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5 November 2010

The Honourable Cameron Dick MP
Attorney-General and Minister for Industrial Relations
State Law Building
50 Ann Street
BRISBANE  QLD  4000

Dear Attorney

I have pleasure in presenting the Commission’s Annual Report for the financial year ending 30 June 2010.

The past year has been an especially busy and productive one for the Commission, during which it published:

• the final Report for the Review of Jury Directions;
• a Discussion Paper for the Guardianship Review; and
• a Discussion Paper for the Review of Jury Selection.

During the reporting period, the Commission also worked towards completing the final Report for the Guardianship Review, which has since been presented to you.

The Jury Directions Report is discussed in greater detail later in this Annual Report. However, I would particularly like to acknowledge the significant contribution made to that review, and to the Jury Selection Review, by the Commission’s former full-time member, Mr Ian Davis, who died unexpectedly in May 2010. Mr Davis was a much valued member of the Commission, and his untimely death has been a great loss for the Commission both personally and professionally.

As Chairperson, I would also like to acknowledge the dedication shown by the members and staff of the Commission over the last year, especially given our heavy workload during this time. The members and staff of the Commission have enjoyed a collegiate and productive working relationship.

Yours sincerely

The Hon Justice Roslyn Atkinson
Chairperson
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CONSTITUTION OF THE COMMISSION

The Queensland Law Reform Commission is an independent statutory body, and is constituted under the Law Reform Commission Act 1968 (Qld).

FUNCTION OF THE COMMISSION

The function of the Commission, as provided in section 10(1) of the Law Reform Commission Act 1968 (Qld), is to review the law applicable to Queensland with a view to its systematic development and reform, including in particular:

(a) the codification of such law; and
(b) the elimination of anomalies; and
(c) the repeal of obsolete and unnecessary enactments; and
(d) the reduction of the number of separate enactments; and
(e) generally the simplification and modernisation of the law.

MISSION STATEMENT

The Commission’s mission is to meet the needs of the Queensland community by reviewing areas of the law in need of reform, and making recommendations for reform. These recommendations are based on extensive research, public consultation, impartiality, equity and social justice. The Commission’s recommendations are published in its final Reports, which are presented to the Attorney-General for tabling in Parliament in accordance with the requirements of the Law Reform Commission Act 1968 (Qld).

COMMISSION MEMBERS

Members of the Commission are appointed by the Governor in Council on the advice of the Attorney-General. The Law Reform Commission Act 1968 (Qld) provides that the Commission must consist of at least three members, who may be full-time or part-time members. Each person appointed to be a Commission member must be a person appearing to the Governor in Council to be suitably qualified by the holding of judicial office or by experience as a barrister or as a solicitor or as a teacher of law in a University.
The Commission’s usual establishment is five part-time members (including the Chairperson) and one full-time member.

SECRETARIAT

The Secretariat’s usual establishment consists of the Director, the Assistant Director, two Legal Officers, the Commission Secretary and one Administrative Officer. During the reporting period, the Commission received additional funding from the Department of Justice and Attorney-General for the Guardianship Review, out of which it was able to appoint a third Legal Officer until December 2009.

The staff of the Secretariat, together with the full-time member, have the day to day responsibility for the carriage of the Commission’s reviews. The Secretariat also provides the Commission with administrative and secretarial support. This includes the management of all corporate governance, human resources and financial matters for the Commission.

THE WORK OF THE COMMISSION

The Commission reviews areas of the law referred to it by the Attorney-General. During the reporting period, the Commission undertook work on the following reviews:

- The Guardianship Review;
- A review of jury directions;
- A review of jury selection; and
- A review of the law in relation to the disposal of dead bodies.

The Commission’s current and recently-completed reviews are discussed at pages 4 to 18 of this Annual Report.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS OF THE COMMISSION

The Commission completed the following publications during the reporting period:

- *A Review of Jury Directions*, Discussion Paper, WP No 67 (September 2009);
- *A Review of Queensland’s Guardianship Laws*, Discussion Paper, WP No 68 (October 2009) volumes 1–2;
• A Review of Jury Directions, Report No 66 (December 2009) volumes 1–2;

• A Review of Jury Selection, Discussion Paper, WP No 69 (June 2010).

A list of all the Commission’s Reports, Working Papers and Miscellaneous Papers is available on its website at <http://www.qlrc.qld.gov.au/publications.htm>. The Commission’s current and recent publications and many of its older publications are also available on its website.

MEETINGS OF THE COMMISSION

During the reporting period, the Commission held 21 Commission meetings.

REMUNERATION

The remuneration for part-time members of the Commission during the reporting period was $20,856 per annum.2

RIGHT TO INFORMATION

In accordance with the requirements of the Right to Information Act 2009, which commenced on 1 July 2009, the Commission has published a Publication Scheme on its website. The Publication Scheme, which describes and categorises information routinely available from the Commission and the terms on which it will make the information available, replaces the Statement of Affairs previously published by the Commission.

---

2 The Chairperson of the Commission, as a judicial member, does not receive any additional remuneration for that office.
Current and recently-completed reviews

THE GUARDIANSHIP REVIEW

Stage one

In October 2005, the Commission received a reference to review aspects of the Guardianship and Administration Act 2000 (Qld) and the Powers of Attorney Act 1998 (Qld). These Acts regulate substitute decision-making by and for adults with impaired decision-making capacity.

The Commission’s terms of reference require it to conduct this review in two stages.

Stage one of the review, which was completed in mid-2007, involved an examination of the confidentiality provisions of the guardianship legislation. The Commission made recommendations to promote transparency and accountability in relation to the making of confidentiality orders. The Commission’s recommendations were almost all accepted by the Government and have been implemented by the Guardianship and Administration and Other Acts Amendment Act 2008 (Qld), which commenced on 1 January 2009. That Act amended the Guardianship and Administration Act 2000 (Qld) to provide for four new types of limitation orders:

- **adult evidence orders** (section 109B), which permit the Tribunal to speak with the adult in the absence of others if, for example, it is necessary to obtain relevant information that the Tribunal would otherwise not receive;
- **closure orders** (section 109C), which permit the Tribunal to close a hearing or part of a hearing to all or some members of the public, or to exclude a particular person (including an active party) from a hearing or part of a hearing;
- **non-publication orders** (section 109D), which permit the Tribunal to prohibit the publication of information about Tribunal proceedings; and
- **confidentiality orders** (section 109E), which permit the Tribunal to withhold a document or information from an active party or other person.

Stage two

Stage two of the review requires a consideration of the balance of the guardianship legislation. In undertaking this part of the review, the Commission is required to give specific consideration to the following matters:

(a) the law relating to decisions about personal, financial, health matters and special health matters under the Guardianship and Administration
Act 2000 and the Powers of Attorney Act 1998 including but not limited to:

- the General Principles;
- the scope of personal matters and financial matters and of the powers of guardians and administrators;
- the scope of investigative and protective powers of bodies involved in the administration of the legislation in relation to allegations of abuse, neglect and exploitation;
- the extent to which the current powers and functions of bodies established under the legislation provide a comprehensive investigative and regulatory framework;
- the processes for review of decisions;
- consent to special medical research or experimental health care;
- the law relating to advance health directives and enduring powers of attorney;
- the scope of the decision-making power of statutory health attorneys;
- the ability of an adult with impaired capacity to object to receiving medical treatment; and
- the law relating to the withholding and withdrawal of life-sustaining measures;

(c) whether there is a need to provide protection for people who make complaints about the treatment of an adult with impaired capacity;

(d) whether there are circumstances in which the Guardianship and Administration Act 2000 should enable a parent of a person with impaired capacity to make a binding direction appointing a person as a guardian for a personal matter for the adult or as an administrator for a financial matter for the adult.

In October 2008, the Commission released the first Discussion Paper (WP No 64) for stage two of the review. That paper examined the threshold issues of:

- the General Principles and the Health Care Principle; and
- the nature of decision-making capacity, and its assessment under the legislation.

The release of that Discussion Paper was followed by a series of seven community forums around Queensland. The Commission also held a number
of focus groups with health professionals and allied health professionals, as well as adults with impaired capacity.

During the reporting period, in November 2009, the Commission released the second Discussion Paper for stage two of the review. That paper examined all the other substantive legal issues arising under the terms of reference, as well as addressing a number of procedural and other issues that had been raised with the Commission during the course of the review.

Following the release of the second Discussion Paper, the Commission held seven community forums around Queensland: Brisbane, Bundaberg, Cairns, the Gold Coast, the Sunshine Coast, Toowoomba and Townsville. The Commission also held a number of focus group meetings with health professionals and allied health professionals.

The Commission also made substantial progress during the reporting period towards completing the final Report, which will contain the Commission’s recommendations in relation to all the issues dealt with in stage two of the review.

A REVIEW OF JURY DIRECTIONS

During the reporting period, the Commission completed work on its review of jury directions.

The Commission received terms of reference on 7 April 2008 to review the directions, warnings and summings up given by judges to juries in criminal trials, with a view to simplifying and improving the current system. The original terms of reference are as follows:

I, Kerry Shine, Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Attorney-General and Minister Assisting the Premier in Western Queensland, having regard to:

- the critical role juries have in the justice system in Queensland to ensure a fair trial;
- the reviews currently being undertaken by the New South Wales Law Reform Commission and Victorian Law Reform Commission of directions and warnings given by a judge to a jury in a criminal trial; and
- the Jury Charges Research Project currently being undertaken by the Australian Institute of Judicial Administration;

refer to the Queensland Law Reform Commission (the Commission) pursuant to section 10 of the *Law Reform Commission Act 1968* (Qld), the review of directions, warnings and summing up given by a judge to jurors in criminal trials in Queensland and to recommend any procedural, administrative and legislative changes that may simplify, shorten or otherwise improve the current system.

In undertaking this reference, the Commission is to have particular regard to:
(a) subject to authorisation being given by the Supreme Court under section 70(9) of the Jury Act 1995 (Qld), conducting research into jury decision-making in Queensland with a view to obtaining information about:

- The views and opinions of jurors about the number and complexity of the directions, warnings and comments required to be given by a judge to a jury and the timing, manner and methodology adopted by judges in summing up to juries;
- The ability of jurors to comprehend and apply the instructions given to them by a judge;
- The information needs of jurors;
- The nature of the split for hung juries;
- The reason/s for a juror or jurors’ dissent in hung juries;

(b) directions or warnings which could be simplified or abolished;

(c) whether judges should be required to warn or direct the jury in relation to matters that are not raised by counsel in the trial;

(d) the extent to which the judge needs to summarise the evidence for the jury;

(e) possible solutions to identified problems relating to jury directions and warnings, including whether other assistance should be provided to jurors to supplement the oral summing up; and

(f) recent developments and research in other Australian and overseas jurisdictions.

In undertaking this reference, the Commission is to work, where possible and appropriate, with other law reform commissions and consult stakeholders.

The Commission is to provide a report to the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister Assisting the Premier in Western Queensland on the results of the research and the review by 31 December 2009.

On 5 May 2009, the terms of reference were amended to delete the requirements in paragraph (a) to conduct research into jury decision-making in relation to the nature of the split for hung juries and the reasons for a juror or a juror’s dissent in hung juries. This followed the introduction, by the Criminal Code and Jury and Another Act Amendment Act 2008 (Qld), of non-unanimous verdicts in certain criminal trials.

A similar jury selection review is currently being undertaken by the New South Wales Law Reform Commission, and one was completed by the Victorian Law Reform Commission in May 2009.
These reviews arose out of a recommendation by the Australian Law Reform Commission in its Report, *Uniform Evidence Law* (ALRC 102, Recommendation 18–1), that:

The Standing Committee of Attorneys-General should initiate an inquiry into the operations of the jury system, including such matters as eligibility, empanelment, warnings and directions to juries.

**Discussion Paper**

Following the publication of an Issues Paper in March 2009, the Commission released a Discussion Paper (WP No 67) in this review in September 2009.

The Discussion Paper outlined a number of proposals and options for reform. It identified possible improvements to some specific types of directions, including limited-use directions, warnings given in sexual offence cases, and directions on self-defence and provocation. It also canvassed a number of proposals for assisting the jury, including enhanced pre-trial disclosure obligations to clarify the issues in the trial, the greater use of written materials and aids for the jury, and the use of 'integrated directions' to improve the delivery of summings-up.

The Commission consulted with, and received submissions from, key professional bodies such as the Queensland Law Society, the Bar Association of Queensland, Legal Aid Queensland, the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions and the Women’s Legal Service, as well as other law reform bodies and interested organisations and individuals.


**Research project**

The terms of reference specifically directed the Commission to consider conducting, or commissioning, research into aspects of jury decision-making in criminal trials:

In undertaking this reference, the Commission is to have particular regard to:

(a) subject to authorisation being given by the Supreme Court under section 70(9) of the *Jury Act 1995* (Qld), conducting research into jury decision-making in Queensland with a view to obtaining information about:

- The views and opinions of jurors about the number and complexity of the directions, warnings and comments required to be given by a judge to a jury and the timing, manner and methodology adopted by judges in summing up to juries;
- The ability of jurors to comprehend and apply the instructions given to them by a judge;
The information needs of jurors;

Research of this nature is ordinarily restricted by section 70(2)–(4) of the *Jury Act 1995* (Qld) which prohibits the publication or disclosure of ‘jury information’. ‘Jury information’ is defined in section 70(17) of that Act to mean:

(a) information about statements made, opinions expressed, arguments advanced, or votes cast, in the course of a jury’s deliberations; or

(b) information identifying or likely to identify a person as, or as having been, a juror in a particular proceeding.

However, under section 70(9), the Attorney-General may apply to the Supreme Court of Queensland for authorisation to conduct research projects involving the questioning of members or former members of juries, and the publication of the results of that research.

An application by the Attorney-General for such authorisation was heard by the Chief Justice, the Honourable Paul de Jersey, on 15 September 2008. His Honour made the following Orders:

1. Pursuant to s 70(9) of the *Jury Act 1995* (Qld), the Queensland Law Reform Commission (‘QLRC’) is authorised to:
   
   (a) conduct a research project into jury decision-making in Queensland, which will involve the questioning of former members of juries; and

   (b) publish the results of the research project.

2. Pursuant to s 70(10) of the *Jury Act 1995* (Qld), that authorisation is on the condition that:
   
   (a) the former members of juries not be identified in any publication by the QLRC;

   (b) the former members of juries be permitted to decline to assist and to decline to answer one or more questions; and

   (c) the QLRC shall ensure that any former member of juries whom it contacts for the purpose of the research project is advised of the contents of this order and, in particular, of the terms of the previous two conditions.

In June 2009, the Commission contracted with the School of Psychology at the University of Queensland to conduct empirical research into jurors’ information needs and jurors’ comprehension and application of jury directions. The project was led by Dr Blake McKimmie, a Senior Lecturer in the School of Psychology at the University of Queensland.

The research involved former jurors who had sat on criminal trials in the Supreme Court and District Court of Queensland in Brisbane over a nine-week period in mid-2009. The project had two phases: a questionnaire which the
participants were asked to complete after being discharged by the trial judge; and a follow-up telephone interview conducted with them privately.

In accordance with the Supreme Court order authorising the conduct of the research project, all participation was voluntary and involved only former jurors who had been discharged by the trial judge and were no longer sitting on a trial. At all times, participants’ responses were collected and stored to ensure the confidentiality of the participants’ identities and to avoid the identification of the trials on which they had sat.

The University of Queensland provided its report on this research to the Commission on 30 November 2009. It is reproduced in full in an Appendix to the Commission’s final Report in this review (Report No 66).

The University of Queensland also provided the Commission with a report containing the results of additional research, involving simulated trials conducted at the University, on the impact of simplified directions on juror decision-making.

**Final Report**


The Commission reached the view that juries are too often confused or unsure about the law that they must apply and the issues that they must resolve. It therefore made a number of recommendations to improve the current system, having particular regard to the need to ensure a fair trial and the desirability of giving directions and warnings that are understood, and are capable of being sensibly and accurately applied, by juries.

Some of the recommendations are for statutory change, some propose changes to the way in which evidence and other information is presented to juries, and some suggest refinements to the Queensland Supreme and District Court Benchbook. Many of the recommendations relate to matters of pre-trial and trial procedure to ensure that jurors are given more meaningful information and guidance throughout the trial.

The Commission’s recommendations in relation to the preparation and conduct of criminal trials included the following:

- The pre-trial disclosure regime set out in Chapter 62 of the Criminal Code (Qld) should be amended to require defendants to outline, before the trial, the issues that are in contention and those that are not in contention.
dispute. However, defendants should not be required to disclose any evidence that they may intend to rely on, except to the extent that this is already required by the Criminal Code (Qld).

- Juries should be informed as early as practicable of the issues in the trial and should be provided with written material, at the start of the trial, on such matters as the burden and standard of proof, the elements of the offence/s charged, the elements of the defence/s (to the extent that defences have been identified by the defendant), and any admissions, agreed facts or other issues not in dispute.

- Defendants should be invited (although not required) to make an opening statement to the jury.

- Juries should be provided with all written, visual and other assistance that may fairly help them to assess the evidence and the issues that they must decide.

- The prosecution and the defendant should be required to inform the judge before the start of the summing up which directions concerning specific defences and warnings concerning specific evidence they wish to be included in, or left out of, the summing up.

- The judge should not be obliged to give a direction in the summing up that was not requested unless, in the judge’s view, it is required in order to ensure a fair trial, and on an appeal asserting any misdirection or inadequate direction of the jury, the court should be required to take into account which directions and warnings were and were not requested by the parties.

- The judge’s summing up should avoid long statements of law and should, so far as practicable, assist jurors by focussing on the factual questions that they must decide. Directions should be prepared and presented with a view to integrating the law into those factual questions.

- Legal aid funding should be urgently reviewed to ensure that any disincentives to the early preparation of matters for trial are removed, and to remunerate practitioners adequately for any additional preparation that may be required as a result of these changes.

With respect to specific problematic areas of concern in relation to jury directions, the Commission’s Report also recommended:

- The replacement of the exclusionary rule in relation to propensity evidence in Pfennig v The Queen (2008) 235 CLR 334 with a provision allowing for the more general admission of such evidence (unless it is considered too prejudicial) and simplified directions to juries on its use; or, in the alternative, a review of the law of propensity evidence in Queensland; and
The clarification and simplification of directions about post-incident conduct by defendants, alleged forensic disadvantage suffered by defendants due to the delay in reporting or prosecuting charges, evidence from unreliable witnesses, the expression ‘beyond reasonable doubt’, the possibility of delivering a non-unanimous verdict in certain cases, jurors’ ability to ask questions during the trial, and the requirement for the jury to choose a speaker.

The changes recommended in the Report are subject to the courts’ and the individual trial judge’s duty to ensure so far as practicable that the defendant and other participants receive a fair trial.

The Report was tabled in the Queensland Parliament on 14 April 2010.

A REVIEW OF JURY SELECTION

On 7 April 2008, the Commission received terms of reference to review the provisions of the Jury Act 1995 (Qld) dealing with the selection, participation, qualification and excusal of jurors. The terms of reference are as follows:

I, Kerry Shine, Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Attorney-General and Minister Assisting the Premier in Western Queensland, having regard to:

- The critical role juries have in the justice system in Queensland to ensure a fair trial;
- The fact that jury duty is an important civic duty and those who become involved in criminal trials have an expectation that they will be determined by a judge and jury;
- It is an essential feature of the institution of juries that a jury is a body of persons representative of the wider community, to be composed in a way that avoids bias or the apprehension of bias and that one of the elements of the principle of representation is that the panel of jurors be randomly or impartially selected rather than chosen by the prosecution or the State;
- The importance of ensuring and maintaining public confidence in the justice system;
- The recent reports released by the New South Wales Law Reform Commission report on Jury Selection (Report 117, 2007) and Blind or deaf jurors (Report No 114, 2006) which make a number of recommendations;
- The review of the selection, eligibility and exemption of jurors currently being undertaken by the Western Australia Law Reform Commission;
- Reforms concerning the composition of juries and conditions of jury service which have occurred in other jurisdictions;
• The Australian, New South Wales and Victorian Law Reform Commissions’ Report on *Uniform Evidence Law* recommended that the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General should initiate an inquiry into the operation of the jury system, including matters such as eligibility, empanelment, warnings and directions to juries.

• The provisions in the *Jury Act 1995* (Qld) prescribing those persons who are ineligible for jury service have not been reviewed or amended since 2004.

refer to the Queensland Law Reform Commission (the Commission) pursuant to section 10 of the *Law Reform Commission Act 1968* (Qld), a review of the operation and effectiveness of the provisions in the *Jury Act 1995* (Qld) relating to the selection (including empanelment), participation, qualification and excusal of jurors.

The scope of this review does not include review by the Commission of Part 6 of the *Jury Act 1995* which contains provisions about jury trial in Queensland, including, for example:

• consideration of whether juries should have a role in sentencing;

• the merits or desirability of trial by jury; or

• the requirement for majority verdicts in Queensland.

In undertaking this review, the Commission is to have particular regard to:

• Whether the current provisions and systems relating to qualification, eligibility and excusals for jury service are appropriate, including specifically whether:

  (a) there are any additional categories of persons who should be ineligible for jury service, such as:

  (i) a person employed or engaged in the public sector in law enforcement, criminal investigation, the provision of legal services in criminal cases, the administration of justice or penal administration; and

  (ii) local government chief executive officers.

  (b) there are any categories of persons currently ineligible for jury service which are no longer appropriate;

  (c) the ineligibility of a person who has a physical or mental disability that makes the person incapable of effectively performing the functions of a juror remains appropriate, particularly in the context of persons who are profoundly deaf or have a significant hearing or sight impairment, having regard to the *Anti-Discrimination Act 1991* (Qld), the *Disability Discrimination Act 1992* (Cth), and the need to maintain confidence in the administration of justice in Queensland.
Possible improvements to proceedings for offences and a review of the appropriateness of maximum penalties under the *Jury Act 1995* (Qld), including:

- Whether the Act should be amended to specifically allow a prosecution for an offence against the Act to be commenced by complaint of the Sheriff of Queensland or someone else authorised by the Minister or Chief Executive; and
- Review the current level of maximum penalties for offences in the *Jury Act 1995* (Qld), particularly relating to the return of notices by prospective jurors and compliance with a summons requiring a person to attend for jury service and, if selected as a member of a jury, to attend as instructed by the court until discharged and whether the maximum penalties should be increased and having regard to the level of penalties for similar offences in Queensland and in other Australian jurisdictions;

Possible alternative options for excusing a person from jury service, such as deferment;

The extent to which juries in Queensland are representative of the community and to which they may have become unrepresentative because of the number of people who are ineligible for service or exercise their right to be excused from service, including whether there is appropriate representation of minority groups (such as Aboriginal people and Torres Strait Islanders), the factors which may contribute to under-representation and suggestions for increasing representation of these groups;

Recent developments in other Australian and international jurisdictions in relation to the selection of jurors; and

Any other related matters.

In performing its functions under this reference, the Commission is asked to prepare, if relevant, any legislation based on the Commission’s recommendations and undertake consultation with stakeholders.

The Commission is to provide a report to the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister Assisting the Premier in Western Queensland on its review by 31 December 2010.

At present, the *Jury Act 1995* (Qld) provides that the following persons are ineligible for jury service:

- the Governor;
- a member of Parliament;
- a local government mayor or other councillor;
- a person who is or has been a judge or magistrate (in the State or elsewhere);
• a person who is or has been a presiding member of the Land and Resources Tribunal;
• a lawyer actually engaged in legal work;
• a person who is or has been a police officer (in the State or elsewhere);
• a detention centre employee;
• a corrective services officer;
• a person who is 70 years or more, if the person has not elected to be eligible for jury service under section 4(4) of the Act;
• a person who is not able to read or write the English language;
• a person who has a physical or mental disability that makes the person incapable of effectively performing the functions of a juror;
• a person who has been convicted of an indictable offence, whether on indictment or in a summary proceeding;
• a person who has been sentenced (in the State or elsewhere) to imprisonment.

In addition to requiring the Commission to examine whether any of these categories should no longer be ineligible for jury service, the terms of reference also require the Commission to examine the extent to which Queensland juries are representative of the community, including whether there is appropriate representation of minority groups (such as Aboriginal people and Torres Strait Islanders).

This review also arises out of the Australian Law Reform Commission’s recommendation in its Report, *Uniform Evidence Law* (ALRC 102), mentioned earlier. A similar review is presently being undertaken by the Law Reform Commission of Western Australia.

The Commission continued work on this review during the reporting period, with the release of a Discussion Paper (WP No 69) in June 2010.

The Discussion Paper outlines the current arrangements in Queensland for the selection and participation of jurors. The Paper also describes a number of recent reforms to the rules of jury selection in other jurisdictions.

The Paper seeks submissions, and includes proposals for reform, on a wide range of issues, including:

• whether electoral enrolment should continue to be the basis of juror qualification;
• whether the current criminal history disqualifications are appropriate;

• whether the current categories of professions and occupations that exclude a person from jury service are appropriate;

• how the Jury Act 1995 (Qld) should deal with the eligibility of people who have a physical disability or a mental disability, people who are unable to read or write English, and people who are 70 years or older;

• whether the grounds for excusal from jury service are sufficient and appropriate;

• alternatives to excusal from jury service, such as deferral;

• ways to increase Indigenous representation on juries;

• the remuneration of jurors; and

• the appropriateness of the current penalties for a breach of the Jury Act 1995 (Qld).


A REVIEW OF THE LAW IN RELATION TO THE FINAL DISPOSAL OF A DEAD BODY

In December 2003, the Commission received a reference to review the law in relation to the final disposal of a dead body. The terms of reference are:

   1. I, ROD WELFORD, Attorney-General and Minister for Justice, having regard to—

   • the fact that at common law the executor (or person having the highest claim to administer the estate of the deceased person) has the duty and the right to arrange for the final lawful disposal of the deceased person’s body including, probably, the disposal of the deceased person’s ashes; and

   • the fact that at common law the wishes of the personal representative or person who has the duty and the right to dispose of the body are regarded as paramount with respect to the disposal; and

   • the extent to which this common law position is or may be amended by the Cremations Act 2003 and the current provisions governing cremations contained in the Coroners Act 1958, or by any other Queensland laws; and

   • the many and varied cultural and spiritual beliefs and practices in relation to the disposal of bodies; and
the fact that from time to time questions arise regarding:

- whether a person who may have caused the death be allowed to arrange for the final disposal of the body; and
- what methods of final disposal of a body are lawful in Queensland; and

the fact that from time to time disputes arise regarding:

- to whom a body is to be released (for example by a hospital or, where relevant, a coroner) for final disposal; and
- the method of final disposal of the body in a particular case; and
- the place for the final disposal of the body or ashes;

refer to the Queensland Law Reform Commission for review pursuant to section 10 of the Law Reform Commission Act 1968 Queensland’s laws regarding the duties and rights associated with the final disposal of a dead body, including, but not limited to:

a. whether, and to what extent, a comprehensive legislative framework is required; and

b. whether any new legislation should provide for an easily accessible mechanism to deal with disputes and, if so, the nature of such a mechanism.

2. In performing its functions under this reference, the Commission is asked to prepare, if relevant, draft legislation based on the Commission’s recommendations.

3. The Commission is to report to the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice by 30 June 2006.

In June 2004, the Commission published an Information Paper, A Review of the Law in Relation to the Final Disposal of a Dead Body (WP No 58), for consultation purposes. The Information Paper outlined the legal rights and obligations and the common practices in relation to the disposal of dead bodies in Queensland. It also considered issues such as:

- whether diverse beliefs and customs are able to be sufficiently accommodated in the disposal of dead bodies in Queensland;

- what should happen when there is a dispute regarding the disposal of a dead body (including whether a person who may have caused the deceased’s death should be allowed to arrange for the disposal of the deceased’s body); and

- the right to dispose of ashes or cremated remains.
Although considerable progress has been made towards the completion of the Commission’s final Report, work on this review was placed substantially on hold in October 2005 when the Commission received the terms of reference for the Guardianship Review. During the reporting period, the Commission has undertaken some additional consultation with key stakeholders in the review. The Commission anticipates that the final Report in this reference will be completed in 2011.
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