comment on. The first issue is the matter of consultation, which was raised by a number of speakers, including the shadow Minister. It is important to emphasise that Part 2, under the heading, "Road Use Implementation Programs", subclause 10(4) very clearly states the commitment to consultation. It says—

"In developing a road use implementation program, the chief executive must take reasonable steps to engage in public consultation."

That subclause actually writes that commitment into the legislation.

Clearly, consultation is important and, as I have said, many members took the opportunity to mention that today.

**Mr Johnson** interjected.

**Mr HAYWARD:** I make the point that it is clearly spelt out in this legislation. Of course, some of the practical examples show that there has been exhaustive consultation on a number of difficult corridor issues. I make the commitment that the Government will consider all community input. However, one of the issues that I think all members of Parliament need to understand is that, in the end, Governments need to make the decisions. Of course, we all need to be aware that not everyone can be satisfied.

As I said, consultation was raised by a number of speakers. The member for Mooloolah said that, in general terms, consultation was broadly good. He was concerned about what he described as the minor issue—and I think it is a minor issue, but nevertheless can be important—of prior adequate notice to members if the Transport Department is calling public meetings or events such as that. I think that should be normal practice, and I am sure that it is. I will move to make sure that that occurs on every occasion. Consultation means that people need to have some confidence in the fact that the process is clearly aboveboard and that there is no unnecessary hidden agenda.

Another issue that was raised by all of the speakers was a desire to seek some satisfactory process of long-term planning. Clearly, this Bill will assist in that process, particularly in the determination of new corridors. As the member for Mooloolah said, it is important that we put those processes in place now so that we can work with the community and understand the arguments that are so necessary when establishing new corridors, because if we do not do that now, it will not get any easier.

It is important that we have some long-term planning and vision and that we look ahead. The member for Mooloolah referred to an area of great interest to me, that is, the Sunshine Coast, which is a rapidly expanding area. Of course, that planning is no less relevant in other parts of Queensland. I agree with the notion and the importance of long-term planning, particularly in areas of new corridors.

Of course, we are accelerating the regional and subregional planning, and that includes regional transport planning. With proper consultation, that will give a sound basis for corridor preservation, once the localities of appropriate corridors have been decided. The issue is important because it is a matter of public interest and public importance. We need to take the opportunity

now to identify appropriate corridors rather than putting it off until it becomes an impossible situation, as has occurred in other parts of Australia—for example, in places such as Sydney.

The shadow Minister raised the issue of the level of road funding. I am sure that we all acknowledge that there are never enough dollars for what we want. I do not pretend that there are buckets of money. There is never enough money. The shadow Minister did acknowledge that funding has increased under this Government and that the amount provided to rural areas has increased. As the member suggested, we will continue to pursue the Federal Government for an increased share of Federal Government funding for road construction in Queensland.

Black spot funding was also raised. The honourable member might recall that in question time this morning the member for Cook asked me a question on the Transport Infrastructure Development Scheme. That is a Statewide scheme which provides funding for a range of new initiatives, including this continued black spot program. We are able to keep that going at least as a State-based program, otherwise it could have ceased. It has proved to be pretty useful, particularly around various parts of Queensland, and has had some excellent success in the far north and north west of Queensland, particularly in some Aboriginal communities where some money has been put to good use. That program provides our local councils with funds to undertake a wide range of works which are essential to the provision of more efficient and more effective transport in the State of Queensland.

I want to take the opportunity to thank all members for their contributions, particularly in the issues raised concerning consultation and the general, positive sense about the need for long-term planning in the provision of transport infrastructure in Queensland.

Motion agreed to.

### Committee

Hon. K. W. Hayward (Kallangur—Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2, as read, agreed to.

Clause 3—

**Mr SANTORO** (4.09 p.m.): I assure the Committee that I will be extremely brief. I refer particularly to clause 3(1)(b)(ii) and clause

3(1)(b)(iii). I particularly want to cross-reference the sentiments expressed within the objectives of the Bill as contained in those two subclauses to what the honourable member for Chermside has just said.

It is important that the community can participate in the requirements of two of the objectives of the Bill, that is, to contribute to the strategic management of road infrastructure and to improve road safety and the environmental impact of road use. In accordance with the objectives that the Government quite properly puts in legislation such as this Bill, I attended a meeting of the AMAC committee and gave people a copy of the Bill. I am sure that the honourable member for Chermside would also claim to be one who promotes the objectives of this Bill. He is a constituent of mine and a neighbour of many of my constituents who are dissatisfied with the singular lack of opportunity that they have had to fulfil the objectives of the Bill by having input into the strategic management of road infrastructure and improving road safety and the environmental impact of road use.

I would have thought that, as a neighbour and friend of the people who attended that meeting, the honourable member for Chermside would have informed them that the Bill was on the table of the House; he did not. I make no apology for going to that meeting, making available to people at that meeting my two copies of the Bill and for making further voluminous copies available to members of the New Ways Not Freeways group and others in the community who requested from me copies of the Bill.

In relation to the initial statements by the honourable member for Chermside—

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr SANTORO:** The Government cannot have strategic management of road infrastructure without dealing with the critical issue of compensation—or can it? It cannot. I am absolutely correct in what I am saying. Never have I said to my constituents the words that were attributed to me by the honourable member for Chermside.

In relation to compensation—in order to achieve the laudable objectives of the Bill, I have said that when the Government undertakes objectives such as improving road safety and the environmental impact of road use, it must consider the very important issue of peripheral compensation. I will continue to push that point with the Government because it is a very relevant point.

In relation to my statements about other transport infrastructure, including the link to the airport—based on a study of documents that have been before me and other members, including the honourable member for Chermside, I have always said that my preference for the link to the airport is along Schulz Canal. I have circulated to all of my constituents—including Mr Sullivan in his own home—the speech in which I referred to that preferred option. I never sought to hide anything about my preference on that issue. I am very, very committed to that option. I have surveyed my constituency, and that is what the majority wants.

The Transport Department under previous Governments has allocated land. That transport corridor has been protected by the Government—and wisely so. I give credit where credit is due—unlike the honourable member for Chermside, who slandered me by saying that he thinks that I knew about the motorway proposals. He is wrong; I never had any inkling of the Government's plans. I was never made privy to its plans or anybody's plans. If the honourable member for Chermside or any other member—

**Ms Spence:** What has this got to do with the clause?

**Mr SANTORO:** The less the member interjects, the quicker I will finish. If the honourable member for Chermside refers to documents that I have tabled and documents that I have given to the AMAC committee, he will notice that, when I visited the Department of Transport and was briefed by senior officers in the company of two local councillors, in their report to the Minister the senior officers said something to the effect that "Mr Santoro was told nothing about the airport tollway." Therefore, I deny the slur. It is not a piece of information; it is an absolute slur by the member for Chermside, who must live in a community that was to be affected by a Government proposal about which he knew and about which he initially refused to admit knowledge. He then became entrapped in his own deceit and his own withholding of information when he should have released it to his friends, his neighbours and perhaps even his parliamentary colleague who represents that area.

I undertake to circulate the speech that I made earlier today, the speech made by the honourable member for Chermside, this explanation and a covering letter. I say to the honourable member for Chermside that, in a few months' time, the people of Woollooin and Kalinga will make their judgment. I am

sure that the person whom they will find wanting in that whole sad and sorry saga will not be me; it will be him. The honourable member for Chermside can rest assured that I will continue to do everything that I have been doing.

I support the *Bugle*, which is an independent local newspaper that is slandered constantly by the honourable member and other Government members. I will not accept anything other than that it is a reputable group of people who run a reputable newspaper. Just because those people act on behalf of the community and in the interests of the community—which is something that the honourable member for Chermside and his Government have refused to do—he should not slander them. However, that is why the honourable member slanders them. That is a reputable organisation.

**Mr T. B. Sullivan:** They were not slandered. Me thinks he doth protest too much.

**Mr SANTORO:** The honourable member says that those people were not slandered. When I fax to them the transcript of what he has said, I am sure that they will form a judgment that is considerably different from his. The honourable member for Chermside is a disgrace to his neighbours and his community, and I will proclaim him as that for as long as I have breath.

Clause 3, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 4 to 25, as read, agreed to.

Clause 26—

**Mr HAYWARD (4.18 p.m.):** I move the following amendment—

"At page 22, line 17, 'the premises'—  
*omit, insert—*

'premises'."

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 26, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 27—

**Mr HAYWARD (4.18 p.m.):** I move the following amendments—

"At page 22, lines 25 and 26—  
*omit.*

At page 23, lines 6 and 7—  
*omit.*"

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 27, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 28—

**Mr HAYWARD (4.19 p.m.):** I move the following amendments—

"At page 23, line 25, 'An'—  
*omit, insert—*

'The'.

At page 24, line 4, 'the officer has'—  
*omit, insert—*

'there are'.

At page 24, lines 9 to 17—  
*omit, insert—*

'(5) The warrant must state—

(a) that an authorised officer may, with necessary and reasonable help and force, enter the place and exercise the officer's powers under this Act; and

(b) the offence for which the warrant is sought; and

(c) the evidence that may be seized under the warrant; and

(d) the hours when the place may be entered; and

(e) the date, within 7 days after the warrant's issue, the warrant ends.'."

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 28, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 29—

**Mr HAYWARD (4.19 p.m.):** I move the following amendment—

"At page 25, lines 5 and 6—  
*omit, insert—*

'(b) the officer must complete a form of warrant ("warrant form") and write on it—'.

At page 25, line 25—

*omit, insert—*

'(10) The court must presume that the exercise of the power was not authorised by a warrant issued under this section, unless the contrary is proved.'."

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 29, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 30 to 74, as read, agreed to.

Clause 75—

**Mr JOHNSON (Gregory) (4.20 p.m.):** I have raised this matter with an officer in the Minister's department this morning and on Monday. I do not need the Minister to comment in relation to the issue of concessional registration for primary producers, but I suggest to him as I did to the officer in his department that, in years gone

by, a registration sticker distinguished between primary producer registrations and commercial registrations, and it would be useful to have those different stickers today. In this modern age, concessional registration for primary producers is for a primary cause, that is, for the primary producers to carry their goods to the railway siding or to the saleyard—it is not for a commercial operation.

Today, commercial operators are paying top dollar for their registration because that registration earns money for them. The officer told me this morning that the Department of Transport, through the use of computers and other methods, can detect whether a registration is issued for the purposes of a primary producer or commercial operator. However, I believe that those different registration stickers would be one way of further enabling departmental officers to know whether a vehicle is used for a commercial operation or a primary production operation.

Clause 75, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 76 to 93, as read, agreed to.

Schedule 1—

**Hon. K. W. HAYWARD** (Kallangur—Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development) (4.22 p.m.) I move the following amendments.

"At page 65, before line 2—

*insert—*

'1A. Section 4(1), definitions, "Coordination Plan", "government supported infrastructure", "port", "port authority", "Port infrastructure", "rail transport infrastructure", "road transport infrastructure", "State-controlled road", "transport infrastructure", "transport purpose"—

*relocate* to schedule 3, as inserted by this Act.

'1B. Section 4, other than relocated definitions—

*omit, insert—*

'Definitions—the dictionary

'4.(1) A dictionary in Schedule 3 defines particular words used in this Act.<sup>1</sup>

'(2) Definitions found elsewhere in the Act are signposted in the dictionary.<sup>2</sup>'

'1C. Section 20(1), definitions "land", "occupier", "owner" and "person"—

*omit.*'

'1D. Section 20(2)—

*omit.*'

At page 65, after line 13—

*insert—*

'5A. After section 45—

'Presumptions about advertising notices

'45A.(1) This section applies to a prosecution for an offence against section 45(3) in relation to an advertising notice.

'(2) Each person whose product or service is advertised on the notice is taken to maintain the notice, unless the person proves the advertisement was placed without the person's knowledge or permission.'

At page 66, after line 3—

*insert—*

'7A. Section 72, definitions "candidate GOC", "GOC" and "notice"—

*omit.*

'7B. Chapters 7 and 8—

*renumber* as chapters 8 and 9.

'7C. After section 101—

*insert—*

'CHAPTER 7—MISCELLANEOUS TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE

'Definitions

'101A. In this chapter—

"licence" means a licence for miscellaneous transport infrastructure granted under this or another Act.

"licensee" means the holder of a licence.

"miscellaneous transport infrastructure works" means—

(a) works done for—

(i) constructing miscellaneous transport infrastructure or things associated with miscellaneous transport infrastructure; or

(ii) the maintenance of miscellaneous transport infrastructure or of things associated with miscellaneous transport infrastructure; or

(iii) facilitating the operation of miscellaneous transport infrastructure or things associated with miscellaneous transport infrastructure; or

(b) works declared under a regulation to be miscellaneous transport infrastructure works.

"required land" means land that has been acquired for miscellaneous transport purposes or an incidental purpose.

'Licence for miscellaneous transport infrastructure

'101B. The Minister may grant to a person a licence to construct, maintain, use or operate stated miscellaneous transport infrastructure on stated conditions.

'Temporary use and occupation of land

'101C. To carry out miscellaneous transport infrastructure works, the chief executive, or anyone authorised in writing by the chief executive, may temporarily occupy and use land, including roads, and do anything on the land that is necessary or convenient.

'Notice of entry or permission to enter

'101D.(1) If a person proposes to occupy or use land under this chapter, the person must—

- (a) give at least 3 days written notice to the owner or occupier of the land; or
- (b) obtain the written permission of the owner or occupier to the occupation or use.

'(2) The notice must state—

- (a) the miscellaneous transport infrastructure works to be carried out; and
- (b) the use proposed to be made of the land; and
- (c) details of the things proposed to be done on the land; and
- (d) an approximate period when the occupation or use is expected to continue.

'(3) A notice may be given under subsection (1) in relation to land even though it is proposed to resume the land for miscellaneous transport infrastructure.

'(4) After the end of 3 days after service of a notice under subsection (1), or with the permission of the owner or occupier, the land may be entered and the miscellaneous transport infrastructure works specified in the notice carried out.

'(5) If a person proposes to occupy or use land to carry out urgent remedial work to miscellaneous transport infrastructure or miscellaneous transport infrastructure works, subsection (1) does not apply but the person must, if practicable, notify the owner or occupier of the land orally before entering the land.

'Compensation for physical damage from entry etc.

'101E.(1) An owner of land that is entered, occupied or used under this chapter may give a written notice to the chief executive claiming compensation for physical damage caused by the entry, occupation or use or for the taking or consumption of materials.

'(2) Compensation is not payable unless a claim is received by the chief executive within 1 year after occupation or use has ended.

'(3) However, the chief executive may allow a claim to be made at a later time.

'(4) Compensation awarded under this section must not be more than the compensation that would have been awarded if the land had been acquired.

'Chief executive may grant interests in land

'101F.(1) The chief executive may, for the State, grant or dispose of an interest in required land used, or proposed to be used, for miscellaneous transport infrastructure to—

- (a) a licensee; or
- (b) someone else authorised under another Act to construct, maintain, use or operate miscellaneous transport infrastructure.

'(2) The chief executive may grant the interest on conditions, including, for example, a condition that the interest ends if the person ceases to be a person entitled to be granted the interest.

'(3) This section has effect despite the *Acquisition of Land Act 1967*.

'Effect of chapter on other Acts

'101G. This chapter has effect despite a provision of another Act about—

- (a) constructing miscellaneous transport infrastructure; or
- (b) acquiring interests in land, or doing anything else, to enable the construction of miscellaneous transport infrastructure.'. .

"At page 66, lines 14 and 15—

*omit, insert—*

'10. Chapter 8, part 3, division 4 (as in force before this amendment)—

*omit.*

'11. Schedule 1—

*insert—*

'11. Regulation of miscellaneous transport infrastructure or miscellaneous transport infrastructure works.'

'12. After schedule 2—

*insert—*

'SCHEDULE 3  
DICTIONARY

section 4 of the Act

"ancillary works and encroachments", for chapter 5, see section 20.

"approved means of access", for chapter 5, part division 2, subdivision 2, see section 47.

"candidate GOC" has the same meaning as in as in the *Government Owned Corporations Act 1993*.

"charge" see section 72.

"construction", for chapter 5, see section 20.

"corporate plan", for chapter 6, see section 72.

"franchised road", for chapter 5, see section 20.

"franchisee", for chapter 5, see section 20.

"GOC" includes a candidate GOC.

"land"—

- (a) for chapters 5 and 7—includes—
- (i) an interest in land; and
  - (ii) land within the beds and banks of a stream, watercourse or inundated land; and
  - (iii) land beneath the internal waters of Queensland; or

(b) for chapter 6—see section 72.

"local government road", for chapter 5, see section 20.

"maintenance", for chapter 5, see section 20.

"means of access", for chapter 5, see section 20.

"miscellaneous transport infrastructure" means transport infrastructure that is not road transport infrastructure, rail transport infrastructure or port infrastructure, and includes anything declared under a regulation to be miscellaneous transport infrastructure.

"motorway", for chapter 5, see section 20.

"notice" means a notice, sign or pictograph of any type of material and whether fixed or moveable.

"occupier" of land, for chapters 5 and 7, means the person in actual occupation of the land or, if there is no person in actual occupation, the person entitled to possession of the land.

"on", for chapter 5, see section 20.

"owner" of land, for chapters 5 and 7, means—

- (a) the registered proprietor of the land; or
- (b) the lessee or licensee from the State of the land; or
- (c) the person who has lawful control of the land, on trust or otherwise; or
- (d) the person who is entitled to receive the rents and profits of the land.

"plant", for chapter 5, see section 20.

"ship", for chapter 6. see section 72.

"State controlled road", for chapter 5, part 5, division 2, subdivision 2, see section 47.

"statement of corporate intent", for chapter 6, see section 72.

"strategic port land", for chapter 6, see section 72.

"vehicle", for chapter 6, see section 72.'.'."

Page 69, after line 22—

*"insert—*

'5. Section 94(1), 'in relation to a ship'—

*omit.*

'6. Section 94(2), 'from the owner or master of the ship'—

*omit, insert—*

'from the persons liable for the expense.'

'7. Section 94—

*insert—*

'(3) The following persons are liable for the expense—

- (a) if a direction under section 88 was given to the master of a ship<sup>3</sup> and the master did not comply with the direction—the master and the owner of the ship;
- (b) if a direction under section 88 could have been given to the master of a ship but was not given for the reasons mentioned in section 93(2)—the master and the owner of the ship;

- (c) if a direction was given to a person under section 89, 90, 91 or 92 and the person did not comply with the direction—the person;
- (d) if a direction under section 89, 90, 91 or 92 could have been given to a person but was not given for the reasons mentioned in section 93(2)—the person.<sup>4</sup>

'(4) If, under subsection (3), more than 1 person is liable for the same expense, the persons who are liable for the expense are jointly and severally liable.'

<sup>1</sup>In some Acts, definitions are contained in a dictionary that appears as the last schedule and forms part of the Act—*Acts Interpretation Act 1954*, section 14.

<sup>2</sup>The signpost definitions in the dictionary alert the reader to the terms defined elsewhere in the Act and tell the reader where the definitions can be found.

<sup>3</sup>Under section 86(3) and (4) (General limitation on harbour master's power to give directions under Subdivision) a direction may be given to a crew member

of a ship and, if so given, is taken to have been given to the master.

<sup>4</sup>Section 88 (Direction to master about operation of ship)

Section 89 (Direction to person in charge of a place)

Section 90 (Direction to person carrying out works)

Section 91 (Direction to person about obstruction)

Section 92 (Direction to person to put out certain lights etc.)

Section 93 (Harbour master may carry out direction.)"

Amendments agreed to.

Schedule 1, as amended, agreed to.

Schedules 2 and 3, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, with amendments.

### Third Reading

Bill, on motion of Mr Hayward, by leave, read a third time.

The House adjourned at 4.24 p.m.

**ANSWER TO QUESTION UPON  
NOTICE****24. Surf Life Saving Club Leases**

Mr HOBBS asked the Minister for Lands—

With reference to his replacement Land Use Policy—

- (1) Will the Crown leases on the Alexandra Headland, Mooloolaba and Maroochydore Surf Life Saving Clubs, that are due to expire in 1995, 1996 and 2015 respectively be renewed?
- (2) If so, what additional conditions will be placed on these leases?

Answer:

- (1) Firstly, I must clarify that the Life Saving Club leases mentioned by Mr Hobbs are not subject to the new policy of the Department of Lands which deals with the secondary use of trust land because they are Special Leases which have been issued to the relevant Clubs direct from the Department of Lands. The new Policy

only relates to leases which have been or will be issued by trustees over trust land.

Secondly, the expiry dates mentioned by Mr Hobbs are incorrect. For the information of the House, the correct dates on which the terms of these leases expire are: Alexandra Headlands—31 December 2036; Mooloolaba—31 July 2021 and Maroochydore—25 November 2016.

As to whether these leases will be renewed, I can only say that having regard to the substantial period of time before the expiry of each lease, it is difficult for me to give any firm commitment. However, unless there is some major shift in the methodology of lifesaving or the environmental management of beachfront land, it is highly probable that an application for the renewal of these leases will be treated favourably.

- (2) Given my preceding comments on the renewal of these leases, it would be inappropriate for me to give any indication of the conditions which will be applicable to beachfront leases which commence well into the next century.