FRIDAY, 20 OCTOBER 1995

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

QUEENSLAND AUDIT OFFICE

Annual Report

Mr SPEAKER: I have to advise the House that today I received from the Auditor-General the annual report of the Queensland Audit Office for the period 1994-95.

PETITION

The Clerk announced the receipt of the following petition—

Noise Barriers, Pacific Highway

From **Mr Barton** (86 signatories) praying that a sound barrier fence be provided on both sides of the highway between Logan and George Streets, Beenleigh.

Petition received.

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

In accordance with the schedule circulated by the Clerk to members in the Chamber, the following documents were tabled—

Electricity Act 1994—

Electricity Amendment Regulation (No. 4) 1995, No. 289

Electricity (Electrical Articles) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 1995, No. 290

Fisheries Act 1994—

Fisheries (Pumicestone Strait Closed Waters) Declaration 1995, No. 291

Occupational Therapists Act 1979—

Occupational Therapists By-law 1995, No. 286

Podiatrists Act 1969—

Podiatrists Amendment By-law (No. 1) 1995, No. 287

Radioactive Substances Act 1958—

Radioactive Substances Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 1995, No. 288

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table—

(a) Treasurer (Mr De Lacy)—

Queensland Machine Gaming Commission—Annual Report for 1994-95

(b) Minister for Justice and Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for the Arts (Mr Foley)—

Annual Reports for 1994-95—

Queensland Law Reform Commission

Court of Appeal

(c) Minister for Administrative Services (Mr Milliner)—

Annual Reports for 1994-95—

Administrative Services Department

Board of Professional Engineers of Queensland

Board of Architects of Queensland

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Papaya Fruit-fly

Hon R. J. GIBBS (Bundamba—Minister for Primary Industries and Minister for Racing) (10.03 a.m.), by leave: The Department of Primary Industries has moved quickly to control a suspected outbreak of papaya fruit-fly in the Cairns district with the establishment of a quarantine zone with a 15-kilometre radius centred on the East Trinity district east of the city. Papaya fruit-fly is endemic in Papua New Guinea, Thailand, Indonesia, Malaysia and Singapore, but has not previously been detected on mainland Australia. However, previous outbreaks have been recorded in the Torres Strait.

There are a number of very serious issues that need to be considered. The implications for trade and horticultural produce are very serious. Quarantine-sensitive export markets such as New Zealand, Japan, North America and Taiwan could be closed pending further information on the outbreak. The trade implications are likely to include restricted movement of Queensland produce interstate as other States move to protect their horticultural industries. The pest has a wide host range in horticultural commodities and will affect almost all Queensland fruit and vegetable products. Trade bans by overseas countries could affect exports from other States as well as Queensland.

Although the insect has been detected in pawpaws on only a single property, routine quarantine measures have been put in place to minimise movement of the insect and maximise the effectiveness of control programs. Under the provisions of the quarantine, no horticultural produce will be allowed to leave the property without the permission of the Department of Primary Industries. All infested fruit will be destroyed. My department is treating this issue with the

highest possible priority. It is being led by a specialist fruit-fly laboratory staffed by five entomologists established at Cairns. As a precautionary measure, more than 500 fruit-fly traps are being set in an arc bounded by Mossman in the north and Cardwell in the south to clearly define the extent of the outbreak. Further traps are also being set in the Burdekin/Bowen area. The DPI is working closely with the Australian Quarantine Inspection Service, and additional security has been put in place to monitor interstate and export shipments of horticultural produce.

The Queensland Fruit and Vegetable Growers Organisation strongly supports the measures put in place by the department and has joined with the Department of Primary Industries in urging all producers to assist in containing the outbreak by immediately reporting any fruit-fly outbreaks in the area.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Mrs J. Leahy and Ms V. Arnold

Hon M. J. FOLEY (Yeronga—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for the Arts) (10.06 a.m.), by leave: On Sunday 6 August 1995, the *Sunday* program put to air a segment relating to the circumstances surrounding the deaths of Julie-Anne Leahy and Vicki Serina Arnold. The program was critical of the police investigation and raised what it claimed were doubts about the conclusions of the coroner that Vicki Arnold killed Julie-Anne Leahy and then herself.

I saw the program before it went to air and gave the Director of Public Prosecutions a direction pursuant to section 10 (1) (f) of the Director of Public Prosecutions Act 1984 in the following terms—

"(1) to review the evidence in the investigation of the deaths of Julie-Anne Leahy and Vicki Serina Arnold at Atherton on or about 26 July 1991 and any subsequent evidence available;

(2) to examine the evidence available from sources in the Department of Justice and Attorney-General, as well as that available in the Queensland Police Service records as far as necessary to comply with (4) below;

(3) the examination requested above in (1) and (2) should be sufficient to recommend whether there are any grounds upon which I should order the re-opening of the coroner's inquest;

(4) to report in writing to me in relation to this review as early as possible and, in any event, within two months from this date, that is, by 9 October 1995."

Mr R. N. Miller, QC, the Director of Public Prosecutions, subsequently assigned this matter to Mr David Bullock, a very experienced consultant Crown prosecutor. I now seek leave to table Mr Bullock's report to me on the review of evidence in the investigation into the deaths of Julie-Anne Leahy and Vicki Serina Arnold.

Leave granted.

Mr FOLEY: Mr Bullock's report is the result of careful, comprehensive and objective examination of the available information. As part of his investigation of the case, Mr Bullock travelled to north Queensland to view the scene and to interview a number of persons interested in the matter. Mr Bullock also furnished a set of appendices containing photographs of exhibits to the investigation which, out of respect for the relatives, I do not propose to release publicly. Members will note that Mr Bullock has concluded that—

"None of the matters raised in this report in my opinion raise a question about the reliability of the coroner's conclusion that Vicki Arnold killed Julie-Anne Leahy and then herself.

It follows in my submission that there is no evidence to satisfy you that the inquest be reopened."

I accept Mr Bullock's conclusion that there is no basis for reopening an inquest.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Environment and Heritage Department Officers

Mr SLACK (10.11 a.m.): I refer the Minister for Environment and Heritage to a report in the *Sunday Mail* of 15 October which indicated that a coastguard officer——

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I remind honourable members that I will not allow interjections to be made while a question is being asked.

Mr SLACK: I will start again. I refer the Minister for Environment and Heritage to a report in the *Sunday Mail* of 15 October which indicated that a coastguard officer had seen a dozen heavily armed men, some wearing Department of Environment and Heritage uniforms, checking firearms and equipment, including machine-guns, in a camp at Bathurst

Bay earlier this year. As the DEH officer in charge reportedly told witnesses to keep quiet about the whole episode, and in view of the constant reports involving illegal arms and drugs trading between Cape York and Papua New Guinea, I ask: can the Minister explain what DEH officers were doing checking that apparent arms cache? Why were they heavily armed? What action has the Minister taken in regard to this matter?

Mr BARTON: I certainly read that *Sunday Mail* article with a great deal of interest last Sunday morning. I thought that I should read it. It contains a few facts. Certainly, a vessel did sink outside Ninian Bay, but the rest of the article seems to be the work of a very heightened imagination. I have undertaken a very thorough investigation of this matter, and if I were to read this morning all the material in my possession which I have received over the past week, my answer to this question would take up most of question time, if not all of it.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr BARTON: I have some notes with me.

As to the honourable member's question about weapons at Bathurst Bay—my advice is that two weapons were present at Bathurst Bay. One was owned by a Sergeant Kelly, who was present and carrying his service revolver. These days, it is quite common for police to wear their service revolvers regardless of where they are; so it was not unusual for that officer to be wearing his service revolver. The other weapon was a .308 stainless steel barrelled rifle in the possession of a departmental officer, P. Stratton. That weapon remained at Ninian Bay for the entire period that coastguard personnel were at the park. Although other officers were present, the only weapons there were the service revolver carried by the police sergeant and the standard issue stainless steel rifle carried by another officer. Quite frankly, it is not unusual for officers who travel into areas such as Ninian Bay—particularly crocodile-infested areas—to carry weapons of that nature. When they are working in a marine environment, it is necessary that their weapons be made from stainless steel. I am informed that there was certainly no cache of arms or machine-guns present.

A number of people were present when the vessel was swamped by a large wave and sunk. Those people were rescued and taken to Bathurst Bay. A number of people were present at that time. I assure the public that my officers—regardless of what operation they are undertaking—do not run around in Army uniforms; nor do they run around with chrome stainless steel magnum pistols or machine-guns. As I have indicated, two weapons were present.

An honourable member interjected.

Mr BARTON: I will not take interjections that I cannot understand.

Mr Slack: Are you saying that the coastguard officer is wrong?

Mr BARTON: I am saying that, according to my information, the coastguard officer was certainly wrong.

Mr SLACK: I rise to a point of order. The Minister referred to some documents. Is he going to table them?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. He has asked his question.

Break and Enter Statistics

Mr LIVINGSTONE: I ask the Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services: is he aware of the launch yesterday of the Federal Government's information campaign on burglary prevention and the release of a new study analysing break and enter trends? What do the figures show for Queensland?

Mr BRADDY: The figures released yesterday are indeed very interesting; they show a significant improvement in Queensland in relation to break and enter offences. What the figures show——

Mr Littleproud: Ha, ha!

Mr BRADDY: The honourable member for Western Downs laughs. Members of the Opposition have never welcomed improved crime figures in this State, and their true hand is revealed when one gets that sort of cynical reaction.

In terms of the figures on break and enter offences—of the six Australian States, Queensland's figures are now the third-best, behind Victoria and New South Wales, and our figures are better than those for South Australia, Tasmania and Western Australia. Significantly, of the six States, only three improved their performance in relation to break and enter offences figures from 1993 to 1994. Again, Queensland was one of those three States, so it is now the third-best in the country in terms of the number of reported offences per 100,000 people, and the situation is improving. However, New South Wales—one of the two States which are currently ahead of Queensland in terms of break and enter figures—suffered a decline in its performance

in 1994, whereas the situation in Queensland improved. Of the top three States, only Victoria and Queensland improved their performance from 1993 to 1994.

I understand that the police operational statistics report for 1994-95, which is due out shortly, will probably indicate a further improved performance during 1994-95 in relation to break and enters in this State. Opposition members may be cynical; they may laugh. But the fact is that Queensland is now the third-best State in Australia in terms of break and enter statistics, and its position is improving year by year. This good result has not come about by accident.

In 1991 this Government made a determination to address the issue of crime prevention. Many different programs were set up, such as: home security advisory displays; crime prevention training programs; the enormous expansion of the Neighbourhood Watch program, which was a disgrace under the previous Government—there were hardly any Neighbourhood Watch groups—and the Property Crime Squad. All those programs are now doing well. It is therefore no accident that Queensland is now the third-best State in the country in terms of break and enter statistics and that our situation is improving, along with that of Victoria.

This Government is determined to increase the numbers and resources within the Property Crime Squad. In its first year of operations, that squad identified $5m worth of stolen property, recovered $3m worth of it and charged over 600 people. This State, this Government and this Queensland police force have been successful in the fight against property crime, and they will continue to be so under this Government.

Tourism Promotion

Mr DAVIDSON: I refer the Premier to the fact that the managing director of the Australian Tourism Council, Bruce Baird, recently hosted all State Premiers to breakfast functions attended by leading tourism industry representatives. Such a function in New South Wales with Premier Bob Carr was attended by 450 tourism representatives. I understand an invitation or request was extended by Mr Baird to the Premier to attend such a function in Brisbane but he chose not to attend. I refer also to a statement on TV last night by the managing director of the Australian Tourist Commission, Jon Hutchison, who said he had not yet met with Tom Burns, the responsible Minister, despite the fact that he had flown to Brisbane for such a meeting. I now ask: given the importance of the tourism industry to Queensland and the Deputy Premier's bucketing of the director of the Australian Tourism Commission, how can the Premier ensure that the concerns of the Queensland tourism industry are at the forefront in international tourism promotion strategies when his Government fails to meet with the key players?

Mr W. K. GOSS: As we know, Mr Baird is a former Liberal member of Parliament.

Honourable members: Ha, ha!

Mr W. K. GOSS: Members opposite should not laugh at him. I know Bruce. During the last year, I stood on a public platform in the Sheraton Hotel with Bruce Baird and praised him for his efforts in relation to the Olympics. I have plenty of time for Mr Baird, and I do not appreciate members opposite laughing at him in that fashion. I ask members opposite—never having been in Government—to accept in good faith that a person in the position of Premier, whoever that may be from time to time, gets a lot of invitations. The Premier cannot accept them all. This Government has, however, put a high priority on the tourism industry. In the first two terms it was given senior portfolio status and indeed——

Mr Borbidge: Every other Premier accepted.

Mr W. K. GOSS: The Leader of the Opposition should not talk to me like that. I can point to a number of invitations that he has not accepted, including the invitation to attend the commemoration of Anzac Day, not one of the members opposite turned up. So they should not give me that nonsense——

Opposition members interjected.

Mr W. K. GOSS: —given the contempt that the Leader of the Opposition has shown for some major community functions. It is much more comfortable for him to be down at Surfers Paradise than it is to attend major and significant community functions. We now have a National Party that is run by a Gold Coast motelier and a George Street QC. That is what the National Party has come to.

Mr Borbidge interjected.

Mr W. K. GOSS: A bit touchy about the Surfers Paradise connection, are we? If that is the sort of National Party they want to be, good luck to them.

Mr Borbidge interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition will cease interjecting.

Mr W. K. GOSS: That will be the day. In our third term, we have appointed——

Mr FitzGerald interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I suggest to the member for Lockyer that his interjection does not add to the flavour, either.

Mr W. K. GOSS: In our third term, we have appointed the Deputy Premier to the Tourism portfolio, which indicates the importance that we attach to it. We have also dramatically increased funds for tourism promotion in this State compared to what they were under the National Party and the National/Liberal Parties. Furthermore, we run the most successful tourism promotion operation of any Australian State, both within this country and overseas. That is reflected in the numbers of tourists coming to Queensland.

In addition to that, we have no hesitation in letting the Mr Bairds and Mr Hutchisons of this world know what we think about their performance and how we think they can improve their performance relating to the premier tourism State, Queensland, which is not receiving its due recognition. We do make our views known to these people, both publicly and privately. The reason that the Deputy Premier was unable to meet with Mr Hutchison was that he had parliamentary commitments.

Let me inform the honourable member that only a few months ago I took it upon myself to tell Mr Hutchison of my concerns about the ATC's performance relating to Queensland. I told him of our concerns about the failure to adequately recognise and promote Queensland and I took him through the brochure that was provided at the International Tourism Exhibition, the ITB, in Berlin. I showed him where Queensland was in the book and told him that I did not think it was good enough. The ATC promotes Sydney too much. The jewel in the Australian tourism crown is Queensland, and we are not going to apologise for standing up for Queensland and getting a better deal. That is not to knock Sydney, which is a top-notch and very attractive tourist destination for international tourists. So is Queensland, and we want to be treated equally.

Social Justice Funding

Mr T. B. SULLIVAN: I refer the Treasurer to the Opposition's claims that the State Government's financial management strategy ignores the important social justice programs, and I ask: can he inform the House whether the State Budget spending in these areas has increased since the election of the Goss Government?

Mr De LACY: I think that is an important question, because I have read with interest comments that somehow our commitment to good financial management is at odds with our commitment to delivering social programs. I want to make it quite clear, as I have done on numerous occasions, that good financial management is not an end in itself; it is merely a means to an end. That end is delivering social programs and improving the quality of life of all Queenslanders.

Today, I would like to indicate to the House the increase in outlays in important social areas that the Goss Government has been able to make and compare them with the increases in the other States, so that I can lay to rest forever the notion that somehow good financial management is not to the benefit of all Queenslanders. These are ABS portfolio categories and therefore to use them is to compare apples with apples; that is, they can be compared equally with the other States of Australia.

In the area of public order and safety, between 1989-90 and this financial year, 1995-96, we have increased spending in real terms by 18 per cent while the other States have increased spending by 13 per cent. In education, we have increased spending—in real terms again, that is, abstracting from inflation—by 35 per cent while the rest of Australia has increased spending by 9 per cent. In health, we have increased spending in real terms by 33 per cent while the other States have increased spending by 8 per cent. In social security and welfare, we have increased spending by 163 per cent, while the other States have increased spending by 44 per cent. In recreation and culture, including conservation, we have increased spending by 135 per cent, while there has been a nil increase in the other States of Australia. Overall, over the last six years the Goss Government has increased outlays in real terms by 39 per cent. The other States, with their attitude to financial management, have been able to increase outlays by only 3 per cent.

We have a policy whereby we do not borrow for social infrastructure. It has been suggested that somehow we are not meeting the infrastructure needs of Queensland. Let me put that one to rest also. Between 1989-90 and 1994-95, Queensland increased spending in capital works from $672 per capita to $923 per capita. At the same time, the other States of Australia have actually

decreased spending on capital works by $27 per capita. In other words, we have increased spending by 37 per cent; the other States have reduced spending by 4 per cent. In conclusion, I make the point that good financial management is not antagonistic to meeting the social agenda; it is absolutely essential.

Transit Australia

Mr JOHNSON: I refer the Minister for Transport to the considerable success that a company called Transit Australia has had in winning a number of new bus service licence tenders approved by his department. I ask: is it a fact that the chief executive officer of Transit Australia is a former senior Department of Transport official who was deeply involved in the tender process which saw the company receive very favourable consideration? What is this officer's name, and what assurances can the Minister give about the integrity of the tender process?

Mr ELDER: The fellow was not involved in the contracts. The contracts have been let to enhance bus services throughout Queensland, from Cairns to the New South Wales border. The letting of bus contracts is a move by this Government to ensure that the provision of public transport is enhanced throughout this State. The people throughout this State deserve the types of services that that move will provide, that is, buses will be running more regularly throughout this State—from Cairns to Coolangatta. In those service contracts, contractors are obliged to ensure that they deliver those enhanced services to people throughout Queensland. When the members opposite were in Government, most of those areas were not serviced by public transport.

Mr JOHNSON: I rise to a point of order. The Minister has not yet answered one part of my question. I ask that he refer to the question.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I cannot tell the Minister how to answer a question.

Mr ELDER: The honourable member asks the questions and I get to answer them.

When the members opposite were in Government, bus licences were issued without the operators being required to meet particular standards. Former bus operators sitting on the back benches opposite can confirm that no standards were set. We are now protecting the interests of Queenslanders. We are looking after the interests of potential passengers—not turning them away from using public transport but enhancing systems throughout the State in order to provide those people with the ability to use public transport and, at the same time, relieve the pressures on the road systems about which the honourable member has concerns.

Mr Johnson interjected.

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

Mr ELDER: In relation to the question that the honourable member asked, I am not aware of any involvement and my understanding is that the person was not involved.

Boggo Road Gaol Site

Ms BLIGH: I refer the Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services to the proposed redevelopment of the old Boggo Road site that was announced by the Premier during the recent election campaign. I ask: could the Minister please advise the House of measures that he is taking to address concerns expressed by residents and organisations located close to the old Boggo Road site? In particular, can the Minister please advise the House of public consultation being undertaken regarding the future use of the site?

Mr BRADDY: The honourable member is, of course, the new member for South Brisbane and she has been very active in that capacity in investigating and considering what will be the use of the Boggo Road site. On 29 August, shortly after the election result was clear, we assembled a consultative committee to investigate using that site as a justice precinct. The member for South Brisbane was very active in suggesting to me the groups that should be involved. She is a member of the consultative committee along with representatives from the Dutton Park State School P & C, the Boggo Road Action Group, the Queensland Law Society, the Aboriginal Justice Advisory Committee, the Catholic Prison Ministry, the Women's Legal Service and quite a few others. The committee has been a very good working committee. We have had several meetings that have provided opportunities for local residents, prisoner advocacy groups and the Law Society to voice their views in relation to the matter.

In addition, at Government expense, four members of that committee went to Adelaide and Melbourne and visited inner-city remand centres that have been operating in those cities for several years. Those committee

members then had a better understanding of the likely impact of an inner-city or close-to-the-city remand centre such as those that operate in those two cities. The committee is working very harmoniously and very constructively. That is an example of what can be done when people are prepared to work with the Government and consult rather than standing outside and throwing stones.

The delegation saw how important those centres are, how well they can work and how well the Adelaide and Melbourne centres blend with their environments. They have also made—as they should—criticisms of how those centres in those two cities are operating and noted aspects to be avoided when we proceed to build another watch-house and remand centre in Queensland.

I commend all the members of the committee. I particularly commend the member for South Brisbane for her energy and enthusiasm when working with those groups. It is quite obvious to me that those groups of people understand and appreciate the opportunity to work with her, the Government and me in relation to these matters. At our next meeting we will be providing statistics in relation to watch-houses to further advance the work of the committee. I anticipate that, within a couple of months, the matter will be resolved once and for all and the Government will be in a position to make final arrangements in relation to the building of an inner-city court complex, watch-house and remand centre.

Queensland Principal Club; Q Promotions

Mr BEANLAND: I direct a question to the Minister for Racing. As he is aware, the Criminal Justice Commission recommended to the Queensland Principal Club for thoroughbred racing that a full and comprehensive audit be conducted of the operations of Q Promotions from its inception. I ask: can the Minister inform the House what action the Queensland Principal Club took in relation to that recommendation?

Mr GIBBS: The member for Indooroopilly, who for some incredible reason has a set against progress in the Queensland racing industry, would be well advised to obtain a copy of the report that was tabled yesterday by Mr Ian Temby into racing in New South Wales, which is virtually a carbon copy of the major reforms made in this State four years ago. That will result in an incredible shake-up among the Australian Jockey Club and the formation of the Australian Thoroughbred Racing Council to administer racing. I make that point because that poor chap opposite is so out of touch that he constantly rises on this favourite subject of his in an attempt to denigrate that which is applauded openly by racing enthusiasts of this country as the most innovative and best scheme that has ever been introduced in this country to encourage people to enter the racing industry and participate in the purchase of a thoroughbred racing animal.

That scheme also ensures the continued and ongoing success of our breeding stock in Queensland. I will refer to the honourable member's point in a moment, but I believe that it is important that this point be made. This season, for the first time ever in the history of the racing industry in this State, we can openly boast that, as a result of the introduction of this Queensland Racing Incentive Scheme, we have five Group 1 stallions now standing at stud in Queensland. We have some of the best brood mares in this country, including 30 which were brought from New Zealand by Mr Rob McAnulty, who is recognised as being among the top bloodstock experts in the world. Those 30 brood mares were brought to Queensland this year to be bred to Queensland sires. That scheme has been great news—a huge success—for the industry. The member for Indooroopilly led the charge on television 12 months ago when he tried to rubbish the scheme. He was set up to do that by a rival sales company that believed that it might lose its monopoly. He is a personal up-front stooge for a number of malcontents within the racing industry.

As a result of his actions, the Criminal Justice Commission carried out a full investigation of the QRIS scheme. It found nothing wrong with it at all. Despite all the innuendo, the false allegations and the insinuations against people, everybody was given a clean bill of health. However, the CJC made a number of recommendations in relation to what it believed were areas in which security could be tightened up.

Since then, the responsibility for QRIS has been transferred to the Queensland Principal Club. In terms of Mr Needham's management—he no longer runs the scheme. His sole role is that of the owner of Q Promotions, which carries out the sale of thoroughbred stock each year. QRIS is now under the full auspices and control of the Queensland Principal Club. To the best of my knowledge, every recommendation that was made by the Criminal Justice Commission for changes to that scheme has been

implemented. The scheme is overseen by the members of the Queensland Principal Club.

I suggest that if the member has a problem with the scheme, he should confer with his colleague the member for Crows Nest, who I am sure could confer with his colleague the member for Toowoomba North, who is his secondary adviser on racing. Then the member for Crows Nest can confer with the specialist committee, which they formed, to advise the member for Toowoomba North to advise the member for Crows Nest, and then the member for Crows Nest can tell the member for Indooroopilly. So it is pretty simple. If the member for Toowoomba North did his job, he would make both the other members much more comfortable.

Challinor and Basil Stafford Centres

Mr HOLLIS: I refer the Minister for Family and Community Services to an article in today's *Queensland Times*, which claims that the Government has ordered a halt to institutional reform at the Basil Stafford and Challinor Centres, and I ask: will she outline the facts of the situation?

Mrs WOODGATE: I thank the honourable member for the question, because I would certainly like this opportunity to clarify what I consider to be a complete misrepresentation of my position. On many occasions, I have said publicly that the institutional reforms being undertaken by the Goss Government will be tailor-made plans for every individual. If people need 24-hour around-the-clock care, that is what they will get. If they require support services combined with a degree of independence, then that is what they will get.

In regard to the movement of residents, what I have said both publicly on many occasions and when I have met with many groups who have come to see me in my office is that this process will not be rushed. No resident will be moved out of the Challinor Centre or the Basil Stafford Centre unless adequate community support and case plans are in place and, more importantly, until I as Minister am satisfied that those case plans are in place and that the supports are there.

Contrary to the story in today's edition of the *Queensland Times*, there has not—n-o-t—been a freeze on reforms. The Challinor Centre and the Basil Stafford Centre will close. I am astonished that the Opposition spokesman, Mr Lingard, welcomed what he thought was a halt to reforms. He seeks to use quotes selectively from the CJC review of the Basil Stafford Centre by Justice Stewart when he believes that they suit his own bent political campaign of fear. For instance, Mr Lingard referred to a lack of staff training and inadequate monitoring of staff. However, he did not say something that was said by Mr Justice Stewart, which was—

> "An insidious institutional culture existed at the centre. This culture promoted the occurrence of client abuse and gross neglect. This culture provided the climate and thus, the opportunity, for acts of official misconduct to take place and minimised the likelihood of both the act and the offender being detected."

As part of his fear campaign, Mr Lingard has said that residents will be at greater risk in the community. Mr Justice Stewart also said—

> "A number of unlawful assaults were perpetrated by staff at the Basil Stafford Centre upon severely and profoundly intellectually disabled persons residing there. Additionally, there were instances of clients being neglected by their care-givers; on occasions, that neglect was gross."

In conclusion, I refer Mr Lingard to the concluding remarks of Mr Justice Stewart that show clearly one more reason why this Government is determined to give the residents of the Challinor and Basil Stafford Centres a better life. Mr Justice Stewart stated—

> "The process of de-institutionalisation is now to be applied to the Basil Stafford Centre, and the sooner the better."

Queensland Principal Club; Q Promotions

Mr COOPER: Further to the question that was asked of the Minister for Racing by the member for Indooroopilly, I table a copy of the minutes of the Queensland Principal Club of 6 July 1995, and I ask the Minister: is he aware that the Queensland Principal Club, despite the recommendation of the CJC and its own financial controller, Mr Carroll, decided at this meeting to meekly agree to a demand by Mr John Needham of Q Promotions to limit that audit to the period 1 July 1994 to 31 May 1995? Can the Minister explain why the Queensland Principal Club rolled over to comply with Mr Needham's outrageous demand?

Mr GIBBS: The second part of the tag teams comes in—the absent member for Crows Nest, who is never at home to do work in his own electorate. No, I am not aware of

that. Of course, what I am aware of is the number of people the member has been meeting with and asking about QRIS over the past couple of weeks. He has been getting the reply from them that they are all very happy with it. The member has also been asking them if they have any dirt on Mr Needham, and they have all been telling him, "No." He seems to be dissatisfied with that.

I am amazed that the member would, following on from his tag partner, ask me in this House if I am aware of what the QPC has done. Does he not ever get the message? Opposition members led the charge and said that the Government should stay out of the racing industry and that, in terms of the Minister's responsibilities, it should be hands off. The QPC runs racing in Queensland. I make the comment that there is never an obligation on anybody, and neither should there ever be an obligation on anybody, to implement every recommendation of the Criminal Justice Commission. We live in a democracy, and that does not mean that every time the CJC delivers a report, everything in that report is necessarily correct. Good God! If we followed every recommendation of the CJC, where would we be today after the shemozzle that we all remember in relation to the poker machine industry report? That report should have kept Opposition members on their toes. The reality is that the CJC can make mistakes; it is not infallible. If the QPC has not implemented some recommendation, I am sure that there is a very good reason for it.

The member might consider taking up the genuine offer that I made to him some weeks ago. I know that the racing industry is a difficult industry to understand and that his only involvement in it has been as an occasional track-side observer on a social occasion. I repeat that offer: if he has a problem understanding the industry or getting across it, my officers are available at any time to give him a briefing. I am there to help him. That is the sort of human being I am.

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

Mr GIBBS: In conclusion, if the member needs a little bit of information and help, he should come and ask for it.

Coopers Creek Cotton Development

Mr ROBERTSON: I ask the Minister for Primary Industries: can he inform the House of the implications of the proposed cotton development on Coopers Creek in the State's far south west in light of concerns about the project expressed by landowners in the region and the New South Wales and South Australian Governments?

Mr GIBBS: I am aware of the deep concern that has been expressed by the Premier of New South Wales and the Premier of South Australia, who I understand will be having some discussion with the Queensland Premier, Wayne Goss, next week in relation to those States' concern about the proposal for the establishment of a cotton industry. I was very heartened yesterday to receive a media release from the Chairman of the Australia Cotton Foundation, Mr Peter Corish, who also expresses grave concerns about the viability of the establishment of a cotton——

An Opposition member interjected.

Mr GIBBS: Yes, that is very good. I am pleased that he did that, because the member will understand what I am going to say. That makes it easier for me.

Mr Corish expressed grave concerns about the establishment of a cotton industry which could have major environmental effects in relation to the Lake Eyre Basin. For those who perhaps are not aware, the Curareva developers have submitted a waterworks application for 14 pumps off Coopers Creek with a maximum diversion capacity of 2,000 megalitres a day. I know that some members on the other side of the House do have grave concerns about this proposal, because it could have an effect on the viability of different parts of rural industry in a number of electorates throughout Queensland. Therefore, I assure all honourable members that the development near Windorah will not proceed without a complete and impartial environmental impact assessment. Before this environmental impact assessment of the project can be undertaken, my department will need to complete a water allocation policy for the entire Cooper system. This study will take into account not only environmental flows but also beneficial flooding and stock and domestic demands. In this way, the proposal can be evaluated not only on its possible impact on the local area but also on the effect it might have on the entire Lake Eyre catchment.

Because this is of such grave concern to local people who may be affected by it, my departmental officers yesterday attended a meeting in Windorah to outline the assessment process to the Cooper Creek Protection Group. They will be inviting members of the group to join an advisory body that is being formed to provide input into the evaluation process. The advisory body will

include representatives of the Department of Lands and the Department of Environment and Heritage, the recently formed Lake Eyre ICM Steering Group and the Queensland and South Australian Conservation Councils. The Department of Primary Industries will also approach the South Australian Department of Environment and Natural Resources seeking its involvement in the evaluation process.

Yesterday, I issued a press release which perhaps some would think was a little premature. In fact, I was accused of that yesterday by a person in the cotton industry. However, I think it should be clearly understood that, from my point of view and that of my department, we also have grave concerns about this project and its viability. The bottom line simply is that the cotton industry in Queensland is recognised in terms of best practice and technology as among the best in the world, and as far as we as a Government are concerned our cotton market is a precious one. The proposed expansion of the industry in that area causes us a great deal of concern and it simply will not be allowed to proceed before all the measures that I have outlined to the House have been put into place.

Roma Fire Station; Telstra

Mr LITTLEPROUD: In answer to a question on 7 September, the Minister for Emergency Services and Consumer Affairs stated that Telstra attempted to contact the Roma Fire Station on only two occasions in response to a call on 000 in July 1995. Telstra has informed the *Western Star* in Roma that it first attempted to contact the station at 15.30, and again at 15.31, 15.32, 15.35, 15.37 and 15.46. I ask the Minister: will he table documentation to prove that this is not the case?

Mr DAVIES: There have been several correspondences between myself and the member for Western Downs in relation to this matter. Obviously I have not got with me the paperwork to which he has referred this morning.

In broad terms, the Mornington systems are widely used across the State, and have been for many years without major problems. I have been advised that there have been delayed responses to two fires reported over the Mornington system in Roma. I am further advised that investigations to date by QFS and Telstra have failed to find a definite cause for these faults. Telstra has agreed to conduct exhaustive tests of the Mornington system at Roma and report back to Assistant Commissioner Jones on the outcomes.

Mr Littleproud interjected.

Mr DAVIES: In response to the interjection, I have clearly said that I do not have that documentation with me this morning, but if the member wants to contact my office, I will agree to give him the information.

To ensure an effective response to all calls in Roma, an interim procedure has been adopted and Telstra has been contacted to perform alterations to the Mornington fire recall system. A diverter is being installed at the Roma exchange to relay all fire calls reported through the existing Mornington system and 000 to Firecom Toowoomba. It will handle the calls and call a silent number to activate the existing Mornington system in Roma. When answered by the Roma auxiliaries, Firecom operators will pass on the pertinent information. If the Firecom operators do not receive any response through the Mornington system for any reason, a secondary procedure will be implemented. A telephone call will be made to the nominated auxiliary fire fighter and to the Queensland Ambulance Service, Roma. On receipt of the calls, Roma personnel will be advised of the malfunction and requested to activate the fire siren.

The interim measure will remain in operation until all avenues of modern technology have been exhausted in an endeavour to establish a replacement system. Concern has been expressed by the Roma Mayor and the member for Western Downs that local calls are being diverted away from the city. However, there is no other acceptable local solution to this problem at present. It is not known when the selective replacement technology will meet this requirement.

As a further strategy, a pager system will be trialled at Roma to establish if a 30 to 60 second response is achievable. The equipment will be tested approximately four times a day in various sections of the community and a report will be tabled at the conclusion of the test. The Mayor of Roma, Mr Barry Braithwaite, was contacted by Assistant Commissioner Jones and advised of the interim measure to be adopted at Roma. A written confirmation will be provided to the mayor to be tabled at the next council meeting.

Bells Creek Fire

Mrs BIRD: I ask the Minister for Emergency Services and Consumer Affairs:

could he inform the House of the situation in relation to the Bells Creek fire?

Mr DAVIES: I would like to inform the House of the current progress with this matter. By way of background, on Tuesday, 9 September 1994, at approximately 18.30, eight volunteer firefighters from Palmwoods and Coochin Creek rural fire brigades were burnt when a back burn went wrong, catching them in a fire ball. Five of them were seriously burnt, requiring ongoing treatment for some time. The volunteers are covered by the Workers Compensation Board. Additionally, Queensland Emergency Services arranged for extensive psychological counselling for the volunteers and their families, some of which is still continuing. Extensive accommodation and travel arrangements were made for the families of the injured to join them during their hospitalisation in Brisbane. Two operational debriefs on the investigation into the accident have been provided to the volunteers. In addition to the standard payments provided by the Workers Compensation Board, Commissioner Skerritt has approved ex gratia payments to some of the injured to assist with short-term financial difficulties. To 16 October 1995 those payments total approximately $118,000. Some of the payments will continue.

The QFS Bells Creek report was released to brigade members and members of the public, as I said earlier, in early September. The draft QFS Bells Creek report was released to the solicitors acting on behalf of the injured fire fighters under FOI. A welfare committee was set up by the Rural Fire Division as a channelling mechanism to enable ex gratia payments to be made to the injured volunteers to supplement the payments made by workers' compensation. This allowed items such as airconditioning to be placed in the homes of the burns victims. In total, as I said earlier, to 16 October $118,000 has been paid in ex gratia payments to help the firefighters through times of difficulties.

However, yesterday the welfare committee released its own report which reviewed the recommendation in the QFS draft report and in the final public version. The tenor of the recommendations is the same as the official QFS report. Unfortunately, however, the welfare committee report makes comment on the QFS draft and the final report's recommendations. Unlike the final QFS report, the draft did not include specific timeframes, failed to identify ownership—in other words, who was responsible for implementing the recommendations—and failed to recognise the work undertaken to mitigate the problems associated with the fire that were identified immediately after the fire. For example, vehicles at the fire station were petrol-driven. All vehicles that are now supplied by the Rural Fire Division are diesel. The final QFS report addressed all of these issues. The only outstanding matter relating to the Bells Creek fire is legal action by a number of volunteers headed by Mr Terry Bobak. Therefore, it would be inappropriate for me to comment on the specifics of these cases.

Mrs Sheldon interjected.

Mr DAVIES: I can say, for the benefit of the Deputy Leader of the Coalition, that on the very night of the fire, the QFS swiftly put in place a four-stage program to safeguard these firefighters' physical, financial, and psychological wellbeing.

Hospital Waiting Lists

Mr GRICE: In directing a question to the Minister for Health, I refer to a constituent, whose name and details I will give the Minister after question time, who is waiting for surgery at the Princess Alexandra Hospital to remove what is believed to be a benign tumour. She was notified that she was to be admitted to hospital on 6 September, but that surgery was cancelled over the telephone. She was admitted to hospital on 13 September, but sent home. She was again admitted to the hospital on 27 September, but sent home. To add insult to injury, she received a letter from the PA Hospital asking about her stay there. When she called the hospital, she was unable to obtain any information as to when her surgery would be performed. I ask: when will this woman be given the operation that she needs so as to put an end to the delays which are proving extremely stressful to her and her family?

Mr BEATTIE: I thank the honourable member for the question. If he is prepared to provide those details to me, I would be happy to give him a detailed response. If the facts as presented are true—and I qualify my statement with that proviso—that would be a matter of some concern to me, and I will make sure that appropriate information is provided to the honourable member.

However, we need to understand that a number of matters are at issue here. Firstly, as we all know, Queensland is going through rapid growth. This year, an additional 25,000 people will use the public health system. That will mean that a total of 575,000 people will use the public health system in this State. Going back five years, that figure was 380,000

people. We have experienced extraordinary growth, which means that there is significant pressure on the public health system. Added to that is the fact that we have an ageing population, which will of course mean additional pressure on, for example, cataract surgery, orthopaedics, hip replacements and so on.

I have made it very clear that targeting waiting times and lists is an issue of priority for me. My predecessor, the Honourable Jim Elder, announced a package to address the issue. In the past few weeks, in addition to meetings on previous occasions, I have had discussions with my department about ensuring that we reduce waiting times and lists. We need to be very careful about how we deal with this issue, but I will be making it one of my top priorities.

I want to make it very clear that these issues can often be a lot more complex than is perhaps suggested. One of the things that I will ask the honourable member to provide to me is exactly what the constituent's doctor said. I need that information so that I know exactly what the circumstances are.

In conclusion, we have allocated $225m for the rebuilding of the PA Hospital. It is a world-class hospital staffed by the best nurses, doctors and allied health professionals in the world. I know that they will continue to provide world-class health services.

Literacy and Numeracy Initiatives

Mrs ROSE: In directing a question to the Minister for Education, I refer to reports that schools have been introducing the Shaping the Future initiatives—the Year 2 Diagnostic Net and the Year 6 Test—and I ask: can he please advise the House of any early feedback on the introduction of these literacy and numeracy initiatives? Can the Minister specify what action will be taken to assist those students who have been identified as needing help?

Mr HAMILL: The measures referred to by the member for Currumbin are important and are a clear demonstration of this Government's commitment not only to canvass the curriculum reforms and improvements to the education system recommended by the Wiltshire report but also to put those reforms into place, in particular a range of strategies to enhance the literacy and numeracy of our young people through early intervention.

I am pleased to report to the House that the Year 6 Test was conducted on Wednesday, 30 August. That test was administered across the State. From all accounts, it was administered very successfully, with very few reports of difficulties. Parents of students in Year 6, such as me, will receive information in relation to their children in November. Indeed, by 10 November the Australian Centre for Educational Research will have forwarded to schools the outcomes in relation to individual students. That will allow teachers to have the opportunity to discuss face to face with parents the outcomes of students who sat for the Year 6 Test as a part of the end-of-the-year reporting process.

With respect to the Year 2 Diagnostic Net, a similar process has occurred. Since mid July, the development stages of students have been mapped in continuum by teachers. Between August and this month, Year 2 teachers undertook the validation tests in relation to the Diagnostic Net. Only last Monday, on the pupil-free day, Years 1 and 2 teachers and key teachers were engaged in moderation processes to ensure that there is comparability across the State with respect to the Diagnostic Net. Again, the parents of Year 2 children will have the opportunity to receive face-to-face reporting from teachers as a part of the end-of-the-year reporting process.

The other important element of those processes is the implementation of student performance standards. Honourable members might recall that I listened very closely to the needs of teachers and school communities with respect to the implementation of student performance standards in mathematics. For that reason, I adjusted the timetable for implementation so that this year's trial would focus on three strands of mathematics. The other three strands of maths will be added next year. In 1997, we will introduce student performance standards with respect to English. Again, I am pleased to report that parents will have the opportunity to hear from teachers as part of the end-of-year reporting process——

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is debating the question. There is a second part to the question; the Minister is only halfway through his answer.

Mr HAMILL: In response to the question asked by the member for Currumbin—at the end of this year, teachers will be reporting back to parents on student performance standards as a part of the reporting process. It is also relevant that we note the outcome of a recent ballot conducted by the Queensland Teachers Union on the

implementation of student performance standards. When given an option of, firstly, to continue with SPS or, secondly, to abandon SPS, some 10,607 teachers voted in favour of a continuation, with 6,372 teachers voting against the program. Interestingly, over 60 per cent of teachers voted in favour of the SPS option. That feeling was carried right across-the-board, and there was an even stronger vote in relation to special, secondary and primary schools and preschools, where SPS is impacting most particularly. The majority in favour of SPS was some 6,805 as against 4,560.

Parents around the State—including me—are pleased that SPS, the Diagnostic Net and the test are working well. Parents will receive reports on all of those measures at the end of this year.

Bus Services, Barron River Electorate

Ms WARWICK: In directing a question to the Minister for Transport, I refer to the rather chaotic state of Cairns bus services since the Transport Operations (Passenger Transport) Act was implemented and takeovers occurred involving the firm Transit Australia. In particular, I draw the Minister's attention to school bus operations, which have suffered as a result of the upheaval to the extent that calls have been made for bus licence takeovers to be revoked. I ask: is the Minister aware that there is widespread discontent with school bus services? What action will he take to rectify this problem?

Mr ELDER: This issue follows on from the matter raised by the member for Gregory, who implied that there was somehow some shoddiness in relation to these bus contracts. I am quite confident that full, open, transparent contracts have been entered into by this Government—as has always been the case—as opposed to the shoddy deals that the Opposition entered into when it was in Government.

As to this problem—when we have a rationalisation of services in a particular area and companies negotiate for the buy-out of various runs, not everyone wants to play the game. Some people might be unhappy with what is on offer. At the end of the day, some people are unhappy about passing over the intellectual property in relation to their runs, which creates a little confusion in the interim period as contracts roll in.

I do not hear the honourable member saying that she is unhappy about the services in her electorate, because in the Cairns area bus services will be increased by 400 per cent. If the honourable member is going to say that she is unhappy with that situation, she should at least have the intestinal fortitude to say so in the local press. If she does not want enhanced services in north Queensland, I am sure that a lot of members further south would be looking for the opportunity to enhance public transport services in their electorates.

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

FINANCIAL INTERMEDIARIES BILL

Hon. K. E. De LACY (Cairns—Treasurer) (11.11 a.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

> "That leave be granted to bring in a Bill for an Act to provide for the regulation of cooperative housing societies, terminating building societies and the Cairns Cooperative Weekly Penny Savings Bank Limited, and for other purposes."

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

Bill and Explanatory Notes presented and Bill, on motion of Mr De Lacy, read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. K. E. De LACY (Cairns—Treasurer) (11.12 a.m.): I move—

> "That the Bill be now read a second time."

I mentioned to the House in my second-reading speech in March this year in relation to the Treasury Legislation Amendment Bill that existing legislation affecting cooperative housing societies and terminating building societies was being transferred to the Queensland Office of Financial Supervision—QOFS—with effect from 1 July 1995, in advance of and in preparation for new legislation being developed to regulate cooperative housing societies in particular. This Bill introduces that modern system of regulation and prudential supervision of cooperative housing societies in particular and certain other societies, including terminating building societies and a general cooperative society, the Cairns Cooperative Weekly Penny Savings Bank Limited, which operates as a financial intermediary.

Presently, cooperative housing societies are regulated by very prescriptive legislation which was enacted in 1958. That legislation

cannot and does not reflect the new prudentially based supervisory systems which have been or are in the process of being introduced in relation to building societies, credit unions and friendly societies. Industry has commended the absence in the proposed legislation of the prescriptive requirements presently imposed on cooperative housing societies by the operation of the Co-operative Housing Societies Act 1958, which will be repealed by this new legislation.

Industry has sought more and broader powers in the proposed legislation than it presently enjoys, and some new powers have been extended to industry as part of this proposed legislation. These powers broaden the scope of societies' operations by allowing voluntary amalgamations, which in turn permits rationalisation of the industry. The amalgamation powers and process will reduce costs and benefit industry. Similarly, the simplification of the lending operations of societies, together with a limited extension of their lending powers, will combine to make cooperative housing societies both easier for consumers to understand and more relevant to their home purchase funding requirements.

Although these new powers do not encompass the wide spectrum of increased powers sought by industry, scope is provided in the legislation for industry to adopt new products through the promulgation of appropriate prudential and other standards so that over a period of time societies may be able to broaden their product range and better service their clients. Consultations are to be held with industry representatives in relation to the content of the prudential and other standards which will be implemented in the supervision of societies under this legislation by QOFS. In this regard, the board of QOFS is empowered under the provisions of the Bill to become the standard-setting body for all societies caught by the requirements of the Bill.

Following passage of the Bill by the House, industry and other interested parties will contribute to the development of the prudential and other standards which will shape the future of the cooperative housing society industry, leading to the commencement of the legislation as soon as possible.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mrs Sheldon, adjourned.

ENVIRONMENTAL LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 14 September (see p. 212).

Mr SLACK (Burnett) (11.16 a.m.): In his second-reading speech the Minister claimed that this is a minor Bill, but in fact it amends substantial and important legislation in significant ways. The Acts amended by this Bill are the Environmental Protection Act, the Marine Parks Act 1982, the Nature Conservation Act 1992, the Queensland Heritage Act, the Recreation Areas Management Act and the Wet Tropics World Heritage Protection and Management Act.

The coalition stands by its original stance with respect to the Environmental Protection Act. At the time that it was introduced, we said that it should have been withdrawn and reconsidered in light of the damning CJC report into the improper disposal of liquid waste in south-east Queensland. As the House will recall, that report was a damning indictment of the Goss Labor Government, particularly its implementation and management of waste-management policies. The then Minister, Mrs Molly Robson—who lost the seat of Springwood to the excellent young coalition member Luke Woolmer—pushed the Bill into the House before the CJC's report was brought down. That was a rude and arrogant move by the Minister and the Government. The Bill before the House corrects a number of drafting errors and seeks to clarify the interpretation of certain sections. The coalition is still of the view that the EPA should be thoroughly reviewed to make it more user-friendly and relevant to the problems of pollution in the State. If the EPA was designed to save the Minister's hide, then it failed miserably.

The Bill before the House also amends the Marine Parks Act 1982 and inserts what the Minister refers to as a standard clause which takes account of a decision by the courts regarding the interpretation of the word "fee". How very convenient for this cash-strapped Government! That is a very helpful ruling for a Government that has pioneered the user-pays principle to the point at which people in the street know that it is simply another word for a tax. The amendment contained in this legislation states that "fee" includes "tax". The Goss Labor Government will deny black and blue that a user-pays fee is a tax; yet included in this very Bill is a provision stating that a fee includes a tax.

What the Minister did not tell us is that the effect of the amendments to both of these Acts is that regulations may be made which prescribe taxes. That is a very sneaky and insidious way to hit the people of Queensland. Furthermore, in its *Alert Digest* the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee states—

> "Section 4(2)(b) of the Legislative Standards Act provides that it is a fundamental legislative principle that legislation have sufficient regard to 'the institution of Parliament'. Section (5)(c) of the Legislative Standards Act provides that:
>
> (5) Whether subordinate legislation has sufficient regard to the institution of Parliament depends on whether, for example, the subordinate legislation—
>
> (c) contains only matter appropriate to subordinate legislation"

The passage from the *Alert Digest* continues—

> "The Committee draws attention to the amendments to the definitions sections, the consequence of which is to allow for a tax to be set by regulation."

I ask the Minister and members to listen very carefully to what the all-party committee says next—

> "It is the Committee's view that the prescription of a tax is a matter more appropriate to primary legislation."

The committee found that the classic definition of a tax is that it is a compulsory extraction of money by a public authority for public purposes, enforceable by law, and is not a payment for services rendered. The committee concluded also that the extension of the definition of "fees" to include "taxes" indicates a clear intention to displace common law doctrines. Can we now say that users of marine parks pay a tax? Will the Portfolio Program Statement for Environment and Heritage include a line which shows the income from user-pays fees/taxes, or will that figure be hidden away in the thicket of words and tables comprising the program statement? It would seem that the program statement does not tell us these little stories, these little gems. It is even doubtful if a question to the Minister would be able to discover the actual returns from the so-called application of user-pays fees/taxes. The same amendment is asserted in the Recreation Areas Management Act 1988. Once again, I am sure the national parks will be pleased to know that a fee includes a tax. It opens the door for this Government to continue the quiet fleecing of the people of Queensland through hidden taxes.

That is what the user-pays fees are. They are this Goss Labor Government's hidden taxes. Every department has its hands in the pockets of the people of Queensland with user-pays fees/taxes. The supposedly warm, cuddly and friendly conservation part of the Department of Environment and Heritage has its sticky little fingers right down into the pockets of the workers of Queensland visiting this State's national parks.

An interesting aspect of this Bill is that the amendments seem to be about fees. It is hard to know if it is by intent or once again just sheer bungling, as happened with the Environmental Protection Act, that fees are proposed by stealth through regulation. Why is this Goss Labor Government trying to sneak in more fees/taxes through the back door? As I said before, it is difficult to find them in the thicket of words in the program statement.

The coalition will oppose those amendments that introduce new taxes. It supports the unanimous findings of the report by the all-party Scrutiny of Legislation Committee.

Mr J. H. Sullivan: Tell us why you're supporting it.

Mr SLACK: The honourable member needs to look only at his own words as chairman of that committee to arrive at the same conclusions as the Opposition arrived at without the benefit of his committee. This report will be a test of his committee's authority within this Parliament. The report states—

> "The Committee requests further information from the Minister as to the appropriateness of allowing taxes to be set by regulation."

It further states—

> "The Committee notes that the insertion of the standard clause ' "fees" includes "taxes" ' will have the effect of overriding the common law distinction between fees and taxes, but refers to Parliament for debate the question whether the distinction should be maintained."

The report also states—

> "In the Committee's opinion, the proposed new Section 41(5) of the Wet Tropics World Heritage Protection and Management Act detracts from the Committee's role of ensuring that the requirement of Part 5 of the Statutory

Instruments are complied with. The Committee is deeply concerned about the drafting practice adopted in clause 27. Clause 27 is the first example of this practice which has been sighted by the Committee. The Committee would not wish to see a precedent established by the provision used in clause 27."

It will be interesting to hear what the Minister has to say to the committee's findings in respect of these clauses. The committee's report highlights—

"• The Committee expresses its concern to the Minister regarding clause 27 which purports to exempt the first management plan for the wet tropics area from the regulatory impact statement requirements and thereby seeks to circumvent provisions of the Statutory Instruments Act.

• The Committee considers that adequate grounds for exemption from regulatory impact statement requirements already exist within the Statutory Instruments Act.

• The Committee requests that the Minister consider whether an express exemption clause is necessary."

I put those findings of the committee before the Parliament for its consideration when it votes on the amendments contained in this Bill.

The Opposition recognises that there are parts of this Bill before the House that are housekeeping matters. I acknowledge that this is the first Bill presented to the House by the Minister for Environment and Heritage. However, it is not for Opposition members to trust what the Minister says in explanation of these clauses because recently I placed on notice a question to the Minister for Environment and Heritage. I asked legitimate questions in respect to this ALP Government's policy leading into the last election. The Minister chose to ignore those legitimate questions and gave a very flippant reply to a legitimate question put forward by me as the shadow Minister for Environment and Heritage. It is natural that Opposition members are sceptical of the answer to that question. It is natural that the Opposition has some concerns about the appropriateness and the validity of answers that the Minister may proffer to these questions raised by the committee and by the Opposition.

The Opposition's view on fees for entry to national parks or in respect of matters concerning the environment and heritage is that in many cases it is legitimate for fees to be charged for services rendered, but the Opposition certainly opposes any suggestion that the department, through the national parks and marine parks under its control, should be a taxing agency for the Government. The very insertion of the word "tax" gives the lie to the fact that they are supposed to be fees. Members opposite appreciate that this State has created national parks. When in Government, Opposition members considered the question of entry fees to national parks. At that time the high recovery cost of collecting fees from visitors to national parks was recognised. That was one of the reasons the then National Party Government decided not to proceed with the introduction of such fees. There were a couple of other reasons. One was that, because of the high cost of recovery, any fee set would be so high as to be unaffordable to the average working person—the working person that members opposite talk about so often.

Mrs BIRD: You didn't care about them. What are you talking about?

Mr SLACK: Of course we do.

Mrs Bird: You did not.

Mr SLACK: Let me say quite categorically that that Government looked at the question of introducing fees. If the honourable member for Whitsunday would allow me to finish my explanation, she may learn something about it.

The National Party Government looked in depth at that situation. As I was trying to explain, the high cost of collection of the fees meant that people would have to pay a fairly high entry fee to cover that cost. One of the reasons that was not proceeded with was that it would be an imposition on many people who should have access to our natural flora and fauna available within a national park. The then Government wanted to encourage people to visit national parks and appreciate our natural heritage within the national parks throughout the State.

The other question relating to entry fees considered by the National Party Government was that the Department of Environment and Heritage could face the problem that the more money it raised through national park entry fees the greater the proportion, in a Budget sense, that would be taken by consolidated revenue. What could have happened was that, through revenue retention, the Treasury would not need to give the department for the management of national parks the amount of money it collected in entry fees, that is,

Treasury would allocate less money than it traditionally did. That has to be a consideration. This Government starts to talk about taxes. I can remember back before the last election we talked about the imposition of licence fees under the Environmental Protection Act. I spell this out very clearly: the Opposition is not against the imposition of fees on those who pollute. In fact, the schedules contained in the old Clean Air Act and Clean Waters Act provide for licence fees and other fees.

What the Opposition is against—what it was on about before the election and still is—is the fact that many of those so-called fees that were being prescribed were straight-out taxes. The figures that were quoted by this Government as to the number of people or businesses that would be required to pay those taxes—6,000—was a gross understatement. We had a very good election policy—despite what members opposite might say—and that was acknowledged by many of the conservationists as well as the Green Party——

Mr J. H. Sullivan: You wrote to a pottery firm in my electorate and told them that they would have to pay several thousand dollars in fees, but you didn't tell them that that was only if they produced 200 tonnes per week. You lied to the people of Queensland.

Mr SLACK: We told the people of Queensland that we would have a—

Mr J. H. Sullivan: You lied to the people of Queensland. You lied to them, and you did it in newspapers and by letter.

Mr SLACK: Mr Deputy Speaker——

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Palaszczuk): Order! I do not need the help of the honourable member for Burnett. However, I will ask the honourable member for Caboolture to withdraw the term "lie", as that term is unparliamentary.

Mr J. H. SULLIVAN: I withdraw the word "lie".

Mr SLACK: We put forward a policy that we would review the Environmental Protection Act, that we would set in train an environmental protection council—consisting of the stakeholders—which would look at the scale of fees and taxes that were being imposed by this Government. That council would review those charges with the object of lessening the charges to those firms that polluted only in a minor way, and it would certainly remove the charges from those firms that did not pollute. As part of that policy, we promised that we would provide assistance to industry that had to comply with the provisions of the Environmental Protection Act. That was part of our election policy, which was not accepted by the members opposite.

I totally refute the allegation by the member for Caboolture that we did not have that policy in place and that we did not spell it out before the election. In regard to the interjection from that honourable member—which has been withdrawn—I would say that anyone who says that we did not have such a policy is uttering an untruth.

Another aspect of mismanagement by this Government to which this Bill relates is the appointment of the Heritage Council. My understanding is that the members of the Heritage Council ceased to be members of that council as of August this year because, in its wisdom, this Government had not provided for people to be reappointed to that council after a three-year term. The embarrassing situation arose in which the 12 members of the Heritage Council were not eligible for reappointment. In order to comply with the Act, the Government found itself in the position of having to appoint completely new members to the Heritage Council.

There are two aspects to this matter. One of them is mismanagement. The making of an elementary mistake such as that by a department has frightening implications. Under the Westminster system, the Minister is obviously the person responsible for a department. The other aspect is the length of time that it has taken for this Bill to come before the House. This happened back in August, and we are now in the month of October. I would have expected that, under a proper and good administration, we would have seen legislation introduced in this House before the expiry date of the three-year term of the members of the Heritage Council. It is very sad that we have had to have this uncertainty in the interim.

I am not sure of the legal implications regarding that council. I ask the Minister to explain the status quo. As the members' term expired in August, do we have a Heritage Council in operation at present? If not, is it a contravention of the Act to not have a Heritage Council in place by now? I would have thought that an appointment would need to be made. The fact is that there was a three-year limitation on the members' term of office. That situation was not advisable. In fact, it was very inadvisable, and it could lead to all kinds of problems relating to the continuity of service of the members of that council and the ability to retain experienced people within the

system. I ask whether it would have been a regulatory requirement of the Act to appoint another Heritage Council at the time of the expiration of the three-year term of the members of the Heritage Council.

This Bill contains some amendments to the Heritage Act to allow for the insertion of the definition of "court cases". We support that. Problems have arisen, and in order to overcome them, the Act needed to be amended. We acknowledge that most of the provisions of the Bill are to correct unfortunate errors that occurred in the drafting of the legislation. However, we very strongly oppose those clauses that relate to the imposition of a tax.

We also question whether the management plan in relation to the Wet Tropics should be allowed to be brought down after the statutory period for its completion. Will we see similar extensions of time being granted to other organisations that are required to bring down a report within a certain time? Will legislation be amended to overcome problems as a result of a report not being presented within a specified time?

All in all, we are very disappointed at the appearance of the word "tax". We remind the Parliament of the report—which I understand is a unanimous report—of the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee. As I have said, this will be a test of the authority of that committee and its value to the Parliament. If its recommendations are to be ignored, then what is the purpose of that particular committee? Will the Minister answer by proceeding with these clauses in this Bill? Is the Minister telling the Parliament that he is going to ignore the recommendations of that body?

The main thrust of the Bill is supported by the Opposition, although we question the reason why the amendments became necessary in the first place. We are concerned that the taxes provided for in this Bill will have an adverse impact on ordinary people.

Mr WELFORD (Everton) (11.38 a.m.): I am pleased to speak in support of this amending Bill. It is not at all surprising that the same old negative comments are trotted out by the Opposition spokesperson, the raising of doubts and fears without any substance, without any decent argument——

Mr Slack: What about the report?

Mr WELFORD: He refers to that report of the parliamentary committee. It is blatantly obvious that he has not even read the damned report. The report raises a series of issues for the Parliament to consider. It does not say that any of the issues raised in the report are necessarily wrong. They are issues that are relevant for that parliamentary committee to raise, but it does not follow that, simply because a parliamentary committee raises them and some dim-witted Opposition spokesperson recites them laboriously into the *Hansard*, there is any substance to the concerns. The Minister will no doubt in due course explain the reasons that the Bill has been drafted in this way. And there are good reasons. The Opposition spokesperson feigns concern for the people in the community because the word "tax" is uttered in a Bill. Is that not typical of the level of superficial debate that we have come to expect from the Opposition on issues relating to environmental protection! And why is that the case? Because their heart is not in it. When it comes to the environment, Doug Slack is more than slack by name. The Opposition does not have the slightest commitment to environmental protection. When the chips are down, the poor old member for Burnett is sent to the backroom and told to be quiet like he was during the election campaign.

Mr Elder interjected.

Mr WELFORD: Let me not delve into that again; it is a touchy subject.

When members of the Opposition are not prepared to engage Government members in decent debate, there is a problem. The Opposition spokesperson knows that the substance of this legislation is an innocuous set of amendments. The contribution was not worthy of the member. In the past, I have heard him make what I regard to be contributions of some sincerity. To criticise these amendments simply on the basis that their existence means that there must have been something wrong with the original Bill is focusing on the triviality, to say the least. One would hope that, in future discussions in this place about issues of environmental policy and when any amending Bill of importance to the environment and the people of Queensland is introduced, we will hear something of greater substance from the members opposite than we have heard so far. Hopefully, the member for Springwood will remedy the weakness of the argument put forward so far by the members of the Opposition. We wish him well in that endeavour because he has a lot of work to do.

I will direct my comments to the amendments to the Wet Tropics World Heritage Protection and Management Act 1993. The World Heritage area of north

Queensland is a place of special value to Queensland and the planet. It is a place that I visited a number of times in my former role as the chair of the State Government's original Alternative Energy Advisory Group, which is now known as the Queensland Sustainable Energy Advisory Group. We investigated methods of providing energy services to people who live near the World Heritage area that would not have an adverse impact on the very real and significant values of that area. It is almost banal now to mention that plenty of members who are currently in the present Opposition and who were previously in the former National Party Government were strenuously opposed to any recognition of the Wet Tropics World Heritage area in far-north Queensland. Six years on, with the World Heritage listing in place and the Wet Tropics Management Plan about to be handed down, what did we see in the election campaign? We saw the Opposition present a policy that proposed to flood great tracts of the World Heritage area for the sake of that revived bogey, the Tully/Millstream dam.

Mr FitzGerald: That's bunkum. It's not great tracts. How many hectares in size?

Mr WELFORD: The member for Lockyer would know a lot about that, because he has been up in that area wandering blissfully through the wilderness wondering where, if they ever get into Government, they can send the next bulldozer to gouge out more dams for another squandering of taxpayers' funds on an energy proposal that does not make any economic sense. That is the policy they presented. Six years on, the World Heritage area is established, the Wet Tropics Management Authority is in place, magnificent work is being done on joint ventures for facilities for visitors, the flora and fauna are being protected, degraded areas are being rehabilitated and the Federal and State Governments have in place cooperative programs to buy back certain areas that were sold for a pittance by the previous National Party Government and allowed to be freeholded and degraded by people with no understanding of the global significance of the area. Yet, despite all of that progress, prior to the last election the Opposition still presented a policy that planned to put a dam in the middle of a place that is one of approximately a dozen on the planet that satisfies all four selection criteria for listing on the World Heritage Register.

I am focusing specifically on the amendments in this legislation that affect the Wet Tropics because the Opposition's policy is a measure of the habitual and absolute incapacity of the Opposition spokesperson and those on whose behalf he speaks to come to terms with the importance of preserving wilderness locations such as the Wet Tropics rainforests of north Queensland. Those rainforests are part of the heritage of our nation and the world, and any Government—whatever its political persuasion—that proposes actions that would adversely impact on the World Heritage value of that area deserves to be roundly condemned.

The amendments in the legislation put in place the legislative requirements to allow the management plan for the Wet Tropics area to be formally issued. I look forward to seeing that plan in place and operating to ensure the long-term protection of the World Heritage area and the provision of access for visitors from Queensland, interstate and overseas. One of the great advantages of World Heritage listing is the opportunity it provides for our State to showcase the very magnificent natural resources with which we are endowed. In the years ahead, the values that make the Wet Tropics so attractive for international tourism and provide our State with an enormous opportunity to attract tourism dollars will need to be carefully managed so that they are not destroyed by the impact of that tourism. Substantially, that is what the management plan will achieve.

In drafting the management plan, a long—some would say unduly lengthy—process of consultation has occurred. Some years ago, a strategic directions document was issued. The community was invited to have input into the plan. Credit is due to Peter Hitchcock, the Executive Director of the Wet Tropics Management Agency, and all his staff for the enormous work they have done, not just consulting with the community but also putting in the place the first steps that were required to identify the important values of the Wet Tropics area that need to be protected. It is not much point trying to develop a plan if one does not know the important values that the plan should protect and, secondly, if one does not know what the community regards as important in terms of access to that area. I am sure that all those points will be adequately addressed when the plan is issued within the next week or two.

The amendments in this Bill recognise that extensive consultation has occurred. That consultation is an express ground upon which it obtains an exemption under the Statutory Instruments Act for the requirement for a regulatory impact statement. Of course, this Government introduced in the Statutory

Instruments Act 1992 the requirement that a regulatory impact statement must be prepared for all legislation coming before the House that has significant impacts. However, there is an express contemplation that where there is extensive community consultation in the development of regulations—and that is the form that a management plan takes; it takes effect as a regulation under the Act—then a regulatory impact statement can be waived. That is what is contemplated in this case.

As I said, the amendment contained in this legislation is not a significant one. Nevertheless, it ensures that we have in place the legislative requirements to see progress made in respect of the management plan and to see it brought to fruition without further delay. As I say, it has been a long and extensive consultation process. I think that it is time that we put the plan in place, have it in operation and review it from time to time. As the tourism industry in north Queensland grows and as we come to learn more about the environmental values of the Wet Tropics region, we will undoubtedly want to make amendments to the plan.

I hope that when regulations are introduced in this place that make amendments to the legislation the Opposition spokesman does not say foolishly that the reason for the changes to the regulations relating to the management plan for the Wet Tropics area is that, somehow, mistakes were made in the first instance. Plainly, that will be false. One of the most significant features——

Mr FitzGerald interjected.

Mr WELFORD: I am pleased to hear that the member will not say that. I hope that Opposition members recognise that, because of the nature of our scientific understanding of these areas, inevitably as we come to learn more about the environmental and natural values of the Wet Tropics region and, indeed, other conservation zones throughout the State, from time to time it will be necessary to adjust the management plans for those areas to ensure the greater protection of the values that are identified and recognised. However, I can predict confidently that the good spirit of that understanding will not be reflected in the speeches that Opposition members will make in this place. Undoubtedly, we will hear them say again and again that they do not want any more changes or any more restriction; that they do not want the places "locked up", which are words that they reiterate in this place each time any issue of environmental protection is discussed.

One can only hope that the great break that the Queensland people received at the last election in having this Government returned—and whatever the narrowness of the margin, it was a great break for the people of Queensland; they were relieved of the prospect of very severe impacts on the environment——

Mr Stephan: 46 per cent of them. What about the 54 per cent?

Mr WELFORD: The majority of people in the majority of the seats of the State recognised that there is only so far one can go. They were smart enough to pull on the handbrake before the Opposition fell over the line. We can be assured that the Opposition was dumbfounded by the prospect of having to take responsibility for the place. The last thing anyone opposite expected was to ever have to be responsible for the Wet Tropics area of north Queensland. We know that because they made all sorts of promises that were guaranteed to undermine the protection that this Government, and this Government alone, was the first to grant those important areas of north Queensland and other areas that Opposition members would have happily seen degraded, deforested, mined and trodden on by unfettered commercial tourism development which they would have accorded their mates through the cheap freeholding of public land, which was their offensive habit when they were last in Government.

Mrs Wilson interjected.

Mr WELFORD: I hear a new member representing a part of north Queensland——

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Palaszczuk): Order! Before the honourable member hears any member from the opposite side of the House, I suggest to the honourable member for Mulgrave that if she wishes to interject, she does so from her own place.

Mr WELFORD: Indeed. Not even the most basic courtesies are extended by those new, naive and uncultured creatures who have in their ignorance joined the Opposition. They are as ignorant of the proper protocols of this House as they are ignorant of the environment in north Queensland.

Those of us on the Government side will be unyielding in our commitment to the protection of the environment in Queensland. As the first Government in this State's history to provide statutory protection for World Heritage values in Queensland, we will not be stampeded by election outcomes or by an ignorant and noisy Opposition into withdrawing from our responsibilities. We will continue to

make all the necessary amendments to any legislation to ensure that the environmental values of the World Heritage areas, the nomination and listing of which the Government has supported, will be retained, embellished and enhanced for the benefit of all Queenslanders now and into the future.

Mr WOOLMER (Springwood) (11.56 a.m.): I have just heard an extremely long diatribe from the member for Everton. He actually managed to say one important thing, and that is that the amendments to the Wet Tropics World Heritage Protection and Management Act that are included in the Environmental Legislation Amendment Bill are significant and should, therefore, under the requirements of the Statutory Instruments and Legislative Standards Amendment Act, undergo an RIS.

I view with concern the exclusion clause that has been drafted into this Environmental Legislation Amendment Bill to exclude the requirement for an RIS to be tabled in this House. Section 43 of the Statutory Instruments Act states—

> "If proposed subordinate legislation is likely to impose appreciable costs on the community or a part of the community, then, before the legislation is made, a regulatory impact statement must be prepared about the legislation."

The *Cabinet Handbook* further defines that point to include direct and indirect economic, environmental and social costs. The social and environmental costs are the points that are pertinent. I believe that the management plan for the Wet Tropics World Heritage Protection and Management Act is of significant environmental import and should, therefore, conform to the requirement for an RIS.

I also view with concern the nature of the exclusion. I have to ask why it has been excluded. Under the Statutory Instruments Act, there are standard provisions by which requests for an exclusion can be made. If it is done or requested on the basis that there has been extensive wider consultation, then it should be requested under that provision and not written into amending legislation in its own right.

I now turn briefly to a broader environmental policy that is also incorporated in this amendment Bill. We heard from the member for Everton about how the coalition supposedly went to the polls without a policy on the environment. How wrong he is! How wrong can he be! How wrong is that! The Opposition went to the polls with significant environmental policies.

Mr Welford interjected.

Mr WOOLMER: I will take that interjection. What did the Opposition say about the Daisy Hill State Forest before the election? It said it would protect it for the future. The coalition would turn it into a koala sanctuary and have an international koala research centre built in that area. We said we would turn the Daisy Hill State Forest into a conservation park. I called for that again in my maiden speech three weeks ago. I said it was good policy before the election and it was good policy after the election, and therefore I thank the Minister for the Environment for including it in his policy announcement the other week. The Government one has when one has no Government! If the Minister for the Environment continues to implement coalition policy in this House, I will gladly stand and support him.

Mr Elder: You run out of steam in a hurry.

Mr WOOLMER: How is the hot seat feeling, Minister? Will the Government play shuffle the deck again? At least the Minister has the commonsense and foresight to realise that what he was doing for the so-called motorway was not in the best interests of the broader community and he has withdrawn from it.

Mr Elder: Any further endorsements of my character?

Mr WOOLMER: No, I will leave that to the Minister; he is very self-congratulatory.

Mr Elliott interjected.

Mr WOOLMER: Yes. One need only look at the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee's *Alert Digest* to realise that the committee has some significant difficulties with this proposed legislation. It calls upon the Minister to recognise and respond to that report.

The committee expressed concern about the exemption which was sought for the RIS and considers it adequate grounds for exemption from that RIS requirement already present in the Statutory Instruments Act. The correlation in the Act between a fee and a tax is also of concern. The definition of "tax" does not necessarily fit with arriving at the front gate of a conservation park and being asked to fork over money. There is taxation by stealth in this Bill. This issue was addressed in the committee's report, and the committee asked for direction in relation to it. Hopefully, the committee will receive that direction from the

Minister in the future, if there is to be an amendment to this Bill.

Mrs ROSE (Currumbin) (12.02 p.m.): It is with pleasure that I rise in support of the Environmental Legislation Amendment Bill. The objectives of the Bill are to amend various pieces of legislation that govern a number of environmental Acts, including the Environmental Protection Act 1994, the Marine Parks Act 1982, the Recreation Areas Management Act 1988, the Queensland Heritage Act 1992 and the Nature Conservation Act 1992. I will discuss those minor housekeeping amendments.

As members would be aware, the Nature Conservation Act conserves nature—in the broader sense—over the whole of Queensland, not just in national parks and not just for certain species of animals and plants. It stresses the need to protect habitats and recognises the role that private individuals can play in the conservation of nature. For the first time in more than 120 years of having related legislation in Queensland, we now have a Nature Conservation Act that represents an integrated approach to ensure the conservation of our natural environment.

The proposed minor amendments to the Nature Conservation Act will clarify the interpretation of a number of sections of the Act and overcome some minor operational anomalies. The first of those are amendments to sections 35 and 37, dealing with chief executive powers in relation to permitted uses in national parks and the power to renew existing authorities for national parks. Section 35 allows national parks to be used for public services, such as communication towers, navigation aids or water supply pipelines, where there is no reasonably practicable alternative, subject to conditions such as that the use is in the public interest and is ecologically sustainable. The justification for the amendment to this section of the Act states that it—

> "Provides powers to the chief executive to grant and issue a new licence, permit, lease, authority, etc. for certain activities that are in the public interest but are contrary to the management principles for National Parks, such as communication towers, navigation aids and water supply pipelines. This was being incorrectly interpreted by a number of tourist operators as meaning a licence, permit, lease, authority, etc. for certain activities granted under the Nature Conservation Regulation 1994."

This is not correct, so the provision will clarify that misconception.

The amendment to section 37 is also very minor. It has the same clarification as the amendment to section 35. The amendments to section 112 in relation to conservation plans provide—

> ". . . for the making of a provision for which a regulation may be made but does not clearly state that these matters may include reference to use or development of land that is part of a critical habitat or area of major interest."

These are very minor amendments, but ones that will clarify a number of minor anomalies and confusion.

Marine conservation is very important, of course, to the Gold Coast region. As well as coastal management and protection, marine conservation is also a major issue. Honourable members may not be aware, but 1995 is actually the Year of the Sea Turtle. The Australian Nature Conservation Agency has been assisting with the South Pacific Regional Environmental Program to organise and run an extensive education program to increase awareness of the decline in sea turtle populations in the Pacific region and to encourage community groups to become involved in turtle conservation.

Recently on the Gold Coast there has been publicity about the number of sea turtles that are being caught in shark meshing and drum lines. Over recent months, the Surfrider Foundation Australia has been calling for the removal of shark meshing and drum lines. Obviously, one cannot consider the marine life issue without considering the human life issue. The reason for the presence of shark nets and drum lines is the protection and safety of bathers and to minimise harm to marine life. The Department of Environment and Heritage has been working with the Queensland Department of Primary Industries to find the most effective and efficient shark control programs which will provide protection and safety for our swimmers and minimise harm to our marine life.

In this Year of the Sea Turtle, the turtles are posing a particular problem, in that they are feeding on the baits set on drum lines and are being snared. The turtles are using these baits as a food source. The DPI operates a marine rescue squad, which patrols the nets and drum lines and assists any untargeted marine life caught up in the nets or on the drum lines. The marine rescue squad has a 24-hour hotline number, which has been made available to all surf-lifesaving clubs and

residents in high-rise buildings. Anyone seeing any untargeted marine life caught up in the nets or on the drum lines can phone the 24-hour hotline, and the marine rescue squad will respond very quickly. The squad is well trained in the field of marine animal handling techniques. The squad usually responds within 30 minutes to free turtles or any other marine life that has been accidentally caught up in the nets or on the drum lines.

A marine scientist is working with the squad, and snared turtles are being tagged and released. Through the program of tagging, the squad has identified that the same turtles keep getting tangled in the nets or caught on the drum lines. The squad is rescuing snared turtles and releasing them into waters away from the drum lines and shark nets. Even though there is still some concern about the amount of marine life accidentally ensnared in the nets and drum lines, I point out that the success rate for rescuing trapped marine life and releasing it is very good. Over 92 per cent of turtles are rescued and released. However, as I said, there is a problem in that the turtles are regularly feeding on the baits on the drum lines. DEH marine scientists and DPI are looking at using a different type of fishhook that will prevent the capture of turtles.

As I said, we cannot look at the issue of protecting marine life in isolation; we have to consider the protection of humans. Most of the sharks trapped in the nets are tiger sharks and bull sharks, which are regarded as being very aggressive towards humans. Although nobody likes the thought of having any marine life ensnared in the nets and on the drum lines, we cannot ignore the issue of the safety of swimmers. Since the nets have been in place, there has not been one shark attack on a netted beach in Queensland.

I am very pleased that 1995 is the Year of the Sea Turtle. The Australian Nature Conservation Agency has been working very closely with the Queensland Department of Environment and Heritage to put together an identification guide in English and a new version in Indonesian which sets out to heighten awareness of the decline in the sea turtle population. It also sets out how people can better understand marine turtle ecology and migration patterns, and identifies threats to turtles and ways to reduce them. The guide sets out an understanding of the relationship of marine turtles with indigenous cultures, and encourages community groups to become involved with management, especially monitoring activities. This includes the recording of tagged turtles, which is being assisted by marine scientists working with the marine rescue teams on the Gold Coast. The agency provides educational materials for use in schools or community group activities, such as guides for identifying different species and recognising signs of turtle activity. This increased awareness and recognition that something has to be done is very encouraging, because sea turtle populations are in decline. On the Gold Coast, the marine rescue squad has been working closely with Sea World. Not only is Sea World a popular tourist water park; it also conducts a lot of research into various marine life.

I return to the Nature Conservation Act. In recent months, the first annual report on the implementation of the Act was issued. The department has been right on track in implementing the various programs under the Act. It provides for protected areas to be dedicated or declared in order to conserve nature. There are a number of classes of protected areas, and a number of advisory committees have been set up to assist with the management of the protected areas and the implementation of these provisions.

Between July 1994 and June 1995, during the first year of the administration of the Nature Conservation Act, two conservation plans were approved. The Nature Conservation (Macropod Harvesting) Conservation Plan sets out the administrative arrangements for the ecologically sustainable use of certain species of kangaroo and wallaby as a renewable resource under a system of licensing and allows the use of macropods to be scientifically monitored. In addition, in June this year the Nature Conservation (Duck and Quail) Conservation Plan was approved by the Governor in Council. That plan provides for the administration of the recreational harvesting of various species of duck and quail and includes provision for harvest periods.

The department's implementation of the programs and provisions under the Nature Conservation Act is right on track. The commencement of the major part of the Act was accompanied by an extensive review of policies and procedures about implementing conservation initiatives. The department has to be congratulated on the way in which it has implemented the Nature Conservation Act. The minor amendments before the House today contained in the Environmental Legislation Amendment Bill will clarify a number of sections and overcome some minor

operational anomalies within the Nature Conservation Act. I support the Bill.

Mr HOLLIS (Redcliffe) (12.21 p.m.): It is with pleasure that I rise to support the Environmental Legislation Amendment Bill. I wish to speak briefly on environmental matters affecting the electorate of Redcliffe. Many members may ask, "What sorts of environmental issues affect Redcliffe?" Environmental issues are not restricted only to the Wet Tropics or to Kakadu; they are part of everyone's daily lives.

Redcliffe is the most densely populated area in Queensland. That is acknowledged in Julian Bielewicz's excellent report on the birds of Redcliffe. Over the years, the shoreline of Redcliffe has been affected adversely by a large number of reclamations by the relevant authorities. I do not intend to criticise previous councils or Governments, but the fact is that approximately two-thirds of Redcliffe's shoreline is now reclaimed land with rock walls which harbour a variety of vermin and which also affect the fish-feeding grounds and the natural environment of the shoreline. If anyone visiting the Redcliffe area wants to see what the shoreline of Redcliffe was like 35 to 40 years ago, I advise them to visit the Filmers Palace Hotel at Woody Point. The owner of that establishment, Mavis Filmer, who has been in the hotel industry for many years, has some excellent large photos hanging on the walls of the lounge depicting what Redcliffe used to be like. I am sure that many residents of Redcliffe and neighbouring areas would be interested in viewing those photographs. In years to come, Governments and councils will be looking for methods of restoring beaches in areas such as Redcliffe. To have adequate beaches for recreational use and for their aesthetic features is a valuable asset to any city on the water.

In looking for alternatives to the reclamation of denuded beaches, we should examine some regions of Victoria. A couple of years ago I visited the Mornington Peninsula, which has similar features to those of Redcliffe. Instead of reclaiming denuded beaches, the relevant authority has set out to restore them. Each year, a huge amount of sand is placed at one end of the peninsula and the lateral drift moves that sand along, which maintains those beaches so that instead of being denuded further by waves and tides they are replenished as the year goes on. That is an excellent method of maintaining beaches rather than destroying them.

The destruction of beaches affects the fishing industry. As well as being a recreational centre, Redcliffe has a very important commercial fishing industry. One can see the effects that reclamation and the canal developments of the past have had on the feeding grounds of fish. To this day, fishermen from both sides of the fence complain about the low quantity of fish available. Those fishermen often fail to point out—and I never fail to remind them of this—that the actions of former Governments in allowing development so close to the beach have caused many of the problems facing the fishing industry today. I was pleased to hear the Honourable the Minister introduce a Bill recently which is aimed at taking action to protect those very important shoreline areas. In the past, no steps were taken to protect those areas. We should be seeking to offer more protection to them in the future.

I turn now to another issue which affects heavily urbanised areas, that is, the disposal of garbage. That is not always the most pleasant subject. For years and years and years, rubbish dumps have operated in Redcliffe that are virtually unmanned and uncontrolled. Huge quantities of landfill—containing all sorts of materials for which we will pay the price later—have been dumped very close to Hay's Inlet, which is a fish-breeding habitat, and also close to canal developments. One wonders what will happen in the forthcoming 20 to 30 years when the leachate starts to seep from those rubbish dumps. That has the potential to be a major environmental problem of the future. Again, this Government is taking steps to prevent that type of environmental damage. Any Government—whichever political colour it may be—must think about the future of Queensland, not merely the present. The legislation to be debated shortly that brings rubbish dumps under the control of the Department of Environment and Heritage is a positive move. That legislation will provide for controlled garbage disposal. The garbage will be inspected appropriately so that the environmental integrity of such dump sites is ensured.

One venture which has been well supported by the community of Redcliffe is the Wallum Project. As I said at the beginning of my speech, Redcliffe is one of the most densely populated areas of Queensland. Unfortunately, it has precious little good parkland and, until recently, it did not have much in the way of botanical gardens. I was pleased to receive advice from the Minister for Education that the project covering an area of

wallum land will be handed over to the people of Redcliffe for use as a botanical gardens. I want to place on record some of the aspects of that project. Firstly, I extend the congratulations of this Government and the people of Redcliffe to the management committee of the Wallum Project, a project which aimed to establish an area containing all-Australian bushland species. "Wallum" means natural flora. The Australian Plant Society, the Herb Garden Growers Group and the Peninsula Environment Group were instrumental in assisting me to facilitate the transfer of the wallum land for the benefit of the people of Redcliffe. On 18 November this year, the Education Minister and I will be handing the project over to the city council. I invite all members to visit Redcliffe on that Saturday morning at 10 o'clock to view that wonderful project. There are very few bushland areas which have been planted by interested community groups and this one will be an asset to the City of Redcliffe.

I turn now to another important asset of the Redcliffe electorate, namely, Moreton Island, which has been very much on the agenda of this Government since it came to power in 1989. Members would be aware that the Government extended the size of the national park on the island to cover a large majority of the island. When the Government made that move, it received a tremendous number of complaints from people at Bulwer and Cowan Cowan because they would not be allowed to take their dogs into the national park, which they had done for many years and expected to be able to do as of right. Those complaints have now quietened down, and people are happy with the four kilometres of beach on which they can exercise their dogs. The foresight of this Government will preserve Moreton Island as a natural habitat forever. That was a very worthwhile exercise on the part of this Government.

The handover of the lighthouse site on Moreton Island is currently under discussion. Recently, I was fortunate to visit Byron Bay, where the lighthouse has become quite a tourist attraction. People can inspect the lighthouse facilities, and they are actually able to rent out the old lighthouse cottages on the site. That is a worthwhile money-making project for the relevant authority. It is a different story with the Moreton Island lighthouse site, because there are no bitumen roads on Moreton Island—thank goodness—and in order to preserve what is a beautiful site, one would not like to see too much traffic allowed in the vicinity.

Over the past four or five years, I have been writing to the relevant Minister for the Environment suggesting that the lighthouse site on Moreton Island be utilised as an educational facility. I understand that there is a possibility that that will occur. As members of the Legislative Assembly, we should be seeking to preserve such facilities for the benefit of our children and future generations. The lighthouse site on Moreton Island offers many opportunities for students to learn about the environment as they appreciate the beauty of that untouched place very close to Brisbane. I am sure that any such move by this Parliament would be appreciated by young people for many generations to come.

The other issue I wanted to raise in relation to Moreton Island was the gun emplacements. In the *Courier-Mail* a few weeks ago the worthy member for Cook was staring out from behind a gun on Thursday Island discussing its historical aspects. He was worried about the Russians coming. However, after today's announcement by Mr Ah Kee that Mer Island is going to secede from Australia, he might need the guns for other purposes.

Moreton Island also had guns positioned to repel invasion. Sadly, the guns in those emplacements are starting to topple onto the beach, and they are being destroyed. There are no longer any guns, just the concrete emplacements.

About 18 months ago I suggested to the Minister for Veterans' Affairs, Con Sciacca, that perhaps it is time to look at preserving one of those gun emplacements. Perhaps one of the guns on Thursday Island could be relocated on Moreton Island——

Mr FitzGerald: No way in the world. The honourable member for Cook would never allow that to happen.

Mr HOLLIS: Or maybe from Fort Lytton. We could raid Tom Burns' electorate as well.

Those areas need to be preserved so that future generations know what happened during the war years. I hope that over the next couple of years the Government will do something about replacing the gun emplacement on Moreton Island so that that piece of history is preserved for students and others who visit Moreton Island.

That is basically all that I wanted to say today regarding the environment. I welcome the new Minister's interest in the environment. It is pleasing to see that he is interested not only in wilderness areas but also in the urban environment. This Bill and the Bill in relation to

garbage dumps that is going to come before the House will make inroads into environmental protection for all Queenslanders.

Hon. V. P. LESTER (Keppel) (12.33 p.m.): This Bill is an extremely important one, as are all Bills that relate to the environment. Environmental legislation needs to be updated continually to cater for the needs of the time.

The environment is an issue of some importance in the electorate of Keppel. One of the reasons for that is that the region is experiencing population growth of approximately 4 per cent. The temptation is great to build high-rises, but environmental planning is very important.

One cause for concern in my electorate is the erosion difficulties that are being experienced at both Kinka Beach and Keppel Sands. Recently I had yet another meeting with the people of Keppel Sands with a view to trying to get the beach protection officers to do something about the problem. I do not know whether they are overworked, but they seem to be a bit slow in doing anything. We hold meetings but not a lot happens afterwards. I point out that both of those beaches are very important to the coast——

Mr Schwarten: And to me!

Mr LESTER: And to the member for Rockhampton. He has a house there—which he is going to lose, if he is not careful.

This beach erosion has to be stopped. It is a very serious problem at Kinka Beach and, if it is allowed to get out of hand, it will be just as serious a problem at Keppel Sands. Over the years many environmental reports have been prepared. In fact, we are in the midst of another one that seems to be progressing slowly. I have to say to the Minister that his department has mucked around with this for a fair while now. He is a good, energetic bloke. I ask him to try to do something about the problem which, as I say, is very serious.

Beach erosion is a problem all over Australia. Recently I visited some of the beaches in northern New South Wales. Byron Bay, Potts Point and Kingscliff have all experienced problems. It has been predicted that Queensland will experience cyclones in the coming year. I hope that we do not and that, if we do, they pass over the unpopulated beaches, miss the cities, and provide rainfall in the bush. I understand that two "beauties" are predicted—whatever that means.

I am still concerned about the threat of sandmining at Byfield. A guarantee has not been given that sandmining will not go ahead. Expressions of interest are still being considered. An environmental impact study is being carried out. It seems to be in the lap of the gods. I do not believe that Byfield is a suitable area for mining. There are many other places where sandmining could be undertaken without any adverse effects on the environment.

That leads me to the issue of the extension of national parks. In the case of Stockyard Point, the environmental officers have gone overboard. Sometimes I cannot quite work these characters out. Stockyard Point had two little bases of water supply for the local people and the department wanted to shut one down. We are still arguing about that. In another instance, those officers wanted to bring the parks so close to the buildings that they would have been taking a line between the back door of the houses and the barbecues. That is plain stupidity. I really cannot understand what those officers are on about. The boundaries of this park need to be kept well back from the homes of the residents of Stockyard Point because if a fire breaks out, we know what will happen. Those homes will be burnt down.

The other day I took the opportunity to visit the Stanwich Bay area, which is outside my electorate but within the Livingstone Shire. A lot of effort has been put into that development. The local member must be quite proud of what is being done there. I understand that he and Barbara Wilden continually attend meetings and that their meetings seem to be more successful than the meetings that we hold at Stockyard Point, which turn into nothing but a brawl with the environmental officers. Those officers should get off the backs of the residents of Stockyard Point and give them a go. Their lifestyle can be maintained without adversely affecting the environment.

Tourism in the Byfield area does need more promotion. I mention here the Knob Creek Gallery and Ferns Hideaway. Some rather silly things do happen. A tourism group wants to conduct horse tours from Byfield up to the Stockyard Point area. Because that area includes a small national park, those people are not allowed to take the horses into that area. Commonsense must start to enter this debate. I cannot understand why exceptions cannot be made in some cases so that practical ventures can be allowed to take place. We need to better promote environmental tourism and ecotourism.

I have taken the odd trip down into northern New South Wales. Recently I went along the Lions road, which is an area in the Border Ranges. It is a pretty rough old track. There are plenty of spots where people can stop and look at the scenery in the Tweed Valley or have a barbecue. Plenty of facilities are available for tourists. One can drive along a rough track and really enjoy the environment in an adventurous way. We should be looking at doing things like that in Queensland. I know that in some areas we have similar facilities, but we could learn a lesson or two from northern New South Wales in that respect.

The environment is particularly important to the electorate of Keppel. It covers the Shoalwater Bay area, which has an excellent liaison with the military. The military personnel have proven to be very good environmentalists. The report of the inquiry into that area indicates that nobody should be allowed to go near the Shoalwater Bay area. I query that. I still believe that there could be a limited amount of ecotourism in that area, because Queensland still has to provide revenue. I am sure that controlled ecotourism in the Shoalwater Bay area would be the logical way to go.

Hon T. A. BARTON (Waterford—Minister for Environment and Heritage) (12.42 p.m.), in reply: First of all, I thank the Government members who participated in this debate, particularly members of the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee. Those comments were added to by the member for Redcliffe. Mr Welford, the member for Everton, spoke very comprehensively about the importance of the Wet Tropics Plan, which will be released within the next week, provided that this legislation is passed today—and I am very confident that it will be.

The member for Currumbin spoke in great detail about the Bill. The important issues mentioned by the member for Redcliffe in relation to the nature of development in wetland areas are certainly lessons to all of us, because the Redcliffe electorate is probably a good example of how not to develop wetlands. This Government has made a commitment to ensure that there are no more areas like Redcliffe along the coastline.

I want to make a few comments about what was said by the Opposition spokesperson, the member for Burnett, the member for Springwood and the member for Keppel. If the first edition of the *Alert Digest* from the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee had not been released already, I find it very hard to believe that there would have been any criticism of this fairly minor piece of legislation. Members opposite who spoke during this debate found nothing else to criticise. I will address their specific criticisms in more detail shortly.

This Bill involves minor amendments to a number of pieces of legislation. In a real sense, it is a genuine omnibus Bill. The Bill is about creating certainty in a number of areas where certainty does not exist. It certainly refers to fees; but in a sense it ensures that the issue is clarified and that unnecessary litigation is avoided as we seek to increase some of the fees. In some cases those fees have not been increased for six or seven years, and they apply mainly to commercial operations within national parks and conservation parks. The people of Queensland are currently subsidising those commercial operations. I believe that that is totally inappropriate.

I question members opposite who talk about a regulatory impact statement—or the lack of one, as they see it. This Bill provides for extensive consultation, which has already taken place over recent years in relation to the draft Wet Tropics Plan, and ensures that we do not need a regulatory impact statement. A regulatory impact statement was not even required when this Bill was first drafted. It is my view and that of my department that the extensive consultation that has taken place in putting the draft Wet Tropics Plan together is at least the equivalent of a regulatory impact statement under the Statutory Instruments Act.

I could ask about the Opposition's agenda in claiming that it wants to oppose the Bill. If members opposite successfully oppose the Bill, we will not be able to release the draft Wet Tropics Plan, which has to be released by 1 November—a little over a week away. If it cannot be released before then, that would delay by at least another year the release of that very important plan to the public of this State and, in particular, those in the tropical areas of Queensland. I hope that the Opposition has no ulterior motive. I certainly question why, all of a sudden, it has woken up to conversation and environmental issues.

In question time today, the first question addressed to me was asked in anger by a member opposite. Now Opposition members are indicating that they will oppose a provision that will stop the draft Wet Tropics Plan from being released for public consultation. If I was a member of the conservation movement in this State, I would be asking those members opposite—who claim to be the newfound

friends of the conservation movement and the environment—precisely what their agenda is by opposing this piece of legislation. Any further delay in the release of that plan will have a very detrimental effect on conservation values in north Queensland. If the plan is not released, that will delay putting the plan into place and put at risk a lot of the values of the Wet Tropics area of North Queensland.

I, for one, do not think that it is good enough for Opposition members to hide behind the first report from the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee—the *Alert Digest*—and to take steps that will have such dangerous impacts on the environment and on the sensitive Wet Tropics areas of north Queensland. It seems to me to be a retreat by members opposite from the so-called conservation values that they espoused so heavily during the recent State election. I will talk in detail later about the first report from the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee. This is the first Bill which has come before this House since that committee was put in place. It needs to be acknowledged that we are all on a learning curve. This Government is on a learning curve in relation to procedures for dealing with reports from that new committee. In turn, I suggest that the committee is on a learning curve in relation to the values that are important for it to consider in ensuring that legislation meets appropriate standards.

This Bill is the first test. But when I answer criticism raised in a pretty feeble way by members opposite about the first report from the committee, I will be suggesting that this House should support the Bill in its current form. For the reasons that I have already expressed, it is absolutely crucial that this Bill passes through this Parliament today. I believe that the committee has gone a little over the top, but I will provide a comprehensive, written response to its members on or before 27 October, as required, and will speak in some detail about the issues they have raised. In my view, and in the view of my department, this Bill is consistent with the standards that are required and have been set by this Parliament over a very long period.

I turn briefly to some of the comments made during this debate. I hope that the Opposition spokesperson, the member for Burnett, is not suggesting—as appeared to be the case—that we should never amend legislation that has been passed by this Parliament. He spoke about the Environmental Protection Act as though it had only just gone through Parliament and indicated that that piece of legislation is seriously flawed. The minor amendments proposed to that legislation really are precisely that; there are a few corrections. That piece of legislation went through the Parliament late last year, not just before the election—as he indicated—although much of it was proclaimed not long before the election.

In relation to the clause dealing with fees, this Government is clarifying—and I stress "clarifying"—that a fee can include a component of a tax. That is a standard provision of much of the legislation of this House. Before 27 October I will provide the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee with a list of 19 other Acts containing that precise clause, including two Acts related to my department, 12 related to the Health Department and four others. The Government is clarifying this issue to alleviate expensive and time-consuming litigation as it increases fees, particularly those applying to tour operators, many of which have not increased for six or seven years because of pressure from operators. To suggest that such a fee is a hidden tax is simply way over the top and beneath what a responsible Opposition spokesperson should say. For Opposition members to claim that the Government's desire to increase fees means ripping money out of the pockets of workers is typical of the snide and untrue remarks made daily by Opposition members. I assure the Parliament that I want to increase fees in cases where commercial operators in national parks are being subsidised. It is about time that they were put well and truly in their place for the sort of nonsense that they carry on with.

Mr FitzGerald: Over that side of the House.

Mr BARTON: Opposition members want to come over to this side of the House. The snide comments that they made in today's debate ensure that they will be sitting on that side of the House for a long, long time.

I have spoken about fees, but I have not yet mentioned the other component. It has been suggested that the legislation should be amended to set a limit. What a free kick that would give the Opposition spokesperson! If an upper limit were set, members of the Opposition could say that the Government or the Minister for the Environment had the power to ensure that even the most minor fees for entry to a national park, or even fees for a minor licence under the Environmental Protection Act, could be—for argument's sake—$23,000, which is one of highest fees set in legislation related to my portfolio. A great deal of investigative work is needed in

relation to licensing under the Environmental Protection Act. To set an upper limit would give the Opposition a free kick. I am not stupid, and I am sure that honourable members are not stupid enough to fall for that. That is simply not on.

I will raise one point about how fees are to be set. The fees are not set by the cost of issuing the licence. I will clarify once and for all that fees under the Environmental Protection Act include the cost of monitoring. It does not cost a lot of money to simply issue a piece of paper, but huge costs are incurred by ensuring compliance with a licence that has been issued and ensuring that monitoring takes place. Depending on how a court interpreted the costs of putting the fee in place and everything related to that fee, particularly the monitoring aspects, the Government could become involved in expensive and time-consuming litigation about the cost of that fee.

The issue of the Heritage Council was raised, I believe, to somehow suggest that the Government has broken the law. Members of the Opposition need to be reminded of one of the most important conventions of Government. An election was called—an election that, I remind the Parliament, those of us who sit on this side of the House won. Those on the other side of the House have not got that through their heads yet.

Mr Slack: You called the election.

Mr BARTON: If the Opposition spokesperson is suggesting that the Government should not have called the election until the new Heritage Council was in place, then that shows the stupidity of the Opposition's argument. The Government was in caretaker mode.

Honourable members would recall that an election was called in approximately mid-June, to be held in mid-July. A period of hiatus followed the election before the Government was back in place. During that period, it was not possible to reappoint the Heritage Council. That the council was not put in place is not a breach of the law; it is recognition of one of the most important principles of Government, that is, that actions of that nature are not to be taken when a Government is in a caretaker role.

Mr T. B. Sullivan: Did the Opposition spokesperson want us to ignore the Westminster tradition in this regard?

Mr BARTON: It does appear to be that way, but I will not dwell on that.

It is important to ensure that honourable members understand that, technically, the Heritage Council is not in place. After I was appointed the Minister for Environment and Heritage, I very rapidly called for nominations to that council. Almost all of the nominations have been received. The new Heritage Council will be in place early next month. That issue has nothing to do with this legislation, which seeks to give the Minister power to reappoint people who have already served two terms on the Heritage Council and are not capable of being reappointed at this time. Those good people have served for two terms, and I want the flexibility to be able to reappoint them for a further term and perhaps another term, if necessary—it may be a future Minister who does that—because to do otherwise would mean denuding the committee of good people. This legislation is not about what the Opposition spokesperson has indicated.

I was going to comment on the contribution of the member for Springwood, but all I can say is that he did not say much. I think he needs to do a little more homework. He turned up today with the report of a committee of which he is a member, but he did not understand it fully.

As to the contribution of the member for Keppel—Vince is one of the best parish pump politicians I have ever come across. Every speech he makes in this place is about a problem that is occurring in his electorate. I congratulate the member for Keppel: he did it again. His contribution did not seem to be about this Bill. He seemed to be very supportive of the Coastal Management and Protection Bill, which I introduced into Parliament yesterday. I look forward to his comments in support of that Bill which will ensure that we have a very well protected coastline in Queensland.

The *Alert Digest* concluded that EARC had determined that, as a general rule, taxes should not be set by regulation. I was planning to provide the House with greater detail about this matter, but I believe that it is satisfactory for me to report back to the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee on or before 27 October. I have taken significant advice on this matter before reaching any conclusions. In the view of my departmental advisers, the committee has misunderstood EARC's report. The correspondence that I will be forwarding to that committee makes it very clear that, if one reads the full paragraph and not just the selective quotation that appears in *Alert Digest* No. 1, it becomes very clear that EARC did not suggest that it would always be inappropriate to allow taxes to be set by regulation. EARC considered that it would ordinarily be recognised that it may be impracticable to do

so in some cases, particularly where there are regular changes to fees and taxes. In addition, EARC did not suggest that legislation that allows the setting of fees, fines or other charges in the nature of a tax should invariably include an upper limit on the amounts that could be set. Indeed, EARC expressly rejected such an approach and suggested that the matter could be reviewed in the light of future experience. Accordingly, it seems to me that, if there are practical considerations that would prevent the fees being set by the legislation itself, then this legislation is entirely consistent with the EARC report.

In a practical sense, members should look at the schedules that come before Parliament as part of subordinate legislation. A huge number are amended for all sorts of reasons. There are amendments to schedules to keep parity with the CPI; amendments to keep parity with another State or the Commonwealth under complementary legislation; increases in fees to deal with emerging anomalies, problems and developments; and increases in fees to deal with policy changes about fees within the overall context of the empowering Act. If we were going to incorporate all of those fees in principal legislation, I would hate to think how big the Government printing office would have to be, or how large the legislation would have to be, or how often members would be in Parliament night and day, 365 days a year, ensuring that we legislate all of those changes to fees.

I remind members that every single one of those pieces of subordinate legislation is capable of being debated in this Parliament. It is not a question that the Executive makes them and they never see the light of day. If there are objections, they can come before this Parliament.

The Government is supposedly not complying with the Statutory Instruments Act requirement for an RIS about the Wet Tropics Plan. I simply repeat what I said earlier—and I stress it—that, in fact, the Government has had extensive consultation and, in the Government's view, it has met the criteria that do not require the Wet Tropics Plan to undergo an RIS. In our view, we have done more than that. Although an RIS was not required for the Wet Tropics Plan when the Government's process began, the Government wants to provide certainty under this legislation, and that is what this provision is all about.

I believe I have answered the concerns raised by the Opposition. I thank all the Government members who spoke, and I commend the Bill to the House.

Committee

Hon. T. A. Barton (Waterford—Minister for Environment and Heritage) in charge of the Bill.

Sitting suspended from 1.04 to 2.30 p.m.

Clauses 1 to 10, as read, agreed to.

Clause 11—

Mr SLACK (2.30 p.m.): Much of the substance of what I am about to say has been covered in the second-reading debate on the amendments before the Chamber. Earlier we heard the Minister attempting to justify his, his department's and, of course, the Government's position in relation to what the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee had to say about clause 11.

I suggest that the Minister is particularly arrogant in his approach, because at one point he said, "The Committee has gone a little over the top on this." At another point he said, "They are on a learning curve." The Minister said those things about a committee of the Parliament; obviously he is saying, "The committee is wrong and I am right." I remind the Minister that he is a member of the Government and that the committee is a committee of the Parliament.

The committee has, in its deliberations and with the submissions received from various sources, made some points within the *Alert Digest*, which is available to all honourable members. Surely if the Minister was serious about his job and the consideration he should give to the points raised by the committee he would have held this legislation back until he had gone to the committee, put his points of view forward and then asked for a further assessment by the committee. He has not done that. He has chosen to say that the parliamentary committee has gone a little over the top, that it is on a learning curve and that he is right and the committee is wrong.

It will be very interesting to see the way that the members of this committee vote, particularly Government members. Will they vote for the parliamentary committee on which they sit and through which they have made certain observations, or will they vote with the Government?

The Minister says that the provisions of clause 11 are common practice and that he is worried about litigation, that the clause is included to avoid any possibility of litigation. It

seems to be of no consequence to him. Surely litigation costs a lot of money. Before anybody litigated whether an imposed charge constitutes a fee or tax, they would have to think very carefully.

The Minister talks about open and accountable Government, so surely he would be able to justify the costing of any fee increases that he may put into the system, remembering that the previous Minister always spoke about fee and cost recovery. Surely that would be easy to justify; surely no case would come before a court unless there was a very sound reason for doing so. In those circumstances, surely it is only right that when talking about taxes—not fees or charges—the Parliament should have the final say on what those taxes should be.

The Minister said that he was not prepared to accept the committee's recommendation for a ceiling amount. He claimed that the amount could be too high and that the fee would have to go up to that amount and that that would frighten people away. If large increases in charges are to occur, surely it is not unreasonable, if that can in any way be considered as a tax, that that come before this Assembly.

The amendment is not merely a simple little change, as the Minister would have us believe; it is a fundamental change, as the committee quite rightly pointed out. It will be interesting to see how the members of the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee vote on this clause.

The member for Everton waffled around the point and attempted to dismiss the importance of the report of the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee. He said it was of little consequence. Is it of little consequence if a committee of the Parliament makes a recommendation and asks the Minister for points of clarification? Surely that would demand that the Minister not proceed with the legislation until he has adequately answered the points raised by the committee.

I will outline, point by point, what the committee actually said. Point 2.3 states—

> "Clause 11 amends the definitions section of the Marine Parks Act 1982 to provide that ' "fee" includes tax'."

That is straightforward. It also makes the observation that the same thing happens with clause 25 in respect to the Recreation Areas Management Act 1988. Point 2.6 refers to section 59 of the Recreation Areas Management Act. Point 2.5 states—

> "Section 30 of the Marine Parks Act provides that:
>
> The Governor in Council may make regulations under this Act, including, for example, regulations about the following—
>
> (n) fees and charges to be imposed upon persons using services or facilities provided in or in connection with marine parks."

That is also straightforward: the Governor in Council can make regulations in respect of fees and charges. It continues—

> "(s) the issue of licences, permits and authorities, the conditions subject to which, and the person or persons by whom, they are issued and the charging of fees in respect of such licences, permits and authorities."

That is understood; it is straightforward. Point 2.7 states—

> "Part 8 to the First Schedule 'Subject Matters for Regulations' refers to:
>
> 8. Fees, etc. Prescribing the matters or things in respect whereof fees, costs, charges and expenses, where such prescription is not otherwise provided for by this Act, shall be payable under this Act and the amounts of such fees, costs, charges and expenses, and prescribing the persons who shall be liable for the payment of such fees, costs, charges and expenses, and when such fees, costs, charges and expenses shall be payable and paid, and providing for the manner of payment thereof and for the recovery of any amount thereof not duly paid."

That is quite clear. The committee's report continues—

> "2.8. Accordingly, the effect of the amendments under both Acts is that regulations may be made which prescribe taxes.
>
> 2.9 Section 4(2)(b) of the Legislative Standards Act provides that it is a fundamental legislative principle that legislation have sufficient regard to 'the institution of Parliament'. Section (5)(c) of the Legislative Standards Act provides that:
>
> (5) Whether subordinate legislation has sufficient regard to the institution of Parliament depends on whether, for

example, the subordinate legislation—

(c) contains only matter appropriate to subordinate legislation.

2.10 The Committee draws attention to the amendments to the definitions sections, the consequence of which is to allow for a tax to be set by regulation. It is the Committee's view that the prescription of a tax is a matter more appropriate to primary legislation. The Committee notes the approach taken by the Senate Standing Committee for the Scrutiny of Bills, as outlined by the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission at para 2.65 of its Report on Review of the Office of Parliamentary Counsel:

The Senate Standing Committee for the Scrutiny of Bills has been prepared to accept provisions enabling the setting of fees, fines or other charges in the nature of a tax by regulation where an upper limit is set by the Act, but has reported open-ended provisions."

The Minister has rejected that. In conclusion, the report states—

"The Committee requests further information from the Minister as to the appropriateness of allowing taxes to be set by regulation."

I take it that the committee has not got that information except what was said by the Minister on the floor of the Parliament today. The report continues—

"Definitions of 'fees' to include 'taxes'

2.11 There is a general presumption that legislation is presumed not to invade common law rights or to alter common law doctrines. The common law can be overridden by express legislation but the courts have indicated that there must be a clear intention on behalf of the legislature to do so.

2.12 The classic definition of a tax is that it is a 'compulsory exaction of money by a public authority for public purposes, enforceable by law and is not a payment for services rendered' (i.e a clear distinction is drawn between a payment for services rendered—or fee, and a tax). The clear exclusion from the definition of a tax of a charge for services rendered is illustrated in a string of cases"—

and the cases are quoted. The report continues—

"2.13 According to the Explanatory Notes, the purpose of inserting the standard clause 'fees includes "taxes" ' into the Marine Parks Act and the Recreation Areas Management Act is 'to take account of decisions of the Courts concerning the charging of fees'. In this case, then, the extension of the definition of fees to include taxes indicates a clear intention to displace common law doctrines."

Then the committee states—

"The Committee notes that the insertion of the standard clause ' "fees" includes "taxes" ' will have the effect of overriding the common law distinction between fees and taxes, but refers to Parliament for debate the question whether the distinction should be maintained."

In the final analysis, it is a matter for this Parliament as to whether it is to be legislative.

Time expired.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: I acknowledge the Minister's comments on this Bill. I also note the comments of the Senate standing committee, some of which have been alluded to already. The digest states—

"The Senate Standing Committee for the Scrutiny of Bills has been prepared to accept provisions enabling the setting of fees, fines or other changes in the nature of a tax by regulation where an upper limit is set by the Act, but has reported open-ended provisions."

For example, if Government delegates the power to tax, such delegations should include an upper limit. I note that this Bill proposes no such limits.

The issue of interchanging the terms "fees" and "taxes" is a significant matter in people's minds. The Explanatory Notes state rather benignly—

"Clause 11 inserts a standard clause relating to the meaning of 'fee' to include 'tax'."

As has been stated by many members, a fee is a payment for service, that is, a charge or a cost—all of which, to me, imply an exchange of benefit.

Conversely, using a dictionary definition, a tax is "a compulsory monetary contribution demanded by a government for its support and levied on incomes, property, goods purchased, etc." A further meaning is "to lay a burden on; make serious demands." I highlight several reasons for my concern about the interchanging proposed for those terms. Firstly, as I have already said, by definition "fees" imply exchange. Whether or not one agrees with the user-pay principles, the imposition of a fee requires a departmental officer or, indeed, the Minister to demonstrate or justify the basis for the fee—for example: a fee for the use of built facilities; information exchange; documentation and services; or a fee for an environmental licence, which could include ongoing monitoring. Conversely, a tax is a charge imposed by Government, and need not be justified. In fact, at any time, one can speak to residents who would respond—and fairly emotively—by saying that few taxes can be justified. Whether that statement is right or wrong, that is the comment often proffered by the community.

On that basis, it is important that the responsibility for the imposition of taxes remain with the elected Government, and that Government must be able to justify imposts on electors. That responsibility should not be confused in the manner proposed; nor should that responsibility be conferred on a bureaucrat. Additionally, if the administrative or bureaucratic arm of Government is unable to impose taxes, it is inappropriate for Government to deflect criticism of any subsequent charges imposed by being able to say, "We didn't do it. The department decided to impose that tax." An elected Government must not only retain the right to impose taxes but also clear responsibility for any taxes so imposed. On that basis, I have some difficulty accepting the proposal to interchange those terms and would continue to request reconsideration on the part of the Government to keep the clear common law distinction between fees and taxes.

Mr BARTON: I cannot say a lot more than was said in the debate on the second reading of the Bill. I want to make it clear that this simply involves the insertion of a standard clause as recommended by the Office of Parliamentary Counsel to take into account recent decisions of the courts in relation to the interpretation of the charging of fees. The amendment provides my department with the ability to calculate the level of fee for a licence or permit to include the costs of monitoring compliance with the terms of the licence or permit, and not just simply the administrative cost of issuing the authorisation.

I understand why members are raising these concerns, and I wish to place some comments into context. The member for Burnett spoke about my being arrogant by saying that the committee is on a learning curve. It needs to be reinforced that that comment was made in the context of this Bill being the very first one to come before this Chamber following the very first *Alert Digest* from the reviewing committee. That committee has requested that I write to it and provide complete information by 27 October, which I will certainly do. I reinforce the point that it is not possible to pull this piece of legislation back without holding back the release of the draft Wet Tropics Management Plan, which is dealt with in a separate clause. I believe that overrides any ability to sit back and simply make sure that everybody is totally comfortable before we pass the Bill.

It is very clear from the information that has been put together on my behalf by my department and Parliamentary Counsel—and from my consideration of it—that EARC did not suggest that it would always be inappropriate to allow taxes to be set by regulation. I reinforce the point that, if members seek to move disallowance motions, such motions can come before this Parliament. I am not suggesting or recommending that members do that, but it is possible for this Parliament to scrutinise legislation. This standard clause is contained in 19 other pieces of legislation. It is a simple fact that this is the first time that a clause of this nature, which is a standard clause, has gone before the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee. In my view, it is fully justified. As the committee has said, the issue is for the Parliament itself to determine. That is what we are doing here this afternoon, and I will leave it in the hands of the Parliament to determine.

Mr SLACK: I take issue with a point to which the Minister referred. He stated that he is prepared to reply to the committee by 27 October. What has prevented him from replying to it prior to today? Nothing! The committee asked for a reply by that date. The Minister has outlined to the Parliament why he believes that this legislation should be passed today, but there was nothing to preclude him from writing to that committee before today, setting out why he thought it was in error and asking the committee to review its advice on this piece of legislation and, in particular, this

amendment. In those circumstances, the Opposition has no course open to it other than to oppose the Bill. We recognise the committee's position, which we uphold. It was up to the Minister to do something about it, but he did nothing. I challenge the members of the committee to vote in accordance with its report tabled in the House.

Mr J. H. SULLIVAN: At the outset, I make it very clear that I rise in my capacity as the member for Caboolture, not as a member of the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee. In respect of the debate on matters raised by that committee—one member participating in the debate has performed, that is, the Minister, who has given this Parliament some reasons for the position he has adopted. One member has not performed, namely, the Opposition spokesman, Mr Slack, who quoted verbatim from a non-conclusive report which suggested to this Parliament that its findings were conclusive.

As to the issue of whether or not this Bill should be withheld until the Minister and the committee have been able to consider this matter further—this matter was not considered when the Legislative Standards Act of 1992 went through this Parliament. Clearly, statutory interpretation is not one of the strengths of the Opposition spokesman. The Legislative Standards Act and the Parliamentary Committees Bill acknowledge the fact that, from time to time, Bills will pass through this Chamber before the committee has even had time to consider them—for example, urgent Bills. That does not preclude the committee from looking at them; it will do so and report to the Parliament accordingly. The Opposition spokesman's argument is very flimsy. The Minister has undertaken to do what the committee asked.

Mr Hobbs: You're looking for a way out.

Mr J. H. SULLIVAN: I will explain something for the benefit of the member for Warrego. The Opposition spokesman has tried to politicise a committee of this Parliament.

Mr SLACK: I rise to a point of order. I merely drew on points made in what I believe is a public document and a unanimous decision of that committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is no point of order.

Mr J. H. SULLIVAN: I want to be brief; I do not wish to delay the debate. Let me simply say this: to repeat parrot fashion in this Chamber the words of the committee is not to come into this place and add anything to the debate. The entire argument of the member opposite has relied on repeating parrot fashion the words of the committee. He has added nothing to the debate. The Minister at least has added to the debate by way of explanation, and I commend him for that. Just in case members opposite are interested—because they have posed the question in the course of their contributions—I advise them that I intend to vote with the Minister on this question.

Question—That clause 11 as read stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 44—Ardill, Barton, Beattie, Bird, Bligh, Braddy, Bredhauer, Briskey, Burns, Campbell, D'Arcy, Davies, De Lacy, Dollin, Edmond, Elder, Foley, Fouras, Gibbs, Goss W. K., Hamill, Hayward, Hollis, McElligott, McGrady, Mackenroth, Milliner, Mulherin, Nunn, Nuttall, Pearce, Purcell, Roberts, Robertson, Rose, Schwarten, Smith, Spence, Sullivan J. H., Welford, Wells, Woodgate *Tellers:* Livingstone, Sullivan T. B.

NOES, 44—Baumann, Beanland, Borbidge, Connor, Cooper, Cunningham, Davidson, Elliott, FitzGerald, Gamin, Gilmore, Goss J. N., Grice, Harper, Healy, Hegarty, Hobbs, Horan, Johnson, Laming, Lester, Lingard, Littleproud, McCauley, Malone, Mitchell, Perrett, Quinn, Radke, Rowell, Santoro, Sheldon, Simpson, Slack, Stephan, Stoneman, Turner, Veivers, Warwick, Watson, Wilson, Woolmer *Tellers:* Springborg, Carroll

The numbers being equal, the Chairman cast his vote with the Ayes.

Resolved in the **affirmative**.

Clauses 12 to 26, as read, agreed to.

Clause 27—

Mr SLACK (2.58 p.m.): This is another clause about which the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee has raised some points. The Government must bear in mind that, if we are to have committees and if they raise points for the Parliament to assess, obviously those matters have to be considered seriously and taken into account. The Opposition does just that. There was no point in the Chairman of the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee alleging so passionately that I have politicised the report of that committee. I have not politicised anything. The report is a public document highlighting valid points which I have now raised before this Committee.

The report makes some points about clause 27. For the benefit of the chairman of the committee, the member for Caboolture, I will quote those points to this Committee. I challenge the member to dispute the points that I am about to raise, which are taken from the report of his own committee. The report states—

"Clause 27 amends Section 41 of the Wet Tropics World Heritage Protection and Management Act 1993 by omitting the current sub-section 5 and substituting the following provision:

A regulatory impact statement under the Statutory Instruments Act 1992 need not be prepared for the first management plan for the wet tropics area.

Guidelines for regulatory impact statements are contained in Part 5 of the Statutory Instruments Act 1992."

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Committee will come to order. The Chair is unsure whether the noise is emanating from the floor of the Chamber or from the gallery.

Mr SLACK: The report continues—

"The Act also specifies the circumstances in which a regulatory impact statement need not be prepared.

However, the Statutory Instruments Act does not envisage that particular pieces of subordinate legislation can be exempted from the requirement to prepare a regulatory impact statement under subsequently enacted statutes.

Section 22(1) of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1995 provides that the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee's area of responsibility is to consider:

(a) the application of fundamental legislative principles to particular Bills and particular subordinate legislation;

and

(b) the lawfulness of particular subordinate legislation

by examining all Bills and subordinate legislation.

Under Section 22(2)(b) of the Parliamentary Committees Act, the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee's area of responsibility includes:

monitoring generally the operation of—

part 5 . . .

In the Committee's opinion, the proposed new Section 41(5)"—

I repeat: "in the committee's opinion"—the unanimous opinion of the committee—

"of the Wet Tropics World Heritage Protection and Management Act detracts from the Committee's role of ensuring that the requirements of Part 5 of the Statutory Instruments are complied with. The Committee is deeply concerned about the drafting practice adopted in clause 27. Clause 27 is the first example of this practice which has been sighted by the Committee. The Committee would not wish to see a precedent established by the provision used in clause 27."

The highlighted opinions of the committee are as follows—

"The Committee expresses its concern to the Minister regarding clause 27 which purports to exempt the first management plan for the wet tropics area from the regulatory impact statement requirements and thereby seeks to circumvent provisions of the Statutory Instruments Act.

The Committee considers that adequate grounds for exemption from regulatory impact statement requirements already exist within the Statutory Instruments Act."

That is quite clear. The highlighted section continues—

"The Committee requests that the Minister consider whether an express exemption clause is necessary."

This arrogant Minister says that he will write back to the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee by 27 October and that he will put this legislation through the Parliament today, despite the comments of that committee. The Minister has had every opportunity to put his arguments on this particular clause before the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee before today and, if the committee was still worried about the matter, request a meeting with the committee to consider his reply so that the committee could draft a response to his reply. But the Minister did not do that. He has argued that he has to come up with this legislation because of commitments under the Wet Tropics Management Plan. I can appreciate the Minister's position, but that does not excuse him bypassing the points raised by the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee.

Mr Veivers: Why have the committee?

Mr SLACK: That is right. Why have committees of the Parliament? We may as well disband them if their recommendations are not considered by the 89 members of this place.

I want to make a point about the Wet Tropics area. We support the World Heritage listing of the Wet Tropics area. Let there be no doubt about that. We support the proper

management of that area. We do not support logging in the area. At the same time, we do not support any abuse by the Minister of statutory requirements. I understand the Minister's problem. His Government got itself into this problem. He can argue about the election being called in June and say that the Government did not foresee these problems. June was not that long ago. It could have been done before then if the Government was managing the affairs of the Environment and Heritage portfolio properly. It did not happen. This last-minute legislation is designed to overcome a jam in which this Minister finds himself. The Government is in a jam. The Opposition does not support the amendment.

Mr BARTON: What feigned indignation! I think the response to this should be stated very clearly. I have already said it in the second-reading debate, but I will repeat it for the benefit of the member for Burnett in particular. As I said earlier, neither the Government nor I accept that clause 27 does attempt to circumvent the relevant provisions of the Statutory Instruments Act. Firstly, the drafting and consultation processes associated with the first management plan have been proceeding for a very lengthy period, as members of this Chamber and members of the public are well aware.

Much of the drafting and public consultation took place before the provisions relating to regulatory impact statements came before this Chamber in the first place. Secondly, the vast amount of information that has been made available during the public consultation phases is comparable to the relatively recent provisions contained in the Statutory Instruments and Legislative Standards Amendment Act of 1994. I believe that section 42(b) of the principal Act would apply and exempt the management plan from the requirements of Division 2 because of the comparable level of publication and consultation undertaken over a period of some years.

Clause 27 removes any uncertainty regarding this comparable level and will allow the plan to be released in the near future. This matter needs to be put in a total context. It removes any uncertainty. The Government could take the risk. It could simply say it believes that it has already met those standards. I am not prepared to do that. That is why I have come into this Chamber and openly put it on the deck. That is no doubt why the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee has raised it. That committee has also indicated it needs to be worked out here. I am prepared to work it out here. At the end of the day, it is up to the Parliament as the master of its own destiny. Had there been time, the Government would have withdrawn the legislation.

Quite frankly, the democrats on the other side have demonstrated their feigned indignation. I remember sitting in the gallery of this Chamber when Opposition members were in power and seeing what they did. Quite frankly, it is clear that this clause will ensure certainty about the provisions. If the Opposition spokesperson is so concerned about the Wet Tropics he should vote for this amendment to enable the management plan to be released next week so that the Government can ensure the protection of this unique area. That is all I have to say.

Question—That clause 27, as read, stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 45—Ardill, Barton, Beattie, Bird, Bligh, Braddy, Bredhauer, Briskey, Burns, Campbell, Cunningham, D'Arcy, Davies, De Lacy, Dollin, Edmond, Elder, Foley, Fouras, Gibbs, Goss W. K., Hamill, Hayward, Hollis, McElligott, McGrady, Mackenroth, Milliner, Mulherin, Nunn, Nuttall, Pearce, Purcell, Roberts, Robertson, Rose, Schwarten, Smith, Spence, Sullivan J. H., Welford, Wells, Woodgate *Tellers:* Livingstone, Sullivan T. B.

NOES, 43—Baumann, Beanland, Borbidge, Connor, Cooper, Davidson, Elliott, FitzGerald, Gamin, Gilmore, Goss J. N., Grice, Harper, Healy, Hegarty, Hobbs, Horan, Johnson, Laming, Lester, Lingard, Littleproud, McCauley, Malone, Mitchell, Perrett, Quinn, Radke, Rowell, Santoro, Sheldon, Simpson, Slack, Stephan, Stoneman, Turner, Veivers, Warwick, Watson, Wilson, Woolmer *Tellers:* Springborg, Carroll

Resolved in the **affirmative**.

Clauses 28 to 30, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

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

JURY BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 14 September (see p. 211).

Mr BEANLAND (Indooroopilly—Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party) (3.13 p.m.): The jury system is central to the democratic justice system. I am pleased to say that the Opposition supports the general thrust of this piece of legislation. Victims of crime, accused offenders and the community as a whole look to trial by jury as the centrepiece of the justice

system to deliver true justice without discrimination, bias or prejudice.

The system of jury trials has been evolving for many hundreds of years, with juries being central to the major societies of history before they were introduced to England over 900 years ago. Juries were widely used in a primitive form throughout Europe before the Normans brought the practice to England in 1066. Records of jury trials were found in early Roman history, while in sixth century Greece the payment received by jurors was a source of popularity for the Government of the day—I think it is fair to say that that is not necessarily true today—even though some of the jury panels numbered as high as 6,000 in those days.

In the English legal system, Henry II was responsible for extending jury use into criminal justice and land title disputes. His provisions allowed litigants to ask for Royal writ to obtain a jury trial. One century after the introduction of juries, the Assize of Clarendon in 1166 required grand juries to report on offences occurring in their jury districts. The development of juries was further spurred by the condemnation of the Lateran Council in Rome in 1215, of previous formal methods of settling disputes, such as battles and ordeals. These rulings led to the jury becoming the official and embodied proof of guilt or innocence in criminal law.

By the fourteenth century the jury was regarded formally as a judicial body. Criminal law was served either by the grand jury, where the sheriff summoned 24 people and chose 23 to serve on the jury to give a majority vote of 12, and the "petit" or petty jury of 12. During the final establishment of the jury as a legal essential, the law confirmed the principles of jury districts to allow judgment by neighbourhood peers and unanimous votes handed down by the petty juries. Jurors were told to either "find a true bill" or "ignore" the charges. The fifteenth century common law adopted the jury as an essential tribunal of fact, with jury verdicts becoming unchallengeable unless the jury had been misdirected or there was a mistake of law.

In Australia, the first recorded jury trial occurred as early as 1789, with the practice becoming firmly established by the 1840s. Both in its origins and in the current day, trial by jury is the heart of the justice system. Being judged by one's peers is the legal essence of democracy. It is the ultimate legal guarantee of justice. Without a properly functioning jury system, the whole justice system would erode.

There are several safeguards that can and must be installed to preserve the jury system. The first of these is secrecy concerning jury deliberations. I will talk more on that shortly. First of all, I want to talk about the eligibility for jury service, because this is a very important change contained in the legislation before the House compared to the previous legislation.

The Bill allows for a much wider choice of people to be included for jury service. The long list of exemptions under the current Jury Act includes not only members of Parliament and officers of Parliament but local government members, lawyers, ministers of religion, doctors, nurses, pharmacists, physiotherapists, university lecturers, school teachers, defence personnel, aircraft pilots and others, including commercial travellers, I might add. Under one section of the Act, any woman, irrespective of age, or any man aged between 65 and 70 years, may opt out of jury service by informing the sheriff that they wish to be exempted. Under another section of the current Act, people over 70 years of age are not required to do jury service. So the exemptions are quite wide. When one considers that some 52 per cent of the population may be excused from jury service, that is, the women in our community, it is little wonder that we have such a very small group of people from which to choose jurors. The current Act also excludes anyone who is of bad fame or repute.

It is little wonder that the representative nature of juries has been questioned in recent years. Another reason for including more of the population for jury service is to ensure that the ability to perform jury service is spread more fairly across the whole community. I think it is particularly important to ensure that there is a fair spread across the whole community, just as it is important to ensure that fairness is shown to those who appear before juries.

One can well appreciate that, when only a fraction of the public is eligible to be a member of a jury panel, because many professional groups, groups with skills and people in the public service have been ineligible for jury service, there will end up being some type of bias. As I mentioned before, 52 per cent of the population—the female portion of the population—may exempt themselves from jury service. We are talking about a very small group of people being eligible for jury service compared to the population as a whole. I think that this is a very important change being made in Bill.

Under this Bill the only exemptions granted are for the Governor, members of

State and Federal Parliaments, those with disabilities that will impair their ability to serve on a jury, and people who are being or are serving judges, magistrates, police officers or correctional officers. Those no longer exempted are barristers, solicitors, members of the Department of Justice and Attorney-General, parliamentary officers, journalists working as court reporters, members of the fire brigade and local government councillors. The new legislation provides for quite a wide field from which to choose jury panels.

The proposed exemptions vary to some degree from the recommendations of the Litigation Reform Commission report of August 1993. I want to take a moment to look at some of those, because I think that there are a couple of difference that are quite important. Firstly, the commission recommended that people aged 70 and over should be exempted from jury service. One has to ask why they have been not been excluded in view of the fact that judges, who are exempted, are forced to retire at 70 years of age, both under the Queensland Supreme Court Act and the Australian Constitution.

There is a recommendation from the Litigation Reform Commission to the effect that people over 70 years of age are to be excluded. Let us consider the reason for the exclusion of those people. In its report the Litigation Reform Commission stated—

> "The proposed exemption of persons aged 70 years or over may appear unnecessarily discriminatory. This must be weighed, however, against the enormous administrative burden that would be placed on the Sheriff if he or she were required to contact all persons of a certain age in order to make some assessment of those who would be capable and those who would be incapable of serving on a jury. The age limit of 70 years suggested is not an arbitrary one—it is the age upon which it is considered undesirable to allow judges to remain in office. On balance, therefore, we suggest the adoption of a fixed line and recommend the exemption of persons aged 70 years or over."

Apart from those reasons that have been spelled out in that report, other very good reasons exist. The point about the retirement age of judges has been covered. People over 70 years old are not always in the best of health. Often, at that stage of life, they do not want to be harassed and hassled by being called up for jury service. I was a little surprised that those people were not exempted. I know that it could be deemed to be discriminatory to exempt people 70 years of age and over, even though they are currently exempted. Nevertheless, judges have to retire at 70 years of age. That is a requirement of the Australian Constitution. Members would recall that the Australian people gave their approval to the amendment to the Constitution that required that. That is also a requirement of the Queensland Supreme Court Act.

Some trials continue for quite some time—sometimes for three or four days. That is a long time for elderly folk to sit through those sessions. I am sure that most elderly people would not want to sit through a trial for the 10, 15, 20 days or more that some trials take. I believe that it is only right and fitting that those people be exempted. I know that the legislation provides for regulations, and the Minister may tell us in his reply that the Government is going to introduce a regulation to that effect. However, as exemptions are spelled out in the legislation, I believe that the exemption for people over 70 years of age should also be spelled out in the legislation. I foreshadow moving an amendment to that effect at the Committee stage and hope that the Minister will give careful consideration to it. That amendment will be moved with the best of intentions in an effort to overcome a situation that could cause many problems for people in the community.

It is fair enough to require people who are under 70 years of age to serve on a jury and for the legislation to be as inclusive as this. However, when people reach 70 years of age, they want to be thinking of other things. Under this legislation, unless some parameters are included to prevent it, people 80 and 90 years old will be called up for jury service. A heck of a lot of work would be created for sheriffs and court staff to cull out those people who do not wish to serve on a jury. Many elderly people will panic if they receive a jury notice, and I foresee members of Parliament receiving many phone calls from those people expressing concern about whether or not they have to front up for jury service. So I appeal to the Minister to exempt from jury service people 70 years of age and over.

The legislation provides for the exclusion of persons who have previously served as police officers in the State or elsewhere and persons who have previously been correctional officers. Police officers are excluded under current legislation. I am not suggesting that they should not be; I believe that they should be excluded, as should currently serving correctional officers. However, under this legislation, people who have been correctional

officers or police officers are excluded. They may have occupied those positions for only a very short period—maybe only a month or two—or they may have occupied those positions for a long period; but that may have been 15 or 20 years before being called up for jury service. From my reading of the legislation, I believe that those people would be excluded. Perhaps in his reply the Minister will tell members why, after a long period, those people should still be excluded.

I am sure that there is a high turnover of correctional service staff. The high number of resignations in the Police Service will mean that quite a large number of people—perhaps thousands—will be excluded from jury service. When both groups of people are taken into account, over the years that figure may go to tens of thousands. I hope that a good explanation will be forthcoming from the Minister in his reply. I appreciate that it would be inappropriate for those people to be eligible for jury service immediately after they have served as police officers or correctional officers. However, perhaps after a certain period they could be eligible to be called up for jury service. From memory, that aspect was not included in the report of the Litigation Reform Commission, which report spells out the exclusion of currently serving police officers but does not mention correctional officers. I understand why current correctional officers should be exempted, but not those who have served in other capacities.

I question the reasoning behind allowing practising solicitors and barristers to be part of a jury panel. I note that the Litigation Reform Commission recommends that those people be exempted. I accept that their inclusion or exemption is probably a marginal issue. There is certainly no reason to exempt people who hold law degrees. People studying law in universities number in the thousands. In fact, more people are studying law than the number who are practising it. Therefore, after considering those numbers, one would not want to exclude people from jury service just because they hold law degrees. Doctors, architects and other professional people will no longer be exempt; therefore, there is no reason to exempt that other group of people. Nevertheless, a reason could exist for exempting practising lawyers and solicitors. I would like the Minister to clarify why those people have not been excluded when the Litigation Reform Commission recommended that they be excluded.

Another group that has not been excluded but which I believe ought to be—and I foreshadow moving an amendment to that effect at the Committee stage—includes local government councillors. People who are elected to public office should be excluded from jury service. Members of Parliament are excluded. I hope that the Minister sees fit to include local government councillors and mayors on the exemption list, because they are representatives of the people. I foresee problems arising if they sit on jury panels. They are elected to work for their constituents, and I do not believe that it is correct or proper for those people to be eligible for jury service while they are local government councillors.

Government members often talk about the position held by local government councillors. Honourable members have heard the Minister for Local Government praising them and giving them more prestige and a more privileged position. Recently, the Government amalgamated a number of local authorities and created a greater workload for many of their employees. Now it is making them subject to jury service. I hope that the Government will see fit to exclude that group. I believe that elected people should not be called upon to do jury service, because that could present clear conflicts of interest and problems that should be avoided. Not many people fall within that group—bearing in mind that the exemption would apply only while those people were serving as councillors or mayors, not after they have moved on to other positions. It would not be a whole-of-life exemption.

Those are a few points of concern in relation to eligibility for jury service. However, I am very pleased to see that a whole range of people who in the past have been exempt from jury service are now not excluded. In recent times, the selection of a representative jury has become a problem. Because of the wide scope of reasons for which people could be granted exemptions, juries have not been as representative as they should. There could be no real justification for excluding the large range of professional, skilled or educated members of the community as occurred in the past. In fact, there is every justification for such people appearing on jury panels. It is terribly important to have a broad cross-section of the public on a jury panel, but in recent times that certainly has not been achieved.

The Bill also allows people such as members of the medical profession or pregnant women to be excused from jury service because of the hardship such jury service could cause to them. So if people have a justifiable reason for being excused, they will be able to claim an exemption from

either the sheriff or the court. I think that is fair and reasonable.

The next point I want to raise relates to changes to the challenge system when a jury is being selected, which is something that has created a good deal of concern within the legal profession. I am sure the Minister had some trouble with this matter because the barristers and solicitors to whom I have spoken believe that the challenge system should remain as it is. Other groups of people seem to think otherwise. Currently, when a jury for criminal trials is being selected, prospective members of the jury are subject to two rounds of challenges. For the first round, there is an unlimited number of challenges; for the second round, generally a limit of eight challenges is set for the prosecution and eight challenges for the defence. Although there is some doubt about whether the legislation allows for it, that is the current court practice. I understand from talking to practitioners that it generally takes some 15 minutes to go through the first process—or the "dummy run" as it is called—of selecting a jury and, on many occasions, less than that. I think that it is important to keep in mind that the system seems to work extremely well. Neither side has any complaints in relation to the current system. Therefore, it is difficult to argue against the current practice on the grounds of the time it takes. As to the cost of such a process—that argument is irrelevant because jury panels have already been selected. However, it appears that, in this legislation, the Government proposes that the first round of challenges to the jury, known as the dummy run, be abolished and that there be only peremptory challenges and challenges for cause. I should mention that the right to challenge jurors for cause exists in the current legislation in relation to civil matters.

If the dummy runs are to be done away with, peremptory challenges are going to be very important. I notice that the Litigation Reform Commission mentions this matter in its report. It recommended the abolition of the dummy run and only having the one jury selection process, allowing for challenges for cause. However, the Litigation Reform Commission points out in its report that the Law Society and the Bar Association are both very much opposed to the abolition of this system. They want the retention of the current system. That attitude ties in with the attitudes of the lawyers to whom I have spoken in relation to this matter. Nevertheless, the Litigation Reform Commission believes that little will be lost by the abolition of this section of the current Act and, therefore has recommended accordingly, and the Government has followed through on that in this legislation. As I said before—and I will talk more about this in a moment—the Government appears to have extended the right to challenge for cause to apply to criminal trials.

As for peremptory challenges—and I will not refer to the practice in civil trials because I do not think that there is great concern about it—in criminal trials, the prosecution and defence will each be entitled to eight challenges. In the case of the need for reserve jurors in a criminal trial, if one or two reserve jurors are required, the prosecution and the defence will each be entitled to one additional peremptory challenge. If three reserve jurors are required, the prosecution and the defence will be entitled to two additional peremptory challenges. If there are two or more defendants in a criminal trial, then each defendant is entitled to the number of peremptory challenges allowed to the defence for each defendant. Likewise, the prosecution is entitled to the number of peremptory challenges that the defence has been allowed.

As for challenges for cause—currently, that practice is allowed in civil cases. However, under this legislation, it will apply to criminal cases. I hope and trust that this practice will be monitored very closely because it becomes very important if dummy runs are to be done away with. I am talking about a very sensitive issue that could very quickly become a major issue if counsel for the defendant believes that he or she is receiving less than what he or she ought to receive in relation to the jury selection process. I hope and trust that the Attorney-General keeps a very close eye on this practice to ensure that the extension of this practice to the criminal courts will be able to cater for and cope with situations as they arise. Under this legislation, a challenge for cause is made if a person is not qualified for jury service, or the person is not impartial. That situation could occur in trials involving politicians or people such as O.J. Simpson, artists, actors and so on. One would have to be very careful about the operation of this provision. It could become a very important part of the jury selection system, particularly as the Government is doing away with the dummy run process which might have helped to obviate any problems. However, I might add that, in the past, the dummy run system does not seem to have helped very much in that regard. So clause 43, which relates to challenges for cause, is important. The current legislation allows for challenges to individual

jurors in civil trials. As I say, this legislation will allow that practice to occur in criminal trials.

The next aspect of the legislation about which I want to speak relates to unanimous verdicts. I am pleased that, under this legislation, there has been a retention of the requirement for a unanimous verdict in criminal trials. I was pleased to see that the Litigation Reform Commission also recommended the retention of the requirement for unanimous verdicts. I think that is important. I do not believe that such a requirement is causing problems. I notice that the Attorney-General in his second-reaching speech referred to the very small percentage of hung juries. I do not believe that the requirement for unanimous verdicts is causing a concern within the community at all. It is a very important aspect of ensuring that we do not get the situation that occurs in some other States. I do not think that removing the requirement for unanimous verdicts has necessarily led to better verdicts, or more correct verdicts. Far from it. Certainly, a large number of instances of hung juries, which can be the only justification for removing the requirement for unanimous verdicts, really has not occurred in this State. So I do not believe that it is an issue that has to be considered.

I want to raise a couple of points in relation to jury lists. I notice that, in the past, there have been a few problems with handling changes to jury lists, which has had an impact upon challenges. That is undesirable and, under this Bill, that practice will certainly be amended. In relation to the lists of prospective jurors, the legislation makes no mention of the inclusion of the occupation or address of the prospective juror. The omission of those details means that the parties are unaware of the juror's address and occupation. Clause 37 of the legislation refers to providing those details to the judge, but no mention is made of providing them to the parties. The question must be asked: why should the judge and not the parties have access to those details? I stand to be corrected on this matter, but that is my reading of the legislation. That is not just the way it reads to me, but also to lawyers, as a couple of lawyers have written to me about this matter. The implications of the parties not knowing those details extends to their right to challenge. Surely the right to challenge will be greatly diluted if neither the prosecution nor the defence have the knowledge of prospective jurors' addresses or occupations. Such details can influence considerably the need for challenges or stand-bys.

There is a strain through the Bill that cuts out of a lot of rights to challenges. Besides the dilution of the right to challenge because of the parties' restricted knowledge, there is also the number of challenges and a lack of provision for dummy runs. Therefore, a very important aspect of the legislation is the information that will be provided on jury lists. All members would understand the reasons for this. They would all have read the Litigation Reform Commission's report, the Carter report and the Nolan report. However, I believe that the addresses and occupations of jurors should be made available to the defence and the prosecution—information which will not appear on the jury list. Of course, a name on a list will not necessarily identify somebody. There are many people with the name John Smith, for instance. A person would have no way of knowing whether or not he or she knew the John Smith on the list. For all sorts of valid reasons, including aiding both the defence and the prosecution, there is a need to list names, addresses and occupations. I appreciate that the new system enhances the provisions for confidentiality, but I do not believe that this inclusion would in any way impinge upon that. As part of the processes that will be put in place, I hope that there will be a section relating to the provision of information. It does not appear to me that that is the case at present. I would like to hear further from the Minister about the listing of names, addresses and occupations of jury panel members.

Of course, the community is greatly concerned about confidentiality. Effectively, the confidentiality provision in relation to jury deliberations represents a new step; it is not contained in the current Act. Furthermore, it could be said that it cuts across the rights of freedom of speech. However, it is clear that the provisions have been included to protect the jury system from prejudicial influences in the form of restrictions on communications involving jurors. In recent days a great deal has been written and said about the confidentiality of the jury room. It is probably one of the most contentious aspects of the legislation. The disclosure by jurors out of court of information about their deliberations and the publication or broadcast of such information has long been viewed with judicial disapproval.

Following the publication of accounts of jury deliberations in a number of celebrated trials in recent years, including the Gallagher trial in Victoria and the Murphy and Jackson trials in New South Wales, statutory provisions were enacted in Victoria in 1985 and in New South Wales in 1987 to protect the secrecy of jury deliberations. In Queensland, disclosures

by jurors in the wake of such trials as those of Dr Peter Bayliss and Mr Brian Maher have prompted increased debate about the need for legislative deterrents to making such disclosures. For example, after the Bayliss abortion trial in January 1986, a report of an interview with a juror in that trial was published. In the interview, the juror stated that she had reluctantly agreed with the other jurors to bring in a verdict of acquittal, although the verdict went against her religious convictions. Judge McGuire, who presided at the trial, later commented that—

> ". . . these publications could have aroused suspicion in the reader's mind that the verdict was not truly anonymously reached. There is, I think, a public mischief in such publications."

Under the reforms proposed in the Jury Bill, the disclosure of jury deliberations will be outlawed by statute, subject to certain exceptions.

There are a number of exceptions in the legislation. It is not quite as clear cut as it would seem, because this Jury Bill prohibits the publication of confidential information about jury deliberations and opinions expressed and makes it an offence to solicit confidential information about jury deliberations from jurors and former jurors. However, that particular section does not spell out that it is not breaking the law to discuss a matter provided that the information discussed does not end up in the public arena. Clause 70 of the legislation prohibits a juror or former juror from disclosing confidential information about jury deliberations where that juror believes that any of the information is likely to be or will be published to the public. In all these cases, the penalty for committing such offences is imprisonment with a maximum penalty of two years.

Of course, under the proposed amendments to the Oaths Act, which are covered by this particular piece of legislation, the oath taken by jurors in both civil and criminal trials will include an undertaking that they will not disclose anything about the jury's deliberations except in certain circumstances set out elsewhere in the legislation in relation to the Supreme Court ordering such an inquiry to be undertaken in relation to the provision of information relating to research.

A number of these amendments are particularly important. To ensure that the system is not reduced to the level of bread and circuses—and we have seen a little of that in recent times in relation to the O. J. Simpson trial, where things seemed to have got completely out of hand, and also some of the Australian cases that I have mentioned—it is terribly important that the sanctity of the jury room be preserved. On the other hand, of course, there must be opportunities for juries to raise issues of legitimate concern about another jury member, bias, fraud, the membership or performance of the jury. They must have the ability to raise such issues. I note that, under this legislation, issues of concern to jurors may be raised with the Attorney-General or the Director of Prosecutions.

I appreciate why that section has been inserted, but I thought I should check to see how independent the Director of Prosecutions is. Unfortunately, there is nothing that I could find in the DPP Act to the effect that the Director of Prosecutions is completely and totally independent. I am not suggesting for one moment that he does not operate independently, but in terms of the legislation he does not appear to be completely independent. It is possible that an Attorney-General—and I am not suggesting this Attorney-General—would be approached by a juror seeking advice on an issue which, for political reasons, the Attorney-General does not want raised: goodness knows what. The Attorney-General may then go to the DPP and apply pressure not to raise the issue. I understand the reasoning behind this amendment. Unfortunately, I see no other way around the problem at the moment. Perhaps if the DPP was entirely independent there would be no problem, but on my reading of the legislation the DPP is not entirely independent. I reiterate that I am not casting aspersions on anyone.

Of course, a juror can raise problems with a Supreme Court judge as they arise, but I wonder whether there is some other way that matters could be raised. A juror can raise a matter with his or her member of Parliament; but again, according to the way I read the legislation, that member of Parliament is very restricted. If a juror came to me and I repeated in the Chamber the matters that that juror told me about, the Minister would no doubt say that the Jury Act does not allow for that. This is a matter of concern. I am not saying that there should be open slather on it, but I believe that there should be another outlet for jurors, because the DPP is not entirely independent and cannot be seen as such under the current legislation. I am not trying to be difficult about the matter; I just ask that we have a fresh look at this issue.

I am concerned about this problem, as are many people in the community. Articles in

one or two newspapers have raised this matter for other reasons. Whereas I agree that we must maintain the sanctity of the jury room and that jurors should retain a certain amount of confidentiality, we have to be sure that we do not stifle any juror from being able to legitimately raise any issue. Jurors should be able to raise any problems with their members of Parliament. I am sure that the Jury Act will not stop members of Parliament from raising matters in respect of the legislation. However, that is not the point. The point is that such action is not provided for under this legislation, and I query this aspect and suggest that the Attorney-General have another look at it.

Other States have moved in this direction. As I mentioned before, New South Wales has moved in this direction, as has Victoria—and justifiably so. We need to ensure that the sanctity of the jury room is upheld. This legislation strikes at the common law principle of the freedom of speech, an issue which is addressed in one of these reports. It crossed my mind that this legislation will strike at jurors' rights to freedom of speech in that they will not be allowed to speak out. Over and above that, we have to weigh up the alternative positions.

For example, we have seen the sensationalism that surrounds some court cases in the United States, as well as in Queensland and other States. We need to prevent the sensationalising of court cases while, at the same time, allowing jurors to raise problems when and if they arise. This is something that is not covered adequately in the legislation. At first blush, this does not appear to be the case; but, when one goes into the issue in more detail, one realises that unless the DPP is totally independent pressure might be brought to bear that prevents him from raising issues of concern to jurors.

I turn to the issue of jurors' fees, a matter which I have raised previously on a number of occasions. It is important that the appropriate fees are paid to jurors. Recently in New South Wales jurors' fees were increased. In Queensland, jurors' fees were last amended on 1 April 1991, and this increase was gazetted on 23 March 1991. Since that time, nothing further has occurred. With these amendments now before the Parliament, it would be a most appropriate time to increase jurors' fees. I will take a moment to give some examples. The legislation will broaden the eligibility criteria for people performing jury service. For instance, a broad cross-section of the community will be included, including skilled professionals and so on. There has to be appropriate remuneration for the services that those people will provide.

At the beginning of this year, the New South Wales Government introduced a new scale of fees for jurors: for a half day, jurors are paid $33; for one to five days, $66; for six to ten days, $77; and for 11 or more days, $90. When one compares those fees to those paid in Queensland, one sees a vast difference. The change in the fee scale in New South Wales resulted from a recommendation of the Court of New South Wales Jury Task Force back in December 1993, which was then presided over by Mr Justice Abadee, and which was introduced in October of last year. That scale was to apply from 1 January this year.

Jurors' fees in Queensland—and keeping in mind that these were last increased back in 1991—are as follows: the fee paid for being available for empanelling is $22; for each day or part day, up to three days, $43; for each of days four to ten, $51; for 11 to 15 days, $64; for 16 to 20 days, $73; and each day after 20 days, $107. So it is only after jurors spend more than 20 days on a trial—and there are not too many of those—that they are paid more than they would be paid in New South Wales. I will not go through the figures that applied previously, because I do not think that they are relevant. Nevertheless, it is worth while comparing the fees paid to jurors in New South Wales and Queensland.

For instance, in Queensland, if a juror is empanelled on a jury for five days, he would receive $43 for the first three days and $51 for days four and five. Therefore, to compare the fee structures, let us assume that a juror is empanelled for five days. In Queensland, this juror would currently be paid $231 for those five days; in New South Wales, $330. And this is only a comparison of fees paid to jurors; it does not include such things as travel, food and refreshment allowances. Recently the Attorney-General has been getting into a bit of trouble over the food that he has been providing to jurors. Perhaps the Attorney-General will inform us of how the food being provided to jurors will be improved. The Attorney-General has certainly been copping some flack in relation to that issue.

I return to the issue of fees. Queenslanders are being disadvantaged, and some attention ought to be paid to this matter. Most jurors serve on short trials, and so particular attention needs to be paid to trials of short duration. Jury service is the highest of the community services, and the fees paid to jurors need to adequately compensate citizens for that service. Many people undertaking this form of public service feel that they are not being treated justly and that they ought to be

paid more adequately. Many employees, small-business people and other self-employed people will be picked up under the new legislation as being eligible for jury service. Some people may have to give up their jobs and forgo income to perform jury service. Self-employed people will certainly be put in that position. Alternatively, an employer may decide not to pay an employee who is serving on a jury.

Per head of population, Queensland has the highest number of self-employed people of any State. In Queensland more people work for small employers than is the case in any other State. Queensland is the State for small employers. This legislation will hit those people hard, because it will open up the range of people eligible for jury service. Many people who, for all sorts of reasons, missed out on jury service in the past will be called up, including women. In the past, women could opt out of jury service for no good reason at all. All of these people will be picked up under the new arrangements. Therefore, it becomes more important than ever that we look at the fees being paid to jurors, because they certainly have the right to be paid a reasonable fee for their involvement.

Earlier, I mentioned in passing the Government's attitude in relation to the food and services provided to jurors. I was quite surprised to see the Government taking that attitude, because jurors should be receiving adequate service. Over the past couple of years, I notice that the senior executive service level in the Department of Justice and Attorney-General almost doubled. Certainly, over the past financial year to June 1994, the senior executive service doubled. There was a huge increase in wages and a flow-on effect from there, yet inadequate attention is being paid to the meals being served to jurors. Again, we will be expecting more and more people to be available to be empanelled for jury service. That is fine, but in those circumstances it is only appropriate that jurors are paid a sufficient amount, because in many cases they will be giving up their employment and income.

I turn briefly to the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee, about which we heard a great deal today. A number of points are raised in the *Alert Digest*, and I do not intend to address all of them. One aspect about which I wish to speak is section 8(1), which is headed "Assignment of responsibility for jury districts to other sheriffs and persons". The *Alert Digest* refers to that matter. It is a pertinent point to raise during this debate. I picked it up when reading the document. The relevant section of it states—

> "Assignment of responsibility for jury districts to other sheriffs and persons
>
> 8.(1) Responsibility for carrying out the sheriff of Queensland's functions under this Act for a particular jury district may be assigned under a regulation to—
>
> (a) the central sheriff; or
>
> (b) the northern sheriff; or
>
> (c) a deputy sheriff; or
>
> (d) another officer or person specified under a regulation.
>
> (2) However, despite an assignment of responsibility under this section, the sheriff of Queensland—
>
> (a) remains responsible for keeping jury rolls and preparing lists of prospective jurors for all jury districts; and
>
> (b) may, by agreement with the sheriff to whom responsibility for a particular jury district has been assigned, issue notices and summonses to prospective jurors for the jury district."

The committee then drew attention to the provisions of clause 8(1)(d). It also referred to a certain section of the Legislative Standards Act allowing the delegation of administrative power only in appropriate cases and to appropriate persons.

I can appreciate the aim of this provision of the legislation. Perhaps the Minister will make some comment about it. I note that the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee has requested that the Minister give consideration to redrafting the provisions to specify appropriate persons or classes of persons to whom the sheriff's responsibility may be assigned under clause 8(1)(d). I am unsure of the Attorney's attitude to that request, but I ask him to make some comment on the matter in order that it may be clarified.

The Opposition supports the general thrust of the legislation. I will raise a number of points at the Committee stage. I will be asking the Attorney to consider a couple of amendments to the exemptions provided under the legislation. I believe that my proposed amendments are reasonable and fair. I am sure that the legislation will overcome a number of concerns held by many members of the community. I trust that the legal profession is not too upset about missing out on the dummy run through a jury panel. I hope that at the end of the day that does not

cause undue hardship to either side. If that turns out to be the case, the matter can be brought back before Parliament. I acknowledge that other States have a limited number of peremptory challenges, and even the English have abolished the subsequent round of peremptory challenges.

Mr J. H. SULLIVAN (Caboolture) (4.04 p.m.): I rise to support this legislation, which makes some long overdue reforms to Queensland's jury system. Before I commence my comments, I commend the Queensland Parliamentary Library Service on the new Legislation Bulletin series that it is producing, particularly Legislation Bulletin No. 2 of 1995, written by Karen Sampford of the library staff. I found that document very informative when considering this legislation.

As the Opposition spokesman indicated, a number of recent reports have dealt with issues relating to juries and have recommended some appropriate reforms. These include the report of the Nolan committee of 1992, the report of the Litigation Reform Commission of 1993, and the Carter inquiry recommendations of 1993, which were of particular interest. The circumstances of what one may call the Joh jury affair certainly intensified community interest in matters relating to juries in Queensland. It is appropriate that we are now addressing some of the recommendations of the Carter inquiry.

A jury was first used in a criminal court in Australia in 1789—just one year after settlement—when a woman who was convicted of breaking and entering a dwelling house and stealing clothes declared that she was pregnant in an attempt to escape execution. I am glad that the member for Keppel is not in the Chamber to hear me say that at one stage in this country breaking, entering and stealing was a capital offence for which people were executed. I am sure that the member would be urging us to reintroduce that penalty.

Mr JOHNSON: I rise to a point of order. I believe that it is very unfair to treat another member of the House in that manner when the member is not in the Chamber to defend himself. The member for Keppel would not think that way at all.

Mrs Edmond interjected.

Mr Turner interjected.

Mr Stephan interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Palaszczuk): Order! There are three honourable members who are very close to being warned under the provisions of Standing Order 123A. The Chair has called, "Order!" I intend to rule on the point of order raised by the honourable member for Gregory. The Chair's ruling is that an honourable member cannot take a point of order in defence of another honourable member who is not in the Chamber. Therefore, I rule the point of order out of order. The honourable member for Caboolture will continue.

Mr J. H. SULLIVAN: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I give the honourable member for Gregory the opportunity to take a point of order on his own behalf when I say that at least the honourable member for Keppel has a sense of humour, and I am sure that he would not have taken the offence taken by the honourable member for Gregory on his behalf.

Following English law at the time, a jury of 12 women was empanelled to examine the truth of that particular woman's claim. History records that the jury found that she was not pregnant, and she was executed for her crime. Juries formed for the investigation of claimed pregnancies remained the only juries on which women could serve in Australia and England until well into the twentieth century. The Jury Act 1929, which is being amended by this Bill, provides that women have the opportunity to opt out of jury service. There once was a time when women were disqualified unless they specifically applied to serve on juries, and I understand that barristers at the time excluded those women in their challenges because they believed that they would be ratbags for wanting to serve on a jury.

The *Bulletin* magazine pointed out in a very interesting article published in 1988 on jury-related issues that, despite the fact that women could opt out of jury service, at that time juries were predominantly made up of women members. Housewives apparently found it very difficult to be granted an exemption so that, because of the extensive lists of those who had automatic exemption or were disqualified because of certain importance placed on activities that many men were undertaking at the time, women made up the bulk of our juries. Basically, some 200 years after our first jury—which was an all-woman jury—the juries being empanelled in this country were predominantly made up of women. Lest the member for Gregory should infer that I do, let me make it clear that I mean no slur on women to say that a jury made up of predominantly women could hardly be considered to be representative of the community.

Mr Johnson: I've got no problem with that.

Mr J. H. SULLIVAN: I am glad to hear it!

According to a quote printed in that *Bulletin* article, in 1980 Lord Denning said of the jury system—

> "Our philosophy is that the jury should be selected at random, from a panel of persons who are selected at random. We believe that 12 persons selected at random are likely to be a cross-section of the people as a whole and thus represent the views of the common man."

I point out that it was Lord Denning who used the words "the common man". The comment continues—

> "Some may be moral. Others not. Some may be honest. Others not . . . The parties must take them as they come."

Two things have contributed to the non-representative nature of juries, and they are addressed in this Bill. The first of these is the extent of existing exemptions and disqualifications. This Bill provides a significant reduction in the classes of persons who are not eligible for jury service. That was recommended by both the 1992 Nolan report and the 1993 report of the Queensland Litigation Reform Commission, although the provisions relating to that matter in this Bill differ in some minor ways from those recommendations. Provisions allowing judges or sheriffs to excuse people where jury service could create undue hardship or inconvenience are appropriate, but the bottom line, I suggest, is that these changes will provide a better panel from which juries are selected.

The second element of the democratisation of juries providing for the cross-section that Lord Denning spoke about is the issue of peremptory challenges. In Queensland, we enjoy a unique dummy run through the jury panel with unlimited challenges. In the subsequent round, the number of peremptory challenges is essentially limited to eight; in some instances at present 14 peremptory challenges are allowed. Both Mr Carter, QC, and the Queensland Litigation Reform Commission have made representations to change the first-round practice. The Litigation Reform Commission stated that the dummy run should be abolished and Mr Carter, QC, said he could not support the practice of permitting unlimited first-round challenges.

Peremptory challenges in the second round are presently limited to 14 for murder and 8 in other cases. It is interesting to compare the situation in Queensland with other jurisdictions in the light of a reduction in peremptory challenges proposed in this Bill for both sides. The article in the *Bulletin* that I mentioned earlier produced a table showing the system in most Australian jurisdictions. I suggest that the eight peremptory challenges in all instances proposed by this Bill can be seen as generous.

In New South Wales, the number of peremptory challenges permitted is three, although there can be unlimited number of challenges if both parties agree. In South Australia, the number of challenges permitted is three. In Tasmania, the Crown is allowed an unlimited number of challenges and the defence six. In the ACT, Western Australia and Victoria the number is eight, which is the number proposed in this Bill. In the Northern Territory, which is in line with the Queensland thinking, the number for a capital offence is 12 and for other offences is six.

I suggest that the number of eight peremptory challenges proposed by this Bill is at least as generous as most other Australian jurisdictions, and I also suggest that it is an appropriate number.

It is interesting to consider what goes on during a peremptory challenge. The *Bulletin* article had quite a bit to say about this subject on the basis of the writer's discussions with solicitors and barristers asking them how they work out who they are going to challenge. It stated—

> "Who makes a good juror?
>
> That there is a science to picking jurors is a myth, although some barristers and solicitors swear by a few basic rules".

I pause to say I take particular offence at the first basic rule of barristers and solicitors when selecting a jury. The article continued—

> "Beards indicate intellectual pretensions or a psychological problem."

Mr Veivers: Have you ever been on a jury?

Mr J. H. SULLIVAN: The member for Southport asked if I have ever been on a jury. Unfortunately, no. Before I began to consider this Bill in greater detail I was called to be on jury panels twice, and in both instances I took advantage of the opportunity to claim an exemption for work reasons. To be honest with the honourable member, I am sorry that the exemptions were so broad as to allow me to do that. I think it would have been a good

experience and one that most Queenslanders should undergo.

Having read this article and discovered this particular golden rule that barristers and solicitors apparently go by, I probably would not have been empanelled.

Mr Veivers: We understand that it would not be that reason.

Mr J. H. SULLIVAN: I must continue.

The next basic rule that members of the legal profession use is that an RSL badge says that the wearer is Right Wing and in favour of the prosecution. A challenge is a must if one's client is of foreign descent. That is also an offensive approach for barristers to take. The article further stated—

> ". . . police prosecutors avoid men in open-neck shirts and students who are, of course, all on drugs.
>
> 'If the accused is a pretty young woman, I challenge older women less gifted by nature,' said a QC who has been 40 years at the Bar."

These reasons for peremptory challenges are offensive. I am almost inclined to say to them that we should not go——

Mr Veivers: Look at O. J. Simpson!

Mr J. H. SULLIVAN: I think the honourable member will find that there were challenges for cause in the O. J. Simpson case.

Mr Bredhauer interjected.

Mr Veivers: You've got a beard, too.

Mr J. H. SULLIVAN: While we are talking across the Chamber about beards, it is interesting that on the same page that the barristers admit that they challenge people with beards appears a photograph of Ken Horier, the President of the New South Wales Council of Civil Liberties, who has a beard.

Just to continue along this line for a moment longer—the *Bulletin* story gave a list of people who are the least likely to be chosen and of the people most likely to be chosen for jury service. The list of least likely include an RSL badge, long hair, beard, hands that tremble, open-neck shirts, student or unemployed.

Mr Veivers: Hands that tremble!

Mr J. H. SULLIVAN: Yes.

Mr Veivers: What if you have a medical affliction?

Mr J. H. SULLIVAN: Hands that tremble with a medical affliction are one thing, but the barristers believe that it always indicates that the person might not be able to see the case out without needing a few drinks.

Some of the reasons for choosing people for jury service are equally offensive. For instance, they will choose people of average looks, so Mr Veivers would have no chance.

Mr Veivers: I'm out.

Mr J. H. SULLIVAN: He is so handsome. People with average looks will not feel so negative towards the accused if she happens to be a young spunk. I am quoting from the article in the *Bulletin*.

Mr Schwarten: What does that mean?

Mr J. H. SULLIVAN: I have no idea.

These are offensive reasons. In terms of peremptory challenges I am not sure that I agree with them at all. However, I am quite sure that eight is simply enough.

The honourable member for Indooroopilly addressed the matter of names and addresses of people on the jury list. I am inclined to think perhaps that we are really better off if we do not delve into that topic.

On this matter of who should and should not be an a jury, perhaps I can give the final word to Mr Justice Kirby. He is a former chairman of the Australian Law Reform Commission and a prominent campaigner for the protection of individual rights. Mr Justice Kirby states—

> " 'Everyone has biases; we can't escape that. We learn them at our mother's knee and they continue right through life,' says former chairman of the Australian Law Reform Commission Justice Michael Kirby. 'One of the advantages of a jury is that its collective biases are unfathomable and unknown and, one hopes, balance out.' "

In respect of both these issues—that is the eligibility to serve on a jury and peremptory challenges—there has been a suggestion that there may be a diminution of rights. The suggestion is made also that it may simply be a loss of a benefit or privilege. This is clearly an area where there can be some debate. It is a grey area. In either instance there is no doubt that the changes will help achieve juries that are more representative and in accord with the philosophy expounded by Lord Denning and the advantages expressed by Mr Justice Kirby. The objectives of the Bill are thus achieved by these provisions and they should be supported.

Another provision of the Bill which has gained some attention is that which requires that jury room confidentiality be maintained.

This is again a provision on which opinion may be divided in respect of the appropriateness of the policy objectives. Nevertheless, there is strong and authoritative support for the provisions. Judge McGuire, who presided at the Bayliss abortion trial in 1986, commented on the publication of statements made by a juror in that case. Judge McGuire stated—

> ". . . these publications could have aroused suspicion in the reader's mind that the verdict was not truly unanimously reached. There is, I think, a public mischief in such publications."

Former Federal Attorney-General, Lionel Bowen, also said that the anonymity of the jury room must be preserved. I quote again from the May 1988 *Bulletin* article, in which Mr Justice Murphy stated—

> "If even one member breaks this practice, the whole principle breaks down and—as we have seen in recent cases—matters can snowball as various members well-meaningly attempt to 'set the record straight'.
>
> 'Jury members must be able to speak their mind freely in the jury room and any possibility of having to publicly justify a decision after the trial would work against this principle.' "

No less an authority on the matter than Mr Luke Shaw has expressed his support for these provisions in the Bill, coupled as they are with provisions that allow jurors to approach the Director of Public Prosecutions or the Attorney-General. Mr Shaw did this in an article in the *Courier-Mail* on 16 June this year. Mr Shaw's opinion in this matter must at least be considered as an educated one no matter what people think of him in relation to other aspects of his public profile.

The excellent legislation bulletin that I mentioned earlier canvasses a number of authorities on both sides of the argument at pages 18 to 22. Media interests have expressed a desire to obtain open access to jurors. I wonder whether we in this country support the kind of media crushes at the end of trials that have occurred overseas.

On balance, and because it is a question of balance, I support the provisions to ensure confidentiality. In respect of the right to freedom of expression—I note that on the issue of confidentiality of jurors there are different approaches, even among prominent civil libertarians. As recently as 13 days ago, the President of the Victorian Council for Civil Liberties, Mr Robert Richter, QC, said in the *Australian*—

> "Part of the virtue of the system is the anonymity of jurors and its major strength is it draws on people who come out of the community and disappear back into it without being subjected to pressure or interrogation."

On the other hand, Terry O'Gorman from the Queensland Council of Civil Liberties has expressed concern about the provisions relating to the jurors' remedy for things that they consider need to be addressed concerning happenings within the jury room. In an article in the *Courier-Mail* of 15 September 1995 titled "New Laws to Protect Secrets of Jury Room", Mr O'Gorman is indirectly quoted as saying—

> ". . . the Director of Public Prosecutions was not independent. Mr O'Gorman said if the Attorney-General rejected a juror's complaint, there was nowhere to go if access to the media was blocked."

I believe that the provisions before the House are important and beneficial to the long tradition that we have of jury trials and people being able to be judged by a jury of their peers. There is nothing in the Bill about which we should be overly concerned, and I am happy to support the Bill.

Debate, on motion of Mr Turner, adjourned.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT

Hon. M. J. FOLEY (Minister for Justice and Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for the Arts) (4.24 p.m.): I move—

> "That the House, at its rising, do adjourn until 10 a.m. on Tuesday, 31 October 1995."

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 4.24 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

1. Primary Industries Department, Budget and Staffing

Mr GILMORE asked the Minister for Primary Industries and Minister for Racing—

With reference to reductions in both staff and funding in the Department of Primary Industries, particularly in the area of the Electorate of Tablelands over the past six years, and apparent further reductions in the budget since the July 1995 election—

(1) What has been the budget for each year from 1989 to 1995 inclusive, for each of the DPI responsibilities including (a) research stations at (i) Kairi, (ii) Walkamin and (iii) Southedge, (b) stock and meatworks inspection services, (c) forestry service and (d) water resources for (A) wages and associated costs, (B) capital works, (C) maintenance and (D) research?

(2) How much of the budget from 1989 to 1995 inclusive has been provided from (a) State, (b) Commonwealth, (c) private or (d) industry sources?

(3) What has been the establishment and actual staff positions in each the DPI sections mentioned in (1) above for (a) scientists, (b) labourers, (c) technicians, (d) administrative staff and (e) management for each year from 1989 to 1995 inclusive?

Answer (Mr Gibbs):

The Honourable Member has sought information from when my Department was administered under three separate portfolios. Collating the relevant budget and staffing information as requested provides little by the way of useful data to indicate the achievement of my department throught the integration of three separate portfolios.

In modern public administration budgets are organised to address outputs and outcomes. In keeping with this philosophy the budget allocations of my Department are made on a Program and Subprogram basis, and not by funding of input items such as salaries or telephones (and not by dissecting and aggregating of inputs). Much of the information sought by the Honourable Member is input data driven. My Department is committed to economy, efficiency and effectiveness.

The Department's Research Stations budget and staff numbers will vary from year to year and sometimes within the year. These variations reflect the prioritisation of workloads and the optimal use of resources. The input data information requested cannot reveal where priorities for industry are on the Atherton Tablelands.

On the question of funding sources; my Department's budget primarily come from both State and Commonwealth sources. Budgets for research activities are managed on a project basis rather than funding source. Moreover the categories of funds referred to in the Honourable Member's question do not normally align with the funding sources available to my Department

There would appear to be no useful purpose served in expending scarce resources to split the funding by sources. In some cases, monies allocated by the State through the consolidated fund are originally sourced from the Commonwealth. However, I can advise the House that research funding from private sources, for the geographical Region in question, is negligible when compared to the significant consolidated fund investment by the State.

The Honourable the Member should appreciate that my Department conducts extensive consultation with industry to determine the priority for research projects. Budget and staffing arrangements for research are a direct result of these consultations and are reviewed throughout the year to ensure their continuing relevance to industry.

2. Bermuda Street, South Coast

Mrs GAMIN asked the Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development—

With reference to the requirement by Marymount College and Burleigh Catholic Parish for 'left in left out' access on Bermuda Street—

As a reply has not been received to my Question on Notice on 31 May 1995, nor to my written representations on 1 August 1995, I now ask him for his response.

Answer (Mr Elder):

When dealing with Schools and Colleges access matters are treated very seriously with the matter of transport safety and the safety of students being paramount.

I have instructed the Department to expedite this matter in close consultation with Marymount College/Catholic Church and the community to resolve these matters as soon as possible.

I will ensure that you are advised of the outcome as soon as the issue is resolved.

3. Kennedy Development Road

Mr JOHNSON asked the Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development—

With reference to his Government's promise prior to the State election on 15 July 1995 regarding funding to bitumen seal the Winton-Hughenden section of the Kennedy Development Road—

(1) Is the Government still committed to improving this road and the sealing of same?

(2) When will the people of this region see this project commence?

Answer (Mr Elder):

The Government has made a commitment to review the development of the Winton—Hughenden section of the Kennedy Development Road in connection with the review of the rail link. The Government will be reviewing the options during 1995. In the

meantime, it remains committed to urgent works on this road.

In conjunction with Council, Queensland Transport is trialing and investigating low-costs seals and a strategy for upgrading this road.

Some funds are provided already for work on this road in the current five-year Roads Implementation Program.

4. Stuart Prison, Escape of Mr F. L. Burrows

Mr STONEMAN asked the Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services—

With reference to the release of Frank Leslie Burrows on unescorted day leave from Stuart Prison granted by the Corrective Services Commission and his subsequent absconding from custody—

(1) What was the specific rationale used to grant leave to a person serving a sentence for a murder of a most violent nature and how could such a prisoner be given a 'low security classification'?

(2) Did this prisoner plan an escape from custody and was that fact known to authorities, yet day leave was still granted?

(3) Why were reports that Townsville police warned of the extremely violent nature of the escapee apparently ignored by the Corrective Services Commission?

(4) How many other prisoners serving similar sentences are currently on day release from Stuart prison?

(5) What weight did the direct written lobbying of a prominent Labor Party politician carry with the granting of leave for prisoner Burrows?

(6) Did this prisoner's day release have the full support of prison management?

(7) Under what circumstances can the reported philosophy of a 'need to keep the family together' be rationalised in this instance when the prisoner had murdered one of the members of the subject family?

(8) What assurances can be given that this situation will not be repeated so that the surrounding community can regain some sense of security?

(9) Is a re-evaluation of the regulations relating to prisoner assessment for day release being undertaken?

Answer (Mr Braddy):

(1) On 17 February 1994, a low security classification was granted to the inmate by the community-based Queensland Corrective Services Commission Board, in accordance with chapter 17 of the Queensland Corrective Services Commission Policy and Procedures Manual, which was introduced in October 1989. On 16 November 1994 the independent Queensland Community Corrections Board gave approval for the prisoner to be granted sponsored leave of absence, for the purposes of resettlement, at the rate of 10 hours per month. The Queensland Community Corrections Board was established through the Corrective Services Act, 1988, under the chairmanship of retired Supreme Court Judge Bill Carter QC.

(2) On 22 May 1995 the inmate's leave of absence program was suspended pending a six-monthly review by the Townsville Correctional Centre's Sentence Management Committee. No evidence was uncovered linking the inmate to an escape plan at that time. On 13 June 1995 a case conference was conducted by the Sentence Management Committee at which all aspects of the inmate's leave of absence program, including psychiatric reports and reports from custodial staff, were considered. The recommendation from that meeting was that the inmate's leave of absence program be continued at the current rate and should be re-assessed later in his sentence. That recommendation was approved by the Acting General Manager of the Townsville Correctional Centre. On 23 June 1995 advice of that decision was passed on to the secretary of the Queensland Community Corrections Board.

(3) There is no record of any warnings being given by Townsville Police in regard to this inmate prior to the inmate absconding from his leave of absence address.

(4) At present there are 18 life sentenced prisoners at Townsville Correctional Centre of whom two are receiving resettlement leave of absence approved by the independent Queensland Community Corrections Board.

(5) No person made any representations for the granting of a leave of absence program for the inmate. Approval was given by the independent Queensland Community Corrections Board on 16 November 1994. The review of that program was carried out by the Townsville Correctional Centre Sentence Management Committee on 13 June 1995. On 2 June 1995 a politician wrote to the Director-General of Corrective Services seeking details on the operation of the leave of absence program at Townsville Correctional Centre. This letter mentioned no inmate by name. On 6 July 1995, more than three weeks after the decision to resume the inmate's leave of absence program, and more than seven months after the independent Queensland Community Corrections Board gave approval for the program, the politician wrote to the Director-General seeking details of the particular inmate's leave of absence program. That inquiry was the only inquiry on behalf of the inmate by a politician.

(6) See above.

(7) The philosophy of maintaining family contact through a leave of absence program was recommended in the Kennedy Report in 1988 and adopted by the Government of the day with the acceptance of the report and the establishment of the Queensland Corrective Services Commission. Approval for the leave of absence program for this inmate was only given after all circumstances were considered including the receipt of positive psychiatric reports on the inmate and his partner.

(8) The Queensland Corrective Services Commission has put in place a series of guidelines governing the leave of absence program. In the case

of life sentenced prisoners decisions to approve leave of absence programs are made by the independent Queensland Community Corrections Board. It should be noted that during the 1994-95 financial year 99.96 per cent of prisoners granted leave of absence did not abscond. However the Commission continues to refine the leave of absence guidelines in light of experience and community input.

(9) The Queensland Corrective Services Commission Board began an extensive review of leave of absence policy in March 1995. A new policy in regard to leave of absence programs was approved by the Queensland Corrective Services Board on 15 August 1995.

5. Hockey Facilities, Carrara

Mr VEIVERS asked the Deputy Premier, Minister for Tourism, Sport and Youth—

With reference to the Government's community recreation package policy to upgrade community sport facilities—

(1) Will he support the plan and application for a synthetic hockey precinct at Carrara on the Gold Coast by the Gold Coast Hockey Club Inc and supported by the current Gold Coast City Council?

(2) Does he agree that this is pursuant to the Labor Party's policy for upgrading community sports facilities?

Answer (Mr Burns):

The Labor Party's policy to upgrade community sports facilities resulted from the long term neglect of the previous National Party Government that left Queensland with some of the nation's worst sporting facilities.

The Goss Labor Government spents record funds on sport in Queensland, more than all other Eastern States combined.

Unfortunately it will take some years to overcome the neglect of 32 years of Liberal/National Party Government.

The Government supported hockey in Queensland by providing $5.15 million under the 1995 Queensland Facilities Development Scheme, Major Facilities Program, to develop a State Hockey Centre at Colmslie and a synthetic hockey field at Rockhampton. Hockey received 35% of the funding allocated to approved projects under the 1995 Program.

Whilst hockey has done very well in 1995, applications in the 1995/96 program will be decided on merit.

8. Darling Downs Regional Health Authority

Mr HORAN asked the Minister for Health—

Will he provide the details of the Darling Downs Regional Health Authority's budget including (a) the base allocation to all hospitals and community health services in the region, (b) the amounts returned for later distribution by the Regional Health Authority and (c) the amount required for the operation of the Regional Health Authority administration?

Answer (Mr Beattie):

(a) Details of the Darling Downs Regional Health Authority's budget as at 13 September 1995 including base and special allocations to hospitals and community health services are detailed in Attachment A.

(b) Details of amounts retained for later distribution by the Regional Health Authority are detailed in Attachment B. In addition to these amounts, there are a number of budget items (approximately $50M across the State) still to be finalised which will result in additional funding to Regional Health Authorities including Darling Downs Regional Health Authority. These additional allocations will be advised to the Authority when outstanding issues have been finalised. Examples of these budget items include Commonwealth High Cost Drugs, Commonwealth Breast Cancer Screening, Queensland Hospital Access Bonus Pool and Medical and Nursing Workforce Initiatives.

(c) The Darling Downs Regional Health Authority Regional Office budget for 1995/96 is $2,207,379. This compares with expenditure of $2,381,546 in 1994/95 and represents 1.58% of the total Regional budget.—2 -

The irony of the Honourable Members concern for the funding allocated to the Darling Downs Region is that the budget for the Region, under the Honourable Member and his Party's policy of a one percent across the board Management Efficiency Dividend, would be grossly reduced in the area of service delivery.

The Honourable Member would know that I'm referring to policy statements outlined in a document which the Opposition used to cost its election promises.

This policy is in stark contrast to the productivity dividend used by the Government over the past six years. The objective of this dividend is to encourage departments to reduce their administrative costs and to increase efficiency but it has never been imposed on the service delivery component in the Budget. The savings generated from this dividend in the last Budget were around $20m and these savings are re-directed to service delivery.

The Opposition's policy proposed to collect $116m in savings from every department. It doesn't take a genius to work out that in the health portfolio this adds up to nothing more than cuts to wages and the funds needed to run hospitals effectively. For Health, this would mean a $27m cut to the Budget, a major blow to the 148 nurses who would need to be sacked from our hospitals.

Assuming the Honourable Member supports the application of this cut across all Regions, and I have not been advised that he would not, then under the Opposition, the Darling Downs Region would suffer. For example, if you applied this one percent Management Efficiency Dividend to Toowoomba Base Hospital it would wipe out $0.5m from its services Budget.

At the end of the day, you can't make savings in the vicinity of $116m without severe reductions in nursing, surgical operations and the upkeep and rebuilding of capital works infrastructure in Health.

I look forward to the Honourable Member's response.

ATTACHMENT A

DARLING DOWNS REGIONAL 95/96 BUDGET

[INCLUDING SPECIALS]

	BASE ALLOCATION	SPECIALS	TOTAL
Toowoomba Health Services	$45,938,376	$8,605,509	$54,543,885
Mt Lofty Health Services	$1,583,559	$77,062	$1,660,621
Cunningham Centre	$617,789	$1,090,376	$1,708,165
Community Health Services "Unara"	$2,942,488	$2,084,094	$5,026,582
Baillie Henderson Health Services	$22,271,280	$3,850,410	$26,121,690
Oakey Health Services	$2,843,039	$465,060	$3,308,099
Gatton Health Services	$1,588,514	$300,713	$1,889,227
Dalby/Jandowae Health Services	$11,124,365	$1,567,867	$12,692,232
Chinchilla/Tara Health Services	$3,649,816	$740,426	$4,390,242
Miles/Taroom Health Services	$2,965,812	$365,670	$3,331,482
Warwick Health Services	$7,512,780	$1,618,750	$9,131,530
Stanthorpe Health Services	$3,729,908	$598,796	$4,328,704
Goondiwindi Health Services	$3,673,636	$597,942	$4,271,578
Inglewood/Texas Health Services	$2,459,720	$380,618	$2,840,338
Millmerran Health Services	$1,029,433	$111,971	$1,141,404
Regional Services *	$4,272,485	$1,376,513	$5,648,998
1995/96 Regional Strategic Projects	$0	$3,718,774	$3,718,774
Undistributed	$0	$3,787,449	$3,787,449
TOTAL	$118,203,000	$31,338,000	$149,541,000

* NOTE: Regional Services includes Regional Office, Regional Information System Unit Regional Health Promotion Unit, Public Health Unit and Environmental Health Unit.

ATTACHMENT B

DARLING DOWNS REGIONAL HEALTH AUTHORITY

AMOUNTS RETAINED FOR LATER DISTRIBUTION

ITEM	AMOUNT
Superannuation Escalation	$1,723,449
Home Support Scheme	$325,000
Medical Workforce Packages	$227,000
Extension of Oral Health to Grade 10	$132,000
Capital Works Pool	$550,000
Workforce Health & Safety	$250,000
Cross Regional Flows—Reserve	$580,000
TOTAL	$3,787,449

9. Roma Fire Station

Mr LITTLEPROUD asked the Minister for Emergency Services and Minister for Consumer Affairs—

With reference to a malfunction of the Mornington fire alarm system at the Roma Fire Station and in spite of two letters to his office and a public assurance by the Fire Commissioner of a detailed explanation for the malfunction, no details have yet been provided to me, the Roma Town Council or the public in Roma—

(1) Is he aware this same alarm system has malfunctioned again since the initial incident in July, although on most occasions it works perfectly?

(2) If it can be established that a technical malfunction of the Telstra equipment was responsible for the malfunction in July and the subsequent loss of a house and contents, will the QFS seek compensation from Telstra?

(3) Will the QFS pay compensation to Mr and Mrs John Quinlan, the owners of the house destroyed in the fire?

Answer (Mr Davies):

(1) In this instance when Telstra received the 000 call, it endeavoured to activate the fire telephone at the Roma Station on two occasions. On the second attempt fire service personnel were notified of the call. On this occasion the delay factor was minimal. I have contacted Fire Commissioner Geoff Skerritt regarding the present situation with the Mornington fire alarm system at Roma. Commissioner Skerritt informed me that he has been advised by Assistant Commissioner Jones that a number of possibilities (eg. pagers and call diversion to Toowoomba) have been investigated and the most suitable apparatus will be installed when all avenues have been thoroughly researched. The Director-General, Dr Leo Keliher, and Commissioner Skerritt will be meeting with Telstra for discussions on this matter.

(2) Investigations have failed to reveal any single cause for the delayed turnout due to the number of conflicting statements from the various agencies involved. Hence, QFS will not seek compensation from Telstra as it cannot be proven that its equipment was at fault.

(3) It is with regret that the property in Roma was lost. However, the Queensland Fire Service cannot be held responsible. Once the call was received by QFS, its performance was exemplary. Auxiliary stations can only respond through notification by the station siren. My office has been informed that, on numerous occasions, the Roma Auxiliaries have received fire calls and responded within two minutes with a one plus four crew on the first pumper. This service is excellent for an Auxiliary Station. The Roma Auxiliaries have received extensive training and a recent road accident rescue course has upgraded their services to the community of Roma.

10. St Helena Island

Mr SLACK asked the Minister for Environment and Heritage—

With reference to the historic and cultural importance of St Helena Island and the need to restore the old convict settlement on the Island—

(1) What work has been done to date to restore remnants of the convict settlement?

(2) Is there a program for restoration of the island structures?

(3) If so, will he outline the details of such a program?

Answer (Mr Barton):

(1) St Helena Island contains the remaining physical features of Queensland's first prison which was in operation from 1867 to its closure in 1932. There has never been a convict settlement on the island.

St Helena Island National Park was declared in 1979 to protect the remains of this major Queensland penal establishment. Management decisions have been directed towards conserving the historical landscape to high standards. This is being achieved by compliance with the Burra Charter which is the Australian standard established by the International

Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites.

Initial work to restore remnants of the penal establishment was undertaken by Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service staff, day release prisoners, contractors and conservation architects focusing on:

collecting and maintaining historical records of all artefacts for the island.

removal of mountains of rubbish that had accumulated by lessees and visitors since the prison closure in 1932.

identification of all significant structures.

In recent years, priority has been given to:

construction of a sea wall around the Lime Kiln;

clearing of weeds from historical structures and the landscape;

removal of numerous large fig trees damaging the foundations and walls of the stone buildings;

shoring up crumbling walls of some structures;

reconstruction of the Chief Warden's Quarters as a museum/information centre;

reconstruction of a section of the causeway;

restoration of the cemeteries;

reconstruction of the fodder shed for displaying historic agricultural implements; and

development of an interpretative program to inform visitors of the historic and cultural significance of the island.

Furthermore, visitor and recreational facilities have been provided including a new jetty, toilets, shelter sheds and picnic facilities.

(2) Yes. A management plan has been prepared that identifies certain works to be undertaken. The management plan recognises that visitors appreciate the present atmosphere of St Helena with ruined structures in a carefully maintained historical landscape. Reconstruction has been limited to structures outside the Stockade and Barracks areas so that the two main groups of ruined buildings remain.

(3) Most of the structures will be managed as ruins while some will be reconstructed or restored for specific purposes. Preservation of the ruins to retain their integrity as ruins can be as expensive as reconstruction.

During the 1995/96 financial year, work will be undertaken to restore the causeway. Future works including the reconstruction of the Superintendent's garden and historical pathways and re-roofing and restoration of the sugar silo are dependent on funds.

11. Toowoomba Police District, Resources

Mr HEALY asked the Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services—

(1) How many additional operational Police will be allocated to the Toowoomba Police District in 1995/96, 1996/97 and 1997/98?

(2) What is his Department's population estimates for this period in the Toowoomba Police District?

Answer (Mr Braddy):

(1) The Government has made a commitment to increase the number of operational police in the Queensland Police Service by 2000 and the number of civilian support staff by 215 over the next 10 years. Regional allocations of these additional personnel will be determined by the Service's staffing model, which ensures an equitable distribution of human resources Statewide.

(2)Based on data supplied by the Department of Housing, Local Government and Planning, the projected population trends for this District are 148,687 for 1995/96, 151,778 for 1996/97 and 154,936 for 1997/98.

12. Withdrawn

13. Police Taping of Conversations

Mr COOPER asked the Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services—

With reference to the alleged practice of some police officers to secretly tape conversations with unsuspecting members of the public—

(1) How widespread is this practice?

(2) What formal procedures exist for police officers to seek and obtain approval for this practice?

(3) Under what circumstances would police officers engage in this practice?

(4) What rights do members of the public have if they suspect any conversation with a police officer is being secretly taped?

(5) Is it true that the *Invasion of Privacy Act 1971*, while allowing for the lawful taping of a conversation to which that person is a party without the permission of other parties to the conversation, it nevertheless provides—except in limited circumstances—that a person is guilty of an offence if he or she communicates a record of a conversation to any person who was not a party to that conversation?

(6) Are police officers subject to this Act and in particular, these provisions?

(7) Are all secretly taped conversations made in the performance of official duties by police subject to the provisions of the *Libraries and Archives Act 1988*, the *Freedom of Information Act 1991* and the *Evidence Act 1977*?

(8) Could these conversations be subpoenaed?

(9) Are all secretly taped conversations undertaken by police officers retained in accordance with the provisions of the *Libraries and Archives Act 1988* which prohibits the disposal of records except in accordance with the provisions of this Act and provides for a penalty of up to $6,000 for the unauthorised disposal of records?

(10) How many such conversations are currently retained by the Police Service?

(11) Have any police officers ever been subject to any disciplinary action or charges for any alleged breach of the *Invasion of Privacy Act 1971,* the *Libraries and Archives Act 1988* or any other Act for improper and/or illegal action in relation to the secret taping of conversations, any subsequent use of those tapes and retention or disposal of those tapes?

(12) If so, what are the details?

Answer (Mr Braddy):

(1) It is a common practice within the Police Service for officers to carry a small tape recorder and to record conversations with persons with whom they have contact. It is a matter for each officer as to whether he or she makes these types of private recordings or not. As such it is impossible to say how widespread the practice is.

(2) Taping conversations to which one is a party is permitted by law, pursuant to section 43(2)(a) of the *Invasion of Privacy Act 1971*. No formal procedures exist in relation to this practice because the Police Service is of the view that the existing provisions and underlying policy of the *Invasion of Privacy Act 1971* operate to protect an individual from arbitrary interference with the right to privacy. The Police Service is cognisant of the fact that while the Act recognises that it is lawful to use a listening device to record a private conversation when the person using the device is party to the conversation, it establishes a significant measure of legal protection against arbitrary interference by operation of a number of sections within the Act. These are:

section 43 which prohibits the use of listening devices;

section 44 which prohibits the communication or publication of private conversations which have been heard unlawfully;

section 45 which prohibits the communication of private conversations by parties to the conversation;

section 46 which renders unlawfully recorded evidence inadmissible; and

section 47 which requires the destruction of irrelevant records made by the use of a listening device.

The law, which is readily accessible, establishes a framework indicating sufficiently clearly, and with adequate foreseeability, the scope and manner of carrying out activities involving the use of a listening device. The Police Service is therefore of the view that the legislation balances the rights of the individual to privacy, with the right of the community to ensure that those who commit offences are brought to justice. Members of the Police Service are aware of the fundamental importance of the right to privacy, and conduct operations in accordance with not only the letter of the law, but in the spirit of the law. Police Officers who communicate or publish any recorded conversation or statement which exceeds what is reasonably necessary, either in the public interest or in the performance of their duties render themselves liable to action for an offence against section 45(1) of the Act, and also to disciplinary proceedings pursuant to the *Police Service Administration Act 1990*.

(3) Officers who elect to make such recordings do so in circumstances in which practical experience has shown that inculpatory or exculpatory statements might be made. Again, it is a matter of judgement for the individual officer.

(4) The taping of a conversation by a police officer does not impact on the rights of a member of the public. Subject to certain specific statutory exceptions, a member of the public is not obliged to answer questions asked by a police officer. That right is preserved regardless of whether the officer is recording the conversation.

(5) Section 45(2) provides the "limited circumstances" referred to in the question. It is worth noting that those circumstances include communication or publication which is made in the course of legal proceedings' where the communication is no more than is reasonably necessary in the public interest; where it is made in the performance of the duty of the person making the communication; or is made for the protection of the lawful interests of that person.

(6) Yes.

(7) Private recordings made by an officer at his or her discretion are not public records and therefore do not fall within the ambit of the *Libraries and Archives Act 1988*. With respect to the *Freedom of Information Act*, the Police Service does not have access to private recordings made by members, and those recordings are not under the control of an officer in his or her official capacity. As such, private recordings are not a document of the agency and are therefore not subject to the *Freedom of Information Act 1991*.

(8) Yes.

(9) See answer to part 7 of the question.

(10) See answer to part 7 of the question.

(11) See answer to part 7 of the question.

(12) This is not applicable.

14. Auctioneers and Agents Fidelity Guarantee Fund

Mr ROWELL asked the Minister for Housing, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Rural Communities, Minister for Rural Communities and Minister for Provision of Infrastructure for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Communities—

Will he provide a list of the housing assistance programs, such as the Community Housing Partnership Program, and organisations that have benefited since the enactment of the *Auctioneers and Agents Amendment Act 1991*, which allows the Government to take funds from the Auctioneers and Agents Fidelity Guarantee Fund, including (a) the cost of each facility, (b) the date the funds were made available and (c) the gross annual amounts received from the fund?

Answer (Mr Mackenroth):

There is no direct transfer of funds from the Auctioneers and Agents Fidelity Guarantee Fund to specific housing programs administered by my department.

Rather, some funds are transferred from the Fund to the Consolidated Fund and a significantly larger amount is provided to my department from the Consolidated Fund to assist in the provision of housing.

In 1995-96 $87.434M has been provided to the Housing Program from the Consolidated Fund.

In relation to the Community Housing Partnership Program, 392 projects have been undertaken throughout Queensland to meet particular local housing needs.

15. Mooloolaba Police Beat, Resources

Mr LAMING asked the Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services—

(1) What is the current staffing level of the Mooloolaba Police beat?

(2) How does this compare with the level when the beat was first opened?

(3) Is this level considered adequate?

(4) What is the intended level in the future?

Answer (Mr Braddy):

(1) The Mooloolaba Police Beat Shopfront is staffed by two sworn members and one full-time civilian staff member.

(2) This is the same operational staffing level as when the beat first commenced in early 1994. The full-time staff member took up duty in May 1994.

(3) The current staffing level is in accord with Police Beat Guidelines. Assistance is also provided, as needs arise, by Maroochydore Police Division general duty staff.

(4) The present staffing level of the Mooloolaba Police Beat is in line with the Queensland Police Service staffing model, and no future increases are planned.

16. Water Charges

Mrs McCAULEY asked the Minister for Primary Industries and Minister for Racing—

With reference to his letter to the Upper Burnett Water Advisory Committee, dated 3 April 1995, in which he advised that his department was reducing the charge for water gained by sand-troughing, to half the normal rate, ie $4.85 per megalitre—

(1) Is he aware that previously in such situations of severe drought, water extracted from the sand beds was neither charged for or considered against allocations, a practice which recognises that bed sand and low flow water is a resource pre-existing any augmentations works?

(2) Is he aware that in excess of $150,000 has been spent by primary producers in the Burnett area on sand-troughing, and that a Government decision to waive all charges in this regard would be a very meaningful gesture towards drought relief?

(3) Will he take steps to implement such a decision?

(4) If not, why not?

Answer (Mr Gibbs):

1. I am advised that in only one year, 1983, water pumped from the bed sands of the Burnett River did not attract a charge and was not considered against allocations.

Water contained in the bed sands is part of the total yield of the system. It needs to be taken into account in assessing water allocations to irrigators. This increases in importance as systems such as the Burnett become more committed over time.

The removal of all charges and not accounting for such use is not fair to those who cannot access this water—nor is it sound natural resource management practice.

2. I am aware of significant expenditure incurred by irrigators in accessing their water allocations during this severe drought. In recognition of this expenditure, the Government has rebated the annual charge by 50%. This has resulted in irrigators paying only $4.85 for a million litres of water.

3. I believe the current approach that was introduced earlier this year is still appropriate.

4. As I stated earlier, to place zero charge for the resource and to place it outside of normal management arrangements would not be consistent with responsible natural resource management practices.

This is the reason why the Government has moved to provide additional water storage.

As outlined in 'From Strength to Strength' the Government has committed itself to a number of water conservation projects in Queensland, aimed at providing some relief from future drought conditions.

Subject to satisfactory evaluations, the Government has identified three projects that will augment existing infrastructure—raising Mundubbera and John Goleby Weirs and improvements to the Barker/Barambah/Boyne system. These will help to improve the sustainability of production in the region in the long term.

17. Mount Pleasant Clinic, Greenslopes

Mr RADKE asked the Minister for Health—

With reference to the planned Mount Pleasant Clinic on Birdwood Road, Greenslopes—

(1) What information has been submitted to the Health Department regarding (a) the proposed medical uses of this private clinic, (b) length of stay, (c) number of psychiatric beds and (d) type of patients from parole board?

(2) Have the facilities at other private hospitals been fully investigated?

Answer (Mr Beattie):

(1) The information received by the Department was provided as information of a commercial-in-confidence nature, so I am unable to identify the specific information requested. The Freedom of Information Act provides mechanisms for consulting relevant parties and, where appropriate, the ability to provide access to exempt commercial-in-confidence information.

(2) Yes.

I thank the Honourable Member for his question because it gives me an opportunity to highlight the Member's highly questionable approach to an important issue in his electorate.

He does not say in his question how critical he has been of the Government's moves to cut red tape. I refer specifically to suggestions made by the Honourable Member that approval for a psychiatric and rehabilitation hospital at the Mount Pleasant Clinic has been improperly rushed.

This claim needlessly misled the community by suggesting the Government had side-stepped any established procedures or requirements in approving the 90-bed hospital. Approval had been given in principal by Queensland Health but it had been drawn to my attention that "red tape" was delaying the final approval.

The community is in need of these beds and I asked the responsible officers if there were any further problems which would not allow the proposal to proceed. I was told that the mix of psychiatric and rehabilitation beds had still to be negotiated, but this would not necessarily hold up approval for the hospital.

I therefore asked that, as all procedures had been fulfilled, to allow final approval, with the requirement that the mix of beds be negotiated with the hospital.

Based on his criticism of the action I took in this matter I can only conclude that the Honourable Member would have preferred it if approval had not been given, denying his local community access to much-needed rehabilitation beds.

18. Ministers' Legal Expenses

Miss SIMPSON asked the Premier and Minister for Economic and Trade Development—

(1) Will he reveal the legal costs and settlements of his Ministers in the 47th Parliament where the bill was met by the public purse?

(2) If so, what are these costs?

Answer (Mr W. K. Goss):

The legal costs paid during the period in question were $10,323.00, and were in respect of two actions, one of which was settled. This figure represents amounts paid defending Ministers in matters related to their ministerial duties (for example where someone brings a defamation action against a Minister in relation to public comments made as part of his or her job).

The payment of legal fees in this context is consistent with the guidelines set down in a 1982 Cabinet decision by the previous Government. The figure does not include costs relating to actions for judicial review of administrative decisions made by Ministers or actions against Ministers where the Minister was representing the Government in matters relating to the running of his or her department (for example actions in contract).

19. Ms H. Demidenko/Darvill

Mr FITZGERALD asked the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for The arts—

(1) Did Helen Demidenko/Darville make any application to receive a grant to support her writing career?

(2) If so, (a) were any grants made, (b) what was the amount of the grant, (c) did the application indicate the applicants ethnic background; if so, what was this claim and (d) what checks were made by his department into the truth of any claim made in the application?

Answer (Mr Foley):

(1) Yes, Ms Darville made an application for grant assistance in July 1994, under the 1995 Arts Grant Programs.

(2)(a) In November 1994, a grant was made to Ms Darville, on the recommendation of the Writing Assessment Panel.

(b) The amount of the awarded grant was $13,500.

(c) In her application, Ms Darville identified herself of non-English speaking background. She further indicated that her mother was from Ireland and her father from the Soviet Ukraine.

(d) The Writing Assessment Panel is comprised of community and industry members who have expertise in the writing field and one observer who is an employee of Arts Queensland.

The panel considered a sample of Ms Darville's work, her resume and the awards she had won in assessing the literary merit of her applications.

As to the information concerning the applicant's ethnic background, this was accepted on its face in the absence of any evidence to the contrary at that time.

The Chair of the Writing Assessment Panel, Professor Graeme Turner, has subsequently confirmed to the Executive Director of Arts Queensland that:

> "....whilst her (Ms Darville's) nomination of herself as a person of non-English speaking background was noted by the panel, the over-riding criteria for the Panel was artistic merit and the track record of the author as demonstrated by her recent success in achieving publication of her work, supportive critical reviews and awards for her writing. The panel's view was that Helen was the outstanding emerging writer in that round."

20. Emergency Helicopter Service, Rockhampton

Mr SCHWARTEN asked the Minister for Emergency Services and Minister for Consumer Affairs—

As he is aware, his department and the Helicopter Sub-Committee of the Rockhampton Chamber of Commerce has been working on a proposal to provide a community-based emergency helicopter service in Rockhampton—

What is the current status of progress on this issue?

Answer (Mr Davies):

The package of aeromedical and aerial rescue initiatives announced by the Government in December 1994 included in-principle support for potential community based, Government subsidised helicopter services in Rockhampton and Mackay.

This support is based on local communities and the corporate sector demonstrating, through a business planning approach, the financial viability of the proposals. It is proposed that subject to compliance with this principle, a service agreement would be signed between the community helicopter services and Queensland Emergency Services (QES), on behalf of the Queensland Government.

The service agreement and financial business plan approach is designed to provide certainty of service delivery and minimum operating standards for the benefit of the public as well as an assured level of support from the Government.

The 1995/96 budget provided funding of $300,000 as a contribution towards annual operating costs for each service in Rockhampton and Mackay.

Officers of QES have liaised regularly with the Rockhampton Chamber of Commerce on the subject of a regional helicopter rescue service based in Rockhampton.

In addition to the financial assistance toward annual operating costs, QES has been developing a series of detailed options to assist with establishment/capital costs of a service. This includes costs associated with acquiring a helicopter and other establishment costs such as hangar accommodation and staff costs. These are estimated to total about $1.5 million.

My Department has also been actively seeking assistance and advice from existing community based helicopter services in south east Queensland and New South Wales which already have years of practical experience in gaining community, Local Government and corporate support for community based, Government subsidised rescue helicopter services. For example, QES organised and funded meetings in both Rockhampton and Mackay with the Head of the SEQEB Helicopter Rescue Service on the Sunshine Coast and discussed similar assistance from RACQ CareFlight on the Gold Coast.

The Executive Director of Statewide Services Division in QES recently discussed the matter with community based services in New South Wales.

The Government is committed to improving rural and regional aeromedical and rescue services for the benefit of Queenslanders. This has already been demonstrated by the Government's support and partial funding for a new fixed wing aeromedical service by the Royal Flying Doctor Service in Rockhampton which started operations in July 1995.

A multi-role rescue helicopter service is also supported by the Government subject to the project being demonstrated to be financially viable.

My Department is committed to continuing close consultation and liaison with the Rockhampton Chamber of Commerce and Local Government in the region on this important initiative.

21. Ipswich TAFE College

Mr SANTORO asked the Minister for Employment and Training and Minister Assisting the Premier on Public Service Matters—

With reference to questions I asked on 28 April 1994 concerning financial mismanagement at Ipswich TAFE College, her predecessor tabled a set of documents, amongst which was a document headed "EV 210 Vocational Education, Training and Employment Corporation—Agreement to Hire Facilities"—

(1) Why was this document, signed on 31 January 1994, backdated to cover the preceding seven months, from 1 September 1992?

(2) Who were the college director(s) for that preceding seven-month period?

(3) Did the "training post" pay rent or lease for that period when there was obviously no valid agreement in place?

(4) Why weren't the relevant sections of Part "F" of the form completed?

(5) Why is the question, "Do you need to hire equipment?", answered "No", when the other documents supplied by the Minister include a list of TAFE equipment previously provided to the hirer?

(6) Why doesn't this agreement cover essential items such as the provision of power, phones, cleaning, etc?

(7) Does she feel that the information on this form constitutes an adequate legal agreement between a TAFE institution and a private training provider?

(8) If not, what does she intend to do to ensure that the leasing of buildings or hiring of facilities by colleges/institutes is done in a more responsible, legally appropriate fashion?

Answer (Mrs Edmond):

(1) The Agreement was signed in January 1994 when the new Director, in reviewing all agreements at the Institute, found that the formalising of the agreement had not been effected.

The period for the hire was for twelve months from 1 July 1993 to 30 June 1994.

(2) During the 7 month period 1 July 1993—31 January 1994, the Directors were Mr Colin Robertson (in an acting capacity) from July to October 1993 and Ms Wendy Protheroe from October 1993 to January 1994.

(3) The "Training Post" has paid all rent due to the Institute for the full period of hire of that facility.

(4) Section "F" is the College checklist that confirms the information on the Agreement was correct. It is true that this confirmation was not circled.

(5) The facilities hired included equipment within the cost. This cost had been negotiated in March 1993.

(6) The price of $10,000 per annum was the cost estimated by a previous Director and included provision of services. There was an additional charge of $2,000 for security services.

(7) I have referred this matter to Crown Law for advice.

(8) See answer to Question 7.

22. Land Rezoning, Ormiston

Mr SLACK asked the Minister for Environment and Heritage—

With reference to the recent applications made to the Redland Shire Council for rezoning of lots 196, 197 and 202 on RP 2465 Rose Street Ormiston from Residential Low Density and Public Open Space to Residential A and as I understand the matter is currently before the Planning and Environment Court following the refusal of the application by the Redland Shire Council—

As the area adjoins the mouth of Hilliards Creek, a significant wetland site, has he taken steps to ensure that the area is protected from development; if not, is it his intention to take steps to see that the area is protected and, if not, why not?

Answer (Mr Barton):

Lots 196, 197 and 202 on RP 2465 Rose Street, Ormiston are freehold and as such are not under the control of the Department of Environment and Heritage.

The rezoning of these three Lots to Residential A is a local government matter and is being dealt with under local town planning provisions.

23. Health Capital Works Program

Mr HORAN asked the Minister for Health—

(1) Will he provide the details of the Capital Works Programme for the next eight years including details of the $150m/year and the extra $75m over two years announced in the 1995-96 budget and the extra $150m announced in the election campaign?

(2) Will he also include in this information (a) a list of all Health Capital Works projects announced during the recent election campaign, (b) the details of all projects and equipment purchases and (c) a timetable of planned commencements and costings of all major stages of each project?

Answer (Mr Beattie):

(1) On 19 June 1995, the Government approved additional projects for inclusion within the $1.725 billion 10 Year Hospital Rebuilding Plan. Capital developments which have been included in the Capital Works Program for the next eight years are as follows:

Herston Complex—$300 million

The Prince Charles Hospital—$80 million

Princess Alexandra/QEII Hospitals—$225 million

Redland Hospital—$45 million

Logan Hospital—$60 million

Mater Hospitals Complex—$50 million

Rockhampton Hospital—$25 million

Emerald Hospital—$8.5 million (increase of $4.7m in funding from $3.8m approved earlier)

Gladstone Hospital—$4.5 million

Woorabinda Hospital—$4.6 million

Eventide Home Rockhampton—$8.5 million

Barcaldine Hospital—$6 million (increase of $2.3m in funding from $3.7m approved earlier)

Toowoomba Hospital—$50 million (increase of $36.648m in funding from $13.352m allocated to the Stage 1 redevelopment to enable additional enhancements to be undertaken to the overall complex)

Clermont Hospital—$6 million

Mackay Hospital—$20 million

Proserpine Hospital—$6 million

Townsville Hospital—$70 million

Palm Island Hospital—$6 million

Mornington Island Hospital—$3.74 million

Cairns Hospital—$70 million

Smithfield Community Health Centre—$4.2 million

Woree Community Health Centre—$4 million

Gold Coast Hospital—$15 million (funding of $12m approved earlier; additional funding provided to address deficiencies)

Palm Beach Community Health Centre—$3.8 million

Nambour Hospital—$30 million

Redcliffe Hospital—$11.27 million ($1.27m within funding provided, allocated for fitout of shell area to accommodate 2 additional theatres)

Caboolture Hospital—$40 million

Ipswich Hospital—$30 million

Maryborough Hospital—$9.5 million (increased funding of $2.2m from $7.3m approved earlier)

Hervey Bay Hospital—$42.1 million (increased funding of $3.8m from $38.3m approved earlier)

Additional funding of $75 million over two years was included in the 1995/96 budget and is to be directed to addressing the backlog of specialist equipment needs at both metropolitan and major provincial hospitals. $35 million has been provided in the 1995/96 financial year to meet priority specialist equipment needs with the additional $40 million being provided in the 1996/97 financial year to supplement capital requirements for major redevelopments within the metropolitan hospitals.

The Government, recognising the capital consumption necessary to meet the many redevelopments throughout the State, has increased

the initial allocation of $1.5 billion to $1.725 billion and will provide further additional funding of $50 million per annum in the financial years of 1997/98, 1998/1999 and 1999/2000. Such funding has been provided to meet expected commitments to undertake redevelopments at major acute hospitals throughout the State.

(2) (a) Projects announced during the recent election campaign are outlined in (1) above.

(b) Equipment purchases listed for 1995/96 financial year are as follows:

Brisbane North Health Region

Royal Brisbane Hospital
- Replacement of 2 Gamma Cameras—$1.05m
- Upgrade of Cardiovascular Angiography Suite—$3.40m
- Operating Room Equipment—$0.40m
- Life Support Systems Upgrade (ICU, DEM, CCU, Lifeflight)—$0.55m
- Electronic Record System—$0.98m

Royal Women's Hospital
- Neonatal Equipment—$0.35m
- Operating Room Equipment—$0.284m
- Heart Rate/Blood Pressure Monitors—$0.25m
- General Equipment—$0.25m

Royal Children's Hospital
- Spiral CT Scanner with Laser Camera—$1.40m
- Digital Acquisition System—$0.60m
- Colour Doppler Ultrasound—$0.30m

Keperra Hospital
- Dialysis Equipment Upgrade—$0.30m

The Prince Charles
- Fluoroscopy X-Ray Machine—$0.50m
- Cardio-thoracic Monitoring Equipment plus telemetry for IC—$0.60m
- Monitoring System 5 Theatres; solar 5000—$0.352m

Oral Health
- Dental Equipment—$0.50m

Total—$12.066m

Brisbane South Health Region

Princess Alexandra
- Replacement Gamma Camera—$0.80m
- 7 x Daylight Processors—$0.70m
- Two CT Scanners—$2.80m
- Mobile Image Intensifier—$0.20m
- Replace Fixed Image Intensifier—$0.60m
- Transoesophageal Echocardiograph—$0.18m
- Monitoring Equipment—$0.433
- 21 x Anaesthetic Machines—$1.654m
- Urodynamics Equipment—$0.075m
- 2 x Operating Cytoscopes—$0.10m

Mater Adult Public
- Replace Anaesthetic Machines—$0.90m
- 16 x Inhalational Agent Monitors—$0.24m
- 13 x Replace Obsolete Ventilators—$0.13m
- Upgrade Hewlett Packard Monitors—$0.25m
- EEG/Cardiac Package—$0.38m

Mater Mothers
- Neonatal Unit Package—$0.32m

Mater Children's
- ICU/High Dependency Unit Package—$0.45m

Logan, Redland & QEII
- Replace Anaesthetic Equipment—$1.50m

All Hospitals
- Replace CSSD and Linen Service—$0.729m

Total—$12.441m

Central Health Region

Gladstone Hospital
- 2 x Ventilators—$0.10m
- Gastroscope—$0.025m

Rockhampton Hospital
- CT Scanner—$1.20m

Total—$1.325m

Central West Health Region

Winton Hospital
- Airconditioning Operating Theatre—$0.090m
- Dental Chair and X-Ray Unit—$0.010m

Jundah Hospital
- X-Ray Unit—$0.035m

Blackall Hospital
- Defibrillator—$0.015m

Longreach Hospital
- ECG Machine—$0.038m

Total—$0.188m

Darling Downs Health Region

Toowoomba Hospital
- Medical Imaging Package (CT Scanner)—$0.60m

Total—$0.60m

Mackay Health Region

Mackay Hospital
- Computerised Tomography Scanner—$1.60m

Total—$1.60m

Northern Health Region

Townsville Hospital
- Cardiac Specialist Equipment—$0.15m
- Monitoring Equipment Emergency—$0.30m
- Ultrasound Urology—$0.30m

Kirwan Hospital
- Neonatal Intensive Care Equipment—$0.25m

Mt Isa Hospital
- Intensive Care Monitoring Equipment—$0.25m

Total—$1.25m

South Coast Health Region

Beaudesert Hospital
- Radiology Redevelopment—$0.455m

Gold Coast Hospital
- Pathology—$0.35m
- Fluoroscopy Unit—$0.40m

Total—$1.205m

South West Health Region

Regional

Radiology Package—$0.25m

Total—$0.25m

Sunshine Coast Health Region

Caboolture Hospital

Pathology Dept Equipment—$0.43m

Northern Sector

Preoperative and Operation Equipment—$0.479m

Redcliffe Hospital

High Dependency Unit Monitoring Equipment—$0.45m

Total—$1.359m

West Moreton Health Region

Ipswich Hospital

Ventilators, Intensive Care Unit and Monitoring Equipment—$0.60m

Endoscopic Camera, Instruments and Ultrasonograph—$0.30m

Digital Radiology Equipment—$1.04m

Total—$1.94m

Wide Bay Health Region

Regional

Ophthalmology and ENT Surgical Equipment—$0.302m

Bundaberg Hospital

Monitoring and Laparoscopic Equipment—$0.496m

Kingaroy Hospital

Theatre Equipment—$0.253m

Total—$0.051m

Total for All Regions—$35.275m

As some projects will overlap from previous financial years, some costs will be incurred during the 1995/96 financial year. These will include the Royal Brisbane Hospital—Psychiatric Unit Redevelopment, The Prince Charles Hospital—Winston Noble Unit Upgrade, Pine Rivers Community Health Centre, Logan Hospital—Stage IIIA Redevelopment and Day Surgery, Redlands Community Health Centre, Yeppoon Community Health Centre, Rockhampton Hospital—Psychiatric Unit, Mackay Community Health Centre, Townsville Hospital—Radiation Oncology Services, Mt Isa Hospital—Stage II Refurbishment and Beenleigh Community Health Centre. Additionally, projects which have been approved previously will commence during the 1995/96 financial year and include the redevelopment of Jacaranda Village located on The Prince Charles Hospital Campus ($7.5m), Rockhampton Community Health Centre ($5.215m), Toowoomba Community Health Centre ($4.872m), Thursday Island Hospital Redevelopment ($15.5m), Thursday Island Community Health Centre ($1.8m), Remote Area Accommodation for Thursday Island, Badu Island and Yorke Island ($9.74m), redevelopments at Badu and Boigu Islands ($3.821m), Cunnamulla Community Health Centre ($0.89m), Bundaberg Hospital Redevelopment ($18.1m), Wide Bay Group Linen Service ($5.4m), Health Services Community Centre Toowong ($6.329m) plus minor upgrade work at Mt Morgan Hospital to cost $455,000 and expanded minor upgrade work at Beaudesert Hospital amounting to $250,000.

(c) The projected timetable of planned commencements of the projects outlined earlier is as follows:

Herston Complex

Stage I—Carparking

Commence December 1995

Completion 1996

Stage II—Royal Women's Hospital

Commence 1996

Completion 1998

Stage III—New Diagnostic and Emergency Departments Completion 2000

Block 7 Refurbishment

Completion 2001

The Prince Charles Hospital

Stage I—New ward block and theatres

Completion 1998

Stage II—Refurbishment of existing buildings

Completion 2000

Princess Alexandra/QE II Jubilee Hospitals

Redevelopment on a staged basis (PAH)

Completion 2001

Upgrading and expanded services (QE II)

Completion 1997 & 1998

Redland Hospital

Stage I—Expanded services/facilities

Completion mid 1998

Stage II—Refurbishment of existing facility

Completion early 1999

Logan Hospital

Stage I—Expanded services/facilities

Completion 1998

Stage II—Refurbishment of older areas

Completion 1999

Mater Hospitals Complex

Refurbishment and upgrading

Completion 1999

Rockhampton Hospital

Redevelopment involving engineering, accident and emergency, etc

Completion 1999

Gladstone Hospital

Refurbishment of building interiors

Completion early 1998

Woorabinda Hospital

Replacement of facility

Completion early 1998

Eventide Home Rockhampton

Replacement of buildings

Completion early 1999

Toowoomba Hospital

Stage I—Theatres and critical care areas

Completion 1997

Stage II—Upgrading balance of complex

Completion 2000

Mackay Hospital

Stage I—Refurbishment of theatres and accident and emergency

Completion March 1998

Stage II—Upgrading psychiatric unit and inpatient wards

Completion late 1999

Proserpine Hospital

Substantially redeveloped

Completion May 1998

Clermont Hospital

Replacement of facility

Completion February 1998

Palm Island

Replacement of facility

Completion March 1998

Mornington Island

Replacement of facility

Completion late 1997

Townsville Hospital

Redevelopment of staged basis addressing block A as priority

Completion between 1997 & 1999 various stages

Cairns Hospital

Stage I—New psychiatric unit

Completion August 1996

Stage II—Clinical services block

Completion 1997

Stage III & IV—Refurbishment of existing buildings

Completion 1999

Woree Community Health Centre

Establishment of new facility

Completion early 1998

Smithfield Community Health Centre

Establishment of new facility

Completion early 1998

Gold Coast Hospital

Redevelopment addressing engineering services and refurbishment of wards

Completion late 1998

Palm Beach Community Health Centre

Establishment of new centre

Completion 1997

Nambour Hospital

Replacement of existing facilities and enhancement of services

Completion mid 1999

Redcliffe Hospital

Stage I—Fitout of shell area for theatres

Completion December 1995

Stage II—Upgrading of rehabilitation facilities and inpatient wards

Completion late 1998

Caboolture Hospital

Expansion of facilities and services

Completion mid 1999

Ipswich Hospital

Stage I—New acute psychiatric facility

Completion October 1997

Stage II—New day surgery, medical and obstetrics facilities

Completion 1999

The Honourable Member for Toowoomba South is well aware that Master Planning exercises are being undertaken at many of the hospital campuses and until such time as agreement has been reached with the outcomes, the timing of such developments is difficult to nominate. The Government is determined to fast track much of the outlined developments to ensure that the very best of facilities are provided in order to maintain health service delivery.

24. Secondment of CJC Officers

Mr TURNER asked the Premier and Minister for Economic and Trade Development—

(1) Which officers of the Criminal Justice Commission were seconded to the Office of Cabinet and certain Government departments in the period prior to the recent State election?

(2) What was the reason for such secondments and what tasks did each officer perform?

Answer (Mr W. K. Goss):

(1) A Criminal Justice Commission (CJC) officer was a temporary employee with Office of the Cabinet from 21 November 1994 to 30 June 1995. A second CJC officer was seconded to the Department of Justice and Attorney-General from 15 May 1995 to 25 August 1995.

(2) With respect to the Office of the Cabinet, as a general policy, secondments both into and out of the Office are encouraged to improve understanding of policy development processes and encourage liaison between agencies. The Office of the Cabinet vacancy was created by the absence of two permanent officers, one on secondment to another department, the second on six months leave without pay. The CJC officer responded to an advertisement for the position and was selected on merit as the best applicant for the job. The officer worked in the Legal and Administrative Policy Unit, primarily on criminal law and police issues. The second officer worked as a policy coordinator in the Aboriginal Justice Advisory Committee Secretariat (AJAC Secretariat). The AJAC Secretariat vacancy was created by a restructure within the Secretariat. While in the position the officer managed the Secretariat support to AJAC and provided policy advice to AJAC. The officer returned to the CJC when the position was filled on a two year contract.

25. Ambulance Service Overtime Payments

Mr LITTLEPROUD asked the Minister for Emergency Services and Minister for Consumer Affairs—

With reference to *The Courier-Mail* of Monday 28 August which carried an article claiming an ambulance officer was refused permission to take a woman whose leg had been severed to hospital because it would have created a call on overtime payment—

(1) Has he investigated this allegation?

(2) Does he accept such administrative direction as being in the best interests of the patient?

(3) What action has he directed to be taken as a result of his investigation?

Answer (Mr Davies):

The statement by Ambulance Officer Shaun Clark in the article appearing in the Courier-Mail of 28 August, 1995 relates to the Supreme Court Proceedings he has instituted against the Queensland Ambulance Service.

Accordingly, it is not appropriate for me to comment on this case.

Any future action in relation to this alleged incident will be taken in the context of the Supreme Court Proceedings.

26. Wageline

Mrs GAMIN asked the Minister for Employment and Training and Minister Assisting the Premier on Public Service Matters—

With reference to Gold Coast companies and businesses who are frustrated in dealing with the state wageline number when trying to find out details of appropriate award wages as the number is constantly engaged—

Will extra Telstra lines be installed at the Gold Coast office for the wageline number, or will a special 'hotline' or '008' number be provided for calls to the Brisbane office?

Answer (Mrs Edmond):

The Southport "Wageline" number connects to two Client Services Officers and an Industrial Inspector all of whom are trained to give detailed advice on award wages and related employment legislation.

This telephone system permits a further queuing of four incoming calls each of whom receive an introductory message followed by a further message 45 seconds later. This second message is repeated regularly to callers unanswered in the queue and will help the caller ascertain whether or not to wait or call back later.

I am advised that this system, known as "Spectrum Gold", is also connected to all other Departmental offices at the same Southport address and is designed to accommodate an extremely high call volume.

The Spectrum Gold system is a pilot project undertaken by the Department and statistics on its operation have only recently been made available for evaluation.

I am advised that at this time it is not considered necessary to install extra Telstra lines for the Gold Coast Wageline number or to provide a special "hotline" or "008" number for calls to the Brisbane office of Wageline. The current pilot project needs to be assessed first for its effectiveness and efficiency in coping with incoming calls.

The Honourable Member for Burleigh is assured that the services provided to the public by the various Branches of my Department, including the Wageline office, are constantly under review. Every endeavour is made to provide an efficient service consistent with available resources.

28. Woorabinda Aboriginal Council

Mrs McCAULEY asked the Minister for Family and Community Services and Minister Assisting the Premier on the Status of Women—

With reference to the Woorabinda Aboriginal Council, which has suffered financial mismanagement in recent times and the previous Minister for Family Services' attempts to put an administrator in to manage the Council—

Will she move to appoint an administrator as the present Aboriginal administration has admitted it has no chance of getting out of its financial tangle without extra funding from the State Government, and therefore those many creditors who are owed money by the Woorabinda Aboriginal Council cannot be paid because her Government is refusing to assist with the extra funds?

Answer (Mrs Woodgate):

In response to the question posed by Mrs McCauley, I can advise as follows:

The Woorabinda Council is facing serious financial difficulties. In essence, the Council is insolvent and unable to meet its debts as they fall due.

Now that the financial position of the Council has been reasonably accurately established, the Government will shortly be in a position to determine what action needs to be taken to resolve the current financial crisis. To date, the Government has made no decision as to whether, or not, this action will involve financial assistance. The Council is aware that one of the options that may be considered by Government is whether it would be appropriate to appoint an administrator under Section 21 of the *Community Services (Aborigines) Act 1984.*

My position is that we must shortly achieve a situation where people who have supplied credit to the Council in good faith, and whose accounts are not disputed, are paid, and where a satisfactory standard of financial administration is in place at Woorabinda.

The Council has been and, of course, will continue to be given all appropriate notice and opportunity for discussion on these matters. I expect to be in a position to make a statement on this issue before the end of November 1995.

30. Pacific Highway, Coomera

Mr BAUMANN asked the Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development—

With reference to yet another accident on the Pacific Highway at Coomera, resulting in horrific personal and property damage—

(1) What plans does his department have in place for the provision of new bridges, the upgrading of this section of highway and parallel service roads and the installation of the concrete buffer wall between north and south carriageways?

(2) What expenditure has been allocated and what time frame is in place for works to be completed?

Answer (Mr Elder):

(1) Concept plans are being prepared for the realignment of the southbound carriageway to allow for the construction of the new bridge and approaches at Coomera, as well as the service road system. It is to be hoped that separation of the carriageways will be such that concrete buffer walls between the carriageways will not be necessary. However, this will be resolved in the design process.

(2) The construction of new bridges and service road is part of the six laning commitment for the Pacific Highway and will be completed within the four year time frame that I have indicated previously.

33. Police Resources, Toowong

Dr WATSON asked the Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services—

(1) What was the full-time equivalent police establishment figure for the "Toowong cluster" as of (a) 31 May 1994 and (b) 31 May 1995?

(2) How many police officers were actually assigned to full-time duty within the "Toowong cluster" in (a) April and May 1994 and April and May 1995?

(3) How many of the officers identified in (2) above were principally assigned to office or desk duties during (a) April and May 1994 and (b) April and May 1995?

(4) What was the frequency distribution for patrols in the "Toowong cluster" by officers assigned to that cluster in (a) April and May 1994 and (b) April and May 1995?

Answer (Mr Braddy):

(1) The authorised strength of the Toowong Division was 68 as at 31 May 1994, and 57 as at 31 May 1995.

(2) The actual strength of the Toowong Division was 68 as at 31 May 1994, and 56 as at 31 May 1995.

The reduction in police numbers was the result of a Statewide rationalisation of regional police resources undertaken in accordance with the Queensland Police Service Human Resource Model. Within the Region, resources were then reallocated amongst Divisions based on the frequency of calls for police assistance together with the reported crime rate for each Division.

(3) Two officers (Senior Sergeant Administrator and Inspector in Charge) were principally assigned to office or desk duties during both periods.

There are a number of tasks which require personnel to be assigned to office or desk duties, including three shop front counters, roster clerk duties and other administrative duties. Officers are usually required to work no more than one eight hour shift per fortnight to operate these positions.

(4) It is not desirable to disclose information pertinent to operational policing numbers. However, the most important concern is that uniform patrols, consisting of two member units, operate 24 hours a day.

Traffic patrols consist of one member (motorcycle) and two person (car) patrols which are intelligence driven and subject to divisional needs and operations.

CIB and JAB crews are subject to a rotational roster involving all plain clothes branches within the region. This ensures at least one plain clothes crew is available on a 24 hour basis. Additional crews are rostered according to operational needs.

It is noted that although CIB, JAB and Inquiry staff are rostered for duty they do not perform patrols as such, as they have specific duties to perform which do not fit patrol criteria.

34. Juvenile Aid Bureau Officer, Coolum Police Station

Mr DAVIDSON asked the Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services—

With reference to the recent State election campaign when he attended a meeting with members of the Coolum community in the electorate of Noosa to discuss the appointment of a Juvenile Aid Bureau officer to the Coolum Police Station—

When will a Juvenile Aid Bureau officer be appointed to the Coolum Police Station?

Answer (Mr Braddy):

(1) Officers from the Sunshine Coast District Juvenile Aid Bureau are based at Kawana Waters, Maroochydore, Nambour and Noosa Heads. These officers are available to perform duty as required in all Divisions within the district, including Coolum.

The incidence of juvenile crime in the Coolum area is considered by the Police Service to be less of a problem than in other areas of the Sunshine Coast District.

There are no plans to appoint a Juvenile Aid Bureau Officer to the Coolum Police Station at this time.

35. Dairy Farmers

Mr STEPHAN asked the Minister for Primary Industries and Minister for Racing—

With reference to comments on the local radio news, that dairy farmers could benefit from the implementation of efficiencies available to the dairy industry—

What efficiencies are available which, in his opinion, are not being fully utilised by the dairy farmers?

Answer (Mr Gibbs):

1. Modern dairy farming is a complex business and dairy farmers are required to make complex decisions about complex technical matters.

2. Herd recording is a universally accepted tool to assist dairy farmers to make critical decisions about their herds and individual cows. Progressive dairy farmers regard herd recording as an essential management tool to enable them to continually improve their herds' productivity and milk quality, enabling them to compete in an increasingly competitive world.

3. Unfortunately, almost half of Queensland's 1700 dairy farmers are not current users of herd recording.

36. Court of Appeal Judges

Mr BEANLAND asked the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for the Arts—

(1) What funds have been budgeted for in 1995-96 for overseas travel by Court of Appeal Judges?

(2) What funds have been budgeted for in 1995-96 for domestic travel by Court of Appeal Judges?

(3) What are the details of the abovementioned proposed travel for 1995-96?

(4) What are the details of overseas travel taken in 1994-95 by Court of Appeal Judges?

Answer (Mr Foley):

(1) For 1995-96 financial year, $108,000 has been allocated towards overseas travel for Court of Appeal Judges.

(2) For 1995-96 financial year, $35,200 has been allocated towards domestic travel for Court of Appeal Judges.

(3) Mr Justice C.W. Pincus and his wife travelled to and attended the American Bar Association Conference and the Canadian Bar Association Conference, both held in August 1995, the former in Chicago and the latter in Winnipeg. Mr Justice Pincus also attended a Judges' Conference held with each of the Bar Conferences. He also had discussions with relevant academics at the University of Chicago (Professor N. Morris) and Columbia University (Professor R. Uviller) concerning criminal law topics; further His Honour attended a sitting of the Second Circuit Court of Appeals during his visit.

In September 1995, Justice G.L. Davies and Spouse travelled officially to the United Kingdom. He attended the 39th Congress of International Association of Lawyers, in London. Also in London, the Judge had discussions with The Right Honourable The Lord Woolf and the Woolf Inquiry Team in relation to litigation reform. The Judge also had discussions with Dr Zuckerman from Oxford University about a draft paper on the reform of the civil justice system.

Mr Justice B.H. McPherson proposes to travel to the United Kingdom in January, 1996 to deliver a paper at an international legal conference on equity at Cambridge University.

Justice G.E. Fitzgerald is considering attendance at an appellate judges' seminar in the first half of 1996, but has not made a final decision.

(4) In April, 1995, Justice G.E. Fitzgerald and Spouse travelled officially to the USA and Canada. In Canada, the Judge attended the 1995 Canadian Appellate Court Seminar. In New York, the President met with the presiding Judge and other Judges from the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court.

In January, 1995 Justice G.L. Davies and Spouse travelled officially to Germany. The Judge delivered a paper to a seminar at the Max-Planck-Institut in Hamburg and had discussions with scholars of that Institute and Judges on civil justice reform. In Berlin, the Judge had discussions with various academics, judges and practising lawyers on questions of procedure and substantive law and took part in a seminar on comparative procedure at Berlin University.

37. Jury Service Exemptions

Mr HEALY asked the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for the Arts—

With reference to exemptions under the *Jury Act* which state that any female person may apply for exemption from jury service without giving any reasons and that male persons over 65 but under 70 years of age may apply for exemption from jury service without giving any reasons—

Will his Government amend this Act to prevent discrimination against male persons, in the first instance, and female persons over 65 but under 70 years of age, in the second instance, to allow Justice Department court staff more scope in jury selection, particularly in rural and regional areas?

Answer (Mr Foley):

The *Jury Bill 1995* was introduced into Parliament on 13 September 1995. The *Bill*, when passed by the Parliament, will replace the *Jury Act 1929* and represents a substantial reform to the current jury system.

One of these major reforms is that juries will be more representative of the community. The *Jury Act 1929* contains a wide range of exemptions from jury service. The *Jury Bill* abolishes most of these exemptions and provides, among other things, that there will be no age limit for jury service and no special exemption requirements relating to female persons.

39. Clermont Hospital

Mr MITCHELL asked the Minister for Health—

With reference to a pre-election promise made by the Minister that $6m would be made available to rebuild the Clermont Hospital—

When will funds be available for this project?

Answer (Mr Beattie):

The 3 Year Capital Rolling Program 1995/96 to 1997/98 within the $1.725 billion 10 Year Hospital Rebuilding Plan makes provision for the total project

budget of $6 million to undertake the preliminary planning, design and documentation and construction of the Clermont project within this period.

40. Oncourse Bookmakers

Mr COOPER asked the Minister for Primary Industries and Minister for Racing—

Will he (a) give an assurance to all on-course bookmakers in the racing industry that he will support their retention on-course and (b) oppose any moves to remove bookmakers from racecourses generally?

Answer (Mr Gibbs):

Under the Racing and Betting Act 1980, the appointment of on-course bookmakers is a matter under the jurisdiction of the relevant Control Body.

Decisions to authorise the continued fielding of on-course bookmakers, both at specific venues and more generally, resides with those bodies.

In arriving at any resolutions regarding the viability of bookmakers, control bodies would naturally take into account the views of clubs and other racing participants.

However, more importantly, the resilience of bookmakers to survive in a modern racing industry will rely on the standard of service they offer.

41. Use of CJC Officers as Consultants

Mr SANTORO asked the Minister for Employment and Training and Minister Assisting the Premier on Public Service Matters—

(1) In what official capacity did a consultant with the Fraud And Corruption Prevention Section of the Criminal Justice Commission work in the directorate office of Bremer Institute of TAFE recently?

(2) If this person worked as a consultant, what was the total cost of his consultancy services?

(3) Were other consultants invited to tender for the supply of such services?

(4) At what other colleges/institutes has this officer, or other officers of the Criminal Justice Commission worked as paid consultants?

(5) In each instance, what was the total cost of the consultancy service provided?

(6) Does this work involve a conflict of interest, particularly in any unit where the Criminal Justice Commission is likely to be asked to investigate fraud or corruption?

(7) Who authorised the use of such Criminal Justice Commission consultants in the Department of Employment, Vocational Education, Training and Industrial Relations?

(8) Why is the department's evaluation and strategic audit unit considered to be unable to review financial processes and "make risk management strategies", the tasks undertaken by the Criminal Justice Commission consultant at Bremer Institute?

Answer (Mrs Edmond):

(1) The Official Misconduct Division of the Criminal Justice Commission (CJC) carried out an investigation for official misconduct at the Bremer Institute of TAFE in 1994. This investigatory report recommended that the CJC's Corruption Prevention Division assist the Institute with risk analysis and assessment advice in terms of the requirements of the *Criminal Justice Act* s.29(3)(e).

(2) The CJC's review and advisory services were provided at no cost to TAFE Queensland.

(3) Tenders were not required or applicable as the advisory service is provided at no cost to TAFE.

(4) None.

(5) Nil.

(6) No. Risk management advice is provided at no cost to the agency. The decision to accept and implement any recommendations is the agency's Principal Officer.

(7) Following an official misconduct investigation the CJC offered risk analysis assistance which was accepted by the Director-General.

(8) The CJC's risk management specialists work in close liaison and complement the work of agency internal audit staff. This has occurred at the Bremer Institute of TAFE.

42. Power Grid Distribution Losses

Mr SPRINGBORG asked the Minister for Minerals and Energy—

(1) What are the power grid distribution losses expressed as a percentage for electricity transmitted from each of the generators listed below to each of the destinations also listed below (summer and winter)—

  (a) From Swanbank to Normanton

  (b) From Tarong to Cairns

  (c) From Gladstone to Townsville

  (d) From Callide B to Mackay

  (e) From Stanwell to Rockhampton and

  (f) From Bayswater to (i) Longreach, (ii) Quilpie, (iii) Warwick, (iv) Toowoomba, (v) St George and (vi) Brisbane?

(2) What are the typical power grid distribution losses per 100 kilometres for both summer and winter for (a) 330kv line, (b) 275kv line, (c) 132kv line, (d) 110kv line, (e) 66kv line, (f) 22kv line, (g)11kv line and (h) 415 volt distribution line.

(3) What are the typical power grid distribution losses in the step-down from (a) 275kv to 132kv, (b) 275kv to 110kv, (c) 132kv to 66kv, (d) 66kv to 22kv, (e) 22kv to 415 volt distribution line, (f) 110kv to 11kv and (g) 11kv to 415 volt distribution line?

(4) What are the anticipated power grid distribution losses in the step-down from 330kv ("Eastlink") to 275kv?

Answer (Mr McGrady):

(1) I am advised that in a transmission network with multiple generators at various locations (such as Swanbank, Tarong, Bayswater) and customers at various locations (such as Normanton, Cairns, Brisbane) it is not possible to assign actual network losses to a customer at a particular location because it is not possible to identify which generator supplies that customer.

The concept of point to point transmission implied by the question may be used in an analytical technique to calculate marginal loss factors as a basis for economic dispatch of generators and for recovering the cost of losses from customers.

The customer's marginal loss factor at a particular instant is the power in megawatts (MW) required to be produced by the "marginal" system generator (that is the last generator dispatched) required to supply the last megawatt of customer load.

Marginal loss factors vary with load, time of day, day of week and season of the year. Recovering the cost of losses using marginal loss factors will overcharge (compared with the actual losses) and a method has to be devised to return the overcharge to customers in an equitable way.

I understand that the matter of determining a charging method for losses is presently being examined for the National Electricity Market development. The results of that investigation will be presented through the National Grid Management Council process.

Actual energy loss in the Queensland network is of the order of 11% of customer energy purchases, distributed approximately equally between the transmission and distribution networks.

(2) Losses in transmission lines depend on the conductor size and the load on the line. For typical conductors and assumed load levels and utilisation levels losses are estimated to be as follows:

VOLTAGE KV	LINE LENGTH KM	CONDUCTOR AREA SQ.MM ALUMINIUM	LOAD MVA (NOTE 1)	LOSS LOAD FACTOR (BASED ON TYPICAL LEVEL OF USAGE)	ANNUAL ENERGY LOSS (NOTE 1)(MWH)
330	100	1110	390	0.3	9145
275	100	1274	290	0.3	6096
132	100	1 x 282	50	0.3	4757
110	100	1 x 282	35	0.3	3364
66	100	1 x 206	12	0.3	1629
22	100	1 x 206	1.5	0.3	552
11 (NOTE 2)	10	1 x 206	1.0	0.3	79
0.415 (NOTE 2)	1	1 x 206	0.25	0.3	251

NOTE 1: MVA—Mega volt amperes; MWh—Mega watt hours

NOTE 2: Shorter line lengths have been assumed for 11kV and 415V lines because 100km would be unusually long for 11kV and impractical for 415V.

3. Typical losses in step-down transformers are:

VOLTAGE KV/KV	TRANSFORMER NUMBER X RATING (MVA)	MAXIMUM LOAD MVA	LOSS LOAD FACTOR (BASED ON TYPICAL LEVEL OF USAGE)	ANNUAL LOSS ENERGY
275/132	2 X 200	400	0.3	4500 MWh
275/110	2 X 200	400	0.3	4500 MWh
132/66	2 X 80	160	0.3	1700 MWh
66/22	2 X 10	20	0.3	460 MWh
22/0.415	1 X 0.5	0.5	0.3	21MWh
110/11	2 X 25	50	0.3	1070MWh
11/0.415	1 X 0.5	0.5	0.3	20MWh

4. Losses in stepping-down from 330 to 275kV at the Queensland terminal of Eastlink are estimated to be about 17 000MW hours per year for 500MW maximum power transfer and loss load factor of 0.3.

44. Detoxification Programs for Watch-house Inmates

Mr RADKE asked the Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services—

As drug dependent inmates of watchhouses commence detoxification programs without any apparent form of medical/nursing supervision other than the visitation of the Government Medical Officer, has any consideration been given to providing a designated nursing presence (Sunday to Thursday normal business hours and 24 hours on Friday and Saturday) in the City and Holland Park watchhouses?

Answer (Mr Braddy):

Consideration has been given to this issue. The Health Department recently commissioned Dr Peter Livingstone (former Director-General of Health) to undertake a study in relation to the services provided by Government Medical Officers. This study was to include the provision of such services to watchhouses. The Health Department is currently reviewing Dr Livingstone's report and

recommendations on this issue. Meanwhile, the Operational Procedures Manual for Police clearly spells out the procedures to be adhered to by police to ensure that their duty of care is exercised while meeting their responsibilities in watchhouses.

45. South-East Arterial Traffic Signs; Leisure Unlimited

Mr GRICE asked the Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development—

With reference to Department of Transport tender QDOT 50/94 for supply and installation of twelve variable message traffic signs for the South East Arterial—

(1) Did Queensland Transport undertake any financial review of the successful tenderer, Leisure Unlimited?

(2) If so, did the investigation reveal an overall credit risk score of 6, meaning suppliers should operate only on a C.O.D. basis?

(3) Has Queensland Transport attempted to collect late delivery penalties of $500 per calendar day as provided in the contract with Leisure Unlimited?

(4) Was a sample from Leisure Unlimited tested by Queensland Transport as were those of other tenderers whose samples were tested on 25 May 1994?

(5) Given the credit risk of Leisure Unlimited, and the already two-month delay in delivery of the signs, will he give an assurance of the worth of the ten-year warranty offered by the company?

Answer (Mr Elder):

(1) & (2) A credit assessment was not obtained of any of the tenderers. The contractor has lodged a security deposit of $75,000 as required by the contract.

(3) No late delivery penalties has been collected as the contract is still in progress. Liquidated damages for late delivery are determined after the date for completion is adjusted for any extensions of time successfully claimed by the contractor and the date of completion is final.

(4) The Ferranti Packard 18" character, 2" diameter hybrid flip disc sign display elements offered by Leisure Unlimited were tested on 25 May 1995. The sample supplied by Leisure Unlimited was not used for this test. As the same sign display was offered by a number of tenders only one sample was required to test the visibility of this product.

(5) Should a warranty claim arise Queensland Transport will pursue appropriate remedies considering the strength of the claim and sound commercial practice.

46. Police Resources, Maroochydore

Miss SIMPSON asked the Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services—

With reference to Maroochydore police resources that are being stretched to look after the district watchhouse prisoners and the fact that these prisoners are imprisoned at Maroochydore for up to 60 days without proper facilities—

(1) Will the Government increase police numbers for the Maroochydore area?

(2) Will the Government guarantee that no more prisoners will be held past the 30-day legislated limit in this or other watchhouses?

Answer (Mr Braddy):

(1) The Queensland Police Service is now undertaking a review of police watchhouses throughout the State and this review includes the recommended staff levels at 24 hour watchhouses. Maroochydore watchhouse is included in this review and the issue of staffing levels at Maroochydore is in the process of determination.

(2) It is not possible to give such a guarantee. At the same time, the Police Service and the Corrective Services are doing everything in their power to alleviate the situation of corrective services prisoners being detained for lengthy periods in watchhouses.

47. Termite Barrier

Mr MALONE asked the Minister for Primary Industries and Minister for Racing—

With reference to the demise of Organochlorins as barriers against termites in under-slab constructions and their replacement with an organophosphate known as Chlorpyrifos, which will add great expense and inconvenience to the owner/occupier of the construction, due to its limited lifespan of some six years and the need for drilling and re-treating the slab—

(1) Is he aware of the great economic costs and potential threat to new constructions should the proposal currently before the National Registration Authority, for the hand-spraying of the organophosphate Chlorpyrifos as an under-slab termite barrier, gain approval and be adopted as acceptable practice in Queensland?

(2) If so, does he condone this practice, even though it undoubtedly means future massive costs and displacement in order to maintain the termite barrier, especially when viable alternatives are available?

Answer (Mr Gibbs):

1. The decision to phase out organochlorine insecticides for termite control was taken in 1992 and the time table for the withdrawal re-affirmed at ARMCANZ in April 1994. The building industry has been well aware of the impact that decision would have on the industry.

At present there is a continuing need for chemical treatment despite the introduction of non-chemical methods which are gaining increasing acceptance. I am aware that the National Registration Authority has been considering an application for the hand spraying of the chemical chlorpyrifos for that purpose. Because the expected life of this treatment to control termites will be less than the economic life

of the building, retreatment may be necessary after a number of years.

2. The proposed use of chlorpyrifos will be only one of the options available to the building industry for termite control for new constructions. Although retreatment may be necessary, I do not accept that its use will involve future massive costs as has been suggested. Drilling and retreating the slab should not be necessary. Perimeter treatments may be all that is required.

48. Live Cattle Exports, Karumba

Mr JOHNSON asked the Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development—

With reference to the loss of revenue experienced by Queensland cattlemen because of the lack of necessary infrastructure at the Port of Karumba and to the wealth generated through the Port of Darwin mainly by Queensland cattle filling Northern Territory live export contracts—

(1) What plans does the Government have to upgrade this important facility at Karumba, so that the financial benefits from live cattle exports can be retained in Queensland?

(2) If it is to be upgraded, will the Government fast track this important project and give our cattlemen a better option to access this viable market?

Answer (Mr Elder):

Firstly, let me say that cattlemen have not lost revenue because a lack of necessary infrastructure at the Port of Karumba. As Minister for Business, and now as Transport Minister I have personally been involved in the development of this innovative venture to export live cattle.

As this business has grown and developed this Government has worked hand in hand with the industry to facilitate the further expansion of this venture. Given the projected growth in this industry we are now looking to dredge the Karumba Port to enable larger shipments to leave this port.

In doing this, there are a number of factors to consider including the concerns of the community and the environment. We have taken a cooperative and inclusive approach in facilitating this work.

The initial dredging report will be finalised in October at which time the Ports Corporation of Queensland (PCQ) intends to circulate this report and form a dredging advisory group.

This group will provide a forum for all interests to be represented, and to progress the dredging plan.

PCQ plans to have all follow up studies and a final dredging report, constituting a long term dredging plan for the port of karumba, completed by the end of 1995.

PCQ will then apply all necessary regulatory approvals with the aim of being in a position to commence dredging, subject to all environmental approval, in early 1996.

49. Seagulls Rugby League Team

Mr VEIVERS asked the Deputy Premier, Minister for Tourism, Sport and Youth—

(1) Is he aware of the situation regarding Seagulls Rugby League Team endeavouring to move to Carrara Stadium?

(2) As this move has the support of the Gold Coast City Council and the business community of the Gold Coast and a consortium has already moved to make this happen, will he and the Government support this move so that a senior rugby league football team can compete from the Carrara venue?

(3) What form will that support encompass?

Answer (Mr Burns):

(1) I received a letter from Dr Douglas Daines, Chief Executive Officer, Gold Coast City Council in my office on 14 September 1995 outlining a proposal to develop the Carrara Sporting Complex as a national and regional sporting complex.

Dr Daines also advised that the Council called a Special Meeting of Council on Friday, 15 September 1995 to consider a proposal by a consortium to develop the Sports Complex at a cost of $16 million, with $10 million being provided by the consortium.

The letter from Dr Daines also requested that the Government consider assisting the Council by providing part of the $6 million for the development of Carrara as a national and regional sporting complex to service a wide variety of sports.

The proposal considered by the Council on Friday included the establishment of an Australian Rugby League Team at Carrara, and other sports including rugby union, hockey, baseball and equestrian events.

(2) I have received a formal submission from the Gold Coast City Council and my Department is in the process of determining what type of Government support can be provided for the project.

(3) The Gold Coast City Council will be advised to submit a proposal under the 1996 National Standard Sports Facility Program to enable the project to be assessed by the Government in more detail.

50. Fire and Ambulance Services, Rockhampton

Mr SCHWARTEN asked the Minister for Emergency Services and Minister for Consumer Affairs—

With reference to the purchase of land by both the Fire and Ambulance Services on Yaamba Road in Rockhampton to provide new premises for those services—

(1) What type of facility is to be built?

(2) What services/operations will be housed there?

(3) When does he expect the facility to be constructed?

(4) What is the estimated cost of the project?

Answer (Mr Davies):

(1) Queensland Emergency Services is planning to establish a combined Ambulance and Fire facility at

North Rockhampton which would incorporate a combined Queensland Ambulance Service (QAS) and Queensland Fire Service (QFS) Regional Communications Centre.

(2) QAS is intending to provide a facility that will provide for up to six ambulance vehicles, which would provide both emergency response and non-urgent transport to North Rockhampton and surrounding areas. In addition, the facility will provide back-up for the Yeppoon and Emu Park areas. The QFS facility will incorporate three fire appliance bays.

(3) QFS and QAS have identified the construction of the joint facility at North Rockhampton in the 1996/97 Capital Works Program.

(4) The estimated cost of the joint facility is expected to exceed $1M. Detailed planning and cost analysis is not completed at this stage.

51. Challinor Centre, Ipswich; Institutions for Disabled

Mrs CUNNINGHAM asked the Minister for Family and Community Services and Minister Assisting the Premier on the Status of Women—

With reference to the residents of Challinor who appear to be at risk of relocation and to the parents of profoundly handicapped children in other institutions who have expressed concerns generally that they wish the status quo to remain—

(1) What is the department's position regarding each institution now operating in Queensland?

(2) What contingencies have been put in place?

Answer (Mrs Woodgate):

(1) The Government is committed to reforming Queensland's outdated institutions for people with disabilities.

In February this year Cabinet endorsed the *Queensland Government Policy Statement and Planning Framework for Institutional Reform*. This is a landmark document which details the requirements that must be adhered to ensure that the necessary key community supports are in place before the person leaves an institution.

The *Institutional Reform Policy* in fact sets out three objectives:

> to support residents of institutions to move to community living;
>
> to provide adequate supports for people at present in the community who would otherwise have to move to institutions; and
>
> to provide quality care for those people who continue to live in larger residential arrangements.

This makes the Queensland approach very different to that of other States, which often merely means the closure of institutions, usually with no additional resources or in fact as a cost-cutting exercise.

In May 1994, the Government announced the approval for the 3 year plan to relocate residents of Challinor Centre, at Ipswich.

At this stage, the Government has made specific decisions to close five Centres for people with disabilities. In addition to the Challinor Centre, these are Basil Stafford Centre at Wacol, Maryborough Disabled Persons Ward, Leslie Wilson Home, Hervey Bay and W.R. Black Home.

The *Queensland Government Policy Statement and Planning Framework* for Institutional Reform does not mean that all institutions will close, but provides a safeguard and framework to ensure that approved reform activities such as those mentioned previously will occur in a well planned and managed way, and where there are sufficient resources.

(2) It should be noted that as yet there has been no relocation of any residents from any of my Departments institutions under the current process of institutional reform. I am committed to ensuring that the key community supports which people will need will be available before any persons relocate. The *Planning Framework* calls for individualised planning in consultation with the person with the disability, their families, friends and advocates to determine the community based services which best suit their needs.

In relation to the concerns of parents of children with severe support needs, the W R Black reform process is recognised as a particularly innovative project, with a large number of the children supported to move to family based care—a much preferred option to institutional care for children.

The various projects to date have all seen additional resources approved, increasing expenditure to in excess of $140 million over the next three years.

These additional resources are to ensure the provision of specific support services for individuals. For example, in relation to the Challinor and Basil Stafford Centre reform projects, packages of supports for individuals will include case management, behaviour intervention, family support, independent representation, and an emergency response strategy.

The process of providing financial support to agencies to provide the range of support services to individuals has also been individualised, enabling individuals to move location or service provider should their current situation not be providing the best outcomes for individuals.

The support provided to individuals will also be reviewed regularly, with the Case Manager having a particular role in relation to monitoring the quality of services provided to individuals not only at the point they leave the institution but to ensure the services adapt to the individual's needs throughout their lifetime.

My Department has made substantial progress in setting up the range of services required and will continue to work with other State Government Departments and the community to ensure the success of institutional reform in Queensland.

The reform projects in Queensland are seen as innovative programs in that there is a whole of government approach being taken to the reform with the departments involved linking very closely to ensure effective coordination of supports for people in the community.

52. Sporting Facilities, Sunshine Coast

Miss SIMPSON asked the Deputy Premier, Minister for Tourism, Sport and Youth—

How much has the State Government spent on sporting facilities in capital grants on the Sunshine Coast, listing the individual amounts awarded to recipients on a yearly basis since 1989?

Answer (Mr Burns):

(1) $1,115,986

(2) 106 projects have received funding:

1989/90			
$1,800	$1,000	$1,600	$3,400
$1,700.00	$1,100.00	$ 446.00	$3,200.00
$4,920.00	$ 240.00	$ 877.00	$ 644.00
$4,370.00	$4,841.00	$ 890.00	$1,060.00
$3,000.00	$26,242.00	$1,920.00	$1,336.00
$3,400.00	$8,093.00	$16,000.00	$3,500.00
$1,500.00	$2,120.00	$ 884.00	$4,400.00
$40,000.00	$ 714.00	$1,156.00	$2,936.00
$12,000.00	$3,000.00		
Total		$164,289.00	
1990/91			
$3,948.00	$3,000.00	$18,400.00	$1,120.00
$13,000.00	$ 388.00	$1,200.00	$ 528.00
$29,000.00	$14,000.00	$24,000.00	$8,287.00
$10,118.00	$1,200.00	$3,000.00	$24,880.00
$16,192.00	$2,500.00	$1,000.00	$20,000.00
$1,984.00	$ 593.00	$20.700.00	$2,739.00
Total		$221,777.00	
1991/92			
$ 980.00	$ 220.00	$ 160.00	$11,200.00
$ 300.00	$ 336.00	$1,800.00	$4,118.00
$ 120.00	$3,300.00	$ 825.00	$ 324.00
$ 440.00	$12,935.00	$20,000.00	$ 180.00
$ 400.00	$13,936.00	$1,260.00	$3,429.00
$ 500.00	$4,000.00	$32,000.00	$18,400.00
Total		$131,163.00	
1993			
$2,700.00	$1,516.00	$10,562.00	$5,000.00
$ 308.00	$1,708.00	$100,000.00	$71,858.00
$ 213.00	$2,040.00	$1,090.00	$4,980.00
Total		$201,975.00	
1994			
$4,975.00	$90,000.00	$6,982.00	$49,500.00
$36,384.00	$6,750.00	$20.941.00	$4,000.00
$60,000.00	$75,000.00	$20,000.00	$22,250.00
Total		$396,782	

53. Queensland Rail Workshops, Staffing

Mr JOHNSON asked the Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development—

(!) How many employees are currently employed by Queensland Rail in its workshops throughout the State and what are the respective numbers in each workshop?

(2) What does Queensland Rail envisage will be the cuts in this area over the next 12 months?

Answer (Mr Elder):

1. As at 3 September 1995, a total of 1905 staff were employed within the Queensland Rail Workshops Group, the distribution of staff throughout the state are as follows:

Ipswich	724
Redbank	333
Rockhampton	529
Townsville	262
Banyo	57
	1905

2. At present I am currently undertaking a review of all workshop activity in the Queensland Rail workshops. I am undertaking on site visits, meeting with staff, unions and management.

No employees will be sacked or forced to relocate.

54. Senior Management Positions, TAFE Colleges

Mr ELLIOTT asked the Minister for Employment and Training and Minister Assisting the Premier on Public Service Matters—

(1) How many senior management positions in Queensland TAFE colleges and regional departmental offices continue to be filled by managers in an acting capacity?

(2) Why have some of these positions been 'acting' positions for many months and what impact has this situation had on the level of morale and on the consistency of decision making within the TAFE system?

Answer (Mrs Edmond):

(1) 6 out of 19 Institute and State Office Directors are holding positions in an acting capacity. These 6 Institute Director positions have been advertised.

(2) The restructuring of TAFE Queensland has resulted in the amalgamation of 33 colleges into 16 Institutes of TAFE. State Office has also been restructured to form 3 Directorates.

The Institute model was established to enable TAFE Queensland to adapt to the competitive training marketplace and to meet the changing needs of business and industry. Improvements in resource use will facilitate cost savings to create extra student places, new courses and better long-term facilities development planning.

TAFE Queensland staff at all levels are facing organisational change as a result of the National Training Reform Agenda and the need to effect workplace reform. The restructuring of the College/Institute network, as part of this reform process, has meant that some staff have experienced uncertainty. This experience and the reaction of staff is no different from employees elsewhere in Australia in both public and private sectors faced with organisational change. TAFE Qld has put in place a number of strategies to assist staff cope with workplace change. Senior Management is involved in all decisions affecting the TAFE system thus ensuring consistency.

55. Townsville TAFE College

Mr STONEMAN asked the Minister for Employment and Training and Minister Assisting the Premier on Public Service Matters—

With reference to the Management Review of Townsville College of TAFE, 29 March-2 April 1993 and as the review team, comprised of the three most senior members of the Department's evaluation and strategic audit unit, indicated in the very first sentence of their report "that financial control had been inadequate at the college for at least the last two financial years"—

(1) Were the members of the review team asked to explain why their unit had failed to act to rectify this situation, particularly as their report indicates, in the same first sentence, that departmental records had indicated this inadequacy in financial control?

(2) Were the same senior officers asked to explain why similar problems were able to continue for considerable lengths of time at a number of other colleges (eg at Ipswich from 1989 onwards) despite repeated detrimental reports from the Auditor-General?

(3) As the review team was trenchant in their criticism of a former Director of Townsville College (a) was that director promoted, despite what the report refers to as his inappropriate "risky" management style and lack of financial expertise, to a position requiring even higher levels of team leadership, managerial skills and budgetary expertise, (b) who were the members of the selection panel which promoted him and (c) in view of this report, have they been asked to account for their decision?

(4) Were the interview panels who promoted individuals who lacked relevant financial management skills, according to this report, into the top financial management positions at Townsville, ever asked to account for their actions?

(5) In other colleges/institutes where financial mismanagement has been cited by the Auditor-General, has any selection panel responsible for selecting officers for promotion into senior financial management positions, ever been held accountable for their decision?

(6) If so, will she detail the selection exercises involved?

Answer (Mrs Edmond):

(1) The Review Team's recommendations, which included (i) the development of prerequisite financial information required by the College Executive to provide relevant and timely data, and (ii) monitoring of the College's financial performance by the Regional Director with monthly reports to the Executive Director, TAFE Queensland, were accepted and implemented as a matter of urgency.

(2) I am advised that, in all instances, decisive and ongoing corrective action has been implemented at State Office and College levels as soon as the Queensland Audit Office reports were presented to the Director-General. In the First Report of the Auditor General on audits performed for the Financial Year ended 30 June 1993, the Auditor-General, commenting of the actions taken by the Department was quoted as stating that:

> "The prompt and comprehensive manner in which the Director-General has responded to the audit issues, many of which I consider are of a serious nature, is acknowledged."

(3) The then Director of the Townsville College of TAFE, was promoted on 6 February 1992. The Management Review of Townsville College of TAFE was undertaken 29 March 1993—2 April 1993.

As a result, the two events are not linked and the question is therefore not relevant.

(4 to 6) The role of the Interview Panel in the recruitment process is to nominate persons on the basis of their satisfaction of key selection criteria contained in the Position Description and their respective skills, experience and merit in comparison to other applicants.

The responsibility for ensuring the effectiveness of persons appointed to positions involving Institute financial management resides with the Director of the Institute concerned. An officer's performance is monitored through the application of various Public Sector Management Standards, including Performance Planning and Review, Training and Development, and Diminished Work Performance.

56. Bremer Institute of TAFE; Skillshare, Ipswich

Mr TURNER asked the Minister for Employment and Training and Minister Assisting the Premier on Public Service Matters—

Have any agreements been entered into between the senior management and/or the Institute Council of the Bremer Institute of TAFE and Ipswich Skillshare/YUPI during the term of the current Institute Director and will she table copies of all the agreements which may have been signed?

Answer (Mrs Edmond):

The Institute Administrator has entered into three Memorandums of Agreement with the YUPI Organisation in Ipswich and I am happy to table each of these documents.

Benefits to TAFE Queensland and the community include:

1. Income generation to The Bremer Institute of TAFE of $385,339.00 received from training programs conducted as part of the strategic alliance.

2. Graduation of students from 22 Work Options courses for which the strategic alliance holds a standing offer agreement with DEET.

3. The current placement of 208 people who were looking for work into programs funded by New Work Opportunities within the Working Nation Initiative of the Commonwealth Government.

57. TAFE Staff Redundancies

Mr GRICE asked the Minister for Employment and Training and Minister Assisting the Premier on Public Service Matters—

With reference to the redundancies policy of Queensland TAFE—

Will she arrange for a completely independent survey of all TAFE staff who have been made redundant during the past three years to determine (a) whether any staff were coerced into signing the documents for "voluntary" early retirement, (b) how many "redundant" staff subsequently noticed their former positions being readvertised and filled and (c) the number of "redundant" staff whose "redundancy" followed their lodgement of PSMC appeals or grievances?

Answer (Mrs Edmond):

The Department is not aware of any staff members who have been coerced into signing voluntary early retirement documents and has received no grievances from any staff member in this regard. I am not prepared to authorise an independent survey in these circumstances.

I am advised that a small number of positions have been advertised subsequent to VER offers being made and accepted in the same area. In these cases, the persons made the VER offers no longer possessed the skills needed to meet the profile needs of the Institute concerned. These positions have been filled by officers whose skills are more appropriate to the current and future needs of the organisation.

Departmental records show that there were three (3) people who lodged stage 3 grievances who were subsequently offered VERs. In two cases, the grievances were lodged two (2) years prior to the offer of VERs and the grievances had no relationship to the VERs.

In the third case, the grievance related to TAFE Queensland's initial reluctance to offer a VER, believing that the person fell outside the scope of the employment categories endorsed by the PSMC as part of the process of realigning the staffing mix required to deliver the TAFE Queensland training profile. This situation was later clarified and a VER offered.

Additionally there was one person who lodged a number of appointment appeals with the PSMC who was subsequently offered a VER. This person however was in a classification of officers where the skills were no longer appropriate to the needs of the organisation.

58. Public Housing, Cairns

Ms WARWICK asked the Minister for Housing, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Rural Communities, Minister for Rural Communities and Minister for Provision of Infrastructure for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Communities—

With reference to the proposed construction of public housing at 7 and 9 Le Grande Street, Freshwater, Cairns—

(1) What does he propose to do with these sites?

(2) Are units, townhouses, detached houses or other structures going to be built on these sites?

(3) If so, how many on each block?

(4) How many will be (a) rental, (b) purchase and (c) rental purchase?

(5) What is the proposed completion date?

(6) When will tenders be (a) advertised or (b) let?

(7) What is the likely cost of each of these buildings?

(8) If this public housing construction proceeds, what community facilities will be provided?

(9) What contributions will be made to the local council?

Answer (Mr Mackenroth):

The project at Le Grande Street is included in the 1995/96 Capital Works Program for construction of additional public rental accommodation to meet the strong housing demand in Cairns.

The sites at 7 and 9 Le Grande Street can be amalgamated into one parcel of land or treated as two separate sites. The decision on this matter has not yet been taken. Apartments will be constructed on the site if it is developed as one parcel of land. If the project is managed as two separate sites, then a combination of seniors units and apartments will be constructed.

If the land is developed as one site, it will be possible to construct up to 13 x 1 bedroom apartments. If it is developed as two sites, it will be possible to construct 6 x 1 bedroom seniors units and 6 x 2 bedroom apartments.

The accommodation would be provided as additional public rental stock.

At this stage, it is intended that the dwellings would be available for occupation in late 1996 or early 1997.

Tenders should be advertised by mid-January 1996 and a contract should be let in March 1996.

The estimated cost of dwellings under the two possible development options are:-

(a) 13 x 1 bedroom apartments—$65,000 per unit; and

(b) 6 x 2 bedroom apartments—$88,000 per unit and 6 x 1 bedroom senior units—$65,000 per unit.

8. It is likely that a small gazebo and possibly a barbecue will be incorporated to provide a community facility for the tenants.

9. Headworks charges and drainage fees will be paid to Cairns City Council.

59. Mingela Range Highway

Mr MITCHELL asked the Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development—

WIth reference to the $8.9m for reconstruction and replacement of the existing narrow and winding highway over the Mingela Range—

Due to the increased heavy vehicle traffic on this highway and the regular accidents on this section, will he give an indication if this project may be fast tracked to 1996 instead of the proposed work set down for 1997?

Answer (Mr Elder):

The proposed project extends from the Haughton River to the top of the Mingela Range, a distance of 7.3 km.

The accident history on this road from 1984 to 1995 reveals 3 fatalities out of a total of 39 reported accidents.

The traffic volumes on this section of road show a consistent 2% growth for the last 5 years with 1200 vehicles per day travelling the Mingela Range with 17% commercial for this region and does not add extra pressure to the road system at these low volumes.

The currently approved Road Implementation Program schedules the reconstruction of this section of road in the period October 1996 to December 1997. The acceleration of the works earlier than this is not possible due to the lead time required to complete the design of the project, call tenders and award the contract.

60. Poisons Hotline

Mr MALONE asked the Minister for Health—

With reference to a recent incident when a constituent was placed on hold for 10 minutes when contacting the Poisons Hot Line in an emergency situation and as this delay could have caused a fatality—

(1) Will he investigate this matter to ascertain if callers are regularly being placed on hold?

(2) Will he ensure that these time delays are minimised?

Answer (Mr Beattie):

(1) The matter has been investigated. The Poisons Hotline receives approximately 25,000 calls per year and of these some 8,000 are automatically diverted to the Accident and Emergency Department when the Hotline number is engaged.

I understand the process of dealing with calls to the Poisons Hotline varies at different times of the day. During daytime hours the Poisons Hotline is attended by staff of the Royal Children's Hospital. These staff also have other patient/client responsibilities. When received incoming calls are prioritised to ensure that all critical calls are addressed immediately. Some less critical calls can be placed on hold for several minutes until staff become available to attend to the caller. In the evening calls are automatically diverted to the Accident and Emergency Department.

In either situation I am advised, it is extremely rare that a call would not be responded to for 10 minutes.

Some callers also ring the Casualty Department direct rather than go through the Poisons Centre Hotline. This practice is not actively encouraged as it compounds the already heavy workload of the Accident and Emergency Departments.

Some calls overnight are transferred to the NSW Poisons Centre which operates a 24 Hour Service. Queensland Health pays for this service provided by the NSW Poisons Centre and my Department liaises regularly with the NSW Poisons Centre to ensure that quality client service is provided to Queensland callers.

If Mr Malone could provide some further information on time and day of the call involved then the particular case could be investigated more fully.

(2) While there will be occasions when calls will be put on hold for short periods, I understand every effort is made to ensure that the delays are minimal, in keeping with the emergency nature of the Hotline service.

61. South East Freeway Noise Barriers

Mr RADKE asked the Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development—

What is the progress of the Noise Barrier Program along the South East Freeway, particularly the area from Marshall Road to Gaza Road?

Answer (Mr Elder):

The Noise Barrier Scheme for this section of the South East Freeway is being prepared and a display board indicating the alignment of the noise barriers has been completed and will be available for public comment.

Public consultation will take place prior to the calling of any contract in order to assess the residents' response to the proposal.

This public consultation process will include letter box drops and public meetings, as required.

It is anticipated that the full public consultation process will be finalised by the end of this calendar year, and tenders for the construction of these barriers will be called in early 1996.

63. Workers' Compensation

Mr CONNOR asked the Minister for Employment and Training and Minister Assisting the Premier on Public Service Matters—

(1) Will she detail the associated rates of workers' compensation premiums each department pays, including the breakdown according to employment description?

(2) What is the total premium each department pays, broken down by division?

(3) When will it be payable?

Answer (Mrs Edmond):

I table Attachment 1 which contains details of Government Departments with new workers' compensation policies effective from 1 July 1995, including premiums and premium rates. The employment description is not used in the premium rate calculation as premiums are calculated on previous claims history.

The State Actuary was consulted in the assessment process.

The majority of Departments have applied for one workers' compensation policy only to cover the liability of all divisions of those Departments.

As this cover commences from 1 July 1995 the premium calculated is a provisional premium and these have all been paid.

I table Attachment 2 which lists the Departments and Divisions of Departments which had policies prior to July 1995. Premium notices are currently being issued to renew these policies to 30 June 1996.

64. Regional Health Authorities

Mr HORAN asked the Minister for Health—

(1) What are the responsibilities and guidelines for regional directors in the offering of payment of cash settlements to people or relatives with claims against a hospital or health authority.

(2) What financial limits apply to any amounts able to be offered by the regional directors?

Answer (Mr Beattie):

(1) Offers of payment of cash settlements to persons with claims against a Regional Health Authority are made on the basis of legal advice supporting the making of such offers and in accordance with the requirements of relevant instruments of financial delegation and the *Financial Delegations (Expenditure, Losses and Special Payments) Policies and Guidelines.*

(2) Under existing Special Payments delegations, Regional Directors have authority to approve the making of "special payments" (which include the payment of money under a settlement) of up to $500,000.

65. Gordonvale State High School

Mrs WILSON asked the Minister for Education—

(1) When will work commence on the manual arts facility at the Gordonvale State High School?

(2) When is it anticipated that it will be completed?

Answer (Mr Hamill):

Site acquisition procedures are currently underway involving a prefered site for the Gordonvale State High School manual arts block. A schematic design will then be completed and due processes of consultation, planning and tendering will follow.

Construction of the facility is expected to commence on 19 February 1996 and to be completed by 24 June 1996.

66. South Coast Motorway

Mr HEGARTY asked the Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development—

(1) How many properties have been paid for by the Department of Transport along the entire proposed South Coast Motorway route?

(2) How many properties have been bought by the department but have yet to be settled?

(3) How many properties are presently under negotiation?

(4) How many property owners received letters from the department saying it was interested in purchasing?

(5) Of those initial recipients who received letters of intent who have not commenced negotiations, what time frame has been set for the finalisation of the offer?

(6) How much money has already been paid out?

Answer (Mr Elder):

1. 55 properties have been paid for from 52 owners, including 4 properties where acquisition has been by proclamation.

2. 9 properties from 9 owners.

3. 54 properties, including 34 involving partial acquisitions by proclamation.

4. A total of 155 property owners received letters inviting commencement of negotiations.

5. Landowners who have received letters of intent but where negotiations have not commenced will be contacted by my Department regarding the present and future status of their cases.

6. A total of $28,673,080 has been paid out in property acquisitions.

67. South Coast Motorway

Mr CARROLL asked the Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development—

With reference to negotiations by Queensland Transport to purchase various properties either in the path of, or necessary for depots to be used in the construction of, the proposed South Coast motorway—

(1) On how many properties has the sale been completed?

(2) Of those acquisitions settled, how many were unconditional contracts as at 15 July and were then completed between 17 July and the date of his response?

(3) Of those acquisitions settled, how many were still “subject to Ministerial approval”, “subject to finance approval”, or “subject to ...” other conditions, though had an agreed price specified as at 15 July and were then completed between 17 July and the date of his response?

(4) How many of those proposed acquisitions, where negotiations had reached agreement on price and all other conditions, remain ready to settle, but uncompleted?

Answer (Mr Elder):

1. Property sales have been completed on 55 properties (52 owners), including 4 properties that were totally or partially resumed by proclamation.

2. There was one acquisition completed between 17 July and the date of my response of August 2, 1995, when the promise was made that the 26 property transactions held in abeyance would proceed to finalisation.

3. Of the acquisitions settled, one had an agreed price at July 15, subject to Financial Approval, and completed between July 17 and August 2, 1995, the date of my response.

4. For the acquisitions that were the subject of my response of 2 August 1995, all are now completed.

For all subsequent acquisitions, 9 have reached agreement on price but are still to be completed.

68. RZ Mines; Sandmining, Capricorn Coast

Mr LESTER asked the Minister for Environment and Heritage—

(1) Did RZ Mines (Nisshoi Iwai) meet with representatives of Department of Environment and Heritage, Livingstone Shire engineers and the Lands Department in Central Queensland on Monday 11 September 1995?

(2) What was the purpose of this meeting, when the Environmental Impact Study is not expected to be completed until at least the end of 1996 and 96 per cent of the Capricorn Coast population do not want sandmining in their area?

Answer (Mr Barton):

(1) Yes, RZ Mines met with the planning steering committee of the Byfield Coastal Advisory Group (BCAG). The members of the Byfield Coastal Advisory Group are the Department of Environment and Heritage, Department of Lands, the Livingstone Shire Council, the Department of Minerals and Energy, the Department of Primary Industries and the Commonwealth Department of Defence.

(2) In July 1995, the Byfield Coastal Advisory Group initiated a formal process for the development of an interim management plan for the Byfield coastal area. The primary objective of this interim management plan is to propose, under current tenure restrictions and authorisations, strategies and actions that will improve the management of recreation, conservation and development in the Byfield coastal area. The strategies and actions will form a coordinated whole of government approach to the area's management until issues such as sandmining and native title rights are resolved through due process. The planning process has a strong element of community involvement and a number of public groups, companies and agencies were invited to address the planning steering committee for the interim management plan to express their view and interests. These groups include Queensland Association of 4-Wheel Drive Clubs Incorporated, Stockyard Point Progress Association, Byfield Resident Action Group, Capricorn Conservation Council, Wildlife Preservation Society of Queensland (Capricorn Branch), Darumbal Noolar Murri Corporation, Capricorn Sunfish, Keppel Island Lifestyle Aboriginal Corporation, Capricorn Tourism and Development Organisation, Capricorn Coast Tourist Organisation, National Parks Association of Queensland, Queensland Commercial Fishermen's Organisation, Capricorn Bushwalking Club, State and Federal parliamentary members, as well as RZ Mines Pty Ltd and Mineral Deposits Ltd. Most of these groups have responded to the request and have made presentations to the Steering Committee.

69. Southbank Institute of TAFE

Mr SANTORO asked the Minister for Employment and Training and Minister Assisting the Premier on Public Service Matters—

(1) What practical, measurable, corrective procedures has the senior management of the department put in place to address the following serious issues arising from the survey of more than 5,000 students of Southbank Institute of TAFE in March; (a) less than half of respondents were satisfied with the efficiency of institute administrative procedures; (b) six percent of students (344 respondents) indicated concern with harassment; (c) aspects of safety (information, standards, enforcement) were of concern to many respondents; (d) international students were the group least satisfied with the education and training they were receiving and (e) students had little knowledge of essential services such as counselling and job placement?

(2) At what other institutes has this survey (or a similar survey) been administered?

(3) Will she table in this House the findings of such surveys?

Answer (Mrs Edmond):

(1) The Honourable Member has misinterpreted the results of the survey as 69% of students did not disagree that the campus administration procedures were inefficient.

Despite the Member's inaccurate information, the Director has provided the following details which indicates that considerable progress has been made in decentralising administration functions into faculties where 92% of students were satisfied as demonstrated in the same survey.

The Southbank Institute of TAFE has responded to information gained through the Student Services Survey in March 1995 by:

(a) decentralising administrative procedures to educational faculties. This has reduced dissatisfaction to 9%;

introducing enrolments by mail;

installing a new integrated telephone and data communication system; and

providing staff development programs for staff in key areas, including financial management, administration procedures, audit review, and human resource management.

(b) Forming the Institute Student Association which is addressing the issue of harassment;

providing the services of four full-time and two part-time student counsellors; and

inviting student representation on all decision-making bodies.

(c) Providing safety information, including Workplace Health and Safety information, through Student Information Kits, student diaries, drills and inductions, and classroom instruction.

(d) Convening a Working Party to assess and improve service to international students;

In addition an International Students Support Officer is based at South Brisbane; and an International Student Counsellor is located at Annerley and

(e) approximately 94% of students enrolled at the Institute are part-time and employed, and do not use these services.

(2) This survey has not been administered at any other Institute, however next month thousands of TAFE Queensland students and staff will be

surveyed to provide feedback for the improvement of services that Institutes are providing to almost 400,000 people across Queensland.

(3) I am pleased to table the findings of the Southbank Institute survey.

70. Southbank Institute of TAFE

Mr STEPHAN asked the Minister for Employment and Training and Minister Assisting the Premier on Public Service Matters—

(1) With reference to the Southbank Institute staff survey and particularly to the general findings that (a) staff do not believe the institute's structure is conducive to an efficient system of operations; (b) staff do not feel the institute rewards people for contributing to the institute's goals and mission; (c) staff do not believe that resources are allocated adequately, or in a timely manner to those who require them and (d) to the most disturbing staff responses to survey categories 7, 8, 15, 16, 23, 26, 26, 47-60, 52 and 60, in what specific ways does she intend to modify the management and structure of TAFE institutes if it is found that the results of the survey of staff at Southbank institute are replicated at other institutes?

(2) What specific steps have been put in place to address the problems identified by this survey at Southbank?

(3) Who are the officers responsible for measuring improvement in diagnosed problem areas?

(4) Will she table their progress reports as they are received?

Answer (Mrs Edmond):

1. The results of the Southbank Institute staff survey will provide a source of information for the ongoing management of the Southbank Institute. The organisational structure was approved following consultation with staff and community members and has been promulgated and discussed throughout the Institute. Minor adjustments are made to the structure on an ongoing basis to address operational needs. The survey was implemented to allow staff in management, teaching and support to express their views and perceptions of operating conditions within the Institute and background information was also sought from each respondent to enable the data to be analysed for each Faculty as well as for the various groupings and roles performed in the Institute. The management and structure of TAFE Institutes are designed to meet the needs of each Institute, and each will be adjusted if there is a demonstrated need.

2. Results from analysis of the survey data have been forwarded to each senior manager for the development and implementation of appropriate corrective strategies prior to the next survey period. The results will be used as the 1994 benchmark against which improvement in performance may be compared.

3. The Institute Director, Finance Director, Business Services Director, Education Services Director, and Human Resource Management Director are the officers responsible for monitoring the effectiveness of the strategies implemented.

4. Southbank Institute plans to undertake the survey annually as part of the process of developing the Institute, and in each case the results will be made public.

71. Fire and Ambulance Services, Toowoomba

Mr LITTLEPROUD asked the Minister for Emergency Services and Minister for Consumer Affairs—

With reference to the opening of a joint communications centre for the QAS and the QFS in Toowoomba by the Honourable Tom Burns just prior to the July State election and as the QFS communications centre is still operating from the fire station—

(1) Is he aware that the professional opinion of firemen is that the best, safest option is to have a communications base located at a fire station?

(2) Is he aware that the new joint communications centre is to be replaced within four years?

(3) Will he reconsider this administrative decision in view of the advice of local firemen?

Answer (Mr Davies):

(1) Yes I am aware that it is the opinion of some of the firefighters from Toowoomba that the communications centre should not be moved from its current location at the Toowoomba Fire Station, Kitchener Street. However, since 1974 the Anzac Avenue Fire Station has been turned out by the existing communications centre at Kitchener Street (4.3 kilometres away) and there has never been any problems with communications. The new joint QAS/QFS Communications centre is located one kilometre from Kitchener Street Station and 3.3 kilometres from the Anzac Avenue Station. A contemporary communications system will be installed in the new communications centre providing a more efficient and effective turnout system.

Experience in other parts of the State has shown that firefighters have the same initial concerns, but that these disappear with experience under the new system.

(2) There are no plans to replace the new joint communications centre within any particular time period. The performance of the new centre will be monitored and any necessary changes made to enhance efficiency.

(3) The decision to move the communications centre to the new joint facility at the Toowoomba Ambulance Centre is currently not being reconsidered, as this type of system has been proven to work very effectively in Brisbane, North Coast and the South Coast regions.

72. Alleged Telephone Tapping by Corrective Services Commission

Mr COOPER asked the Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services—

With reference to an allegation in *The Weekend Independent* of 8 September which links the

Corrective Services Commission Internal Investigation Unit to the tapping of the unlisted home telephone of a journalist on that newspaper—

(1) Is he absolutely confident that this unit has not tapped this telephone as alleged; if so, what is the basis of his confidence?

(2) Will he guarantee that the Criminal Justice Commission investigation into this allegation, an investigation confirmed in writing to me by the Acting Chairperson, Mr L F Wyvill QC, will not be hampered in any way by the Government's continuing refusal to make the Corrective Services Commission accountable to that body?

Answer (Mr Braddy):

(1) The Member for Crows Nest question is again based on a false premise. The article referred to in the question raises allegations against the Corrective Services Investigation Unit (CSIU), an independent unit of the Queensland Police Service, not the Corrective Services Commission Internal Investigation Unit. The CSIU advise me the unit has never been involved in any investigation concerning *The Weekend Independent* or any of its journalists. In addition at present there is no legislation empowering officers of the Queensland Police Service to obtain warrants to perform telephone interceptions. Investigations requiring telephone interceptions rely on liaison with other law enforcement agencies such as the Australian Federal Police, National Crime Authority or the Criminal Justice Commission whereby a joint investigation is conducted utilising the various powers vested in each organisation. Warrants are issued by Supreme Court Justices and would only be issued in relation to criminal offences, mostly in relation to major or organised crime. The CSIU has not made an application through any Federal agency or the Supreme Court for assistance in the use of telephone interceptions for any investigations. The allegations include that the journalist referred to in the question was given a copy of a 'telephone traffic operation sheet' listing her name and silent phone number, other telephone lines with names and details of dates, and times and recordings made of incoming and outgoing calls. This document is alleged to carry the notation 'auth.QPS.933.'. The document is alleged to have originated from Telstra's Head Office for the period Monday 28 August 1995 to Thursday 31 August 1995. Telstra have informed the CSIU that the term 'telephone traffic operations sheet' is not a term used by Telstra for any official correspondence. Additionally, the reference number 'auth.QPS.933' has no meaning for either the CSIU or the Telstra Liaison Officer. Current CSIU records indicate that there have been no requests for call charge records relating to any telephone numbers for August or September 1995. In addition, Telstra advise that call charge sheets show STD calls and not local calls as allegedly is the case in this document.

(2) The Member for Crows Nest apparently still does not understand that the Corrective Services Investigation Unit is a unit of the Queensland Police Service, and as such, falls fully under the jurisdiction of the Criminal Justice Commission.

73. State Government Environmental Policy

Mr SLACK asked the Minister for Environment and Heritage—

With reference to the Environmental Commitments sought from the Goss Government submitted by the Australian Conservation Foundation, Australian Marine Conservation Society, Australian Rainforest Conservation Society, Queensland Conservation Council, The Wilderness Society, Threatened Species Network (Qld) and the Wildlife Preservation Society of Queensland and which was provided as the ALP election policy—

(1) Did officers from the Environment and Heritage Department play a part in the preparation of the response; if so, which officers were involved?

(2) Did Australian Rainforest Conservation Society director, Aila Keto contribute to the response; if so, what was her contribution and in what capacity did she make the contribution?

(3) Did any other officials from the above organisations contribute; if so, what was the nature of their contribution?

(4) Do or have any of the officials of the above organisations hold or held consultancy or other positions with any unit of government; if so, would he provide details of the positions?

Answer (Mr Barton):

(1) In relation to questions 1, 2, 3, 4, I can understand the disappointment and frustration on the part of the Honourable Member for Burnett at the conservation movement's unwillingness to support the coalition in the election campaign. If the Honourable the Member wants more details on why this was so he is best advised to consult the conservation movement directly.

74. Pilchard Netting

Mr LAMING asked the Minister for Primary Industries and Minister for Racing—

Will he assure this House that before any licence is granted for the purse seine netting of pilchards in Queensland, a full resource and environmental impact study is completed and all relevant community groups such as recreational and game fishermen and the general public are consulted and their views taken into consideration?

Answer (Mr Gibbs):

1. Applications to undertake exploratory or developmental fishing such as fishing for pilchards are made under the new *Fisheries Act 1994* introduced by the government earlier this year. Under the Act, applications are to be made to the Queensland Fisheries Management Authority (QFMA).

Applications are subject to the provisions of a policy on exploratory and developmental fisheries which has been approved recently by QFMA.

That policy provides for applications to be considered in a framework involving the use of an Information Paper about the known status of the fish stock to be targeted. It adopts the recently

introduced consultative scheme of Management and Zonal Advisory Committees as the primary source of advice and consultation about proposals lodged.

2. An Information Paper referring to the application for a Developmental Fishing Permit for Pilchards has been prepared and circulated to the Management Advisory committee for subtropical fin fishes (Sub Tropical FINMAC) and to zonal advisory committees for areas from the Queensland/NSW border to Bustard Head (north of Bundaberg). All stakeholder interests are present on these committees. These include direct fishing interests, aboriginal, conservation, local government, tourism amongst many others.

The application will only be considered by the QFMA once the advice from all those sources has been received.

75. Bird Breeders' Licences

Mr HEALY asked the Minister for Environment and Heritage—

With reference to his department's Recreational Wildlife Licence for the keeping of native Australian birds—

(1) What is the current fee for an Aviculturist keeping a variety of single species native birds, ie one bird of each species for non-breeding purposes, given that the variety may include species such as a Red Tailed Black Cockatoo and a Major Mitchell Cockatoo?

(2) What is the current licence fee for the keeping of more than one bird of the same species, such as the Red Tailed Black Cockatoo or Major Mitchell Cockatoo for non-breeding purposes?

Answer (Mr Barton):

Schedule 12 of the *Nature Conservation Regulation 1994* sets out the full range of birds classified as restricted wildlife, which because of the wild status of those species are likely to be threatened by widespread trade and keeping, and therefore, while keeping is not precluded, require an aviculturist to be the holder of a Recreational Wildlife (Specialist) Licence which costs $150 per year plus a $30 charge per bird for once-off DNA sampling and a microchip implant. The Red Tailed Black Cockatoo and the Major Mitchell Cockatoo are two examples of those species listed in Schedule 12.

Recognising the special case of birds such as the Red Tailed Black Cockatoos and Major Mitchell Cockatoos which have long been kept as family pets, a number of options are available for the owners of these birds:

1. If a person keeps one or two birds as pets only (that is they do not breed), and they were formerly the holder of an E Class Licence under the *Fauna Conservation Act 1974,* then an annual 'permit to keep' will apply at a cost of $30.00 (previously $22.00), with a once off charge of $30.00 per bird for DNA sampling and a microchip implant;

2. If a person keeps one or two birds as pets only (that is they do not breed), and they were obtained as sick, injured or orphaned wildlife, or the birds have been family pets for a long time, then a permit to keep will be issued without fee, with a once off charge of $30.00 per bird for DNA sampling and a microchip implant; or

3. If a person keeps more than two Red Tailed Black Cockatoos or Major Mitchell Cockatoos or breeds and sells birds on Schedule 12, then they must hold the standard Recreational Wildlife (Specialist) Licence at a cost of $150.00.

76. Board of Architects

Dr WATSON asked the Minister for Administrative Services—

With reference to the House of Representatives' Standing Committee on Community Affairs which established, in December 1994, an inquiry into migrant access and equity and as the Committee is giving particular reference to (a) the effectiveness of accreditation of overseas qualifications and the impact of overseas qualifications on access to education, training and labour market programs, and employment; (b) as assessment (or analysis) of barriers faced at entry points to services and/or at any other point in accessing a full service, including availability and suitability of interpreter services; (c) the level of cultural sensitivity of organisations and institutions providing such services and the existence of suitable cross-cultural training programs for staff; (d) the impact of access and equity principles on service delivery and (e) the existence and adequacy of mechanisms to monitor such services in order to guarantee access and equity principles—

Does the Board of Architects administer their Act in a way which ensures that access and equity principles are met; if so, how does this Board satisfy each of the five references enumerated in the preamble above?

Answer (Mr Milliner):

The Board of Architects, Queensland administers the *Architects Act 1985* in a manner that ensures that access and equity principles are met.

The purpose of the Board is to:

- protect the public interest by ensuring that only competent, qualified persons practise as registered architects;
- register natural persons holding the prescribed qualifications as architects in Queensland;
- approve companies holding the prescribed qualifications as approved architectural companies in Queensland;
- investigate complaints against architects and/or approved architectural companies, conduct hearings, either private or public and impose penalties;
- instigate legal proceedings against non-registered natural persons and/or non-approved architectural companies for breaches of the Architects Act 1985;
- undertake accreditation visits and approve courses in architecture;
- maintain a register of architects; and
- conduct examinations.

Section 17 of the Architects Act 1985 provides that a person shall be entitled to be registered as an architect if the Board is satisfied that the person is of good character and reputation and has passed either the prescribed examinations conducted by the Board or a course of study in architecture (the syllabus of which has been approved by the Board) and has such practical experience in architectural work as is prescribed.

Architectural principles do not have geographic boundaries. Therefore, experience and qualifications gained overseas are recognised.

As with other State and Territory Boards, the Queensland Board of Architects has neither the financial nor human resources to maintain records of all academic qualifications in architecture issued by overseas institutions. Reliance is therefore placed on the offices of other organisations with the resources and skills to perform accreditation of architectural qualifications. These organisations include the Architects Accreditation Council of Australia Inc (AACA) and the National Office of Overseas Skill Recognition (NOOSR).

The AACA comprises representatives of all Australian State and Territory Registration Boards of Architects including Queensland, as well as a representative from the Royal Australian Institute of Architects. NOOSR is a division of the Commonwealth Department of Employment, Education and Training.

One of the principal objectives of the AACA is to recognise, accredit and where appropriate, coordinate acceptable standards of architectural education for National and international reciprocity. Both organisations have compiled comprehensive records over a number of years relating to accreditation of overseas qualifications.

By relying on these bodies for accreditation of overseas qualifications, and through a National system of accreditation of the schools of architecture in Australia, a uniform approach is made to the evaluation of all qualifications for registration for all registration Boards in Australia.

The registration activity undertaken by the Board is addressed to all persons on an equal basis, regardless of their background.

77. Enduring Power of Attorney

Mrs GAMIN asked the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and minister for the Arts—

With reference to representations from the Alzheimer's Association (Queensland)—

When will he move to (a) legalise substitute decision making arrangements such as Enduring Power of Attorney to cover medical and lifestyle decisions, (b) modify current legislation dealing with financial administration matters, (c) establish procedures for appointment of a substitute decision maker for an adult person who has lost legal capacity but has no Enduring Power of Attorney and (d) establish statutory substitute decision makers of last resort where there is no suitable person to make decisions on behalf of a disabled person?

Answer (Mr Foley):

Although the question was asked in four parts, I have answered them together as the same answer applies to each part.

Problems in this area are currently resolvable through the use of a variety of legal and legislative provisions, including the *Public Trustee Act 1978,* the *Intellectually Disabled Citizens Act 1985* and the *Mental Health Act 1974*.

The Government is currently awaiting two final reports of the Queensland Law Reform Commission—in relation to adult persons, the Final Report on Assisted and Substituted Decisions, and in relation to children, the Final Report on Consent to Medical Treatment of Young People.

The Queensland Law Reform Commission is presently considering submissions received in response to its draft report and discussion paper on these two topics and hopes to complete its final report, including draft legislation prepared by the Office of Parliamentary Counsel, in early 1996.

These reports will make recommendations on the issues the subject of representations from the Alzheimer's Association (Queensland).

If the Honourable Member has any particular problems, I would encourage her to take them up directly with the Intellectually Disabled Citizens Council and the Public Trustee. In addition, although the deadlines for the receipt of formal submissions has passed, I would also encourage the Honourable Member to make her views known to the Queensland Law Reform Commission.

Finally, for the information of the Honourable Member, the matters raised in her question also have significance for my colleague, the Minister for Family and Community Services.

78. Importation of Chicken Meat

Mr PERRETT asked the Minister for Primary Industries and Minister for Racing—

With reference to the united opposition by the state’s 102 chicken meat growers to plans by the Labor Federal Government to relax quarantine restrictions on the importation of poultry meat into Australia—

What representations has he made to his Federal colleagues to assist in averting the certain disease and economic risks associated with relaxation of the quarantine restrictions?

Answer (Mr Gibbs):

1. Import controls and quarantine issues are Commonwealth responsibilities. Draft protocols for the importation of cooked chicken meat products from the USA, Thailand and Denmark were released by the Australian Quarantine Inspection Service (AQIS) in June 1994.

2. As yet, the Commonwealth has not determined its final decision in relation to the importation of cooked chicken meat. From a quarantine perspective, the Commonwealth needs to assure itself that any such importation would not jeopardise Australia's animal health status.

3. In response to a previous submission from my predecessor, the Federal Minister for Primary Industries and Energy, Senator R Collins, stated on 14 November 1994 that my Department would be kept informed of developments in the risk assessment process.

4. As there have been no new developments or information to submit on this matter, I have made no further representations to the Commonwealth but will do so if further information on the risk assessment is unsatisfactory.

5. While it is important to ensure that Australian industries are not subject to unfair import market

competition, the nation, as a major agricultural exporter, has much to gain from trade liberalisation.

79. Gambling

Mr BAUMANN asked the Minister for Family and Community Services and Minister Assisting the Premier on the Status of Women—

With reference to the burgeoning gambling economy in Queensland, will he detail the Government's new initiatives to counter the adverse social problems now beginning to manifest themselves in society today?

Answer (Mrs Woodgate):

In 1992/93 this Government allocated $925,000 in recurrent funding from the charitable levy on the turnover of gaming machines in hotels to services for problem gamblers and research into the effect of gaming machines on Queensland.

The research component is being conducted over three years by the Australian Institute for Gambling Research (AIGR) at the University of Western Sydney and the Queensland University of Technology. This comprehensive research was designed to identify any social problems linked to the introduction of gaming machines into clubs and hotels, as well as any positive social and economic impacts. In March this year, my Department released the first year report on the Social and Economic Impact of the Introduction of Gaming Machines to Queensland Clubs and Hotels. Overall, the research findings support the Government's introduction of gaming machines, citing: the lack of obvious negative implications within the general population; favourable community attitudes; the benefits to the clubs and hotels industry; and the net economic benefit accruing to the State. Of particular note is the finding that machine players were no more likely to experience economic hardship than non-players. The research also found strong support for the regulatory regime established for the gaming industry and the establishment of services to assist problem gamblers and their families. I am also pleased to advise that this study has been acknowledged by the University of Nevada as, to date, the most comprehensive social impact assessment conducted any where in the world.

Previous research has suggested that only a small proportion of gamblers will experience gambling problems. Such problems are hardly new, having long been raised as a concern in connection with TAB betting and casino gambling. Today, however, a response to this issue is provided by the four resource centres for problem gamblers, known as Break Even services, funded by the Department of Family and Community Services. Funds of $815,849 per annum have been allocated to these services since 1992/93. Located at Brisbane (including Sunshine Coast and Gold Coast), Toowoomba, Rockhampton and Cairns, the services are innovative in design and originally unique to Queensland. They offer a multi-disciplinary approach to assist the client and the client's family through the provision of addiction counselling, financial counselling, family counselling, and information and education. This service model has subsequently been taken up by Victoria and South Australia.

The funds used to support the AIGR research project are now available for redistribution and are being allocated for enhancement to services. From 1995/96 additional recurrent funds of $109,000 have therefore been allocated to the network of Break Even services to increase their capacity to provide services to problem gamblers.

Community education and other measures aimed at early intervention and prevention are vital responses to the issue of problem gambling. To strengthen gaming industry efforts to prevent problem gambling, the Department of Family and Community Services is currently in the process of establishing a Problem Gambling Advisory Committee. The committee will comprise representatives from the Break Even services, the gaming and liquor industries, and government departments. It will provide an ongoing forum for monitoring the impact of problem gambling and have a key role in initiating industry strategies further to address problem gambling issues.

81. Mahogany Glider

Mr ROWELL asked the Minister for Environment and Heritage—

With reference to mahogany glider habitats in the Ingham Tully region and to a number of Interim Conservation Orders which were issued prior to the 15 July election—

(1) Why did the department issue these orders at such short notice when they had years to inform landholders that the endangered species may be habitating their property?

(2) When will the matters be resolved of landholders who have mahogany glider habitats on their property?

(3) If compensation is the final outcome, will the amount received equate to market value of the area in question?

Answer (Mr Barton):

(1) The mahogany glider thought to have been extinct since early this century was only rediscovered by Queensland Museum researchers in 1989.

The mahogany glider is a nocturnal, hollow-dwelling mammal. It is these characteristics which have made it difficult to define the distribution and population status of the species. Scientists in cooperation with

the Queensland Department of Environment and Heritage have been assessing the status of the mahogany glider in key localities under current threat of clearing while a further study is looking at the ecological aspects of the glider.

General expansion of the cane industry, which has grown by 30% in area in the last 5 years and is now further enhanced by the Sugar Industry Infrastructure Package (SIIP), means that caneland will continue to rapidly encroach into remnant native forest areas. In the Tully area only 15% of lowland habitat remains.

(2) There has been ongoing liaison with landholders as surveys have proceeded, with the focus being on those landholders having particularly significant habitat (due to size, habitat quality, continuity with protected habitat, or important corridors between significant habitat).

While these negotiations have been continuing a conservation plan is being prepared by the Department for the mahogany glider. The plan will focus on the key known habitat areas and those other key areas where the glider is likely to occur.

The proposed strategy will provide permanent protection for mahogany glider habitat. This strategy is composed of several components including the dedication of critical habitat, acquiring land and entering into voluntary conservation agreements. This will ensure mahogany glider colonies can travel throughout their full range in search of food.

It is proposed that this plan will be released for draft comment in several weeks.

(3) Section 126 of the Nature Conservation Act provides for compensation if:

> (1)(a) a conservation plan is approved for an area identified under the plan as, or including, a critical habitat or an area of major interest; and
>
> (1)(b) a land-holder's interest in land in the area is injuriously affected by a restriction or prohibition imposed under the plan on the land-holder's existing use of land.
>
> (2) The land-holder is entitled to be paid by the State the reasonable compensation because of the restriction or prohibition that is agreed between the State and the land-holder or, failing agreement, decided by the Land Court.

Furthermore, if lands are acquired by the Department, fair market value will be paid based on Crown valuations.

82. Recategorisation of Properties in Ipswich City, Boonah, Laidley and Gatton Shires

Mr FITZGERALD asked the Minister for Lands—

With reference to the Ipswich Land District—

How many properties have been recategorised under the *Valuation of Land Act* from primary production status to another category in (a) Ipswich City, (b) Boonah Shire, (c) Laidley Shire and (d) Gatton Shire?

Answer (Mr McElligott):

The number of properties recategorised for each of the local government areas requested for the periods 1 July 1994 to 30 June 1995 and 30 June 1995 to 5 September 1995 are as follows:-

Local Government Area	1 July 1994 to 30 June 1995	30 June 1995 to 5 September 1995	Total
(a) Ipswich City (incorporating Moreton Shire)	16	3	19
(b) Boonah Shire	13	0	13
(c) Laidley Shire	2	1	3
(d) Gatton Shire	12	1	13

83. Tinaroo Dam

Mr GILMORE asked the Minister for Primary Industries and Minister for Racing—

Due to the prolonged drought in Far North Queensland, water reserves in Tinaroo Dam are not considered sufficient to sustain full allocation to irrigation farmers in the district. In considering the alternatives of (a) having the dam remain at less than capacity or the construction of the North Johnstone Diversion to Tinaroo Dam or (b) having the dam filled and losing considerable volumes of valuable water over the spillway—

(1) Will he give a commitment to (a) the installation of an inflatable extension to the height of Tinaroo Dam, or some other mechanism to increase the capacity of the Dam or (b) In the event of an overflow, departmental estimates indicate the loss of some 2 million kgs of barramundi from the reservoir?

(2) Will he give a commitment to the installation of a device suitable to the containment of barramundi in the dam?

(3) Due to the general deterioration of distribution infrastructure relating to the dam and extra demands on that infrastructure, will he commit to the funding of urgently needed maintenance to the channel system and the duplication of the Granite Creek Syphon?

Answer (Mr Gibbs):

1. The prolonged drought throughout Queensland has impacted significantly on all water storages in Queensland. Tinaroo Falls Dam is no exception.

The supply available from the dam was always assessed on the basis that during prolonged drought when the dam was low some restriction in supply would be necessary.

The Department of Primary Industries (DPI) is evaluating a number of options to augment supplies available from Tinaroo Falls Dam to meet future water demands in the area.

These options include a Fabribag on Tinaroo. A report will be available in the near future. Until this report is finalised and the outcomes of the feasibility study for a Sugar Industry on the Tablelands are known, I am unable to make a commitment to any of these options.

2. In relation to barramundi in the dam, it was always recognised some fish would be lost over the spillway during times of flooding. The DPI has considered ways of preventing such losses but there are problems by using any physical barrier.

Investigations into acoustic, light and electric barriers have not given promising results.

3. As water demand from the MDIA has grown the necessity to duplicate the Granite Creek siphon has been recognised. Accordingly for this current year $800 000 has been allocated for this purpose. Other funding for replacement of drop boards and refurbishment of control gates is continuing.

84. Maroochydore TAFE Building

Miss SIMPSON asked the Minister for Employment and Training and Minister Assisting the Premier on Public Service Matters—

(1) When the State Government negotiated to buy the old Newspaper Place building in Maroochydore for use as a TAFE building, what professional advice was taken regarding the cost and extent of the redevelopment of the building before the purchase?

(2) Will she release that advice and any subsequent advice following the purchase of the building?

(3) Will she advise if there has been any change in the projected cost of redeveloping the building?

Answer (Mrs Edmond):

1. TAFE Queensland sought professional advice from the Department of Lands, the Administrative Services Department and the Physical Resources Branch of TAFE Queensland relating to the redevelopment of the building prior to its purchase.

2. I am prepared to release the advice provided by the Department of Lands and Administrative Services Department should the Honourable member request it. Access to this information was granted to Mr Bruce Laming MLA on 19 May 1995. The advice provided by Physical Resources Branch, TAFE Queensland, was a budget estimate for refurbishment of the building. This advice was part of a submission to Executive Council, and therefore in accordance with government policy, I am not prepared to release this information.

3. Following purchase and vacancy of the building, a more detailed investigation of the refurbishment requirements was able to be conducted by the Administrative Services Department. There has been no further change in the projected cost of the building.

85. Gladstone Judo Club

Mrs CUNNINGHAM asked the Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services—

What action does he intend to take to rectify the current situation with regard to the seizure of funds by the Gladstone Police Youth Club of their associate club, the Gladstone Judo Club, which appears to be an inappropriate confiscation of funds, requiring intervention?

Answer (Mr Braddy):

The Queensland Police Citizens Youth Welfare Association (QPCYWA) is a private company limited by Guarantee not having share capital. The Company was incorporated in the State of Queensland on 20 May 1948 under the then *Companies Act 1931*.

The QPCYWA is not part of any Government Department and acts independently of the Government.

The QPCYWA is administered by a Board of Directors which was established under the provisions of Clause 46 of the Articles of Association of the QPCYWA. Those Articles are approved by the Australian Securities Commission.

In relation to the specific question asked by Mrs Cunningham, I have no jurisdiction as Minister for Police to intervene in the business of a private company, and therefore propose to take no further action. Furthermore, I understand that the Gladstone Judo Club has initiated legal proceedings against the QPCYWA and it would therefore be improper for me to interfere in these proceedings.

86. Fire Service, Warwick and Stanthorpe

Mr SPRINGBORG asked the Minister for Emergency Services and Minister for Consumer Affairs—

(1) What is the current status of any review which may have been conducted into the staff numbers and arrangements at both the Warwick and Stanthorpe Fire Stations?

(2) What changes, if any, have been made or are planned to be made at these stations as a result of any recent review which may have been conducted into the abovementioned matters?

Answer (Mr Davies):

(1) There is no review being conducted into staff numbers and arrangements at the Warwick and Stanthorpe Fire Stations.

The workplace reform package is currently being conducted and this does not affect staff numbers and arrangements.

(2) No changes have been made or are planned for these stations as a result of any recent review.

88. Board of Professional Engineers

Dr WATSON asked the Minister for Administrative Services—

With reference to the House of Representatives' Standing Committee on Community Affairs which established, in December 1994, an inquiry into migrant access and equity, giving particular reference to (a) the effectiveness of accreditation of overseas qualifications and the impact of overseas qualifications on access to education, training and labour market programs, and employment; (b) as assessment (or analysis) of barriers faced at entry points to services and/or at any other point in accessing a full service, including availability and suitability of interpreter services; (c) the level of cultural sensitivity of organisations and institutions providing such services and the existence of suitable cross-cultural training programs for staff; (d) the impact of access and equity principles on service delivery and (e) the existence and adequacy of

mechanisms to monitor such services in order to guarantee access and equity principles—

Does the Board of Professional Engineers administer their Act in a way which ensures that access and equity principles are met; if so, how does this Board satisfy each of the five references enumerated in the preamble above?

Answer (Mr Milliner):

The Board of Professional Engineers of Queensland administers the "*Professional Engineers Act 1988"* in a manner that ensures that access and equity principles are met.

The purpose of the Board is to:

protect the public interest by ensuring that only competent, qualified persons practise as registered professional engineers;

prevent Registered Professional Engineers from performing or attempting to perform in connection with commissioned engineering services that are outside their area of professional competence;

ensure that professional engineers maintain appropriate technical and professional standards; and

provide a mechanism whereby complaints by the public can be realistically assessed and meaningful redress can be taken where appropriate.

The requirements for registration under the *Professional Engineers Act 1988*, are that applicants have academic qualifications that satisfy the Institution of Engineers, Australia National Competency Standards and five years experience as a professional engineer. All engineers, irrespective of background, must possess these qualities. The five years experience can be obtained in Australia or overseas or in any combination of both. Engineering principles do not have geographic boundaries so there is no reason to require Australian experience for migrant engineers, although they are expected to make themselves familiar with Australian Codes of Practice. The Board is bound to comply with these requirements of the legislation.

In the administration of the Act, the Board has become aware of the difficulties faced by persons with non-English speaking backgrounds in accessing registration, maintaining continuing education or addressing complaints about the professional conduct of registered professional engineers.

The Board does not itself accredit overseas qualifications. It relies on the National Competency Standards of the Institution of Engineers, Australia. The Standards have been developed by the Institution under a jointly funded contract with the Commonwealth Government through the National Office of Overseas Skill Recognition (NOOSR). They are particularly relevant to the evaluation of migrants whose qualifications and experience cannot readily be assessed through existing mechanisms. The Standards stimulate continuing professional development, recognise levels of expertise, and facilitate the maintenance of professional and technical competence.

It has been the experience of the Board that overseas applicants for registration have English as first or second language and no difficulties in this respect have been encountered. The Registrar has participated in the Horizon Work Skills Workshops for migrant engineers from a variety of countries, conducted through the auspicing body of the Queensland University of Technology and the funding body of the Office of Labour Market Adjustment, Department of Employment, Education and Training; and the Skills Recognition Branch, Department of Employment, Vocational Education, Training and Industrial Relations.

The Board recognises the Queensland Government Ethnic Affairs Policy which seeks the establishment of equal, effective and comprehensive rights, including political, legal and industrial rights for all people regardless of ethnic background and is guided by these principles. Board activities are addressed to all persons on an equal basis regardless of their background. It has not been identified that anyone has been disadvantaged because of cultural background.

89. Landsborough-Maroochydore Spur Line

Mr LAMING asked the Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development—

Will he give details of the feasibility study undertaken, including (a) costs for land acquisitions, (b) costs of construction, (c) construction timetable and (d) proposed route through to Maroochydore for the “$90m spur line from Landsborough to Maroochydore”, as promised by the Government prior to the recent State election?

Answer (Mr Elder):

The text of the commitments correctly indicate that this issue has, to date, been considered primarily at a concept level, and that more detailed consideration is required prior to the accurate determination of route and costs, etc. Hence the commitment to allocate $1 million towards planning in 1995/1996. Nevertheless, indicative information in respect of the spur line is available as follows:

(a) Cost of Land Acquisitions

As previously mentioned, investigations to date have been preliminary only, and it is not possible to provide a precise estimate for land acquisition costs at present. Total land acquisition costs will, of course depend upon the exact route taken. An indicative figure is approximately $20 million (ie. the figure included in the commitment as representing "preliminary works").

(b) Costs of Construction

Again, only preliminary investigations have been undertaken. The construction costs are however, currently anticipated to be in the vicinity of $4 million per kilometre (current prices). With a route distance of approximately 27 to 35 km (depending on the alignment), this suggests that total construction costs would be between approximately $110 million—$140 million.

(c) Construction Timetable

A detailed timetable, has of course, not yet been prepared. However 4-5 years has been mentioned in the election commitment for preliminary works, and approximately 3 years will be required to construct the line and stations.

(d) Proposed Route through to Maroochydore

As mentioned, the route has been considered in indicative terms only. A precise route can only be determined following detailed investigations and extensive consultation.

90. Highway Maintenance Program

Mr FITZGERALD asked the Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development—

What is the maintenance program to remove tyre retreads that are on and beside highways, in particular (a) the Cunningham Highway in the Ipswich City and the Boonah Shire and (b) the Warrego Highway in Ipswich, Laidley and Gatton Shires?

Answer (Mr Elder):

The maintenance program includes a daily patrol on weekdays, of both the Cunningham and Warrego Highways to remove any pieces of tyre rubber or any other obstacles that may have potential to cause harm to the public.

91. Beehives, Disease Control

Mr MITCHELL asked the Minister for Primary Industries and Minister for Racing—

With reference to difficulties being encountered by large numbers of bee-keepers with American Foul Brood Disease—

(1) How many inspectors does the Department of Primary Industries employ to cater for the needs of the State's 140,000 registered hives?

(2) How many inspections have they made for this disease in the past six months?

(3) What is the extent of the inspection backlog?

(4) What plans have been put in place to provide additional inspection services to meet the industry's needs?

Answer (Mr Gibbs):

1. The Department of Primary Industries employs two inspectors to service the beekeeping industry.

2. Approximately 50 apiaries with widely varying numbers of hives have been inspected in the past six months.

3. As of September 1995, there are 47 apiaries warranting attention.

4. Strategies now in place to manage the disease include:

(a) The inspectors have increased their time in the field.

(b) Honorary inspectors have been appointed to assist with the inspection process.

(c) Adoption of a compulsory honey testing scheme to locate American Foulbrood has been agreed with industry.

(d) Seminars have been conducted to educate beekeepers on how to identify and eradicate the disease. Ten seminars have been conducted and a further five are scheduled for this year.

(e) Many other beekeeper meetings and field days on the identification and eradication of this disease have been attended, to advise beekeepers and encourage a self help approach to the problem.

93. Health Capital Works Program Signs

Mr HORAN asked the Minister for Health—

With reference to the hospital capital works signs erected at major hospitals just prior to the 1995 State Election—

(1) How many such signs were erected?

(2) What was the location and cost of each sign?

Answer (Mr Beattie):

(1) 21 at 17 sites.

(2)

LOCATION	NO. OF SIGNS
Herston Complex	3
The Prince Charles Hospital	2
Princess Alexandra Hospital	2
Queen Elizabeth II Jubilee Hospital	1
Logan Hospital	1
Redland Hospital	1
Ipswich Hospital	1
Gold Coast Hospital	1
Caboolture Hospital	1
Toowoomba Hospital	1
Toowoomba Community Health Centre	1
Cairns Hospital	1
Hervey Bay Hospital	1
Bundaberg Hospital	1
Maryborough Hospital	1
Wide Bay Group Linen Service, Maryborough	1
Woree Community Health Centre	1
Total	$124,843.44

The erection of signs at locations involving capital funds is a common practice within the building industry and has been adopted both within the public and private sectors. The erection of such signs was a practice adopted by the previous Government. In fact, a Manual of Procedure was issued outlining the process to be utilised for signage associated with capital developments.

Records of the previous Government's expenditure on signage is either lost or held in the files kept by the former Hospital Boards. It surprises me that the Honourable Member would raise this issue given the National Party's proven and demonstrated record of

abuse in spending taxpayer funds on Government promotion.

Fortunately, the Queensland public can now enjoy an accountable system of Government in this State.

94. Home Base, Aspley

Mr LITTLEPROUD asked the Minister for Emergency Services and Minister for Consumer Affairs—

With reference to the annual fire levy payable by the owners of Home Base, Aspley and as the owners were advised that their annual fire levy was to increase from $5,830.24 to $65,511.00—

(1) Has this levy been reviewed?

(2) If so, what is the revised levy and how is this new levy justified?

Answer (Mr Davies):

(1) Representatives of the Commissioner of Queensland Fire Service met with the owners of Home Base, Aspley on 6 September 1995 to advise that the levy has been reviewed and reduced.

(2) It has been recommended that this property be assessed as Group 12 which is $37,516.40 "Drive-in shopping centre 40,001—60,000m²" as the actual area of the property for assessment purposes was 59,703m². This assessment is consistent with other similar properties, eg. Home Base, Jindalee, which is practically identical to Home Base, Aspley.

The owners of Home Base, Aspley did not agree with this assessment and were invited to put forward what they consider to be the correct category. They have not responded as at 5 October 1995.

There is no appeal against the final determination of the Commissioner, QFS.

95. Sunshine Motorway Tolls

Mr TURNER asked the Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development—

With reference to the decision made by the Goss Government on the South Coast Tollway—

What steps does he intend to take to fulfil the Labor Party's long-standing promise to remove the tollways from the North Coast highways?

Answer (Mr Elder):

The Sunshine Motorway was originally established by the former National Party Government as a tollway facility as funding was not available from other sources for its construction ahead of normal road programs. It has been necessary for this Government to continue with the toll principle in order to contribute towards the cost of servicing the resultant debt.

The decision to proceed with Stage Two followed a lengthy planning process and comprehensive public consultation confirming majority support for the extension of the Motorway.

Consequently, it would be unfair of me to create local community expectations of lifting these tolls as the current Government has made no commitment to the removal of the tolls earlier than planned.

However, I have agreed to review the Sunshine Coast Motorway generally, bearing in mind the social impacts of the tolls for local residents. I am particularly concerned that these residents are not gaining the full benefit of the early construction of the motorway.

96. Property Crime Squad

Mr COOPER asked the Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services—

Will he confirm or deny police sources concerns that the budget for the much vaunted Property Crime Squad has now, post-election, been slashed, thus reducing the Squad, to quote police, "running on a shoe-string and virtually now at a standstill"?

Answer (Mr Braddy):

The Property Crime Squad has actually been strengthened in the period since the election. It has experienced a reallocation of budgetary resources during the post-election period due directly to the development of new strategies to combat major and organised property offenders.

Intelligence and research this year indicated that offenders were becoming aware of the Squad's covert and conventional policing methods. In order to maintain and enhance the Squad's effectiveness, innovative strategies were devised. A major initiative was to increase the utilisation of covert police operatives by the Squad in its investigations.

Since the election the squad's approved strength of 28 police including a 5 officer surveillance team, has been supplemented by the allocation of a further 5 police personnel to this Squad. This police staffing is supported by 4 permanent civilians performing data entry and 1 research officer. In response to the increasing workload of the Squad and, in recognition of the need for timely and accurate intelligence to be disseminated, it has been necessary to employ an additional two temporary data personnel since the election.

97. Bunya Mountains National Park

Mr SLACK asked the Minister for Environment and Heritage—

With reference to proposals to include parts of State Forest 151 Parish of Haly, Neumugra and Tureen and the whole of State Forest 510 Parish of Cooyan within the Bunya Mountains National Park Estate—

(1) Will he reaffirm that it is not the Government's intention to support the areas nomination for World Heritage Listing?

(2) What will be the annual budget for the management and protection of the extended national park area, particularly, in relation to fire management and prevention?

(3) Is it the Government's intention to exclude cattle grazing and beekeeping from the area?

Answer (Mr Barton):

(1) As you may be aware, in considering the nomination of the Central Eastern Rainforests of Australia to the World Heritage List, the World

Heritage Bureau recommended that consideration be given to including the Bunya Mountains National Park within the listings.

Although there are strong ecological grounds for including the Bunya Mountains in this listed area, the Federal Government has indicated that it will not pursue this without the concurrence of the Queensland Government, in accordance with the Intergovernmental Agreement on the Environment.

The World Heritage listing of other sites in Queensland such as the Great Barrier Reef, the Wet Tropics and Fraser Island has resulted in the international recognition of the significance of these areas and produced considerable direct and indirect benefits to the local economies of the surrounding communities. However, it is apparent that some sections of the communities adjacent to the Bunya Mountains have misplaced concerns about the impact of World Heritage listing and the Queensland Government has indicated to the Commonwealth that it should not proceed with a possible nomination of this area without broad community support.

Prior to the last election, the Queensland Government gave a commitment to the conservation movement that it would "make measurable progress towards nomination of outstanding sites already deemed to have World Heritage value such as the Bunya Mountains and Cooloola National Parks (including extensions)." It is important that the community has the opportunity to fully appreciate the positive outcomes that can flow from World Heritage listing and the Government is optimistic that once the communities in the Bunya Mountains area see the tourism and other benefits resulting from the listing of the Scenic Rim national parks, they will be more supportive of proposals to World Heritage list the Bunya Mountains.

(2) The total budget, including expenditure for fire management, for the existing Bunya Mountains National Park is about $175,000.

The resources necessary to maintain existing standards of fire management for the State Forest areas will be available as part of the overall expenditure on management of the protected area estate.

(3) In relation to stock grazing, section 17 of the *Nature Conservation Act 1992* establishes the constraints and limitations on the Chief Executive's powers with respect to permitted uses in national parks. Stock grazing is clearly not a permitted use. This is spelt out in section 53 of the *Nature Conservation Regulation 1994* which stipulates, in effect, that a stock grazing permit cannot be granted for a protected area that is designated as a national park.

However, section 36 of the *Nature Conservation Act* provides a transitional mechanism for new national parks by which the pre-existing stock grazing permits and special leases can be replaced with an authority pursuant to the Act. This authority enables the continuation of the lessees' or permittees' current usage of their respective areas, under essentially the same terms and conditions. However, the tenure for these authorities would be limited to the unexpired term shown in each of the pre-existing stock grazing permits or special leases. They could not be reissued beyond that term.

In relation to beekeeping, the provisions of section 36 would also apply if any apiary permits under the *Forestry Act 1959* were in force prior to the excision of the land for national park purposes. However, I am advised that there are no current permits in force on those areas of State Forests 151 and 510 that are proposed for redesignation as national park.

98. TAFE College Seminar Expenses

Mr SANTORO asked the Minister for Employment and Training and Minister Assisting the Premier on Public Service Matters—

With reference to the ad hoc, incomplete and financially inadequate documents the then Minister tabled on 28 October 1994 in relation to my questions on seminar expenses—

(1) Have officers of the department's Audit Unit examined the adequacy of these documents in relation to financial accountability requirements?

(2) Why is the accounting process, if indeed the department uses one, so lacking in fundamental requirements, when page 70 of the TAFE Annual Report clearly indicates that CAP should provide, efficiently and accurately, the "specific details of all promotional seminars, workshops and meetings" that I requested?

(3) Is CAP or any other program utilised to gather and collate financial data on seminars, conferences and meetings?

(4) Why are salaries or fees paid to presenters not shown for any seminars?

(5) Why are postage and administration fees shown for only one program?

(6) Did any other program involve such costs?

(7) Is there any rationale underlying the decision to charge participants fees for some programs but not for others?

(8) Why is the same seminar sometimes run at TAFE colleges where there is no cost for hire of the venue and on other occasions expensive venues hired for the program, when local colleges would have been available?

(9) Why do some TAFE colleges charge up to $450 for use of their facilities (by 80 participants) whilst other colleges (attended by 110 participants) make no charge?

(10) In the time that the former Minister had these documents which clearly are inadequate for the purposes of proper financial management and accountability, what was done to ensure that proper and complete records are produced, both for internal management purposes and for official audit?

Answer (Mrs Edmond):

(1) The Department has an annual audit program to satisfy all aspects of financial accountability, including the matters covered in the question raised by Mr Santoro.

(2) In the answer provided to Mr Santoro on 28 October 1994, it was indicated that it was not possible in the time available to provide specific details of all promotional seminars, workshops and meetings organised by DEVETIR during 1992/93 and 1993/94, given the widespread of activities for which the Department is responsible, and its location throughout the State.

The Department utilises the Queensland Government Financial Management System (QGFMS) as its primary corporate accounting system. At the corporate level, information was not held to identify whether expenditure charged on QGFMS in relation to seminars and workshops was directly attributable to "promotional" matters. Given the nature of the Department's portfolio, many such activities are conducted by the Department for purely educational and information purposes. The maintenance of such information at this level of detail is not considered to be a cost-effective use of the accounting system.

In response to the Honourable Member's reference to the TAFE Annual Report and its mention of the College Administrative Computer project (CAP), this system was designed primarily as a student record and educational management system for TAFE Queensland. As such it is not an accounting system although it does provide facilities to record and report on activities involving education of TAFE students.

(3) QGFMS collects financial data relating to seminars and conferences.

CAP is one of several supplementary accounting systems used by the Department to manage the largely decentralised financial arrangements operating within the Department. CAP includes modules to record the liability of TAFE clients for payment of course related fees and charges and to manage the timely payment of these fees and charges, including participants fees for seminars or conferences.

CAP does not provide the facility to record the costs associated with the conduct of any activity. Whilst resource utilisation (such as teachers, rooms, equipment etc) is recorded on CAP, no financial information relating to the costs of these resources is held on the system.

(4) The accounting system was not designed to maintain this information separately as it was not considered cost effective. In the majority of cases, presenters were existing staff of the Department.

(5) Postage costs were identified separately by the Division of Workers' Compensation as this was the one major promotional activity conducted by that Division in the period in question.

Given the broad range of ongoing promotional and awareness activities undertaken by other areas of the Department, postage charges for seminars are not isolated and costed on a project by project basis.

No separate administration fees were provided in the answer given to the Honourable Member on 28 October 1994.

(6) Please see answer to question 5.

(7) Participants are not charged fees for Departmental seminars where those seminars are clearly designed as information sessions and where it is decided that the Government has a responsibility to ensure clients are well informed about basic legislative/regulatory or other requirements. Fees are generally charged in those cases which do not meet these criteria. For example, on the advice of the Rural Industry Workplace Health and Safety Committee, no fees were charged to attendees at the "Managing Hazardous Substances at a Rural Workplace" owing to the financial hardship brought about by the drought.

(8) TAFE Colleges are frequently used for Departmental seminars. However, on some occasions, TAFE Colleges are not available or it is not considered appropriate to use them. The use of private venues, particularly in relation to areas of competitive operations (such as sessions relating to Competitive Funding of Providers Initiative Information Sessions), encourages the open participation of both private and public bodies in a neutral location.

(9) Within the provisions of Public Finance Standard 320, the charging policies of each TAFE Institute are determined by the respective Directors depending on the purpose of the seminar.

(10) See response to questions 1 and 2.

99. Mount Morgan Hospital

Mr PEARCE asked the Minister for Health—

With reference to a commitment prior to the State Election to spend $455,000 on improvements to the Mount Morgan Hospital—

What is the current status of that commitment and when is this work likely to commence?

Answer (Mr Beattie):

I thank the Honourable Member for his longstanding interest in the operation and maintenance of Mount Morgan Hospital. His outstanding representation on the health needs of Queenslanders, particularly those serviced by health facilities in Central Region, has resulted in major gains in service delivery for the Region.

Q-Build has been engaged to act as Project Managers for this project with Project Services being engaged to prepare documentation for the items identified in need of upgrading to meet current *Building Act* compliance standards.

Documentation is currently being prepared and construction is to commence on site on 13 November 1995 to achieve practical completion by 28 February 1996. As this point in time, actual progress is ahead of program by two weeks and it is envisaged that Q-Build will meet the target dates indicated.

100.Palm Beach Dental Unit

Mrs GAMIN asked the Minister for Health—

With reference to complaints I have received that the Dental Clinic at Palm Beach will only accept “urgent”

cases and that only residents living south of Tallebudgera Creek can access this clinic—

(1) When will the proposed dental clinic be open for general business, ie normal appointments, not only "urgent" cases?

(2) Is the arbitrary cut-off point of Tallebudgera Creek fact or fiction?

(3) If such a dividing line is being exercised, will he move immediately to open up the Palm Beach dental services to all residents who require such services in order to take the pressure off the Gold Coast Dental Hospital at Southport?

Answer (Mr Beattie):

(1) Approval has been given for this proposal as a result of the energetic representations made by Mrs Rose, the Member for Currumbin, who has worked hard to secure better health services for residents on the Southern end of the Gold Coast—after years of National Party neglect.

The Palm Beach Dental Unit will offer both routine and emergency treatment and I commend the Member for Currumbin for her representations on the urgency of this new facility at Palm Beach.

Oral health services in the South Coast Region were integrated as of September 1995 to allow for a more responsive service to the heavy demand in that region.

(2) The arbitrary cut-off point of Tallebudgera Creek is fiction. Due to the location of the Palm Beach Dental Unit, the majority of patients who will access the service will reside on the southern end of the coast.

(3) Not applicable as my response to (2) answers this question.

101.Retail Meat Outlets

Mr PERRETT asked the Minister for Primary Industries and Minister for Racing—

With reference to the registration and regulation of retail meat outlets by the Queensland Livestock and Meat Authority—

(1) How many retail butchery outlets are operating in Queensland at the moment?

(2) How many of those outlets have been given Q-Safe accreditation?

(3) How many are operating pending accreditation?

(4) How many have indicated they will be unable to comply with accreditation requirements?

(5) How many retail butcheries were operating one year ago and two years ago?

(6) Have any Queensland communities been left without a retail butchery because operators were unable to meet the high cost of Q-Safe accreditation?

Answer (Mr Gibbs):

1. In Queensland there are 1,811 meat retail premises including traditional butcher shops, supermarkets, specialty poultry shops and delicatessens operating under interim, temporary or full accreditation.

2. The proprietors of 223 accredited meat retail premises have achieved Q Safe accreditation.

3. The proprietors of 145 accredited meat retail premises have submitted quality assurance manuals and are operating under temporary accreditation.

4. There has been no indication from Industry as to the number of proprietors that may be unable to comply with accreditation requirements. Nevertheless, it is estimated that about 60-75 traditional butcher shops could close within the next year or so. These closures cannot be attributed solely to non-compliance with accreditation requirements. Other factors such as aggressive competition from and between supermarkets, extended trading hours, long term low volume of business, poor shop and product presentation, change in shopping trends from the older traditional butcher shops to more modern facilities with extended ranges of value-added products and failure to maintain premises to prescribed standards, will contribute towards closures.

5. (I) There were 1,542 registered meat retail premises in Queensland as at 30 June 1993.

(ii) As at 30 June 1994, 1,610 persons were accredited to operate meat retail premises in Queensland. Much of this increase comprised specialty poultry shops.

6. A small number of butcher shops have closed in rural towns sporadically over a number of years. However, there has not been a noticeable increase in closures in rural towns since the introduction of the Meat Industry Act 1993 and associated Q Safe accreditation requirements. The reasons for these closures apart from those indicated above, could be attributed to lack of community support and, more latterly, an increasing availability of prepackaged meat from other retail outlets.

102.Heavy Vehicles on Highways

Mr STEPHAN asked the Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development—

With reference to comments from motorists regarding heavy vehicles which travel close together along highways—

(1) What is the minimum distance required between heavy vehicles travelling on highways?

(2) What warnings and prosecutions have been made on vehicles breaching the regulation while travelling the highway between Cooroy and Gunalda?

Answer (Mr Elder):

In answer to the Honourable member for Gympie's question of 14 September 1995 about heavy vehicles travelling close together on the State's highways, the Traffic Regulations talk about long rather than heavy vehicles. Long vehicles include vehicles more than 8 metres in length, vehicles with dual wheels on any axle, or a vehicle towing another vehicle.

For any of these configurations the regulations require that wherever conditions permit, a distance of at least 60 metres should be maintained between two such vehicles travelling in the same direction on highways and the like.

This distance restriction for heavy vehicles does not apply in built-up areas or where the road includes two or more marked lanes for vehicles travelling in the same direction. In these situations the regulations simply require all drivers to keep a reasonable distance between vehicles having regard to factors such as speed, traffic and other road and weather conditions.

103.Queensland Building Tribunal

Mr CONNOR asked the Minister for Housing, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Rural Communities, Minister for Rural Communities and Minister for Provision of Infrastructure for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Communities—

With reference to the Queensland Building Tribunal (QBT) which has come under a great deal of criticism lately by industry bodies and builders, contractors, sub-contractors and especially consumers and as the QBT was originally touted as a low cost solution to building disputes and as one of the most common criticisms of the QBT is that it is overly legalistic and, as a result, protracted and expensive—

(1) How many actions have been resolved by the QBT over the last 12 months?

(2) How many cases are on the current waiting list?

(3) What is the current rate of hearing these cases?

(4) What was the average wait for a hearing (a) last year and (b) this year?

(5) How much is the average claim?

(6) What was the total amount of claims awarded last year?

(7) How much, in legal costs, was awarded?

(8) What is the average legal cost awarded for each claim?

Answer (Mr Mackenroth):

(1) In 1994, 1474 applications were resolved by the QBT. To 30 June 1995, 726 applications were resolved.

(2) There were 450 applications on hand at 30 June 1995 and they were either at mediation or at various stages of preparation for hearing. There were no applications which were on a waiting list for a hearing date.

(3) The QBT is currently holding 80 hearing days per month. This is an increase from 46 hearing days per month in 1994.

(4) The average wait for a hearing from the Pre-hearing Conference to the date of hearing was

(a) last year—95 days

(b) this year—57 days and reducing.

(5) The average claim in 1995 to 30 June was $15,955. The claims ranged from $273,273 to $254. However, in addition there are claims for rectification and other orders which are unquantified. This figure also does not include the amounts for any cross-claims or third party claims. The QBT also has jurisdiction to review decisions of the Queensland Building Services Authority ("the Authority") and to determine discipline applications brought by the Authority. These applications are not included in the above average claim figure.

(6) The total amount awarded in 1994 was $1,694,809 in 197 applications. Rectification was also ordered in addition to a monetary award in 18 of these applications. In the other 60 applications no amount was awarded because rectification was ordered or the application was dismissed, stayed or transferred to a Court.

Out of 1995 applications received to 30 June, 87 have been disposed of by a hearing. In the 43 applications where monetary awards resulted the total amount awarded was $331,097. Rectification was also ordered in addition to a monetary award in 4 of these applications.

In the other 44 applications no amount was awarded because rectification was ordered or the application was dismissed, stayed or transferred to a Court.

(7) Of the 272, 1994 applications which have been disposed of by a hearing, costs were awarded in 53 cases. In 18 of those applications the costs were not determined by QBT and are unknown. In the other 35 applications where the QBT quantified the costs they amounted to $79,245.

In regard to the 1995 applications received to 30 June, 90 applications have been disposed of by a hearing and costs were awarded in 17 applications. In 6 of those applications the amounts were not quantified by QBT but left to the parties to agree or to come back to QBT. As the parties have not required the QBT to determine these amounts they are unknown. In the other 11 applications costs of $8,275 were awarded.

(8) Of the 1994 applications where costs were quantified, the average amount awarded was $1,495. However, in 16 of these applications only the application fee of $200 was awarded and in 6 other applications costs of less than $200 were awarded.

Of the 1995 applications where costs were quantified, the average amount awarded was $752. However, in 3 of these 11 applications, only the application fee was awarded and in 2 others less than $200 was awarded.

104.Atherton Tableland Sugar Mill

Mr GILMORE asked the Treasurer—

With reference to a public meeting in Mareeba prior to the election at which he gave a commitment to infrastructure spending of three times the amount of private funding invested in a sugar mill on the Atherton Tablelands—

Can the various consortia interested in sugar mill development and farmers in the district now depend on this commitment as part of their planning regime?

Answer (Mr De Lacy):

I refer to the Member for the Tablelands, Mr Tom Gilmore's question regarding infrastructure spending for a sugar mill on the Atherton Tablelands.

At no time did I promise to a "commitment to infrastructure spending of three times the amount of private funding invested in a sugar mill on the Atherton Tablelands".

These sorts of comments from the Honourable Member do him no credit and are certainly not in the best interests of his constituents.

The report which the Government has currently commissioned is designed to investigate the overall infrastructure requirements arising from the expansion of the sugar industry and the potential development of a mill on the Tablelands. This involves analysis of the potential land which would be available for the expansion of cane farming on the Tableland and the water infrastructure that would be required for any such expansion. Transport infrastructure (road and/or rail) that would be required is also being analysed along with the capacity of ports to handle increased tonnages of sugar.

The Government is seeking a clear understanding of the overall feasibility of the expansion of the sugar industry on the Tablelands. I am aware of two milling groups who are keenly interested in this region—it will be a commercial decision between the growers and the millers as to which group succeeds. In the light of this report, the Government will examine if and to what extent it would support the necessary infrastructure, remembering that industry would also have much to gain from this expansion.

105.Grid Mains Power, Jundah and Windorah

Mr JOHNSON asked the Minister for Minerals and Energy—

With reference to requests by citizens of the Barcoo Shire and, in particular, the towns of Jundah and Windorah for access to grid mains power—

(1) When can the people of the Barcoo Shire expect to be connected to a State grid?

(2) What is the likely cost to each of the 40 rural properties for such a connection?

(3) What is the likely cost for householders in the two main centres for such a connection?

(4) If this connection is to be denied, what alternative has the Government in mind and at what cost to individuals and property owners?

Answer (Mr McGrady):

I have sought advice from the Capricornia Electricity Corporation about the matters raised by the Honourable Member. The answer to this question rests with the landholders and their preparedness to meet the costs of extending supply. The Barcoo Shire landholders were offered electricity supply in 1989 for an average cost of $164,000 for each of the 43 properties. Of this amount Capricornia Electricity Corporation was providing $24,000 and each customer was to contribute $140,000 as a non-refundable capital contribution. Only 12 properties accepted the offer and the scheme lapsed. It is therefore unlikely that the same group would now be prepared to meet costs which have increased since 1989.

The likely cost to each of the approximately 40 rural properties would probably have increased to the extent that the average cost of extending supply would be close to $200,000.

As the householders in Jundah and Windorah are already supplied with electricity generated at diesel power stations in the towns, it is not feasible to expect them to pay any costs associated with alternative means of supply.

The alternative to extension of Capricornia Electricity Corporation's electricity supply network in Barcoo Shire involves the use of Remote Area Power Supplies comprising hybrid solar, wind and local diesel generators at each property. The cost of such RAPS plants suitable to supply the average homestead would vary depending on the extent of requirements plus the cost of diesel fuel and maintenance.

In February 1995, the Goss Government announced the introduction of the Remote Area Power Systems Scheme. Under this scheme, persons in remote areas can receive a grant of up to a maximum of $7500 to install approved stand-alone power systems which incorporate renewable energy. This grant scheme will apply in locations where the cost to the householder of connecting to the nearest practical electricity grid exceeds $30,000. The Government has already received over 800 expressions of interest in this scheme.

106.Eastlink

Mr MALONE asked the Minister for Minerals and Energy—

With reference to the proposal for the interconnection of the Queensland and New South Wales power grids via "Eastlink"—

(1) What pressure either overt or covert has been applied on the Queensland Government by Prime Minister Keating, either directly or through his agents, to make this interconnection?

(2) What price has been agreed between Queensland and New South Wales for the purchase by Queensland of New South Wales power?

(3) For the construction of "Eastlink", what will be the area of (a) private land, (b) national park, (c) forestry reserve, (d) vacant Crown land and (e) Crown leasehold land covered by the easement or acquired access?

(4) What area of currently standing forest will be cleared within Queensland to accommodate the line?

(5) What is the anticipated cost of easement or acquired access for the line?

Answer (Mr McGrady):

(1) No pressure either overt or covert has been applied to the Queensland Government by Prime

Minister Keating, either directly or through his agents, to make this interconnection.

(2) A final price has not yet been agreed upon as negotiations are still continuing between the QTS and Pacific Power.

(3) The total area in Queensland required for easements is about 1600 hectares. The bulk of this land will be private land. Approximately 250 hectares of this will be in forest reserve, vacant Crown land and Crown leasehold. No area of national park will be covered by the easement or acquired access. The total area required for access, however, cannot be accurately assessed until the preferred route alignment is finalised and detailed structure siting has been completed. Access arrangements will involve the use of existing roads and tracks wherever possible and will be negotiated with individual property owners.

(4) It is estimated that approximately 700 hectares of easement in Queensland will cover land forested to some degree. Clearing of timber will only be necessary where trees constitute a hazard to the powerline. In environmentally sensitive areas every care will be taken to avoid unnecessarily removing vegetation where it is critical for soil stability and habitat maintenance.

(5) It is not possible at this preliminary stage to provide a meaningful assessment of compensation costs for easements and access. Once the final alignment has been selected in August 1996, compensation will be assessed on a case by case basis.

107. Wet Tropics Research Station, South Johnstone

Mr ROWELL asked the Minister for Primary Industries and Minister for Racing—

As the first stage of the Wet Tropics Research Station at South Johnstone has been completed and staff have moved in, when will the research component of the station be built to carry out the important facets of support to a wide range of agricultural industries?

Answer (Mr Gibbs):

The second stage of the Centre for Wet Tropics Agriculture located at South Johnstone was released to public tender on September 1995. This stage will complete the expanded research facilities for investigating future strategies for sustainable nature resource management and primary industry development for this important area of Queensland.

I expect the second stage building to be completed for occupation by June 1996. With the completion of this stage the Government will have made a total investment in excess of $4.5 million in developing this world class research and development facility. Facilities such as this are further tangible evidence of the benefits arising from the review of research where the commitment of my Department to a major research effort for the primary industries of this State was confirmed.

108. Air Conditioner Gas

Mrs McCAULEY asked the Minister for Minerals and Energy—

With reference to his responsibility for the introduction of new environmentally friendly refrigerant gasses for air conditioners—

(1) Which product has been endorsed by his department?

(2) Which products were considered and rejected?

(3) What information was considered as part of the decision-making process?

(4) Specifically, was the energy efficiency of each product considered and what was the outcome in each case?

Answer (Mr McGrady):

(1) As Minister for Minerals and Energy I do not have the sole responsibility for the introduction of such gases but have a responsibility to ensure that gases are used safely. No products have been endorsed by my Department. The issue is not one of endorsement, but one of consumer safety. While some refrigerant suppliers have advertised in the Queensland Government Mining Journal this certainly does not mean that these or any other products necessarily have the endorsement of the Department or the Government. The need for replacement refrigerant gases comes from the phasing out of refrigerant R12 and similar gases which, though non-toxic and non-flammable, have been banned from use at the end of 1995 under Commonwealth Greenhouse Legislation.

(2) No products have been considered and rejected. At the moment, while my Department has expressed the opinion that it will not endorse or approve flammable hydrocarbon gases as replacement products, there are currently no imposed regulations in place to prevent their use. There is no intention to reject any product, but rather to ensure safety limitations on their use. I have introduced a regulation making the use of flammable hydrocarbon refrigerants fall under the control of the Gas Act. This would bring the use of LP gas in refrigeration under the same jurisdiction as all other uses of these gases. Training and licensing of installers and service persons will also be considered to ensure that community safety is not compromised in any way.

(3) Consultation was held with all relevant Government departments and with major industry bodies. A public meeting attended, by some 70 stakeholders, was called to discuss these issues. Information arising from the public meeting was considered. I have also referred to existing reputable national and international standards and classifications in considering this matter.

(4) The energy efficiency of the products is not a matter of issue here. If flammable hydrocarbon gases can be used safely, then from an efficiency and environmental point of view, they have attractive properties.

109. Sporting Facilities, Gold Coast Campus of Griffith University

Mr VEIVERS asked the Deputy Premier, Minister for Tourism, Sport and Youth—

(1) What help does he intend to give to the location of a sports precinct at the Gold Coast Campus of the Griffith University?

(2) Will this financial support be forthcoming in time for this complex to be completed for use by athletes training for the Olympics in the year 2000?

Answer (Mr Burns):

(1) Preliminary discussions have occurred at officer level with Griffith University representatives to establish a sports precinct at the Gold Coast Campus of the Griffith University.

The former Minister, the Honourable Bob Gibbs, wrote a letter to Griffith University which, while giving no commitment, supported the project in principle.

(2) The Griffith University project group developing the concept has been advised to submit an application for funding assistance to progress the project under the 1996 National Standard Sport Facilities Program.

The project application for funding will be assessed under the set guidelines for the National Standard Sport Facilities Program.

110. TAFE College Vehicles

Mr ELLIOTT asked the Minister for Employment and Training and Minister Assisting the Premier on Public Service Matters—

(1) In addition to spending approximately $500 per working day on taxis, what did the Southbank Institute of TAFE spend on its fleet of 10 vehicles in 1994-95, in particular, what was the cost of (a) leasing/purchasing vehicles, (b) fuel, (c) registration, (d) insurance (if applicable) and (e) maintenance/repairs per vehicle?

(2) What was the average distance travelled, per day, during 1994-95 (excluding use by staff to travel to/from work)?

(3) What are the comparative daily usage figures of vehicles in the substantial vehicle fleets of the following institutes/head office sections (excluding use by staff travelling to/from work) (a) Far North Queensland Institute—Cairns TAFE, (b) Gold Coast Institute of TAFE, (c) Brisbane Institute of TAFE—Ithaca campus and (d) Vocational Education and Training Branch?

(4) What is the justification for the disproportionately high number of vehicles at the South Burnett campus of the Southern Queensland Institute of TAFE?

(5) How many vehicles was the department able to dispense with when the operation of colleges was rationalised and amalgamated with the creation of institutes?

Answer (Mrs Edmond):

(1) During 1994-1995, Southbank Institute spent an average $360 per working day on taxis. In the first two months of 1995/96 costs have been reduced to an average $233.00 per working day. During this period, a fleet of 10 passenger vehicles was operated by the Institute. All of these vehicles were leased from Q-Fleet.

(a) Leasing costs for the period amounted to $48944.00. The average per vehicle was $4894.40.

(b) The total cost of fuel used by these vehicles was $15895.00. The average per vehicle was $1589.50.

(c) The registration costs relating to these vehicles were included in the terms of the lease agreement with Q-Fleet.

(d) Insurance costs relating to these vehicles were included in the terms of the lease agreement with Q-Fleet.

(e) Maintenance/repair costs for the period amounted to $392.03 and the average per vehicle was $39.20.

(2) The average distance travelled per day during 1994-1995 (excluding use by staff to travel to/from work) was 91 kilometres.

(3) That the average daily business usage of all vehicles at each of these locations for 1994/95 was:

Far North Queensland Institute of TAFE, Cairns TAFE—56.85km

Gold Coast Institute—52.84km

Brisbane Institute of TAFE, Ithaca Campus—53.35km

Vocational Education and Training Directorate—50.78km

(4) The vehicle fleet of the South Burnett campus of the Southern Institute of TAFE consists of three station wagons, one sedan, two mini-buses, a four wheel drive troop carrier, a truck and three tractors. A Magna sedan is used by senior managers and all other staff to effectively deliver college and institute services. Two Commodore station wagons are used in the transport of college personnel involved in delivering government-funded vocational education and training and commercial activities at numerous sites off-campus and in the support of institute initiatives. A Toyota Coaster Minibus and a four wheel drive troop carrier are used for transportation of students involved in educational activities off campus.

An International truck is used primarily for activities associated with conducting training in the rural area, especially the transportation of supplies, livestock and equipment throughout the South Burnett district. The rural training provided by the campus is also supported by three tractors.

A Magna station wagon is used by the Manager of the Cherbourg Campus to visit remote aboriginal communities to determine the unique needs of these people and to participate in strategic management issues for the college and the Institute. This campus also utilises a Toyota Coaster Minibus to transport

students to outlying communities and off-site locations to broaden their educational experiences.

Because of the considerable distances travelled (average trip 350 kilometres) and the lack of efficient and timely public transport, the Institute advises that the use of its fleet for the transportation of students is the most economical method.

(5) TAFE Colleges were aggregated into Institutes in order to achieve administrative efficiencies and savings whilst maintaining and increasing the quality and variety of training provided to clients. In the Southbank Institute of TAFE this has resulted in a 9.9 per cent reduction in the cost of service delivery from $6.94 per student contact hour in 1993/94 to a projected $6.25 per student contact hour in 1995/96. Similar reductions are expected to be achieved in Institutes across that State as they develop more fully. The establishment and maintenance of an adequate vehicle fleet is an essential component of achieving these administrative efficiencies.

In addition, the restructure of Southbank has generated savings of $800,000 in the first full year.

Vehicle usage for non-SES Q-Fleet vehicles is monitored on a monthly basis. Where a vehicle travels less than 1200 kilometres per month over a period of three months or more, the relevant Director is instructed to justify the retention of the vehicle. Twelve hundred kilometres is used as the benchmark to ensure that the vehicle will average 40,000 kilometres over the two year leasing period.

111. Bremer Institute of TAFE

Mr GRICE asked the Minister for Employment and Training and Minister Assisting the Premier on Public Service Matters—

Have staff at Bremer Institute of TAFE been given verbal advice to be very careful about enrolling deaf students as the institute has to meet the cost of paying for an interpreter to assist such students?

Answer (Mrs Edmond):

No. The Institute's policy in respect to students with a disability, is that following an assessment of needs of the student, appropriate assistance is provided.

I can advise that only one hearing impaired student has sought assistance during the past year and that this was approved.

112. Transport Department, Sunshine Coast

Miss SIMPSON asked the Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development—

(1) What non-Government valuers have been used by the Queensland Transport Department in the Sunshine Coast district since 1989?

(3) How much have they each been paid, and what is the department's criteria for selecting valuers?

Answer (Mr Elder):

1. Individual Case Files on Property matters are maintained to meet all legislative requirements, however to allow an answer to this question computer records have only been kept since July 1990. The following is a list of valuers in these records:

Michael Slater

Taylor Byrne

Alan Carrick and Assoc

Rafter and O'Hagan

Egan Leggett and Rogers

Randal Warren Valuations

Sergiacomi and Gillespie

Bugler Francis Valuers

Henzells Agency Pty Ltd

2. A total of $81991.40 has been paid to the previously mentioned valuers. As these contracts are commercial in confidence the amounts paid to each individual valuer is unavailable.

When selecting consultants, Queensland Transport treats each case on its respective merits. Selection of a valuer is based on experience in a particular line of work as well as familiarity in the area and in acquisition work in general.

113. Queensland Rail Training Courses, Gladstone

Mrs CUNNINGHAM asked the Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development—

With reference to approaches to me by a number of concerned Queensland Rail employees at Gladstone—

(1) Is he aware that staff wishing to attend in-service training courses to gain advancement within Queensland Rail often face difficulties in obtaining the necessary leave and are told the reason for refusal is "staff shortages"?

(2) Is promotion being impeded because there are insufficient staff available to fill positions left vacant through promotion within Queensland Rail?

(3) Is it correct that the proposals in the Queensland Rail enterprise bargaining process will remove penalty allowances for employees for protracted hours of work and require them to accept unreasonable conditions (some of these concerns have been tabled before the Arbitration Commission)?

Answer (Mr Elder):

(1 & 2) Training opportunities in Queensland Rail have increased dramatically. Staff are encouraged to attend courses to further their skills and knowledge whenever possible. Practical limitations, however, influence the timing at which individuals can be catered for.

With respect to Gladstone I assume that the staff in question are examiners employed in the area.

Examiners play an integral role in maintaining the safe operation of our railway network. The skills employed by a railway examiner are unique to the

railway and consequently training is performed within the organisation. Classes typically consist of ten trainees and run for periods up to five months.

Examiners are located at all major centres throughout the state. At each location, the number of qualified staff is maintained to sufficiently perform the regular workload plus any foreseeable events. In the case of unpredictable events, staff coverage is provided by a combination of temporary secondment from other locations and by working overtime.

Training opportunities within Queensland Rail have increased dramatically. Staff are encouraged to attend courses to further their skills and knowledge whenever possible. Practical limitations, however, influence the timing at which individuals can be catered for.

In recent times, there has been an unprecedented level of staff departures throughout Queensland from the examiner ranks. The situation has been brought about mainly by promotion and transfer. Consequently, a temporary shortage of examiners has resulted. The workload is being maintained through overtime and revised work methods.

The shortage is minor and only temporary. New work methods with greater efficiency are being introduced and additional courses for new entry into the examiners ranks are being organised. All efforts are being made to allow staff fulfil their chosen career paths.

(3) All rail unions are a signatory to Queensland Rail's Enterprise Agreements (EA) which are ratified by the Industrial Relations Commission. There is a requirement by the Industrial Relations Commission that certified agreements are a completely agreed document between the parties, otherwise ratification by the Industrial Relations Commission will not be forthcoming.

The IRC also takes into consideration what effect the proposed agreement will have in respect of its Public Interest test and possible ramifications any issue may have on other awards of the Commission.

It was recognised during negotiations for EA2 that QR needed to review its existing method of payments for employees working shift work. This recognition was supported by the fact that a large number of QR employees were working shift work.

During the last 10 to 15 years there has been a greater emphasis placed on QR to provide a 24 hours per day / 7 days per week operation. Therefore, those employees which were normally considered day workers are now required to work around the clock.

Clearly those employees who have been working the new shift work arrangements have been receiving substantially higher wage outcomes due to the penalty payments which apply.

Any movement to a new shift work penalty payment arrangement will be addressed through consultation with the relevant unions concerned.

In respect of the issue being tabled in the IRC, QR and the unions have submitted a draft new award for QR to ratify. The draft award contains reference to the `shift allowance' provisions only, while maintaining the current conditions for shift work/overtime penalties for employees.

Any change to the current conditions would happen as a result of consultation and negotiation with the unions, resulting in an award variation.

Queensland Rail will commence negotiations to develop Enterprise Agreement 3 with rail unions in July 1996.

114.Harness Racing, Mackay

Mr MALONE asked the Minister for Primary Industries and Minister for Racing—

With reference to a strong rumour circulating in the Mackay region in regard to the future of harness racing which is worth more than $1m to suppliers and supporters—

Will he give an assurance that there are no plans to downgrade the status of harness racing in the Mackay region?

Answer (Mr Gibbs):

The Mackay Harness Racing Club (MHRC) has been running up to 40 meetings per year, usually on Wednesday afternoons. The club is entitled to receive up to $225,900 from TAB profit to fund its 1995-96 racing program.

After a period of disruption at local committee and club administration level, the Queensland Harness Racing Board has been providing managerial assistance to help keep this club afloat.

The Queensland Principal Club, the control body for the thoroughbred code, (through the Mackay Turf Club) is also examining options to assist the management of the Harness Racing Club, which shares the same venue as the Turf Club

Subject to the requirement that registered race clubs of all three codes of racing operate in a financially responsible manner, the MHRC will continue to make its contribution both locally and for the wider industry good.

115.Mining Leases, Emmogen Creek

Mr GILMORE asked the Minister for Minerals and Energy—

With reference to the request to his department by Mr Kenneth D Ritchie previous lessee of ML 719 and ML 720 situated in the vicinity of Emmogen Creek, north of Cape Tribulation for detailed information in respect of a chronology of events in respect of his mining operation in the period from 1980 to the time of forfeiture of the leases—

Will he provide such a detailed chronology and an explicit and detailed account of the reasons for the forfeiture and reasons why Mr Ritchie was not paid compensation for those leases?

Answer (Mr McGrady):

Mining Lease 719 was transferred to Mr Ritchie in February 1980 and Mining Lease 720 in November 1981. From the date of purchase of the leases to their forfeiture in January 1985, no mining activity as

required by the then Mining Act 1968 had been undertaken by Mr Ritchie.

In response to complaints from Mr Ritchie, the forfeiture of the leases was the subject of an investigation by the Ombudsman in 1985. The Ombudsman found that the administrative actions taken were not in any way improper or discriminatory.

On 3rd September 1987, Mr Ritchie issued a Supreme Court Writ against the State of Queensland claiming that (a) the leases were not validly forfeited; (b) damages for nuisance; (c) damages for disturbance of easement; (e) interest; and (f) costs.

As the Court action is still pending, legal advice has been that no comment should be made on the matter.

116. Buy-back of Land, Cairns

Ms WARWICK asked the Premier and Minister for Economic and Trade Development—

With reference to a letter to him, dated 2 August 1995 from Mr Tom Pyne, Mayor of Cairns, concerning Consideration of Buy-Back—Whitfield, Cairns, and as to date no reply has been received by the concerned residents of Whitfield and in light of pre-election promises to fund the Hillslopes Buy-Back—

(1) Has any contact been made by senior officers of his Government, with senior officers of the Federal Government and the CEO of Cairns City Council?

(2) If so, what has been the outcome?

(3) Is the Government willing to negotiate a buy-back in conjunction with the local and Federal governments?

Answer (Mr W. K. Goss):

The election commitment referred to a twelve point plan which, among other things, included planning controls and land acquisition as mechanisms to protect Cairns Hillslopes. I understand that as part of the FNQ2010 growth management process a Hillslopes Protection Strategy will be developed which will identify key areas of environmental value and consider options for protection of hillslope land in private ownership through planning controls, voluntary conservation agreements or acquisition. Discussions have been held between senior officers of the State Government and officers of the Commonwealth Government in relation to a Hillslopes Protection Strategy.

On 6 October Deputy Prime Minister Brian Howe announced a commitment of $60,000 to the Hillslopes Strategy. The Commonwealth Government has not established whether it will contribute to the acquisition of identified parcels, however Minister Howe stated that "buybacks were not the first option to look at".

The State Government's position is that if the Hillslopes Protection Strategy identifies land as warranting acquisition, consideration will be given to purchase, preferably in conjunction with the Commonwealth Government and Cairns City Council on the basis of a 1:1:1 contribution. In relation to the subject land at Whitfield, my understanding is that given higher priority hillslope areas for conservation, (some of which the State has already acquired), this particular parcel has low conservation value, would be poor value for money, and does therefore not warrant acquisition. I understand that Cairns City Council development conditions are very stringent on this site and if enforced, should minimise impacts. I have recently written to the Mayor of Cairns to confirm this position.

117. Bond University

Mr QUINN asked the Treasurer—

(1) Is he involved in providing funds by way of loan or overdraft to any university for the purpose of participating in the purchase of Bond University; if so, which university is involved and what arrangements have been made or are being considered to facilitate the loan/overdraft?

(2) Has he granted permission for any university to enter into negotiations with respect to obtaining any advance by way of loan or overdraft from any bank, person or Government instrumentality for the purpose of participating in the purchase of Bond University; if so, which university is involved, what information did he request and what information was supplied?

(3) Will he guarantee that no public funds will be used by any Queensland university or entities controlled by the university, to participate in the purchase of Bond University?

(4) Is he satisfied that such a purchase would not be in breach of sections 46 and 50 of the *Trade Practices Act?*

Answer (Mr De Lacy):

(1) The Queensland Government has been approached by several preferred registrants regarding possible funding for the purchase of Bond University. Due to the commercial sensitivity of these proposals, I am not in a position to provide further information at this time.

(2) See answer to question (1).

(3) There will be no contributions from the Consolidated Fund for any preferred registrant for the purchase of Bond University.

(4) Any prospective purchaser would need to undertake a proper due diligence exercise as a matter of course and in this process they should consider the Trade Practices Act implications and obtain legal and financial advice as appropriate.

118. Use of Former TAFE College Directors as Consultants

Mr TURNER asked the Minister for Employment and Training and Minister Assisting the Premier on Public Service Matters—

(1) How many of the TAFE college directors, who retired with substantial financial benefits within the last 14 months, have continued working for the department as “consultants”?

(2) Has such “consultancy” work been advertised so that other equally or better-qualified consultants could compete for it?

Answer (Mrs Edmond):

1. Only one TAFE Queensland College Director has retired in the past 14 months since July 1994. This person has not been employed in the Department as a consultant.

2. See Answer No. 1.

119.Southbank Institute of TAFE

Mr STEPHAN asked the Minister for Employment and Training and Minister Assisting the Premier on Public Service Matters—

With reference to the memorandum of 7 October 1994 from the Director, Southbank Institute of TAFE, to all Program Directors, re Budget strategies—

(1) How has the costing of $5m p.a. referred to in item #4 been calculated?

(2) How many permanent teachers at the institute were on reduced teaching hours during the first quarter of 1994-95?

(3) In the first quarter of 1994-95, what was the total cost to the Institute of teachers who, having negotiated reduced teaching hours, then taught for more than the negotiated number of hours and then claimed for the “excess” hours at casual or penalty rates, as indicated in this memorandum?

(4) What was the cost to the taxpayers of this practice throughout TAFE colleges in 1993-94?

(5) Does she agree that the immediate withdrawal of delegated expenditure authority (point 5 of the memorandum) from all Strategic Business Unit Managers at Southbank clearly indicate that the director believes he cannot rely on their financial competence, integrity and responsibility?

Answer (Mrs Edmond):

(1) The $5 million referred to in the memorandum represents the estimated cost in 1993 of Southbank Institute teachers teaching less than 21 hours per week. TAFE Queensland teachers are employed under the TAFE Teacher's Award—State (6 April 1991). Under this award, "within the ordinary weekly attendance hours, Teachers and Principal Teachers shall be entitled to eight (8) hours for associated functions and three (3) hours for incidental duties based on 21 hours teaching per week." Teachers teach less than 21 hours for a variety of reasons, including when there is insufficient industry and community demand for training relevant to their skills and experience. During these hours, teachers undertake additional duties of benefit to the Institute and students, including course, curriculum or special program development and review, industry liaison, professional development, course and career counselling.

(2) During the first quarter 1994-95 an equivalent 86 teachers undertook these duties.

(3) It is not possible to identify the total cost to the Institute of teachers teaching less than 21 hours and claiming casual rates as permanent and casual pays are maintained through different payroll systems. This will be available when a new system (REDIPAYS) is introduced in early 1996. Several strategies have been implemented by the Institute to address inefficiencies resulting from this practice including reviewing and changing the skills mix of Institute staff against industry demand and the employment of specialist non-teaching staff to undertake incidental duties previously completed by teachers.

(4) It is similarly not possible to identify the total cost of this practice across TAFE Queensland during 1993-94. Institutes through their Enterprise Agreement Implementation Plans have however identified and implemented strategies similar to those adopted by Southbank in order to reduce these costs.

(5) No, I advise that the decision to withdraw delegated expenditure authority was made during the amalgamation of colleges to form the Institute, and prior to an Institute management structure being formalised. The decision did not reflect any lack of confidence in staff.

120.Ipswich TAFE College

Mr LESTER asked the Minister for Employment and Training and Minister Assisting the Premier on Public Service Matters—

With reference to financial accounting requirements, Ipswich College would have issued (and retained copies of) receipts for moneys collected from “The Training Post” for lease/rent of college premises/facilities situated at Ipswich Campus—

Will she produce copies of such official receipts from the time “The Training Post” first occupied such premises, till the present time?

Answer (Mrs Edmond):

The Training Post rented College facilities from the period 1991-1994.

The arrangements were terminated in December 1994. As at June 1995 all debts owed by the Training Post to The Bremer Institute of TAFE (formerly the Ipswich College of TAFE) were paid in full. I table all relevant documents.

121.Ipswich TAFE College

Mr SANTORO asked the Minister for Employment and Training and Minister Assisting the Premier on Public Service Matters—

With reference to my questions on 28 April 1994 to the then Minister for Vocational Education relating to financial mismanagement at Ipswich College of TAFE and to his response which indicated that (a) some documents could not be located in the limited time available (obviously neither the college nor TAFE head office had an efficient filing system), (b) some documents were unavailable as they had been referred to the Criminal Justice Commission (obviously TAFE head office photocopiers weren’t

working so no copies had been made and kept) and (c) he would advise the Parliament of the result of the urgent investigations he had put in train in relation to matters raised in my questions and as the department has now had adequate time in which to ensure the appropriate documents are located or returned from the CJC, and investigations completed—

Will he now provide the documents necessary to answer the questions placed on notice on 28 April 1994 and advise the Parliament of the results of those urgent investigations put in train by her predecessor?

Answer (Mrs Edmond):

In answer to Question 121, I table copies of payment details in relation to The Training Post, including details of the final payment.

I also table copies of all available approvals and claims for payment in relation to the fashion subjects, during which students made components of uniforms for the West Moreton Building Society.

No other agreements between the College and the West Moreton Building Society have been located.

As far as the Criminal Justice Commission is concerned, the investigation is now complete. It was the Commission's view, "having considered the advice of its financial analysts and the results of the investigation, that none of these allegations could be further productively investigated, in view of the state of record-keeping at the College at the time of the allegations and view of their age. The Commission accordingly intends to take no further action in these matters".

In view of the problems that the College had experienced, the Commissioner suggested to the College "that it might find an assessment by the Commission's Corruption Prevention Division of assistance". The Director-General accepted the offer.

In relation to the promotional video, the investigation found that:

. the records covering the period when the videotape was produced are incomplete

. the College Director of the time has taken leave to undertake vocational educational and training duties in the United Arab emirates

. the Executive Director, TAFE Queensland wrote to that Director seeking information which will allow the Department to conclude its investigation

. in the letter received from the previous Director he asserts that all Government guidelines were followed in the process re the production of the promotional video at Ipswich College of TAFE

. investigations showed that expenditure vouchers associated with this purchase were in order.

I table documents relating to this purchase:

- the Requisition for Goods and/or Services
- the Purchase Order
- A letter of acceptance of quotes; and
- A letter of non-acceptance of quotes.

122.Mount Pleasant Private Hospital

Mr HORAN asked the Minister for Health—

With reference to the recent licence approval of the Mt Pleasant Private Psychiatric and Rehabilitation Hospital at Birdwood Road, Greenslopes—

(1) Why was this approval rushed through in one week following publicity in the *Sunday Mail*?

(2) Was this approval in complete accord with the Cabinet approved guidelines for private hospital licensing and did the application have the approval of the appropriate officers within Queensland Health?

(3) Did the application provide the required detail of bed mix and bed usage?

(4) Did the listed directors change during the period of licence examination?

(5) Why was this approval given ahead of other similar applications which had been before Queensland Health for longer periods of time?

Answer (Mr Beattie):

It would be irresponsible on my part if I failed to point out that the line of questioning being pursued here by the Honourable Member clearly illustrates just how out of touch the National Party is on health policy.

(1) The approval was not rushed through. This application was one of a number of applications for private hospital developments and expansions which had a major focus on psychiatric patients. Queensland Health had considered this application over a period of months. The application was finalised after the applicants met with me on 22 August 1995 and I directed my Department to reply within a timeframe of two weeks. My directive predated the *Sunday Mail* article.

(2) Yes

(3) Yes

(4) No

(5) As previously indicated, this application was one of a number of applications for private hospital licences which had a focus on psychiatric patients. These applications raised similar issues which required a Departmental position to be established. As a matter of common practice all applications are handled in date order of receipt except where extra information is required, or the complexity of the assessment requires additional time to be taken to determine the application.

I would extremely grateful if the Honourable Member made public his concerns about why this project should not have been approved.

123.Employment; Green Jobs in Industry

Mr LAMING asked the Minister for Employment and Training and Minister Assisting the Premier on Public Service Matters—

With reference to suggested job opportunities outlined in the book *Green Jobs in Industry* (pages 59, 61 attached)—

What efforts have been made by the Queensland Government to access available Federal funding for “large-scale job opportunities in water auditing ... waste water recycling and infrastructure development”?

Answer (Mrs Edmond):

Inquiries to the Commonwealth Government have revealed that there are no new sources of funds from the Federal Government to provide job opportunities in "green" employment. Rather it is expected that the opportunities provided by current Labour Market Programs such as Jobtrain, SkillShare, LEAP (Landcare and Environment Action Program) etc. would be utilised to support innovative programs and work experience which will lead to green jobs.

Officers from my Department are consulting with officers from Department of Primary Industries and the Department of Environment & Heritage to explore options for further development of "green" employment initiatives as part of the Goss Government's Youth Jobs Plan initiative.

This initiative will provide 1000 young people with training and work experience in National Park projects through the Youth Conservation Corp. An anticipated 780 environmental traineeships will also be provided for unemployed youth. Departmental officers are exploring the possibilities of linking these initiatives to the Commonwealth "Green Jobs in Industry" proposals or developing new initiatives to assist in job creation.

124. Personalised Number Plates

Mr FITZGERALD asked the Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development—

With reference to personalised number plates for registered motor vehicles—

(1) How many personalised number plates were purchased by motorists in 1994-95?

(2) What amount of money was collected?

(3) Are owners of "Hot Rod" vehicles able to register vehicles at concessional rates and purchase personalised number plates?

Answer (Mr Elder):

In responding to the Member for Lockyer's question concerning the number of personalised plates purchased in 1994-95, let me first explain that there are a number of different custom and personalised number plate products available for purchase from Queensland Transport. These include the standard "personalised" plate range, "black and white" plate, and prestige plates.

In 1994-1995 the department sold 11,086 sets of personalised plates, 1,293 sets of black and white plates, and 214 sets of prestige plates.

Gross income from the sale of these custom and personalised plate products was $3.5M in 1994-95. The net income, after taking into account the costs associated with manufacturing these special plates, the salaries and administrative costs of the small unit responsible for managing custom and personalised plate business and the promotion and advertising costs involved in marketing these products, was $2.48M.

The Member for Lockyer also inquired concerning concessional registration of "hot rods" and whether owners of hot rods can purchase personalised number plates. Hot rod registration applies only to vehicles manufactured prior to 1 January 1948.

Concessional registration is granted to owners of these vehicles on the condition that they are only used for—

participation in rallies organised by the Australian Street Rod Federal;

participation in processions for which a permit has been issued under the Traffic Regulations;

exhibition at fetes and the like conducted for charitable or educational purposes; and

preparing for and proceeding to and from such activities.

While these vehicles typically are issued with standard number plates, there would be no reason why an owner could not purchase and attach a set of custom or personalised plates. Hot roads are able to be identified as having concessional registration by the special concessional windscreen registration label issued for these types of vehicles.

125. Environment and Heritage Department, Closure of Far-north Queensland Roads

Mr ELLIOTT asked the Minister for Environment and Heritage—

With reference to recent press reports that his department intends permanent closure and re-vegetation of the Clohesy River corridor from Lake Morris through to Davies Creek, the ABC road network from Lane Tinaroo to Davies Creek, the Mount Lewis, Mount Windsor, the South Johnstone Forestry network, the Culpa Road and the Koombooloomba Forestry Road network and the road through the Lake Eacham National Park—

(1) What are the Government’s intentions in respect of each of these abovementioned roads?

(2) What technical advice has been considered by Government in determining that roads ought to be closed?

(3) What community consultation was entered into by his department in respect of these proposed closures?

(4) When can we anticipate such closures to proceed?

(5) What is the anticipated economic loss to the Far North Queensland Tourist industry from such closures?

Answer (Mr Barton):

(1) to (5) None of the roads mentioned have been permanently closed.

A draft Wet Tropics World Heritage Area Management Plan is being prepared and will contain proposals for the future management of roads and

forestry tracks in the World Heritage Area. It will be released for community comment later this year.

The aim is a cost effective and manageable transport system that meets the community's needs, provides a range of visitor and tourism opportunities, and does not compromise Queensland's international obligation to protect the area's World Heritage values.

126. Aboriginal Primary Health Care Support Network

Mrs McCAULEY asked the Minister for Health—

As Minister responsible for Aboriginal health care, what support has he offered in respect of a submission by aboriginal groups to the Federal Government for funding for the Aboriginal Primary Health Care Support Network being established in Far North Queensland and does he support this proposition?

Answer (Mr Beattie):

I have not received a copy of the funding submission for the development of an Aboriginal Primary Health Care Support Network, and consequently I am unable to comment on this matter.

127.State Government Land, Stafford Heights

Mr J. N. GOSS asked the Minister for Environment and Heritage—

With reference to commitments and public assurances given by the Government to preserve bushland and the desire by residents of Stafford Heights for the preservation of the 6.1 ha of remaining bushland left in Stafford Heights—

What steps has he taken to ensure that the Remick Street Reserve bushland at Stafford Heights will be preserved?

Answer (Mr Barton):

While the Reserve does not contain sufficiently high conservation values to warrant acquisition by the Department of Environment and Heritage, it does have local significance as it provides a bushland node on the Downfall Creek corridor.

The Department of Environment and Heritage is unable to consider purchase of this area as its acquisition budget is fully committed to priority land purchases throughout the State.

It is suggested that the Brisbane City Council be approached as that authority may be interested in acquiring the Reserve as parkland, utilising funds which may be available from Council's Environmental Rate Levy.

128.Peak Crossing Correctional Institution

Mr CONNOR asked the Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services—

(1) Is he, the Queensland Corrective Services Commission, or any agency associated with his department or the Commission, intending to establish a prison, prison farm or any other institution that will involve prisoners or other offenders at or near Peak Crossing near Ipswich?

(2) If so, (a) what is the institution and who will administer it, (b) how many offenders will it hold, (c) when will it open, (d) what type of offenders will be housed and (e) what is the cost of the proposal?

Answer (Mr Braddy):

No, the QCSC is not considering any such proposition at this time. The QCSC is actively investigating the site for a wilderness program for young offenders and is open to requests from the community for the establishment of WORC-type camps for offenders.

The WORC program has not been involved in consultations for the establishment of a camp in the Peak Crossing area. However, workers from the WORC program have been performing community work at the Kalbar showgrounds. Inquiries relating to the possible location for a youth Wilderness camp have not yet commenced.

If the member has any further information I would be happy to have the matter investigated.

129.Housing Department Units, Yeppoon

Mr CARROLL asked the Minister for Housing, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Rural Communities, Minister for Rural Communities and Minister for Provision of Infrastructure for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Communities—

With reference to home units being built for the Department of Housing at 23 Meikleville Street, Yeppoon and to the fact that the block is only small and there is little, if no suitable infrastructure nor transport in the area and the local community is very upset—

(1) How many units are being built on this site and in this community?

(2) What will be the proportion rented, and sold?

(3) What infrastructure and transport assistance will he be supplying to the area?

Answer (Mr Mackenroth):

Eight one bedroom units are currently being constructed on this site. As a result, a total of 11 units are currently under construction in Yeppoon. A further 6 dwellings are programmed for commencement this financial year.

There is a strong demand for public housing in the area and current and future projects are assisting to meet that need. All eight dwellings being constructed at Meikleville Street will be available for rental purposes to applicants on the public housing wait list for the area.

This project has been planned in consultation with local government and meets requirements stipulated. It has been developed in an existing serviced residential area and no additional infrastructure was required. Provision has been made for adequate car accommodation on the site. Various amenities such as schools and the main business centre are available within a 2.5 kilometre radius of this site.

130.School Resources

Mrs GAMIN asked the Minister for Education—

As I did not receive a reply to my question dated 7 June 1995, I again ask him (a) to explain the marked difference between resource levels provided to high schools and primary schools and (b) why primary schools in huge growth areas and with socio-economic difficulties are so gravely disadvantaged in comparison with secondary schools?

Answer (Mr Hamill):

(a) Resources are provided to schools according to a number of allocation methodologies. Generally these resources can be grouped under three headings, i.e. Staffing, Facilities and Financial.

Staffing

The staffing models which are currently used have developed over a considerable period of time. Consequently they are underpinned by the traditional view of need (eg. the significant management structure of secondary school has included heads of department and also the specialist nature of secondary subjects has led to smaller class sizes).

In addition, the model operates within industrial constraints, for example the non contact time differential between the primary and secondary sectors.

Recent developments which have increased the level of resources to primary schools include:

- the introduction of on hour contact time from January 1995;
- lowering the threshold enrolment figure at which a primary principal has a full teaching load from 157 to 126;
- introducing deputy principals with a half teaching load from enrolment 400;
- providing 1.5 hours per Year 2 class as key teacher time;
- employing 110 education advisers (literacy and numeracy);
- employing 135 educational advisers (english and mathematics) working primarily in the primary sector.

Facilities

In developing the capital works program (which includes minor works) priorities are set on the basis of needs. The sector (eg. primary or secondary) is not a factor in assessing priorities.

Financial Resources

Financial resources are provided to schools by way of the school grant.

The issue of the funding gap between the primary and secondary sectors was considered prior to implementing the *Helping P&Cs with the Basics* initiative. In order to narrow the gap, the greater percentage of funding provided through the initiative was allocated to primary schools (eg. in 1993/94 and 1994/95, some $9 million of $12 million was allocated to the primary sector).

As part of the preparation of the *Helping P&Cs with the Basics* initiative, interstate comparisons were made. These showed that the difference in funding levels between primary and secondary in Queensland was consistent with the situation in other States. Research also noted that the Commonwealth Government recognised the greater cost of providing secondary education and structured its funding to both state and non-state sectors accordingly.

Schools in huge growth areas and with socio-economic difficulties.

Additional support is provided to schools with high concentration of students from low socio-economic backgrounds through the Special Program School Scheme. The majority of the two hundred and fifty schools in the current three year program are primary schools.

131.Pork Industry

Mr PERRETT asked the Minister for Primary Industries and Minister for Racing—

With reference to the perilous state of the pork industry which is losing 100-200 producers in Queensland each year, given current returns approximately 28 cents per kilogram below the cost of production—brought about by unfair competition from subsidised Canadian pork, and increased prices for grain and protein—

Why has he refused requests for assistance by way of feed freight subsidy to an industry suffering the extraordinary circumstance of unfair competition in addition to drought?

Answer (Mr Gibbs):

The freight subsidy arrangements under the Government's Drought Relief Assistance Scheme are aimed at maintaining the breeding nucleus of herds and flocks where management practices have changed because of drought.

Pig producers do not qualify for this form of assistance for various reasons.

Firstly, their management or feeding practices do not change under drought conditions. This does not dispute the fact that the cost of feed grains can increase as a result of drought. Also, they continue to feed for growth as well as maintenance.

No pig producer feeds solely to maintain a breeding herd.

This is very different from the drought management practices in the grazing industries.

132.Greyhound Racing, Central Highlands

Mr MITCHELL asked the Minister for Primary Industries and Minister for Racing—

With reference to the Clermont Progress Association which is very eager to establish greyhound racing in the Central Highlands and which has the support of the Belyando Shire and surrounding mining centres—

(1) What criteria is required to be met by the association to become registered for greyhound racing?

(2) Would there be any assistance from Government for the establishment of such a project?

Answer (Mr Gibbs):

1. Should the Clermont progress association wish to establish greyhound racing in the central highlands, it needs to contact the Greyhound Racing Authority (GRA) of Queensland. This statutory authority has been set up to control, supervise, and regulate greyhound racing.

The Authority is also charged with promoting the greyhound code and would welcome any proposal to establish a new greyhound club and venue. The association would need to discuss with the GRA the criteria that it would consider in registering a new club.

2. Whether any assistance could be provided from the racing development fund for such a project would depend on the merit of the application and the recommendations of the GRA and the State's greyhound racing clubs.

133. School Transport

Mr BAUMANN asked the Minister for Education—

As several young school children have become ineligible for transport assistance under current guidelines since the completion of Michigan Drive, Oxenford and because of the unusual circumstances, there is now no safe pathway or bikeway for access to their nearest school, will he relax the conditions governing eligibility until a safe alternative can be provided in this extremely hazardous situation?

Answer (Mr Hamill):

Conveyance of students to school has always been parental responsibility. Successive State Governments have provided various forms of assistance to schools in certain circumstances.

The main focus of the school transport scheme is to assist parents/guardians of geographically isolated students with the cost of accessing the nearest state school with the year level required.

With finite resources available, it is necessary to impose distance thresholds to establish eligibility:

(a) Primary students must live more than 3.2km by shortest trafficable route from the nearest state primary school: and

(b) Secondary students must live more than 4.8km by the shortest trafficable route from the nearest state secondary school.

A change of policy from 'nearest school' to 'school of choice' could not be achieved in the current economic climate without jeopardising other education services. It is therefore assumed that parents who choose a school other than their nearest State school, do so in the full knowledge of the costs involved.

All policy guidelines have been met in assessing the eligibility for transport assistance of those students referred to in the Member's request.

These ten children do not attend their nearest State school, Oxenford State School. Five attend Coomera State School and the other five attend non-state schools. There have been no changes to safety conditions in the area, and students still travel on the same bus to and from school.

Some students may be eligible for assistance under the safety net provision for financially disadvantaged students.

To determine eligibility they should contact the Transport Services Officer, Queensland Transport on (07) 3553 1197.

135. Driving Instructors, Compulsory Accreditation

Mr HEALY asked the Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development—

Will he indicate whether or not compulsory accreditation will be introduced for driving instructors or does the Government still favour a voluntary accreditation proposal, given that the State's 620 driving instructors who are currently licensed and subject to police and Queensland Transport scrutiny, fear that a voluntary system will lead to deteriorating standards of driver training?

Answer (Mr Elder):

While there is growing acceptance among driving instructors for accreditation, I am aware that many within the industry remain concerned about the voluntary nature of accreditation. I have received direct representations from the Australian Driver Trainers Association (ADTA) concerning their preference for compulsory accreditation.

Accordingly, I have requested Queensland Transport to work with industry representatives to develop a model of compulsory accreditation for my consideration which best meets the needs of consumers, industry and government.

This model will need to -

- minimise costs to consumers, industry and government;
- ensure consumer protection;
- ensure a satisfactory level of client service;
- provide flexibility for an improvement in standards; and
- take into account the Hilmer process.

Once I have considered the model developed by the Driving Instruction School Industry and the department, I will be taking a submission on the matter to Cabinet.

136. Liquid Waste Disposal

Mr SLACK asked the Minister for Environment and Heritage—

With reference to Volume 1 of the CJC report on its public hearing into the improper disposal of liquid waste in South East Queensland, in which the Inquiry made a very strong call for a further investigation into the impact of mining in Queensland by a person or

body possessing appropriate power and expertise, and while acknowledging that the Government called for an industry environmental protection policy to be undertaken on the mining and petroleum industries—

(1) Does he acknowledge that the environmental protection policy process does not fully address the main basis for the further investigations recommended by the CJC Inquiry—that being the conflicting nature of the Department of Minerals and Energy and the necessity for environmental requirements to be grounded in regulation rather than in administration?

(2) What measures is he going to take to ensure that these issues will be addressed in the manner and depth recommended by the CJC Inquiry, thus regaining some credibility for his Government on this issue?

Answer (Mr Barton):

(1) No. The Environment Protection Policy which is being developed for mining is subordinate legislation under the Environmental Protection Act 1994. The Policy, which in accordance with the Act, will be developed through a full and detailed public consultation process managed by the Department of Environment and Heritage in consultation with the Department of Minerals and Energy, requires approval by the Governor in Council following consultation of all submissions made to myself as the Minister responsible for administration of the Act. Early development of the Policy is being assisted by a steering group comprising the above two Departments, the Queensland Mining Council, and the Queensland Conservation Council. It should be noted that following approval of the Policy, the administering authority must give effect to the policy. Thus the environmental requirements for mining will be grounded in regulation, not administration.

(2) It is Government policy that the Environmental Protection Policy for Mining will incorporate at least the following components:

Review of the current Environmental Management Policy for Mining in Queensland involving a refinement of policy objectives, planning framework to achieve objectives, environmental management performance measures and security deposit system.

Policy on environmental impact assessment process covering all stages of mineral development from project feasibility, tenure application and approval and tenure relinquishment.

Policy on environmental compliance auditing, monitoring and enforcement procedures.

Comprehensive technical guidelines setting out environmental best practice technology for a range of environmental impact issues common to the exploration and mining industry.

As indicated in (1) above the Policy will become subordinate legislation under the Environmental Protection Act, and important components will be incorporated into the environmental provisions of the Mineral Resources Act 1989. Such action will provide a clear and enforceable legislative basis for the environmental aspects of the important mining sector, and in the view of the Government, will be the most comprehensive and environmentally progressive instrument dealing with mining within local Australian jurisdictions.

137. Fire Service, Staffing

Mr LITTLEPROUD asked the Minister for Emergency Services and Minister for Consumer Affairs—

With reference to the cost of providing safe manning levels on first response fire vehicles, his predecessor promised the use of overtime to achieve this until new firemen were trained and later announced capital works expenditures would be needed to allow this to be funded—

(1) How much is overtime costing the Queensland Fire Service each week to make safe manning levels possible?

(2) What items of capital expenditure have been cancelled so far because of this?

(3) What else is to be axed in 1995-96?

Answer (Mr Davies):

(1) From 1 July 1995 to 30 September 1995 the average overtime cost for the QFS has been $96,830 per week.

(2) No items of capital expenditure have been cancelled because of this overtime.

(3) Nothing is planned for cancellation in 1995-96 financial year. However the QFS will be monitoring Capital Expenditure, as it monitors all expenditure.

138.Electricity Industry

Mrs SHELDON asked the Treasurer—

With reference to the $1.4 billion market value of the debt of the Queensland electricity supply industry at 31 December 1994, as per the final half-year report of the former Queensland Electricity Commission, and to the combined debt of the generation and transmission arms of the industry in its fully corporatised format at 30 June this year of $2.7 billion—

Why is the debt of the Queensland electricity supply industry in June 1995 recorded as over a billion dollars more than it was six months earlier?

Answer (Mr De Lacy):

On 1 January 1995 the Queensland Generation Corporation (QGC) and the Queensland Transmission and Supply Corporation (QSTC) were established as Government Owned Corporations, replacing the Queensland Electricity Commission and the seven Electricity Boards.

An important component of corporatisation is the establishment of commercial capital structures as means of replicating private sector commercial disciplines. After detailed review of the balance sheet of the electricity corporations and a comparison with other State and international electricity organisations, a gearing ratio (debt: debt plus equity) of 33% was determined for the electricity corporations, which translated to a debt transfer of $1.3 billion to the corporations. This was

outlined earlier this year in a press release issued by the Minister for Minerals and Energy on 27 March 1995 and was also referred to in the May State Budget.

I confirm that the market debt of the electricity industry was $2.7 billion at 30 June 1995 compared with $1.4 billion at 31 December 1994. The increase is explained by the transfer of this $1.3 billion of public debt to the new electricity corporations as part of the process of corporatisation. This level of gearing is in fact, conservative. The average gearing ratio of companies in the 'All Industrials' on the Australian Stock Exchange is considerably higher at 77%.

It must be stressed that the overall level of State debt has not been affected. The transfer of debt to the electricity corporations merely represents a re-allocation within the State Government sector.

140.Ipswich and Redbank Railway Workshops

Mr JOHNSON asked the Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development—

With reference to the winding down of the Ipswich Rail workshops and the transfer of all future works in that region to the Redbank facility—

Will Redbank be able to engage in contracts such as is being undertaken for National Rail by the Ipswich workshops?

Answer (Mr Elder):

The Workshops Strategy as approved by Queensland Rail in July 1993 considered the transfer of all functions undertaken at Ipswich to the new Centre of Excellence at Redbank.

An investment of $36 million at Redbank over three years provides for a number of new facilities to accommodate Ipswich functions including an 80 metre x 80 metre wagon manufacture shop, the biggest by far in Australia which will have the capability to undertake all wagon manufacturing work usually performed at Ipswich as well as additional wagon manufacture either for Queensland Rail or external customers such as NRC.

Potential workloads for wagon manufacture during 1996/97 include 100 container wagons per year, 150 coal wagons and 200 NRC container wagons per year and would require the full utilisation of the new facilities at Redbank.

In addition Redbank Workshops will have the capability for the overhaul or repair of wagons to meet the ongoing maintenance needs of Queensland Rail's large wagon fleet, and will have ongoing capacity for development and modification of the existing fleet to meet specific needs of QR's customer groups.

141.Boat Ramps, Hinchinbrook Electorate

Mr ROWELL asked the Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development—

As boat ramps are important facilities on the eastern seaboard areas of the State will he give details of any program in place to provide all tide, all weather boat ramps throughout the Hinchinbrook Electorate?

Answer (Mr Elder):

The Queensland Government currently owns various boat ramps within the Hinchinbrook Electorate which can be classified as all tide/all weather. These are at Dungeness, Mourilyan Harbour and Innisfail. All tide facilities are also available at Clump Point but launching may be difficult in adverse weather conditions.

The present situation is that the Queensland Transport 1995/96 Maritime Capital Works Program does not include the provision of a new facility within the Hinchinbrook Electorate.

However, Queensland Transport's Northern Region is about to invite Local Government Authorities to submit boat ramp projects on a priority basis to establish a five (5) year program for the construction of ramps in that Region.

The issue of providing all tide/weather facilities is a difficult one. There are significant problems associated with providing facilities such as this.

Ramp sites with natural low tide access in all weather conditions are limited.

Those sites where such access could be provided initially by dredging would suffer from excessive siltation and costly ongoing maintenance dredging, apart from other limitations on usage because of wind and wave exposure.

Other sites fringed by mangrove lowlands, such as in the Hinchinbrook Channel, render the deepwater passages inaccessible by land without major engineering effort and environmental damage.

Alternative methods of construction may need to be considered such as an elevated ramp extending to deep water. However structures such as this are costly to construct and an estimate on a concept proposal for Cardwell has indicated that this may be as high as $1.4 million. This would be a major investment for this type of facility and would need to compete for funding priority on a statewide basis.

I can assure you that the needs of the Hinchinbrook Electorate will be fully considered in the development of Queensland Transport Northern Region's five (5) year Maritime Infrastructure Program.

143.Teachers Numbers

Mrs WILSON asked the Minister for Education—

(1) Is teacher morale at an all time low?

(2) Why is teacher stress level so high?

(3) Is it very difficult to find relief teachers?

(4) Why do teachers constantly complain about lack of disciplinary measures (student behaviour management) in the classroom?

Answer (Mr Hamill):

(1 and 2) Teacher Morale is not at an all time low. Schools are now resourced better than ever. The

increases in staffing and funding over the past six years has been well documented and, as a direct result of the funding initiatives of the current Government.

The introduction of initiatives from Shaping the Future have changed the work practices of many teachers. These initiatives have generally been well received by teachers. Additional relief time and support have been provided to assist teachers to implement the initiatives and minimise any discomfort that teachers may feel in the short term as changes are consolidated in the workplace.

The incidents of occupational stress in teachers should be considered in relation to the proportion of stress related claims lodged by sectors Departmental employees. Teachers are counted as 71% of Departmental employees and lodged 80% of stress related claims in the 1994/95 financial year. Hence stress levels in teachers are not significantly higher than other employees in the Education Department.

The Department of Education is one of five Government agencies participating in seven occupational stress initiatives.

The purpose of these initiatives is to reduce the negative impact of occupational stress on our employees and similarly reduce the cost of workers compensation to the broader community.

(3) Some regions are experiences some shortages of relief teachers for schools. This is due to a number of factors including:

> Implementation of professional development for Shaping the Future initiatives. In 1995 teachers were being provided with training in the Year 2 Net, Year 6 Test and SPS Maths, whereas this will not be an issue next year.
>
> The implementation of key teacher relief time through Shaping the Future. This time is currently provided by relief teachers but it is planned to remove some of this to permanent part-time appointment, which will relieve the relief teacher pressure.
>
> High levels of sick leave caused by significantly increased epidemics of various strains of influenza.

(4) Education is currently receiving much media attention, including methods for dealing with disruptive student behaviour.

At various times during the debate on behaviour management, some individuals have chosen to 'blame' members of the school community including teachers, parents, students or the Department of Education. Student behaviour is sometimes seen as purely a problem located within individual students, rather an issue which has to be addressed systematically by the whole school community.

The Department of Education policy "Schools and Discipline: Managing Behaviour in a Supportive School Environment" provides a framework which allows all members of the school community to feel safe and valued. Individual schools are now finding ways of doing this which best suits their community.

Where student behaviour issues are more severe than a teacher feels they can manage alone, there are a range of support systems throughout the State which teachers and their schools can access. The "Maintaining School Discipline" reform package announced in the election will provide additional support for teachers in this area of student discipline through the appointment of 56 additional staff and the establishment of a range of alternative education programs across the State.

144.Home Hill Hospital

Mr STONEMAN asked the Minister for Health—

With reference to announcements in respect of the problems of financial mismanagement in the Northern Health Region and undertakings to correct the present situation—

(1) What assurance can be given to the people of Home Hill that there will not be another proposal to close the facility down as part of any new plan?

(2) Why is the Home Hill Hospital experiencing continuing removal of infrastructure capacity?

(3) What commitment will he give to the community that there will be no negative change to funding for the hospital to such an extent that it becomes an empty shell and subject, therefore, to closure by default?

Answer (Mr Beattie):

(1) The Honourable Member has embarked on a campaign to downgrade the importance of the Home Hill Hospital. This adversely impacts on the dedicated staff who work at the hospital and the patients who are treated there. The Northern Region's current draft 10-year health services plan outlines no intention to close the Home Hill Hospital.

(2) The Home Hill Hospital, together with several other health facilities, has experienced improved services in recent months as a result of a rearrangement of resources allocated across the region. For example, I am advised that last year provided its central sterilising machine to the Bowen Hospital. To ensure that Home Hill would have adequate access to sterilisation facilities, the Ayr Hospital took responsibility for the sterilisation of Home Hill's equipment. The result is that Home Hill's sterilisation needs are being met more quickly and efficiently than it ever did under the previous Government as a direct result of inter-regional coordination of services.

In addition, one of Home Hill's three renal dialysis machines was lent to Townsville last month to meet higher demand for the machines there. Home Hill currently has one dialysis patient and therefore still has one machine. Should the demand for renal dialysis machines increase in Home Hill the machine that was borrowed by Townsville will be returned.

The Honourable Member should tell his Townsville based constituents that in his view they should not have the spare dialysis machine. Obstetrics, theatre and laundry services were closed down at Home Hill Hospital more than eight years ago under a National

Party Government, of which he was a senior member, because the services could be more efficiently and effectively provided at Ayr Hospital—14 km away.

Home Hill Hospital recently employed a full-time courier to ensure that turnaround times for the delivery of laundry, stores and sterile equipment are kept to a minimum.

While some services and infrastructure have been wound down at Home Hill Hospital over the past decade because of the hospital's inability to attract and retain appropriate trained staff, the quality of patient service has actually improved because of the expanded services available at nearby Ayr Hospital.

(3) In recent funding discussions concerning the Northern Region no moves were made to alter the current level of funding for the Home Hill Hospital. However all services throughout the region may experience some changes over time, according to the changing demands and needs of the community.

145.Rugby League Grounds

Mr VEIVERS asked the Deputy Premier, Minister for Tourism, Sport and Youth—

(1) Has the Queensland Government made any decisions regarding the allocation of grounds for playing rugby league in Queensland to either Rupert Murdoch's Super League or the Ken Arthurson/John Quail Australian Rugby League syndicate?

(2) If so, what are the details?

Answer (Mr Burns):

(1) The Government has made no decision with regard to the allocation of grounds for playing rugby league in Queensland.

The use and allocation of venues for the playing of rugby league is the responsibility of individual venue management agencies, which in the case of Suncorp Stadium is the Lang Park Trust, and in the case of Stockland Stadium is the Thuringowa-Townsville Joint Local Authority Board.

R. G. GILES, ACTING GOVERNMENT PRINTER, QUEENSLAND—1995