



Speech by  
**Mr DENVER  
BEANLAND**

**MEMBER FOR INDOOROOPILLY**

---

Hansard 26 August 1999

**ROAD TRANSPORT REFORM BILL**

**Mr BEANLAND** (Indooroopilly—LP) (11.40 a.m.): I rise in this debate to raise three matters. The first relates to the ticking of a box on driver licence applications for the purpose of donating organs and tissue for transplants, which we debated in this place a couple of weeks ago. I raise this matter because it is a very serious issue. I notice that the Minister has some 18 amendments to this legislation. I had hoped that, in those amendments, we would have seen an amendment in relation to this issue, if it is necessary—it may be necessary to amend only the regulations. However, this legislation also covers the regulations in the Act and some changes need to be made to allow such information contained on drivers licences to be forwarded to the Health Department. I hope to hear from the Minister as to when not only the Parliament but also the public can expect these changes to be made so that that can occur.

As the Minister is aware, the subject of organ and tissue donations is a matter of great concern and debate within the community. The Minister should at least be seen to be on the front foot in relation to it because, if nothing is done, it could easily fall off the agenda and it will not be two weeks but two years later that nothing still would have been done. Although currently there is a box on drivers licence applications that people can tick to donate organs and tissue for transplants, as we heard in a previous debate, that information simply stops with the Department of Transport. In other words, it is not much use because the Health Department does not get that information. Therefore, I ask the Minister: how much progress has been made in relation to resolving that matter? As I have indicated previously in this place, it is not a matter that requires a great deal of change to the legislation or the regulations; it is a matter of when the Government determines to make the proposed changes. Currently, people wishing to donate their organs and tissue for transplants can indicate that on their drivers licence and that can be looked at by the hospital staff. However, people have to be in a hospital when their death occurs for that to happen. That information is not much use if their death occurs at home or at some other place.

This issue is of great concern to the public. I hope that we might hear from the Minister about it. I also hoped that, if any legislative changes were required to enable the information to be passed on, they would have been included in the Minister's amendments. As I say, I do not believe that legislative changes are required for that to occur; it merely requires a change to the regulation. However, I want the Minister to clarify this issue. Today is the first opportunity since we had that debate on the Transplantation and Anatomy Amendment Bill for the Minister to clarify this situation. He has the report of the Legal, Constitutional and Administrative Review Committee. The preparatory work has been done. It is a matter now for the Minister and the Government to go forward on. To date, we have not had any indication as to the tack that the Government is proposing to take in relation to what is a very serious and a very important matter. It is an issue that relates to the Minister's portfolio. I would not want to find out that, in two years' time, nothing has occurred—that we are still talking about it but have not taken action.

As I say, I think that it is purely the regulations that need to be changed to allow that to occur. In any case, I would like to hear from the Minister exactly what course of action he is taking in relation to this very important matter, which has been debated previously in this place.

I want to say something about the reduction of speed limits from 60 km/h to 50 km/h in residential areas. That initiative started under the former Government, so members on this side of the Chamber support it, and it is working well. However, a number of streets in residential areas still have speed limits of 60 km/h. For example, Oxley Road, which travels through Sherwood, Chelmer and Graceville, is one; Meiers Road at Long Pocket/Indooroopilly is another.

Firstly, I refer to the speed limit along Oxley Road. I would like the Minister to have another look at this matter. It is an issue that in the past the Minister has received correspondence about, and I am sure that he is going to receive more correspondence about it in the coming weeks. Currently, that road has a 60 km/h speed limit. I ask for that speed limit to be reduced to 50 km/h, and for a number of good reasons. That road is located in a residential area. Sherwood State School, Graceville State School, Milpera High School, Corinda State School, Corinda High School and the Oxley schools are all located along that road. In addition, a number of kindergartens and preschools are located along the route as well as a range of shops. Although there is no strip shopping, there are some significant shopping centres. Currently, there is a great deal of concern about the speed limit because of not only the number of vehicles that use that route but also the number of heavy vehicles that use it.

Although there has been resistance to reducing the speed limit from 60 km/h to 50 km/h, I believe that that should be done in the interests of safety. At the end of the day, to have these vehicles travelling along Oxley Road at 60 km/h serves little purpose. When they get to the Walter Taylor Bridge, they generally come to a dead halt because of the queue of vehicles waiting to get across it. Certainly, during peak periods there is always a queue. Therefore, the vehicles might as well travel along Oxley Road at 50 km/h because they are certainly not going to get across that bridge any faster. The reduction in the speed limit could also very well save lives.

I know that the school and kindergarten communities have expressed a great deal of concern that Oxley Road, the one which so many of them have to cross to get to their local school, kindergarten, or child-care centre, has been left with a speed limit of 60 km/h. I can understand their belief that that speed limit ought to be reduced.

The other road that I mentioned is Meiers Road at Long Pocket/Indooroopilly, which in fact is a dead-end street. It leads out to the Indooroopilly golf links from Indooroopilly Road and Harts Road. Again, it has a 60 km/h speed limit on it instead of a 50 km/h speed limit. I can understand the concern of local residents because, although vehicles travel along that road to the golf links at 60 km/h, it is very much a residential area. It is not a road for which there can be a justification for the 60 km/h speed limit as it does not take through traffic; it is a dead-end street. There seems to be some resistance to reduce the speed limit on that road to 50 km/h. I have had correspondence with the Minister on this issue and to date we have not made much progress on it. However, I ask that further consideration be given to this matter.

In relation to streets that are primarily residential, have a lot of residential character or which a number of schoolchildren cross, unless the Minister can show that there is going to be some improvement in traffic flow if the 60 km/h speed limit is retained, there is little purpose in keeping them at that speed limit. I contend that there is little benefit in both of the streets that I have mentioned having a 60 km/h speed limit. In the interests of road safety, I ask that the speed limit be reduced on those roads.

The last matter I want to raise is the duplication of the Gateway Bridge—whether it is the duplication of the bridge or the construction of a tunnel; I will leave that to the Government. Certainly, that bridge is facing a growing problem of traffic gridlock. The Government should be not only planning a duplication of the bridge but also getting into action down at the mouth of the river.

Over the next few years, the situation is going to go from bad to worse if that route is not duplicated, which would affect all of Brisbane. In the past the Minister has expressed reservations about building more bridges across the river, but there certainly needs to be a duplication of the traffic corridor that passes over the Gateway Bridge if heavy vehicles and other vehicles continue to use that corridor in increasing volumes. Without such a duplication, the city centre and other parts of Brisbane will be flooded by vehicles that would otherwise use the Gateway Motorway. Of course, heavy vehicles in particular will find other routes through residential areas, which is something that we need to avoid.

I hope that this matter is very high on the Minister's list of priorities. There is no traffic plan incorporated in the town plan, which I think is very regrettable because traffic problems are occurring right around the city. In fact, there is no city traffic plan at all. Therefore, the whole traffic problem is made considerably worse and will get even worse unless we develop a planned and coordinated approach to tackle the issue. The matter of an additional traffic corridor, whether it be a bridge or a tunnel at the mouth of the river certainly relates to the State Government and is the responsibility of the Minister for Transport.

I would like to hear the Minister's comments on what the Government is proposing to do in the near future in relation to the three matters that I raised. I ask the Minister: when can we expect to see some results in relation to the three issues?

---