

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 1 NOVEMBER 1979

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

INCIDENCE OF FLUOROSIS, CHILDREN
ATTENDING PROSERPINE SCHOOL
DENTAL CLINIC

Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX (Nundah—Minister for Health) (11.2 a.m.): I wish to make a ministerial statement in relation to claims about the incidence of fluorosis among children attending the Proserpine School Dental Clinic. The allegations were made by Mr. Geoffrey Smith, a dentist employed by the Proserpine Hospital Board who also carried out work for the school dental clinic. Before going any further I would like to point out that Mr. Smith has since resigned, and I can assure members that no pressure was placed on him to take this course of action. I might add that he also declined to make details of his research available to the dental investigation team sent to look into his claims.

However, the point at issue is the dental health of children in the Proserpine district, and whether or not the incidence of fluorosis is high as a result of the town's fluoridated water supply. As soon as Mr. Smith's claims were made known to me I ordered an immediate investigation of the dental health of children there. The investigation was undertaken by Mr. W. T. Videroni, Principal Dental Officer, and Mr. T. M. McEniery, Senior Dental Officer (Preventive), both members of the School Dental Service, Division of Dental Services, State Health Department.

It is important that members realise that many children attending the Proserpine School Dental Clinic have not lived in the town all their lives. Some also come from outlying non-fluoridated areas.

I table the report of those officers.

Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the report on the table.

THURSDAY, 1 NOVEMBER 1979

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. S. J. Muller, Fassifern) read prayers and took the chair at 11 a.m.

PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table, and ordered to be printed:—

Report of the Apprenticeship Executive for 1978-79.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council under the Racing and Betting Act 1954-1978.

Regulations under—

Stamp Act 1894-1979.

Hospitals Act 1936-1979.

Children's Services Act 1965-1978.

I would like to make a few points about that report. Firstly, the results show that there is excellent and improved dental health in Proserpine, and this is consistent with data from all Queensland fluoridated areas.

Out of 339 children examined, there were no severe cases of fluorosis detected. The terms "severe" and "moderate" are clinical criteria for the description of degrees of fluorosis. The whole range of criteria comprises "normal", "questionable", "very mild", "mild", "moderate" and "severe". Tooth enamel is an extremely sensitive barometer to fluoride levels. An explanation of each criterion is included in the report.

Proserpine children exhibit an extraordinarily complex array of fluoride exposures, including naturally-occurring fluoride; town water with its various sub-groups of exposures at school; total use etc.; various exposures to fluoride tablets and exposure through water systems in other localities both natural and artificially fluoridated.

It is interesting to note that prior to fluoridation in 1967, 13 (19 per cent) Proserpine eight-year old children showed fluorosis. In the survey just completed, taking the Proserpine children as a whole and excluding "questionable" fluorosis, there were a total of 55 cases in the "very mild" category or above. This gives a general prevalence rate of 16.2 per cent. If the group taking tablets in the first four years is considered, the prevalence rate is 24 per cent. Children who used the Proserpine town water supply had a prevalence rate of 10.7 per cent. None of the parents or children in the "mild" and "very mild" categories were concerned, and were usually unaware of any departures from "normal".

It appears that one of the present underlying causes of unacceptable fluorosis, that is to say, naturally-occurring fluoride in amounts significant in a tropical climate compounding with fluoride supplements, may have operated in 1967 as well as in 1979. This additive effect of tablets being maintained through periods of residence in a fluoridated or natural fluoride area can be seen in quite a number of cases. The survey therefore highlights a problem in relation to the use of fluoride supplements which I believe we must tackle immediately.

The results among all 339 children examined showed a community fluorosis index of .31, which is well below the index of .60 at which fluorosis can be described a public health problem. But a breakdown of the figures showed that among the 84 children who had been given fluoride supplements (tablets or drops) during any of their first four years, the community fluorosis index was .53. Although this still is below the level of .60, I believe it warrants a strong health education programme aimed at ensuring that parents do not over-fluoridate their children. Before sounding a warning on the indiscriminate use of fluoride tablets let me say that investigations within my department, as well as many overseas studies, have proved the value of fluoride supplements in the prevention of dental caries. Used accurately and with due consideration to the other sources of fluoride in the child's diet, they are a preventive measure of proven value.

A decision to use a fluoride supplement should be made in the knowledge of other fluoride intakes. For example, the home water supply may be, in part at least, bore water with a significant natural fluoride content. In the Proserpine area fluoride levels in bores where analyses have been carried out vary from .1 to at least .4 parts per million. It is quite clear that by administering fluoride supplement some parents may be inadvertently bringing about a situation which could result in noticeable fluorosis in their children's teeth.

I believe health officers at all levels of government should undertake education programmes to avoid this problem. I have already issued instructions that this be carried out by the State Health Department's

Division of Health Education and Information. Local councils throughout the State will be advised of this and copies of the Proserpine report made available to them on request. It must be stressed, however, that the Proserpine report clearly indicates the success of the local council's fluoridation programme. For example, the investigators compared the incidence of dental caries in Proserpine with that of children attending the school dental clinic at East Ayr, where there is no fluoride added to the water supply. Their report says that they also compared the 1979 Proserpine results with those obtained in a survey there in 1967, prior to fluoridation of the town's water supply.

Compared with either the 1967 Proserpine or the 1979 East Ayr school results there are reductions in dental caries ranging from 70 per cent at age 6 to 40 per cent at 10. The result of the high caries rate in Ayr on treatment time is most striking. Both clinics commenced at approximately the same time. In Proserpine the whole school has been treated and the children are now in the process of being recalled. In Ayr the work-load only allowed children up to Grade 3 to be treated before recalls of the patients first seen became necessary. In other words, East Ayr School is taking twice as long for treatment as Proserpine. The impact of fluoridation on dental health and the costs involved in maintaining children's teeth are therefore clearly shown.

The report, in my opinion, performed three functions. It underlined the success of the Proserpine fluoridation programme, put to ground the claims that it had caused widespread fluorosis but at the same time pinpointed a loophole in terms of added fluoride supplement levels. The two officers are to be congratulated on their efforts and, as I stated before, immediate action will be taken to implement health education programmes on the aspect of fluoride supplements.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CASEY (Mackay—Leader of the Opposition) (11.10 a.m.), by leave: Yesterday in this Parliament I questioned the Transport Minister on the timing of the Brisbane rail electrification programme and mentioned a statement by Sir Gordon Chalk on 14 November 1974, indicating that the project would be finished inside three years. The Transport Minister tried to dismiss my question by saying he was not aware of any statement in that context by Sir Gordon.

I now table the appropriate proof of Sir Gordon's statement.

Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the document on the table.

For the benefit of the Transport Minister, I now inform the House that the statement concerned was not a personal opinion by Sir Gordon, as indicated by the Minister, but a statement of Government policy for

the 1974 State election contained on page 11 of the National Party-Liberal Government Policy Speech (part 2).

It is incredible that the Transport portfolio is administered by a Minister who is not even aware of his own Government's stated policy in an election in which he was a Government candidate.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE OF SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION

Mr. GYGAR (Stafford): I lay on the table of the House the seventh report of the Committee of Subordinate Legislation on the Industry and Commerce Training Regulations, and I move that it be printed.

Whereupon the document was laid on the table, and ordered to be printed.

BUILDERS' REGISTRATION AND HOME-OWNERS' PROTECTION BILL

INITIATION

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Minister for Works and Housing): I move—

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to consolidate and amend the laws relating to the registration of persons competent to build and the protection of owners of homes; to repeal the Builders' Registration Act 1971–1973 and the House-builders' Registration and Home-owners' Protection Act 1977–1978; to amend the Building Act 1975–1978; and for related purposes."

Motion agreed to.

PORT OF BRISBANE AUTHORITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Leader of the House) for **Hon. M. D. HOOPER** (Townsville West—Minister for Maritime Services and Tourism): I move—

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to amend the Port of Brisbane Authority Act 1976–1979 in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

1. DEVELOPMENT OF CID ISLAND

Mr. Casey, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Water Resources—

(1) When did the Government invite applications for the development of Cid Island, in the Whitsunday group, as a sea world or marineland venture? Who was the successful applicant, and what was the length of time given for the applicant to develop the project?

(2) Was an environmental impact study completed by the successful applicant? Was it approved by the Co-ordinator-General's Department and, if so, on what date?

(3) Has the successful company, which is headed by Mr. Keith Williams, who is a well-known Gold Coast personality, now indicated that it no longer wishes to proceed with this development because of its proposal to now develop a tourist resort on nearby Hamilton Island and, if so, will those companies which were unsuccessful in their original bid be now given the opportunity to carry out this development or will fresh applications be called because of the previous indication given by the Government for the need for this type of tourist attraction to be developed in the Whitsunday area?

Answers:—

(1) Applications were invited for the development of tourist attractions on Cid Island on 7 November 1975, closing date for receipt of applications being 2 March 1976. An application by Whitsunday Reef World Pty. Ltd. was provisionally accepted, but no development rights were granted pending the outcome of environmental studies.

(2 & 3) The company was supplied with guide-lines for an environmental impact study, but it subsequently advised it did not propose to proceed with the project. No further action is proposed at this time to make any part of the island available for leasing.

2. LAND ACQUISITION AND COMPANY TAKE- OVERS BY IWASAKI SANGYO (AUST.) PTY. LTD.

Mr. Casey, pursuant to notice, asked the Premier—

(1) With reference to the Federal Government's decision made on 25 October blocking further acquisitions or take-overs by the Iwasaki Sangyo company for at least 90 days and as activities of this company in Queensland are subject to a most unusual parliamentary franchise agreement, was his Government informed of the background activities that prompted such sudden and unusual Federal Government action under the Foreign Takeovers Act and, if so, what are the details of such circumstances?

(2) Did the Federal intervention follow the introduction into Australia by the Iwasaki Sangyo company of a sizeable sum of money, reportedly several million dollars, which was diverted to purposes other than the stated development of the Yeppoon tourist resort?

(3) What were these other purposes for which the money was diverted, and did they include other acquisitions apart from the purchase of further land in the Central Queensland area?

(4) Has his Government been notified of all of the land and/or company purchases of the Iwasaki Sangyo group in Queensland since the commencement of its operations in this State and, if so, what are they?

(5) Will he also investigate strong suggestions current in Brisbane that one of the acquisitions proposed by the Iwasaki company is the Lone Pine Koala Sanctuary and, following such investigations, will he advise the Parliament of the current situation regarding same?

Answer:—

(1 to 5) The administration of the Foreign Investment Review Board is solely a matter for the Commonwealth Government and the relevant Commonwealth Minister.

The Queensland Government's interests in the Iwasaki Sangyo company relate to the development of a tourist resort at Yeppoon under the provisions of the Queensland International Tourist Centre Agreement Act 1978. The land to be included in the resort is described in schedule A to that agreement.

As I have said on previous occasions, the Queensland Government does not keep dossiers on purchases made by businessmen keen to be involved in the development of this State, irrespective of their nationality, and has not done so in the case of Iwasaki Sangyo (Aust.) Pty. Ltd.

3. ILLEGAL USE OF TELEPHONES

Mr. Gygar, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Mines, Energy and Police—

With reference to efforts to prevent illegal gambling in Queensland—

(1) Does the Police Department maintain regular liaison with Telecom to ensure that applications for the installation of multiple telephones at unusual locations are investigated to ensure that they are not being used in S.P. operations?

(2) Does Telecom co-operate fully with the Queensland Police by providing such information and, if not, what is the reason?

(3) Will the Queensland Police establish close liaison with the new Australian Federal Police Force to ensure that they supervise all Commonwealth laws and directives in regard to illegal use of telephones and procedures for telephone installation and so lay the basis for a co-operative attack on large scale illegal gambling and thereby prevent organised crime from using such activities to finance other illegal ventures in this State?

Answers:—

(1 & 2) If answers were given to these questions, law enforcement operations may be affected.

(3) The Queensland Police Department had a close liaison with the Commonwealth Police Force, and this liaison will continue

with the new Australian Federal Police Force with a view to combating all types of illegal activities.

4. SCREENING OF PROHIBITED FILMS

Mr. Gygar, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Mines, Energy and Police—

(1) Were police raids made on the Booval Swifts Football Club, Ipswich, and the Thorneside Hall in the Redlands district recently?

(2) Were prohibited movies being shown?

(3) Have any charges been laid?

(4) Were names of persons present taken and, if so, what are the names?

Answers:—

(1) Yes. Ipswich police executed a warrant on the Booval Swifts Football Club, Ipswich, on 1 June 1979 and Licensing Branch police executed a warrant on the Thorneside Hall, Thorneside, on 28 September 1979.

(2) Obscene movies were exhibited at both localities.

(3 & 4) In relation to the Ipswich matter, two persons were charged on summons with exhibiting obscene films. Marigan Prennerl and Drago Antonovic both appeared at the Ipswich Magistrates Court on 23 August 1979 and were convicted. Names of some other persons present were taken by police, but as no court action has been taken against these persons I do not propose to disclose their names.

In relation to the Thorneside matter, summons action is to be taken against two persons for exhibiting obscene movies and a liquor offence. At this stage I do not intend to name these persons as the matter is still subject to court action. Five persons were arrested and charged with offences relating to gaming, and they forfeited bail. They were Russell James Hughes, Clement Gerald Barraud, John Wayne Barraud, Laurie William Brugge-man and John Milton Harris.

5. MIGRANT ASSIMILATION AND CONTRIBUTION TO DEVELOPMENT OF QUEENSLAND

Mr. Ahern for **Mr. Row**, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Industry and Administrative Services—

With reference to Opposition criticism on 30 October of his alleged lack of appreciation of ethnic groups in society, will he inform the House of the outstanding success of migrant assimilation in this State now and in the past and of the great contribution by migrants to the development of Queensland?

Answer:—

I agree entirely with the sentiments expressed by the honourable member with regard to the very great and significant contribution migrants have made to the development of Queensland. Furthermore, I am proud of the way in which migrants generally in this State have become Queenslanders. There is no doubt that the record of integration of migrants into this great State of ours is one in which we can all take a great deal of pride.

Particularly since the Second World War, large numbers of migrants have come to this State from all parts of the world. In fact, between 1947 and 1979 the Queensland work force increased by 879,000 people. Of these approximately 130,000 were migrants.

Migrants have contributed not only to the technological progress in this State but also to its cultural development, making it a State of wide cultural richness. Perhaps the most apparent indication of successful and harmonious integration of migrants into our society is the significant lack of discrimination against migrants in this State. There may well be some instances of this sort of bigotry, but I am happy to say that they are very isolated and very limited. This position is the exact opposite to that which the honourable member for South Brisbane tried to place before this House in his speech on Tuesday last, and I believe that he should at least be remorseful, if not ashamed, of the false attitudes which he attempted to express.

6. FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO BUS COMPANIES

Mr. Davis, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Transport—

Will he detail the amount paid in assistance to each bus company under the Urban Passenger Service Proprietors Assistance Act 1975–1977 for 1978–79?

Answer:—

For the 12 months ended 30 June 1979, assistance under the Urban Passenger Service Proprietors Assistance Act by way of general subsidy amounting to \$1,686,474.95 was paid to 53 proprietors; interest subsidy on loans amounting to \$65,670.84 was paid to 15 proprietors; and local pensioner subsidy amounting to \$30,231.80 was paid to 29 proprietors.

Mr. Davis: Can I have the list?

Mr. TOMKINS: No.

Mr. Davis: I want the list.

Mr. TOMKINS: No. I am not prepared to make the list available. They are the total figures, and that is it.

7. ELECTRICITY TARIFFS, ELECTRIC RAIL SERVICES

Mr. Davis, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Transport—

(1) With reference to the advent of the electrification of the suburban railway system, has the Railway Department negotiated with the S.E.Q.E.B. or some other authority the rate that will be charged for power from that authority?

(2) If so, what is the rate to be charged?

Answers:—

(1) Yes.

(2) The department will be paying a standard general tariff.

8. SCREENING OF FILM SHOWING SAFETY FACTORS AND DANGERS ASSOCIATED WITH ELECTRIC RAILWAY NETWORK

Mr. Davis, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Transport—

(1) Has the Railway Department shown a film to some of its employees emphasising the safety factors and the dangers that are associated with the electrification of the suburban railway network?

(2) If so, and considering that there are large numbers of dangers and problems associated with this new type of project that the general public should be made aware of, will he consider having the film made available to the general public?

(3) Will he arrange to have the film shown at various locations such as shopping centres, etc., in the areas that will be affected by the rail electrification?

Answers:—

(1) Yes.

(2) It is not agreed that there are large numbers of dangers and problems associated with electrification, but there needs to be an awareness by the public that the overhead wiring and suspension equipment is live and normal precautions need to be taken to avoid contact with this equipment. The situation is similar to that pertaining to overhead power lines generally. The wide publicity given to energisation of the overhead wiring system and specific advice given to worker groups whose occupations may bring them near to overhead equipment, is considered to adequately meet the needs of the situation.

(3) The film was basically produced for inclusion in a schools education programme arranged in conjunction with the Education Department and this programme is now in full swing. However, I have discussed with the Commissioner for Railways the possibility of wider exhibition, and he will be happy to consider specific requests for showing of the film to other interested groups.

9. BUNDABERG/ISIS IRRIGATION SCHEME

Mr. Ahern for **Mr. Powell**, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Water Resources—

(1) At the conclusion of Phase 2 of Stage I of the Bundaberg/Isis irrigation scheme, what will be the total storage capacity of reservoirs which will service the requirements of the scheme?

(2) How much water from the storages, annually, will be allocated to (a) cane-farming and (b) other farm requirements?

(3) How much water from the storage will be allocated to other requirements?

(4) What are those requirements and how much water will each receive?

Answers:—

(1) With the full development of Stage I of the Bundaberg irrigation scheme, the following storages will be provided—

Kolan River—	Megalitres
Fred Haigh Dam	586 000
Bucca Weir	20 600
Kolan Barrage	4 000
Burnett River—	
Gayndah Weir	16 100
Burnett Barrage	27 000
Total Capacity	653 700

The average supply level from the above system of storages is estimated to be 225 000 ML annually.

In planning the scheme, it was apparent that the above system of storages did not meet the full water requirements of the proposed development and accordingly provision has been made, at full development, for an additional 25 000 ML per annum being supply to the area from Wuruma Dam on the Nogo River.

Despite this supply from Wuruma Dam, shortages of supply could occur in a number of years. In a considerable number of periods the supply available would be restricted to about 62 per cent of normal.

(2) (a) The estimated annual water requirement for the level of cane assignments which existed at 30 June 1970 is 234 500 ML.

(b) The requirement for crops other than sugar-cane (based on the area of such crops irrigated prior to 30 June 1970) is 6 930 ML.

(3 & 4) The only other allocation proposed from the scheme is 7 950 ML for urban supplies to Bundaberg and Gin Gin as follows—

Bundaberg City Council—	6 170 ML.
Woongarra Shire Council—	1 480 ML.
Gooburrum Shire Council—	250 ML.
Kolan Shire Council—	50 ML.

10. BUNDA INDUSTRIAL ESTATE

Mr. Ahern for **Mr. Powell**, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Industry and Administrative Services—

(1) Has the Bunda Industrial Estate been recently valued?

(2) Are the new valuations in the Bunda Industrial Estate higher than other industrial land in the Bundaberg city area?

(3) As a result, are the rates now payable on freehold land in the Bunda estate area in excess of those payable on other industrial land?

(4) Will he intercede on behalf of the owners and tenants of land in the Bunda Industrial Estate with a view to having some uniformity in the rates payable on industrial land?

Answer:—

(1 to 4) I am advised that the Bundaberg city area was revalued as at 30 September 1976 and the new valuations became effective for rating purposes from the beginning of the current financial year. I am not aware of any basic differences in valuation between the Crown industrial estate and other industrial land. However, I will be happy to raise the matter with my colleague the Honourable the Minister for Survey and Valuation, and ask him to give advice on the aspects mentioned by the honourable member.

11. TEACHING PROGRAMMES FOR MENTALLY RETARDED CHILDREN

Mr. Scassola, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Education—

(1) Is he aware of a recent statement made by Dr. Alex Maggs, Assistant Director of the Special Education Centre at the Macquarie University, at a conference on the mentally handicapped that children in the 35-55 I.Q. range can, with the assistance of highly specialised teaching skills and structural systematic teaching programmes, gain basic academic skills?

(2) What action is being taken to ensure that mentally retarded children in Queensland will have the benefit of such teaching skills and programmes?

Answers:—

(1) Yes.

(2) The available empirical evidence on early educational intervention for children with special needs does not support adherence to any one method of teaching. Within the pilot programme in my department, the teaching style is chosen to suit the particular needs of the child and programmes are developed from a number of sources including some of the material from Macquarie University. I have the utmost confidence in the level of competence of teachers in the Division of Special Education.

12. BRIGHTON STATE SCHOOL

Mr. Warburton, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Works and Housing—

With reference to the coverage which I gave during my speech on 11 October to the very necessary work which needs to be done on administration, health and staff facilities at the Brighton State School, and bearing in mind the correspondence which has been received by the school from Government departments since the matters were first raised in 1970 and which clearly shows in some instances that plans for the urgent work were in hand, when will work commence?

Answer:—

Funds are not available at present to permit this work to be undertaken. The project will receive further consideration next financial year in relation to the funds then available.

13. REDEVELOPMENT OF ANZAC SQUARE

Mr. Warburton, pursuant to notice, asked the Premier—

With reference to his Government's apparent rejection of Brisbane City Council's plans for the elevated Civic Square stretching from Queen Street to Anzac Square—

(1) Was a letter stating that no objection would be raised by the Queensland Government to the transfer of the Shrine of Memories to Anzac Square as the result of the re-development proposals signed by him and received by the R.S.L. State President?

(2) Is he aware that many of the most beautiful and impressive war memorials in the United States of America and Canada are those that have been upgraded to compliment the development and planned progress of the cities in which they are situated?

(3) Is there any legal impediment to the council's proposal and, if so, will he explain what that legal impediment is, and was this the reason for his Government's rejection?

(4) If there is no legal impediment to the council's redevelopment plan, what was his Government's reason for blocking its progress?

(5) With reference to the deep concern at his Government's action of the Returned Services League, particularly when the league was led to believe that the project would receive Governmental approval if it was supported by the league, will he undertake to have the Anzac Square redevelopment proposal re-considered?

Answers:—

(1) The proposed plans for the elevated Anzac Square and the transfer of the Shrine of Memories involve separate questions. The letter to which the honourable member refers relates to the technical

aspects of whether or not the Memorial Shrine could be safely removed from its present location.

(2) I am not aware of the situations mentioned.

(3 to 5) The decision that Anzac Square, as it presently exists, remain unchanged was made after very careful consideration of all relevant facts, and it is not intended to reconsider the matter.

14. ISSUE OF PERMITS AND LICENCES UNDER FAUNA CONSERVATION ACT

Mr. Warburton, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Culture, National Parks and Recreation—

With reference to a recent Magistrates Court decision emphasising that under the Fauna Conservation Act 1974–1976 a permit is necessary to keep fauna of any kind except, for example, species of exotic fauna or gazetted aviary birds—

(1) Is he aware that a permit to keep fauna, costing \$10 per year, must now be obtained by any person in possession of, for example, one galah or one native green budgerigar, and that the fine for an offence is \$1,000?

(2) Is he also aware that a person who gives, for example, one galah to a friend must first obtain a fauna dealers' licence costing \$30 per year, and that the fine for an offence is \$3,000?

(3) Is he also aware that even if the person obtains the permit and licence already mentioned, to enable that person to dispose of the galahs a permit to move fauna, costing \$1, must be obtained, and that the fine for an offence is \$1,000?

(4) Will he advise what action he intends taking as the result of the Magistrates Court decision so that ordinary citizens will not be unduly penalised?

Answer:—

(1 to 4) I am aware of the recent Magistrates Court decision and its implications as referred to by the honourable member, and these are presently being examined.

15. BRAKING SYSTEMS ON TRUCKS

Mr. Austin, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Transport—

(1) Has his department carried out any surveys or tests on the braking efficiency or systems on trucks?

(2) Have any reports been prepared by his department or any other Australian State Government departments and, if so, what were the findings of his department or other States' departments?

Answer:—

(1 & 2) Surveys or tests on the braking efficiency of all commercial vehicles, including trucks, would come within the province of the Machinery Inspection Branch of

the Division of Occupational Safety, administered by my colleague the Honourable the Minister for Labour Relations, to whom the honourable member may wish to redirect his question.

Mr. Austin: I do so accordingly.

16. ROAD-WORKS, GYMPIE ROAD

Mr. Austin, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads—

(1) Has the Main Roads Department any plans to upgrade that section of Gympie Road between the Kedron Park Hotel and the Kedron Post Office and, if so, will the Kedron Brook Bridge be widened as a part of this scheme and when is work likely to commence?

(2) What proposals are in hand to rectify the pavement failures at the Leckie Road intersection?

Answers:—

(1) A scheme for the widening of the Kedron Brook Bridge is proposed and has been tentatively programmed for the 1981-82 financial year.

(2) A special maintenance scheme is being prepared for the removal of the pavement surface irregularities at Leckie Road. It is currently anticipated that this work will be carried out early in the 1980-81 financial year.

17. TEACHER AIDES

Mr. Shaw, pursuant to notice, asked the Deputy Premier and Treasurer—

(1) Is he aware that the announcement in the Budget that the services of teacher aides will be reduced in the new year is causing great concern for parents and teachers?

(2) What is the anticipated saving from the reduction in the services of teacher aides?

(3) Was any investigation made into the likely detrimental effects of the proposed cut-back of teacher aides on the standard of education?

(4) Will he reconsider his decision to cut back teacher aide services and, instead, provide sufficient funds to prevent a decline in the standard of education available to Queensland children?

Answer:—

(1 to 4) As I foreshadowed in the Budget speech, the Honourable the Minister for Education is currently undertaking a complete review of the services and programmes provided by the Education Department. A reduction in the number of teacher-aide hours worked is also under consideration as part of that review. The honourable the Minister will be making any necessary announcements when the review has been completed.

However, I would assure the honourable member that any reduction in aide-hours worked will involve no retrenchment of staff and will be implemented in a manner that will ensure that the present high standard of education in Queensland is maintained.

18. FENCING OF PRIVATE SWIMMING-POOLS

Mr. Shaw, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads—

(1) With reference to recent Press statements that he has offered to approve for the Brisbane City Council what have been described as compromise ordinances providing for fencing of swimming-pools, and as the few details which were released show that the compromise ordinances will actually be more repressive than the ordinances originally proposed by the council, will he enter into negotiations with the council, and possibly the Local Government Association, with the aim of preparing a standard set of ordinances which will provide reasonable protection for children while being not unduly restrictive?

(2) Will he also, as a basis for negotiation and comment, release the details of the ordinances which he offered to grant to the Brisbane City Council?

Answers:—

(1) I have already taken the matter up with the Lord Mayor.

(2) Since the matter is presently under consideration, I do not think I should release details at this stage.

19. TAKE-OVER OF GRAZING PROPERTIES BY MEAT-PROCESSING COMPANIES

Mr. Shaw, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Water Resources—

(1) Is he aware of media reports that Tancred Brothers Pty. Ltd., the meat processing group which already controls about 20 284 sq km of grazing land in Queensland, is presently negotiating a take-over of the Australian Pastoral Co., which consists of nine Queensland grazing properties?

(2) As the aggregation of such areas of grazing land in the hands of meat-processing companies represents a threat to normal marketing practices, will he have the acquisition of such areas investigated in the interests of the beef industry?

Answer:—

(1 & 2) I would refer the honourable member to my reply on 24 October 1979 to the honourable member for Gregory in regard to the same subject.

20 & 21. COUNCIL LAND POLICY IN
LESLIE HARRISON DAM
CATCHMENT AREA

Mr. Kaus, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads—

(1) With reference to the statutory provisions in the Brisbane Town Plan and the ordinances which provide that minimum lot sizes of 4 hectares each will be permitted in the non-urban zone, what status in law do council policy plans have in relation to the Leslie Harrison Dam catchment area?

(2) What will be a land-owner's right to claim compensation for injurious affection as a result of such policy?

Answer:—

(1 & 2) The honourable member's question seeks an expression of opinion on a question of law, namely, the interpretation of the provisions of the City of Brisbane Town Planning Act 1964–1979, and, accordingly, I do not feel that it would be appropriate for me to state an opinion in the matter.

However, I would point out that the Act provides that land-use policy determinations made by the Brisbane City Council that cannot be adequately presented or interpreted except by means of a map must be effected by way of an amendment of the Brisbane Town Plan. The council apparently contends that the policy referred to by the honourable member can be presented or interpreted without the use of a map and therefore does not require to be effected by way of amendment of the plan. It is a matter for legal argument whether this contention is correct.

The final determination of the legal position is one for the courts, and the Act provides a right of appeal to the Local Government Court if an application for the subdivision of land is rejected.

The question of the right of a land-owner to obtain compensation for injurious affection also involves a legal interpretation of the provisions of the Act, which provides a right of appeal to the Local Government Court if a claim for compensation is rejected by the council. In view of this position, I feel that it would be inappropriate for me to comment on the question of the right of a land-owner to claim compensation by reason of the policy referred to by the honourable member.

Mr. Kaus, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads—

Are there any other policy matters passed by the Brisbane City Council in relation to restriction on development of land contained within the unmarked

catchment area of the Leslie Harrison Dam within the Brisbane City Council boundary?

Answer:—

To my knowledge, there are no policies of the city council which relate to the development of land within the catchment of the Leslie Harrison Dam, other than that which was adopted by the council on 24 April 1979.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

BRISBANE AREA RAILWAY ELECTRIFICATION

Mr. CASEY: I direct a question to the Minister for Transport. Following my question yesterday concerning the five-year development programme to be undertaken by the Metropolitan Transit Authority and the Brisbane area rail electrification programme, I ask: Is he aware that, on page 25 of the Metropolitan Transit Authority's report, it states that the present diesel-hauled stainless-steel carriages will continue to be used for peak passenger services for the rest of their useful life? What is his department's estimate of "rest of their useful life"? Does that mean that, even after the suburban rail system is totally electrified, services in peak periods until possibly after the year 2000 will be only partially electrified? Will the proportion of diesel services during peak periods remain as high as 30 per cent?

Mr. TOMKINS: I gather that the Leader of the Opposition is referring to the stainless-steel carriages that years ago were intended for electrification. The position is that the Treasurer very kindly made \$200,000,000 available for our electrification programme and, if there is to be any adjustment of funds, it will be carried out by the use of the carriages referred to by the Leader of the Opposition. We called tenders for 92 electrified carriages. Without a shadow of a doubt, they are the best in the world. They incorporate every modern feature. In fact, I have been told that they are the Rolls Royce of electric carriages. Anyone who will travel in them will agree with that. If there is to be any adjustment of funds, it could be that some of those stainless-steel non-electrified carriages would have to be used between electric carriages. That could happen if we were short of funds. We have not got to that stage, and until we do the question does not arise.

As to their effective life—we have carriages dating back to almost the turn of the century that are still being used. I presume that these stainless-steel carriages could be used for equally lengthy periods.

Mr. CASEY: By way of a supplementary question, and with reference to the stainless-steel carriages that the Government began to purchase under contract in the 1950s, when Labor was in office, I ask: As a means of speeding up the electrification

programme and getting it to 100 per cent efficiency, has his department given consideration to the conversion of those carriages to electrified carriages and, if so, does it have any estimate of the cost involved? I remind the Minister that it was the original intention to convert the stainless-steel carriages to electrified carriages. Will this be done in view of the need to speed up the electrification programme?

Mr. TOMKINS: I have been told that those carriages are now quite unsuitable for electrification. I do not know who drew up the original plans for them, but I have been told that they cannot be converted for electrification. It would not be an attractive proposition to do that. We are about to provide a new electrified rail service, of which everybody will be proud. The old carriages will be used only if they have to be used.

PETRIE-REDCLIFFE RAIL LINK

Mr. CASEY: In directing a further question to the Minister for Transport, I refer him to the report tabled by him on Tuesday in relation to the electrification programme and the upgrading of the urban transport system generally. I remind him of his promise, given on behalf of the Government during the Redcliffe by-election campaign, to construct a railway from Petrie to Redcliffe. I now ask: As the document tabled by him on Tuesday contains no information whatever concerning that project, does the Government still intend to construct the railway, as promised by it during the by-election campaign? Or is this just another promise given by the Government before an election and forgotten about after the votes are counted?

Mr. TOMKINS: The Leader of the Opposition can say that very easily, but it is just not true. We announced the policy and we propose to carry it out. Before any progress can be made on the Petrie-Kippa-Ring line we have to make an environmental impact study.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order.

Mr. TOMKINS: I do not know why we have to undertake all these studies, but that seems to be the situation at the present time. I point out to the Leader of the Opposition that when the environmental impact study is concluded I will make my report to Cabinet and a motion will be put before the House.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order or certain members will be leaving the Chamber. I give my complete and total assurance on that.

REIMBURSEMENT TO LOCAL AUTHORITIES FOR LOSS OF ROAD MAINTENANCE TAX REVENUE

Mr. KAUS: I ask the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads: With reference to the Government's decision to abolish road maintenance tax, will local authorities continue to be reimbursed their share of the lost revenue?

Mr. HINZE: As promised by this Government, which always keeps its promises—

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Archerfield will come to order.

Mr. HINZE: Local authorities have been assured that this year they will again participate in the distribution of funds from a source.

INCLUSION OF NORTHERN AND WESTERN AREAS IN CONSUMER PRICE INDEX MEASUREMENT

Mr. R. J. GIBBS: In directing a question to the Deputy Premier and Treasurer, I refer to the dismal failure of the Liberal and National Parties to honour their promises to overcome inflation, as evidenced by the Consumer Price Index for the September quarter which shows a rise of 2.3 per cent. I now ask: Does the Treasurer not now agree that in relation to Queensland, with more than half the population outside the metropolitan area, the Consumer Price Index is incomplete while it is measured only on Brisbane, thus ignoring the effects of transport costs caused by the Federal and State Governments' inflationary petrol and rail-freights policies?

As inflation is again rising, will he now undertake to recommend to Canberra that a northern and western centre be included in the assessment in order to provide a more accurate guide to cost movements in Queensland?

Dr. EDWARDS: I indicate at the outset that I certainly would not be honest if I did not say that the Government is concerned about the slight rise in inflation over the last few months and the prospect that it could rise a little further before it again comes down. But, on the other hand, I wish to make it quite clear that this, of course, is a very healthy situation when related to the inflation problem in some overseas countries. Many of the problems facing this nation are related to problems overseas.

I cannot allow the opportunity to pass without referring to the inflation that occurred during the days when the Labor Party was in Government in Canberra.

Opposition Members interjected.

Dr. EDWARDS: I am sure the response indicates the concern that the Opposition has about those days and about the effect that inflation at that time had on this country.

As regards the suggestion about the C.P.I.—this is a matter that has been of concern to many people throughout the State. I am told that there are some technical difficulties in the administration of these matters, but I assure the honourable member that I will have his suggestion considered and will come back to him with a reply in the near future.

GOODNA T.A.B. AGENCY

Mr. R. J. GIBBS: In directing a further question to the Deputy Premier and Treasurer, I refer to my question in the House last week concerning the Goodna T.A.B. and the subsequent winding up of the agency agreement. I ask: Will he inform this House, or advise me, of the exact reason for the termination of the agency agreement at the Goodna T.A.B.?

Dr. EDWARDS: I cannot inform the House publicly about this particular matter, as it is for the Totalisator Administration Board of Queensland. The decision was made—and I believe it was a wise one—in the light of the information available to the board; and it has, in fact, been confirmed. All I am prepared to say is that the honourable member need have no fear that the person who was in fact dismissed has not been, in my opinion, in the opinion of the board, and in accordance with the facts provided, treated in the correct manner.

BRISBANE—LISMORE RAIL LOOP

Mr. BISHOP: In addressing a question to the Minister for Transport, I refer to a proposal from the Lismore City Council that a rail loop be established joining Brisbane, the Gold Coast, Murwillumbah, Byron Bay, Bangalow, Lismore, Casino, Kyogle and Ipswich. As this proposed rail link would serve an area containing 1,000,000 people, I ask the Minister: Can he give an assurance that he will look closely at the proposal when it is received by him, give it every possible encouragement and have discussions with the New South Wales and Commonwealth Governments?

Mr. TOMKINS: I saw the proposal reported in the Press. On paper it looks to be quite a good suggestion. However, there are a lot of practical difficulties involved in it. As honourable members know, Lismore is in New South Wales and I am sure the Government of that State wants to keep it there.

The other thing is that the Kyogle line goes south through that country; so in effect there is already a rail link. Talk about a link from Lismore to Brisbane raises interesting possibilities. I assure the honourable member that when the proposal is received I will discuss it with my officers and, in due course, write to him about it.

LURE FAILURE, GOLD COAST GREYHOUND RACING CLUB

Mr. BISHOP: I ask the Deputy Premier and Treasurer: Is he aware of the failure of the lure at the Gold Coast Greyhound Racing Club to operate over a period of some weeks? Can he indicate what steps have been taken to investigate the failure of the lure's operation on those occasions and what has been done to prevent future failures?

Dr. EDWARDS: My attention has been drawn to the problems associated with the lure at the Gold Coast Greyhound Racing Club over the last few weeks. This matter has caused the club and the Greyhound Racing Control Board a great deal of concern. I have asked for a full report on the matter. In fact, I was in touch with the chairman of the Greyhound Racing Control Board this morning. He has indicated that an enormous amount of testing has been undertaken over the last few days. No fault can be found in the system. Other instances have been drawn to the board's attention and it has asked the police to investigate. The S.E.Q.E.B. has been asked to fully investigate the power aspect of it. The matter is causing us a great deal of concern, and I hope to have a further report within the next two days. We make no apology for being very concerned about the matter. The police will be investigating it and, if necessary, action will certainly be taken.

FINANCING OF BEACH RESTORATION WORK

Mr. BISHOP: I ask the Deputy Premier and Treasurer: In view of statements made some time ago that the method of arranging subsidies to local authorities is to be reviewed by the Government, will there be any change in the 20 per cent subsidy being provided for beach restoration work? Will he again take up with the Federal Government its lack of subsidy for this work in order that local authorities will not have to continue to provide 80 per cent of the funds?

Dr. EDWARDS: In reply to the second part of the question, I will be quite happy to take up with the Federal Government the possibility of our receiving funding, which we believe we are entitled to, for such an important national programme. I assure the honourable member that we will do that.

As to the first part of his question about a subsidy scheme—it is true that the Government is undertaking an investigation into what is really a grant scheme, as the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads has referred to it on a number of occasions. The Government makes grants in the form of subsidies. We have agreed with the Local Government Association to undertake an investigation, but that has been delayed by the untimely death of the man who had been appointed to undertake the investigation.

The Government will proceed with the investigation into the subsidy scheme for local authorities and statutory bodies such as the Beach Protection Authority. I understand the honourable member's particular interest in this matter and I can assure him that in this financial year the present criteria will remain. Therefore, until the scheme is revised, any beach protection project that has been undertaken will certainly continue to receive the present level of funding, or grant programme as we like to call it now. If necessary, the implementation of a new scheme will take place in the next financial year.

At 12 noon,

In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No. 307, the House went into Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE—ESTIMATES— SEVENTH AND EIGHTH ALLOTTED DAYS

(Mr. Kaus, Mansfield, in the chair)

ESTIMATES-IN-CHIEF, 1979-80

SURVEY AND VALUATION

DEPARTMENT OF VALUER-GENERAL

Hon. J. W. GREENWOOD (Ashgrove—Minister for Survey and Valuation) (12.1 p.m.): I move—

“That \$5,512,430 be granted for ‘Department of Valuer-General’.”

The major responsibilities of my portfolio as Minister for Survey and Valuation are the operations of the Department of the Valuer-General and the Department of Mapping and Surveying and Office of the Surveyor-General. I have great pleasure in presenting to the Committee the Estimates for those departments.

In the course of the debate on the Budget papers, my colleagues will be speaking about the operations of their several departments and outlining the many ventures to be undertaken that will be of benefit to the people of this State. The funding for the various departments, without increasing the tax burden on Queenslanders, must have presented very great difficulty for the Treasurer, at whose door this responsibility is laid. We are well aware of the problems confronting him each year at Budget time, and I congratulate him most sincerely on the presentation of his excellent Budget last month, containing, as it does, both new initiatives in Government and significant relief in some areas of taxation.

Each of us is aware that the revenues of this State are derived partly from our share of income taxation, collected by the Federal Government and returned to us, and partly from the generation of our own revenues within the State. It is in this part of the process of local revenue generation that the Valuer-General's Department plays such a vital role.

All honourable members are well aware of the importance of local administration in our three-tier system of government. Local authorities are charged with important responsibilities, being the arm of government closest to the people. Just as a State has to budget each year, so local authorities must budget annually, and one has only to look at any such budget papers to realise the importance of the collection of rates in local authority finances.

The Valuer-General's Department provides an impartial basis for the levying of rates and land tax; but it is, of course, the responsibility of the local authority to decide the amount of revenue that it wishes to raise in a given year, to decide whether it wishes to raise that revenue by means of one uniform rate in the dollar on all land values in the shire or whether it chooses, within the limitations of the Local Government Act, to strike a lower rate for rural than for urban lands, and to decide whether it will strike special rates for benefited areas. In other words, although the Valuer-General's Department fixes valuations, the department has nothing to do with the way in which local authorities use those valuations and, in particular, with the amount of rates that are charged.

The Committee will see from the Budget papers that during the year 1978-79 it cost the State \$4,910,987 to maintain the Valuer-General's Department. However, during that period, the department's collections amounted to \$1,985,579 from the charges for various services about which I will speak later. It has never been intended that the department will be self-sufficient, as, like all service departments, it does not expect to be fully recompensed for all its efforts.

If we wish to compare the revenue that accrues directly to the State from the operations of the department, it would be appropriate to consider the combined expenditure and collections of the Valuer-General's Department and of the Commissioner of Land Tax. If we take the cost of administering the office of the Commissioner of Land Tax for the 1978-79 year of \$1,506,782 and add this to the cost of administration of the Valuer-General's Department, we arrive at a total administrative cost of \$6,417,769. However, we should add to the collections by the Valuer-General the sum of \$16,041,805, being the revenue collected by the Commissioner of Land Tax. Total collections therefore amount to \$18,027,384. It will be noted that the combined expenditure of the two departments is approximately 36 per cent of the collections.

This, of course, is by no means the end of the story. As honourable members know, the valuations made by the Valuer-General are used by 132 local authorities in Queensland as a basis for the levying of general rates. The latest available figures, for the 1977-78 year, show that rates levied on the Valuer-General's valuations amount to

\$205,841,000. So the services of the Valuer-General's Department provide the tax base for a very large part of Government and local government activity in this State.

If it were not for this method of raising revenue, local authorities would in some way have to find a compensating revenue-raising system by an authority completely independent of the local authorities. We have all heard stories about local authority rating before the establishment of the independent authority of the Valuer-General. At the very best, valuations were performed in a somewhat rough and ready manner.

Mr. Prest: They are now.

Mr. GREENWOOD: The honourable member would know all about the rough and ready, wouldn't he? He would be an expert in that.

As I was saying, valuations were performed in a somewhat rough and ready manner, except in those local authorities where professional valuers were retained. At the worst, they were performed by incompetent people.

Mr. Prest: You're a square peg in a round hole.

Mr. GREENWOOD: The honourable member would know something about incompetence, too. Sometimes those incompetent people were motivated by considerations—

Mr. K. J. Hooper: Like me.

Mr. GREENWOOD: Considerate, like the honourable member opposite, and considerations other than those contained in the Valuer-General's textbook. Those more mature members will recall the system prior to 1946.

As an independent authority, the Valuer-General has no axe to grind and therefore will not be influenced by local pressures of favouritism. Despite some criticism over the years—criticism that is always levelled at those organs of government concerned in any way with the raising of taxation—I would suggest that no thinking person would question the Valuer-General's absolute independence in the matter of fixing the levels of his valuations. From my very close association with the department, I can assure the Committee that the Valuer-General performs his duties without fear or favour. In addition, Queensland has the benefit of appeal from the Valuer-General to an independent system of Land Courts. I shall discuss these points in more detail later in this speech.

One criticism that has occasionally been levelled at the whole system of local government finance is that revenue-raising based upon the unimproved valuation of land is an inappropriate means of raising finance for State and local authority purposes. In Australia, as well as in New Zealand and England, a number of official investigations over the past few decades, ranging from

royal commissions to committees of inquiry, have examined alternatives to this form of revenue-raising. Although various methods of valuation have been recommended and adopted in other places, all those official investigations concluded that rating for taxation on some form of land valuation should be retained.

Despite the superficial attractiveness of poll taxes and other alternative schemes, the end result of these inquiries is that no practical and preferable alternative has so far been devised. We can therefore expect that the present methods of raising local government revenues used in Australia, based as they are on some form of valuation of land, are likely to remain a fact of life in this country for some time to come. This does not mean, however, that we must accept the present method of valuation as an established fact of life.

Honourable members have heard me on previous occasions suggest to them that the present unimproved value system is in need of reform. Such a system is an appropriate one for use in a developing State, particularly in the earlier stages of development when the original nature of land is readily envisaged. As a State develops, the concept of unimproved value becomes more and more artificial, until it reaches a stage where the arguments as to the original or unimproved nature of the land occupy a disproportionate amount of the time of the valuing authority. It is my view that we are perhaps reaching that stage in Queensland, and I would hope that in the not too distant future we may reach a decision to implement a valuation system more appropriate to our present stage of development. Certainly these matters are under active consideration.

As a means of gaining information on valuation methods in other States and countries, the Valuer-General has arranged an interchange of officers between Queensland and New Zealand. An officer from New Zealand will spend six months in Queensland working in the Valuer-General's Department, and a valuer from Queensland will spend the same period in the New Zealand department. There is no doubt that the mutual exchange of information which will result will be of benefit to both departments. If any changes in the valuation system in Queensland are under consideration we will have first-hand knowledge of the systems operating in New Zealand. Therefore, the Valuer-General's Department has taken early advantage of the officer-interchange plans approved by the Government as a general principle in November 1978.

From what I have said, I would suggest that no member of this Committee could have any doubt that the Valuer-General's Department earns its keep. I would suggest that it not only earns its keep but that it provides very good value for the taxpayers' money. The Valuer-General provides the revenue-raising bodies with a very suitable revenue base. The department, as such, as I have

shown, receives a very modest, not to say meagre, proportion of the revenue which it is largely responsible for generating. The service which it provides in return for this relatively small amount of money is indeed creditable.

The department performs valuations ranging from suburban allotments in Brisbane to huge cattle stations on the edges of the Simpson Desert. Officers inspect the lands and make their comparisons, and arrive at their valuations. Those valuations are then processed through the administrative section of the department, and then issued with the assistance of a computer to the various land-owners.

Currently, the Valuer-General's Department maintains 837,585 rateable valuations throughout the State. The computer record contains comprehensive information regarding each parcel of land in the State. In addition to ownership, real property description and valuation details, information is stored relating to land usage, and in the case of urban properties, particulars regarding street name and number, zoning and map reference are held. Provision also exists within the system for the inclusion of additional information such as geocoding identifiers, in order to make it easily adaptable to the requirements of a land data bank.

Understandably, some land-owners wish to challenge the valuations of their land as fixed by the Valuer-General. A cheap and relatively simple procedure has been established to enable them to object against their valuations and, if they wish to do so, to discuss the valuations with representatives of the department in an objection conference. In the year 1978-79 a total of 14,007 objections were considered by the Valuer-General and, in most instances, discussions with the owners would have taken place.

After a land-owner has objected against his valuation and received the Valuer-General's written notice of decision upon his objection, he has the further right to challenge the valuation in the Land Court. In the year 1978-79 a total of 458 appeals to the Land Court were decided. This involved the Valuer-General's officers in the preparation of statements of evidence and, of course, in actually giving evidence at the Land Court hearings. After the Land Court has made its decision, an owner who is still dissatisfied may pursue the matter further by appealing to the Land Appeal Court. In the last financial year, 18 land-owners took appeals to this court. It is only on rare occasions that a land-owner appeals further to the Supreme Court or even higher on matters of law.

Mr. Davis: That's because they run out of money.

Mr. GREENWOOD: The details of the results of those appeals are set out in full in the report I tabled last week.

I might just take that interjection from the honourable member and point out that

it is very, very rare that legal costs are awarded against an unsuccessful appellant, so that the appellant is able to have his day in court whether or not he does it himself or with the advantage of counsel and solicitors. That is a matter for him, but he can have his day in court in practice without the penalty of costs being awarded against him if he happens to be unsuccessful.

Mr. Davis: His own costs come to a dollar or two.

Mr. GREENWOOD: But that is a matter for him. He can if he so desires.

Mr. Davis: How much would it cost to have someone like you in court?

Mr. GREENWOOD: That is classified information. Open government has not extended that far.

The Valuer-General's Department meets the full administrative cost of these objections and appeals. No responsibility in this respect is imposed upon the revenue-raising body. This, of course, is as it should be, as an independent authority can approach such challenges in a professional and disinterested manner. It was recently brought home forcefully to both the Valuer-General and me the extent to which the department goes in providing this service to local authorities. In one local authority a number of large land-owners had appealed to the Land Court against the Valuer-General's valuations. These matters involved very important principles of law, the outcome of which would seriously affect the particular local authority revenues. The local authority offered financial and other assistance to the Valuer-General to assist him in defending these appeals. It was with some pride that the Valuer-General was able to decline this kind offer and state that he retained the best available legal advice and that his officers were thoroughly familiar with and experienced in this type of court procedure. This does demonstrate the extent of the service which the Valuer-General is called upon to provide, and he does this as part of his every-day administration. The cost of providing this service does, however, contribute significantly to the total cost of administering the department.

In defending appeals against his valuations, the Valuer-General is in a very real sense protecting the interests of other ratepayers in the local authority area. If some land-owners were able to have their valuations reduced because the Valuer-General failed to meet the challenge adequately, then an unfair rate burden could fall upon those land-owners who had not challenged their valuations. It is essential that land-owners be given the opportunity to express dissatisfaction with the Valuer-General's valuation of their properties. It is equally essential that, once the Valuer-General has carefully considered objections and issued his decision upon them, any further challenge must go to a completely independent tribunal.

In order to keep faith with those land-owners who do not appeal to the Land Court, the Valuer-General is under a duty to defend valuation appeals and leave the final determination to such challenges to the court. If it were otherwise, the Valuer-General's independence would be very seriously eroded, and he could be coerced into reducing his valuations at the expense of those who would not adopt such tactics.

In the vast majority of cases, land-owners do not challenge their valuations, and most of those who do object accept the Valuer-General's decisions on objection. Where an objector makes out a case which justifies a reduced value, the Valuer-General readily takes this action. Even in those cases where land-owners have neither objected nor appealed, the Valuer-General is ready to reduce valuations when he considers such action is justified, and where it is permitted within the terms of the Act. This occurs on occasions when reductions have been made to valuations of similar properties as a result of objection or appeal. The Valuer-General's primary consideration in all this is to achieve and maintain relativity between valuations in a local authority area so that the rating burden can be shared equitably between all land-owners.

In addition to carrying the responsibility for defending challenges to the rating and taxing base, the Valuer-General's Department also maintains the valuation rolls for each of the local authorities in Queensland. Each time a parcel of land is sold, the parties are required to notify the Valuer-General of the transfer. The valuation rolls are therefore continually changing and, if we consider the multitude of other changes to land because of subdivision, amalgamation of titles, resumption and so forth, we can begin to appreciate the magnitude of the task of maintenance of 890,238 valuations, which is the present figure being maintained throughout the State. I mentioned a few moments ago the figure of 837,585 rateable valuations. The balance of 52,653 are, of course, the valuations of lands which are exempt from rating.

If honourable members cared to glance at the provisions of section 13 (2) of the Valuation of Land Act, they would see some of the many reasons why a valuation may be altered during the period between general revaluations of a local authority area. In addition to valuations created by subdivision, areas are amended from time to time; public works are undertaken; cyclones and other natural disasters permanently damage land; sugar-cane assignments and tobacco quotas are required or altered. Some lands qualify for concessional values; other lands are disqualified from concessional values. Values must be altered to maintain relativity after objections or appeals are decided; others because there has been an error or omission; and still others because of the implementation or alteration of a town plan.

The Valuer-General's Department has a well-trained staff of clerical and administrative officers to take care of these maintenance functions. In recent years, with the computerisation of valuation records, the maintenance functions and the issuing of valuations have increased in speed and efficiency. The computer also enables the retrieval and assembling of a great diversity of information from these records. As the master rolls are updated by the Valuer-General's Department, details of the alterations are forwarded to local authorities. From time to time, these local authorities and officers of the department reconcile their records to ensure that all information has been transmitted.

Mr. Prest: I hope you get on to surveyors.

Mr. GREENWOOD: I will come to that.

The Valuer-General's records contain the only comprehensive list of land and its ownership in Queensland. As honourable members would know, the Titles Office contains the records of all land in Queensland which has been registered under the Real Property Act.

That Act applies to land which has been alienated from the Crown—in other words freehold land held in fee simple. Even then it is not a complete record of freehold lands, as there are some titles which were granted by the Crown prior to the enacting of the Real Property Act. This freehold land is referred to as "old system title".

In addition, of course, the Lands Department records contain the details of all Crown leasehold properties, but they do not contain details of leases, licences and permits to occupy granted by other Government departments, such as the Mines Department, Queensland Railways and the Commissioner of Water Resources. It will be seen that the records of the Valuer-General's Department are therefore extremely important to this State, quite apart from their valuation significance. It is essential for any State to have a comprehensive list of details of all the real property within its boundaries. Indeed, I should amend that statement and say that it is essential for any State to have a comprehensive list of details of all land within its boundaries, because what I have referred to is, of course, both real property and personal property in the leasehold lands. The records of the Valuer-General provide this, and they are a very important foundation upon which in the future we hope to build a land data bank.

It will therefore not come as a surprise to anyone if I say that the information contained in the records of the Valuer-General's department is constantly being sought in various ways by other departments of the State and by the Commonwealth. I am sure that the Treasurer is most grateful to the Valuer-General and his officers for the work that they do and the information they provide to assist him in dealing with the Grants Commission.

This is by no means the end of the list of services provided by this versatile and enterprising department. My Cabinet colleagues are well aware of the great service that the department provides in making valuations, mainly for acquisition purposes, for other State departments. Probably the public generally is not completely aware of this function. In the year 1978-79 the department valued a total of 1,020 properties, the valuations of which totalled more than \$25,000,000. The majority of these valuations were made for the Main Roads Department and the Queensland Government Railways for the purposes of assessing compensation for land resumption in connection with the work of these departments. In such cases, if a dispossessed landowner chooses to have his compensation claim determined by the Land Court, the valuer from the Valuer-General's Department who made the assessment is called upon to give evidence before that court and, on appeal, before the Land Appeal Court.

A little known but very important facility that is available to members of the public is that of obtaining details in respect of real property from the Valuer-General's Department. People wishing to avail themselves of the public service facilities provided by the Valuer-General, may, upon payment of a small search fee, obtain details of information recorded on the Valuer-General's rolls with respect to any property in the State. The search facilities are used by a large cross-section of the community, and in the last financial year over 12,000 such searches were made.

For the purpose of administration the State is divided into some 13 valuation districts, each administered by a district valuer. At present only details of properties within a particular valuation district can be searched at the relevant district office. But with the development of computer technology, it will be possible in the not too distant future to extend these search facilities so that a person in any part of the State can obtain details of properties in any other part of the State. It is planned to create State-wide indices of all land parcels on microfiche, which will enable interested persons to obtain details of real property quickly and inexpensively. This indexing system will have most of the advantages of a conventional on-line computer system but will be created at a fraction of the cost. It has been so designed that it will be easily convertible to an on-line system should the demands on its usage increase. It can be used to provide the basic information for the establishment of a land data bank.

Computerised land information systems have achieved world-wide significance in recent years. The concept of a land data bank in this State is a very real possibility in the very near future. Honourable members will recall that it was the subject of a study last year by the Valuer-General, Mr. Grierson, manager of the applications section of the State Government Computer

Centre, the Surveyor-General and myself. Such a system would provide comprehensive on-line information about all aspects of land utilisation, and it is envisaged that it would be used by many Government departments, Crown instrumentalities and local authorities, as well as being available for interrogation by members of the private sector. It would provide a central reference point for all inquiries on land matters, and it is considered that the speed of services provided by Government instrumentalities would be substantially increased because of the faster access to information.

Similar facilities are available in respect of details of properties that have been sold. These facilities are used mainly by members of the valuation and real estate professions, but they are also available to and used by members of the public. Approximately 23,000 such searches were made during the last financial year. So popular has this service become that arrangements have been made to provide computer print-out lists to those firms which use the facility on a regular basis. The concessional rates available for persons requiring extensive computer listings are extremely attractive. As an example, a firm obtaining details of all land sales in the city of Brisbane for the 1978-79 financial year could acquire the computer listings for an amount of \$2,301. This represents a saving of over \$12,000 if it had obtained the same information by manual methods.

The computer listings have the added advantage of being produced in sequential order and are accompanied by comprehensive statistics of the various types of sales covered by the list. To enable these public inquiry services to operate more efficiently, microfiche viewers have been installed in all district offices. This enables the operator to have ready access to extensive records in an easily storable and retrievable form. I consider that we have every reason to be proud of this expanding function of the department. It is an invaluable service to those involved in the real estate industry. We are finding that people who wish to purchase land in an area are able to inform themselves of many of the details of the property and of prices that have been paid for similar properties in the vicinity. Anyone interested in further details of the operations of the Valuer-General's Department would find these set out in the annual report prepared by the Valuer-General.

From what I have said in this brief outline, I would suggest that we make very good use of the money which Parliament allocates to us each year. The provision of an efficient service does not come cheaply, but I am certain that the taxpayers of Queensland are getting their money's worth from the relatively small amount that it costs to administer this most essential department. For too long the functions of this department have remained somewhat of a mystery to the community at large. The community's only contact with it has been the receipt of

notices of valuation, which to the majority of minds is a prelude to an increase in local authority rates. The community generally has not understood the processes involved in the making of valuations for official purposes; nor has it been aware of the inexpensive and easy means of contesting valuations.

Since I have been responsible for this department, I have continued the efforts of my predecessor to educate and inform the public about these matters. As part of this campaign, I have had prepared a pamphlet entitled "Your Valuer", which was released following a Statewide publicity campaign in February this year. I feel certain, from comment received, that the moneys expended on this pamphlet will be more than repaid in the public's awareness of the land-valuation processes. From now on, it is planned to forward a copy of this pamphlet with every notice of valuation that is issued.

The staff of the Valuer-General's Department are subject to more than their share of criticism. This is probably inevitable, as the nature of their function is such that it affects the burden of rating of all land-owners in the State. The valuers of the department bear the brunt of this criticism. I pay tribute to the professional manner in which these valuers carry out their sometimes arduous duties. I can think of no other profession in which every action of its members could result in their being called upon to justify those actions under cross-examination in a court of law. That the valuers of the department emerge from court challenges with their reputations intact is a credit to the way in which they perform their duties.

I also wish to pay tribute to the Valuer-General and all members of his staff. They perform their various duties diligently and skilfully, and it is to their credit that they are able to provide the public with the service that they do within the limits of a relatively small budget.

Mr. Davis: Would you like to have more responsibilities given to the department?

Mr. GREENWOOD: The Valuer-General is doing fairly well with his limited resources at present; but if the offer is to provide more money for the department, I am sure we could find a useful way to spend it.

DEPARTMENT OF MAPPING AND SURVEYING

That brings me to the Vote of \$9,899,842 for the Department of Mapping and Surveying and the Office of the Surveyor-General. In beginning the discussion of the Estimates for this department, I say to the Committee with some confidence that the Government of Queensland leads Australia in the recognition that it has given to mapping and surveying as a basis for resource management.

Mr. Prest: It should, too; it has got worldwide publicity.

Mr. GREENWOOD: I thank the honourable member for that comment. On previous occasions, I have addressed the Parliament on the subject of mapping and surveying in relation to the development of our State, and I reiterate that an accurate and complete survey system and a series of reliable maps are fundamental to orderly and efficient development.

It is perhaps unfortunate that the establishment of a survey system is not a spectacular operation. Indeed, it is not something of which many members of the general public would be aware. Similarly, the value of maps often is not fully appreciated. Nevertheless, it is a fact that no major aspect of the physical development of our State can proceed without recourse to accurate surveys and reliable maps. The construction of roads, railways, buildings, water-storage facilities, the development of our coalfields, the management of our farmlands, our forests and our national parks are all dependent upon proper mapping and surveying.

Maps also make visible the orderliness of our social system. They show land boundaries, the boundaries of local government areas and the boundaries of many other administrative areas. Town-planning schemes are illustrated on maps, and we show our land-tenure system on maps. All of these things—the land itself, other elements of our natural resources, our cultural features, our boundaries—exist not as discrete components but as a unified entity. That entity is the State of Queensland. This is the basis of the Government's mapping programme—that Queensland will be mapped as a whole, systematically and definitively.

The Department of Mapping and Surveying was created in 1975 as a result of the recommendation of a Cabinet-appointed committee of inquiry into surveying in Queensland, and the establishment of the department laid the foundation upon which the mapping and surveying of Queensland could be undertaken in a comprehensive and efficient manner. From the beginning it was recognised that the size, physical characteristics and patterns of settlement of Queensland would make the task a formidable one. In other circumstances, recognition of this factor might have led to the development of a huge central mapping authority. However, in line with our philosophy, the Government of Queensland has resisted this temptation and has chosen instead to maintain a relatively small department, from which contracts are let out to private enterprise.

The Department of Mapping and Surveying operates as a production unit, but equally importantly it has the function of co-ordinating the major thrust of mapping and surveying activities of both the public and the

private sectors. In this way, all of the State's expertise, manpower, equipment and funds are directed in a single concerted effort.

This philosophy is embodied in the broad charter of the department, which is to achieve optimum servicing of the mapping, surveying and related information needs of Queensland, having regard to the effective use of private and public resources. I emphasise the word "effective". This statement summarises the way in which the department operates.

In the sphere of operations of the public sector, the Government has formalised the co-ordinating role of the department by the establishment of the Queensland Surveying and Mapping Advisory Council. This inter-departmental body, established by Cabinet in 1976, ensures that all of the Government departments that are involved in mapping and surveying, either as participants or as major users, are consulted regarding the State mapping programme and all significant survey projects. Through the operations of the council, duplication of effort is avoided and, as far as practicable, mapping programmes are formulated to provide the maximum benefit to the maximum number of departments.

I pass now to the use of private resources. A decade ago, a relatively few surveyors in the private sector were undertaking land boundary or cadastral surveys on behalf of the former Survey Office. Staff surveyors worked more or less in competition with the private sector. At present, about 120 firms carry out work in collaboration with the department. This is not only in the field of boundary surveying but also in photogrammetry, cartography, geodetic survey work and aerial photography. A new method of contracting for aerial photography has proved successful and is being adopted for future work. It involves competitive tendering, with incentives to the contractor for continuity of work in a given area.

Ten years ago, annual payments to the private sector amounted to less than \$250,000. For the last three years, payments have been in excess of \$1,000,000 each year. In 1977-78 they peaked at approximately \$1,600,000. An important aspect of this is that complete major mapping and surveying projects are undertaken by the private sector, with the Department of Mapping and Surveying acting solely as the co-ordinator. An example of this is the mapping associated with the construction of the Wivenhoe Dam. That involved 142 map sheets, all of which were completed by the private sector.

As a result of this policy, it has been possible to restrain the growth of staff numbers in the department while at the same time increase map production very substantially. For example, since 1975-76, departmental

staff numbers have increased by much less than 10 per cent. The precise figure is 4.5 per cent. The figures are as follows:—

Year	Number of Staff
1975-76	505
1976-77	506
1977-78	537
1978-79	528

Over those same years, map production has increased by over 100 per cent. In 1975-76, the total number of maps produced was 289. In 1978-79 the figure was 607, an increase of approximately 110 per cent. Departmental efficiency has played a big part in this increase in productivity. Also, at the time of the establishment of the department it was estimated that a 60-year programme would be required to provide the minimum adequate mapping for Queensland. By the effective marshalling of all of the State's professional capacity, however, it is now feasible to complete this task in a more reasonable time span.

It is important to emphasise also that mapping and surveying are not limited to traditional forms and methods; an important aspect of the department's operations is the application of advancing technology. For example, aerial photographs and satellite imagery are not maps in the strictest sense, but the development of their application to the field of resource management is a major function of the department.

Mr. Davis: You are not going to be like your predecessor and talk for two hours, are you?

Mr. GREENWOOD: The honourable member will have to wait and see.

The types of maps produced have generally been related to the needs of the community as interpreted by Government instrumentalities. Thus, from the early days of settlement of Queensland there has been an ongoing requirement for cadastral, or land boundary maps to facilitate the administration of Crown land. During World War II, however, it became very apparent that Australia had an urgent need for topographic maps to be used for the strategic purposes of the armed forces. Since then large-scale developmental projects have resulted in a continuing demand for this type of mapping.

In the immediate post-war period map-making was revolutionised by the development of photogrammetry—a process by which topographic maps are produced from aerial photographs. Topographic maps, however, derived from an aerial photograph still look like any other topographic map, but quite recently a totally new procedure has been introduced by which maps are produced using the aerial photograph itself as the base. In this way every detail on the ground which is recorded by the camera is automatically displayed on the map. Other details such as contour lines, place names and land boundaries are then superimposed by the

usual photogrammetric and cartographic techniques. This process is known as orthophoto mapping. The purpose of these comments has been to review, very briefly, the development of the technology in recent years.

I now turn to what I shall term the marketing activities of the Department of Mapping and Surveying. As I mentioned a few moments ago, maps have generally been produced in response to quite obvious and specific public needs. I have also stated that the value of maps has often not been completely understood. This applies to the general public and in some cases to Government instrumentalities. With these factors in mind my department has embarked upon a campaign of taking its products and services into the market-place.

We believed that if the usefulness of modern maps was to be publicised then a much greater demand would be generated and this would lead to substantial economies of scale. This campaign has proved to be outstandingly effective, with the single most significant success being the implementation of the large-scale orthophoto mapping programme, which involves local authorities in a cost-sharing arrangement. The scheme was introduced towards the end of 1976 and to explain its rationale I shall quote from the "Local Government Bulletin" of 22 December that year. It states—

"... In the absence of an integrated large scale mapping program, Government Departments and Local Authorities have found it necessary to commission private practising surveyors and mapping firms to produce special project mapping to fulfil their particular requirements.

"This approach is costly, produces maps suitable for a single purpose only and results in waste and duplication when adjacent areas are required to be mapped, whereas properly co-ordinated programmes, planned sufficiently far in advance of requirements, can produce generally useful, all-purpose mapping at a significantly lower cost . . ."

If I might summarise, the problems with project mapping were the overlapping of sheets, different scales, different accuracies, reference to different datum and, of course, duplication.

The bulletin that I referred to invited local authorities to enter into a financial partnership with the State Government for the establishment of co-ordinated mapping schemes to provide for large scale developmental mapping. The financial basis of the scheme was that local authorities would contribute 40 per cent of the cost of the work up to a particular stage of its completion. Publication and distribution of the "Local Government Bulletin" were followed by a programme of personal contact with representatives of many of Queensland's 134 local authorities, during which the benefits

of the scheme and the merits of the particular type of proposed mapping were carefully explained. So successful was the promotion and so popular were the maps and the scheme that the demand quickly outstripped the capacity to produce. For this reason the scheme had to be suspended by Cabinet in September 1978 until the backlog of orders could be reduced. In October 1978, a new plotting machine was installed in my department's photogrammetric branch, and this has been instrumental in accelerating the production process.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: Never mind the department. You've been on your Estimates for about 50 minutes.

Mr. GREENWOOD: I am talking about the value the honourable member is getting for his money.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: I like the sound of your voice, but 50 minutes for a small department! I'm glad you're not Treasurer.

Mr. GREENWOOD: I am glad the honourable member is so interested in the department. Thus, in July of this year it was feasible to re-introduce the cost-sharing scheme, this time with a revised financial arrangement whereby 60 per cent of the total cost is now met by the participating local authorities.

Projects have been completed in the Pine Rivers Shire, Redcliffe city, Warwick city and the Beaudesert Shire. Mapping is well advanced in the Blackall Shire, Bundaberg city, Gympie city and the Widgee Shire; in the Livingstone, Maroochy and Peak Downs Shires and in Toowoomba city. Negotiations are proceeding in relation to several other local authorities.

An important ingredient in the success of this scheme has been the application of project management. A project manager was appointed to give the client a one-point liaison with the department. In the case of the mapping for the Maroochy Shire Council, for example, an officer of the department was appointed project manager, responsible for the successful completion of the task in accordance with predetermined target dates and in compliance with rigid performance standards. The mapping involved the co-ordination of a series of complex activities requiring personal negotiations with the client shire, private-sector practitioners and numerous branches of the department. I am pleased to report that owing to the skill and diplomacy of the project manager very good relations were established and maintained with the shire, and the whole operation has progressed to the satisfaction of all concerned.

The cost-sharing scheme is one aspect of the department's marketing activities. Another is aimed at producing useful maps which will appeal to the general public. At this stage it is considered that the best

means of achieving this is by utilising colour aerial photography and satellite imagery to produce aesthetically pleasing maps of popular recreation areas. The first of these, the Bribie Island South recreational map, was produced during the year and was initially made available to the public at the recent Royal National Association Brisbane Exhibition. This map was promoted in association with a poster based on colour aerial photographs of features of Moreton Bay and adjacent areas, and again the response was so gratifying that it has been decided to continue along these lines. Maps of this type are presently in course of production, or planning, for areas such as Fraser Island, Hervey Bay, the Sunshine Coast and the Whitsunday Islands.

The administrators of the department and I are confident that there are many new ways in which the science of mapping and surveying can provide much needed services to the community and to commerce and industry, and we are continuing to explore these possibilities. For example, my Surveyor-General has been given the official responsibility for the collection and dissemination of satellite imagery in Queensland. The utilisation of this "imagery from space" is in its infancy, but it will certainly increase dramatically when the new receiving station at Alice Springs becomes operational.

In keeping with our policy of maximising the uses to which modern technology can be put, we moved at once to form a widely representative Remote Sensing Landsat Committee. The committee met on six occasions during the year, and the results of its findings have been conveyed to the Australian Liaison Committee of the Commonwealth Department of Science and the Environment.

In addition, the department, in association with the University of Queensland, conducted a seminar in February 1979 called "Introduction to Remote Sensing". This was attended by over 100 representatives of some 20 Government instrumentalities and representatives of the private sector. It was the first of its kind to be held in Australia. New South Wales followed a little later with a similar seminar at the Macquarie University. These activities are aimed at promoting the utilisation of advancing technology in a generalised way, but it is important for me to emphasise that the department is also active in promoting the use of new techniques in specific cases.

One instance of this was the bringing together of photogrammetric methods and traditional field survey procedures to effect land boundary surveys, on a very large scale, at the Homeboin property in the Mitchell district. This resulted in a 30 per cent saving in time and money compared with the conventional method, and, incidentally, was made possible by the improvements effected by the provisions of the Surveyors Regulations of 1978 under the Surveyors Act 1977-78. The department's research

staff is presently studying the application of aerial surveying and remote sensing to such activities as sugar-cane farming, grain growing and the mining industry.

The application of terrestrial program-metry is also being investigated in relation to the graphical representation of buildings of historical significance and of archaeological sites. We hope to work closely with the National Trust and kindred organisations in this area of activity.

The third aspect of marketing of the department's products and services is that of the actual selling and distribution of its products and services. For a number of years, the sale of maps to the public and their distribution to other Government departments have been conducted from premises which have become quite inadequate for this purpose. Similarly, the facilities provided for the public to inspect and purchase aerial photographs and technical information related to surveying have also become out-moded.

To counter this situation, a number of measures have been implemented or are in the process of being introduced. Most importantly, a modern central-city sales outlet is being constructed in the Government buildings at Anzac Square, from which sales to the public will be conducted in an appropriate environment. Bulk distribution of maps will eventually take place from a new building at the Rocklea Survey Depot.

The catalogue of all available aerial photography in Queensland has been computerised to increase the efficiency of the response to inquiries, and records of other data is being similarly filed. Specialised services to the public, such as photographic processes and map-mounting, have been greatly improved by the installation of new devices and the acquisition of new materials.

A very important extension of the services provided by the department is that of the network of the regional and district surveyors. Regional surveyors have been located in Brisbane, Rockhampton and Townsville, and district surveyors in those centres and also at Toowoomba, Roma, Maryborough, Bundaberg, Mackay and Cairns. These field officers not only co-ordinate the work of the private sector practitioners, but also have the important role of establishing liaison with clients and potential clients of the department.

The Toowoomba office has become an important outlet for the department's maps and aerial photographs, and other regional offices are currently preparing to participate in this capacity. The range of activities being conducted at regional offices is proposed to be expanded by the addition of drafting staff. This resource should increase speed and efficiency of services provided at the regional offices. This proposal is well advanced, and a training programme for the first group will commence in November.

[Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.15 p.m.]

Mr. GREENWOOD: Another matter I draw attention to is the fact that costs of cadastral land boundary surveys will be reduced as a consequence of the progressive establishment of proclaimed survey areas in which the regional and district surveyors have a paramount role.

With the large number of surveys to be undertaken in association with the development of the port of Brisbane, for example, it was logical that this would be the subject of a proclaimed survey area. Proclamation was made during the current year, and the Drayton area was also proclaimed in the subject period. Work is progressing towards similar proclamations in further areas in Brisbane and at Ipswich, Deception Bay, Mackay, Rockhampton and other provincial centres.

As previously mentioned, map productivity has been increased. During the year, maps were published covering some thirty-six areas of the State, including Beenleigh, the Burdekin basin, Cairns, Gladstone, Mount Isa and Warwick.

Special mapping included the Wivenhoe maps which I described a few minutes ago. It also included mapping for use in the 1981 census, which was undertaken for the Australian Bureau of Statistics, and the department is currently involved in a joint programme with New South Wales to produce maps along the State border in the Texas-St. George area.

I have also mentioned the promotional activities of the department and I briefly elaborate on this aspect. I believe that increased public awareness, and indeed increased awareness from the honourable gentleman opposite, of the importance of mapping and surveying is an essential part of the charter of my Department. I also believe that an effective way of achieving this is through the education system of our State. For this reason, I was very pleased to be associated with the inaugural national map week—"Map Week '79". The main thrust of this was aimed at our schools, by conducting cartographic competitions for students at all levels. In addition, the department arranged map displays at the Brisbane Exhibition, at the Toowoomba Farmfest and at many metropolitan and provincial shopping centres.

As to the future—I believe that the evolution of computerised land data banks will bring a new dimension to the storage and distribution of land data, and central to this will be the identification of individual parcels of land. This represents the adaptation of a traditional function of mapping and surveying to the requirements of an emerging technology. If I might restate it briefly, geographical retrieval of information cannot be achieved without suitable identifiers in each of the computer-stored files. The identifiers must be derived from some geographical co-ordinates—the x, y and z co-ordinates. These, of course, can only be established by mapping of the areas concerned to high standards.

I turn now to reporting the activities of the several bodies which are associated with the functioning of the Department of Mapping and Surveying. The first is the Queensland Place Names Board.

Official definition and naming of suburbs and localities is essential for planning purposes and for the provision of community services by a wide range of Government departments, local authorities and private organisations. During the year 1978-79, the board defined and named 69 suburbs in the shires of Albert, Logan, Pine Rivers and Redland. These were in addition to four other local authorities in which the board had earlier defined suburbs, including the city of Brisbane in 1975. Forty-six per cent of the State's population now lives in officially defined areas which, however, cover only .24 per cent of the State's area. The board will investigate and determine the localities, boundaries and names of suburbs in a number of other local authority areas in the coming year.

The board's newly established Place Names Research Assistance Committee has already begun to reconstitute the card index system of place names. This will be of great assistance to the board and the Department of Mapping and Surveying in ensuring a correct and uniform nomenclature on maps. The Legislative Revision Committee of the Place Names Board in the coming year will draft much needed amendments to the Queensland Place Names Act of 1958.

The Fraser Island Committee, in collaboration with the Forestry Department and the National Parks and Wildlife Service, will this year complete the first ever comprehensive nomenclature review of Fraser Island. After consultation with anthropologists and historians, the board will approve many traditional names which have never before appeared on maps, and will in some cases change the spellings of existing names in the light of historical research. This nomenclature review is essential to the production of up-to-date tourist maps of Fraser Island.

Next I would like to refer to the Surveyors Board of Queensland. This is the first full year in which the board has operated under the Surveyors Act 1977-1978. An important feature of the Act is that registration as a surveyor is not restricted to those surveyors who are competent in cadastral, or land boundary, definition. Surveyors who are proficient in other aspects of their profession are also eligible for registration.

Through the wide representation of the nine-member board and other provisions of the Act, surveyors have a greater opportunity to guide the affairs of their profession. This was highlighted during the year when the board was instrumental in acquiring the services of Mr. John Morgan, the Surveyor-General of Western Australia, to conduct an inquiry into the activities of surveyors in surveying allotments on Russell Island.

Mr. Davis: It should have been done 12 months previously.

Mr. GREENWOOD: The member for Brisbane Central shouldn't mutter. If he has something to say, let him speak up.

Mr. Davis: I said that it should have been done 12 months earlier.

Mr. GREENWOOD: One can do all sorts of things, if one's imagination is used. As soon as the problem surfaced and evidence was available, the inquiry was conducted. I have no doubt that some honourable members opposite would be prepared to go on witch-hunts without evidence. All I can say is that we on this side of the Chamber require some evidence before we do so. When the evidence is forthcoming, then the inquiry is also forthcoming.

Consequent to Mr. Morgan's report, the board has caused several charges to be drawn against a particular surveyor, and these are currently being heard before a Surveyors Disciplinary Committee.

Finally, I shall report on a particular aspect of the subject of finance. In late 1978, the department made its first submission to the Commonwealth Grants Commission on the subject of special grants, on behalf of the Treasury, and the Surveyor-General with senior staff appeared before the commission. It is a tribute to the department that the standard of services achieved has been achieved with an amount of money very considerably less than that afforded to what could be described as the standard States, and in particular the States of New South Wales and Victoria. By way of conclusion to these remarks I would like now to quote a passage from the commission's report—

"The Commission recognised that Queensland has special needs in light of comparisons with the standard States of New South Wales and Victoria. In order to provide equivalent services, Queensland was recommended for a grant of \$3.27 million dollars."

In this coming year, the department will again present a submission for special grants, on the basis of comparison of needs with the standard States of New South Wales and Victoria. In addition, a comprehensive submission will be prepared for the purpose of an updating by the commission of a relativity review of all six States, where a comparison of the needs of Queensland will be made with all other States.

In view of those comments by the commission, I think it fair to say to the Committee that this State can be very proud of the efficiency of the department and the level of achievement it has reached with substantially less funds than those enjoyed by what are described as the standard States.

Mr. MILLINER (Everton) (2.26 p.m.): The debate on the Estimates introduced by the Minister for Survey and Valuation gives honourable members one of their very few opportunities to discuss matters pertaining

to the departments under the Minister's control. It is a relatively small portfolio, the ministerial responsibility covering about six areas and only five Acts.

Originally, the portfolio was the Ministry for Survey, Valuation and Urban Affairs. I should be very interested to know why the "Urban Affairs" was dropped, because in these times, when so many problems face urban-dwellers and when so many problems relating to the development of urban areas arise, one would have thought that it would have been a very important part of the portfolio and one that should have been retained.

Mr. R. J. Gibbs: Don't you think that attaching other responsibilities to the portfolio would make the task beyond the Minister's capacity?

Mr. MILLINER: I am not sure about that; perhaps it would.

As the Minister has pointed out, the valuation of land is one of his ministerial responsibilities. Of course, the valuation of land affects every land-owner in Queensland, and the Valuation of Land Act has caused some problems, in particular problems for some local authorities.

The Bowen Shire Council wrote to me a couple of months ago in relation to the valuation of the Bowen Shire. The council made a request to the Minister that the next valuation be made effective from 30 June 1980 instead of from 30 June 1981, and I think that highlights one of the problems. In that instance, the Valuer-General valued the Bowen Shire after a slump had occurred in rural industries. Later, conditions improved and property values increased by from 1,200 to 1,400 per cent. Consequently, because of the rate determined by the Bowen Shire Council, a very heavy burden has fallen on the urban section of the shire. I reiterate that the valuation of land is causing some problems.

Earlier this year, a problem that arose at Port Douglas was mentioned in this Chamber. A man had cut off portion of his cane farm and erected a house on the esplanade at Port Douglas. The valuation of that property was \$30, but the property next door on the esplanade, which was on a 24-perch block, was valued at about \$16,000. The valuer said in his report, "Even if this land was unassigned cane land, it had to be worth more than \$30."

In my own electorate of Everton, some problems relating to valuation have arisen. The Valuer-General carried out a valuation of the Pine Rivers Shire about 12 months ago. Some 10 or 15 years ago, many people seeking the tranquillity offered by a rural atmosphere moved to my electorate and purchased acreage in the Arana Hills and Everton Hills areas. At that stage, it was virtually virgin land. There were no roads, and it was a peaceful area in which to live. At that time, these people, who were mainly working men and women, paid

in the vicinity of \$4,000 to \$5,000 for 5 or 10-acre blocks. Over the past 10 or 15 years, a tremendous boom in land sales has occurred. Land developers purchased the land around those blocks and subdivided it into 24-perch allotments. Consequently, the 5 or 10-acre rural blocks are situated smack, bang in the middle of large residential areas. Their valuations have risen to the \$200,000 mark. The occupiers of those blocks are finding it extremely difficult to pay the rates levied by the local authority. I realise that the levying of rates has nothing to do with the Valuer-General's Department. The valuation of land, however, is the basis on which local authority rates are determined.

As the Minister pointed out, the community has had difficulty in understanding the system that is based on unimproved value. He mentioned that he had circulated a pamphlet entitled "Your Valuer", in which he said he believes that Queensland has a very good valuation system and that it will work only if people understand their rights, particularly their rights of objection to new valuations. That is not a bad start to trying to make people aware of the position. I was pleased to hear the Minister say that copies of that pamphlet would be included with valuation notices. Clearly, people just do not understand how to go about objecting and how the valuation system works.

The Valuation of Land Act came into force in 1944. It achieved the desired result of bringing about uniformity in valuations through the State. The system worked fairly well up till 10 or 15 years ago. With the subsequent boom and bust periods the situation that developed can only be described as chaotic.

The first effect of the boom and bust periods was felt in the rural areas. At first, in the late 1960s a slump occurred in the sheep industry. It was followed by a slump in the cattle industry. At that stage, there was no real problem with the local authority rating system. The boom and bust periods in urban areas really did cause problems.

The present valuation system cannot cope with the local authority rating system. Take, for example, a coastal shire consisting of tourist areas and also sugar and cattle-grazing areas. Because southern millionaires were prepared to move in and pay ridiculously high prices for land in the coastal tourist areas, the valuations in those areas rose in some instances by 8,000 per cent. The valuations in the sugar areas, however, remained static. With the bust in the grazing industry, the valuations in the grazing areas have in fact gone downwards. Under the circumstances, it is virtually impossible for local authorities to work out an equitable rating system.

The whole system of local government rating should be based on the services received by the residents. Take, for example, two adjoining properties, one of which originally had a deep gully running through it and was subsequently filled by an owner who had foresight. Under the present system

based on unimproved value, even though the two blocks are identical today, the one that originally had the gully running through it is valued at a lesser amount and therefore the rates on it are lower. Quite obviously, the whole system should be looked at.

As far back as 1961, various people suggested that the system should be looked at. Eminent people such as Sir Harold Richter suggested that it should be looked at. In 1966, the Government conducted an inquiry into the system that operated at that time. Some two years ago, a Press release issued by the Minister for Survey and Valuation and the Minister for Local Government stated that they were going to have a look at the system. I believe we should introduce the site value system of valuation that was introduced recently in New South Wales. I shall now quote an article in "The Queensland Graingrower" of 24 January 1979, which claims that it is a more equitable system. It states—

"The land value system for local government rating should be more easily understood by landowners and should achieve greater equality between rural rate-payers."

In the same article, the New South Wales Minister for Local Government, Mr. Harry Jensen, referred to the unimproved valuation system that we work under, and when talking about the Valuer-General, he said that he has had—

"... the almost impossible task of valuing land as if it were in its original state after taking into account the development and services in the surrounding district."

The Government should be doing something about it. I hope that the Minister will introduce the site value system.

I think it was early this year that I asked the Minister a question about the inquiry that was taking place into a new valuation system, whereupon the Minister informed me that his committee was still investigating the problem. The Minister may be so good as to inform the Committee of the members of that committee and the outcome of its deliberations so far. I sincerely hope that something flows from it fairly soon.

The objection appeals system should be streamlined. The preliminary appeal is a very good one. It consists of an appeal to the Valuer-General. Following the objection a conference is convened between the appellant and a representative of the Valuer-General's Department. The conference is usually held on the land in question. If the person objecting is not satisfied with the conference, his next appeal is to the Land Court. This is where many of the problems arise. Many people who are not happy with the decision made by the Valuer-General are not prepared, because of the legal costs involved, to press an appeal in the Land Court.

I should like a completely independent appeals tribunal to be set up to hear appeals

against land valuations. I envisage such a tribunal comprising a magistrate, a representative of local government and a registered valuer. That would be a very democratic tribunal. In appeals to such a tribunal it could be provided that one party could not have legal representation unless the other party agreed to it. That would avoid legal costs usually involved in appeals to the Land Court. If an appeals situation similar to that in the Small Claims Tribunal was provided many more people would press appeals.

Mr. Davis: And that would save the barristers' fees.

Mr. MILLINER: It probably would. It is unfortunate that fees charged by barristers today are rather exorbitant.

Mr. Greenwood: What about the uneducated people who do not know very much? Without legal representation they would be in a very difficult position.

Mr. MILLINER: I agree, but the Small Claims Tribunal appears to work very well. Maybe a further appeal to the Land Court, with legal representation, would be desirable.

I am pleased to note that district valuers are appointed throughout the State, but I would like to see the department more decentralised, with the district valuers having more staff at their disposal. When the valuation of a certain area is undertaken, the valuers resident in the area would be very familiar with what has happened.

The heavy work-load in the Valuer-General's Department concerns me. Recently I asked the Minister a question about that. The question stemmed from an article that appeared in the "Queensland Fruit & Vegetable News" of 17 May 1979. In that article the consulting valuer to the C.O.D., Mr. Rod Brett, was reported as having said to a meeting of the Deception Bay and District Farmers' Association—

"After explaining the role of the Valuer General's Department and how valuations are made, Mr Brett also advised growers to be wary of obvious mistakes resulting from the heavy workload which faced the Department."

I find that fairly disturbing, and I hope the Minister will look at it. I have had a personal experience that makes me tend to believe the article in that journal. Following the revaluation of the Pine Rivers Shire some 12 months ago, I received a notice of valuation from the Department of the Valuer-General. The notice is made out to Glen R. Milliner and Eileen Kay Britten, which is my wife's maiden name. It is a valuation notice for a property at 8 Yandeera Avenue, Arana Hills. I have never owned a property in Yandeera Avenue, Arana Hills, although I did own a property at Samford, which is also in the Pine Rivers Shire.

Mr. R. J. Gibbs: Furthermore, they are suggesting you are living in sin.

Mr. MILLINER: That could be the suggestion, but I assure the honourable member that it is not true.

Following the receipt of this notice, I wrote to the Valuer-General enclosing a photocopy of the notice and pointing out the fact that I did not own the property, and, what was more, had never owned it, but as yet I have not received a reply from the Valuer-General. I hope that matter will also be looked into.

We have seen a decline in morale in the Valuer-General's Department. I know that a lot of members received an anonymous circular from someone working in the department claiming that certain religious groups were being persecuted.

Mr. Bourke: It was a scandalous bit of rubbish.

Mr. MILLINER: It may have been, but it obviously came from someone in the department. It is unfortunate that these types of things happen.

Another important department under the Minister's control is the Department of Mapping and Survey. Again, the morale of this department is at an all time low. What is now known as the Department of Mapping and Survey was once the Survey Office attached to the Lands Department. At that time the office had a hierarchy of two persons, the Surveyor-General and the Deputy Surveyor-General. But with the setting up of the Department of Mapping and Survey, we now find a hierarchy of four executives, the Surveyor-General, the Director of Mapping, the Director of Surveying and the Director of Technical and Administrative Services. And who got the job of Director of Technical and Administrative Services when it came up for grabs? In another example of jobs for the boys it went to Mr. K. J. Davies. I know what the Minister will say about this, but we all know Mr. Davies' history.

Mr. Mackenroth: He was a member of the Liberal Party.

Mr. MILLINER: In fact, he was on the executive of the Liberal Party. He was the campaign director for a Liberal Party candidate in the last Federal election.

Mr. Davis interjected.

Mr. MILLINER: That was Mr. Jull.

The propaganda machine within the department has been built up. Four years ago there was no such thing as the publicity section of the department, but I am reliably informed that that section now employs about 10 people who should be engaged on mapping work within the department.

One sees from the departmental Estimates that there has not been an increase in the number of employees since 1978-79 when 879 were employed. This is a disappointment.

What is happening is that the Public Service is virtually stagnating, and young people who are seeking careers within it, particularly specialist careers such as those of surveyor or valuer, are finding it extremely difficult to obtain them. I hope that the department can see its way clear to create more job opportunities for those who will be leaving colleges of advanced education and universities, so that they can find a place within the work-force.

Mr. HARTWIG (Callide) (2.46 p.m.): I wish to make a contribution to the debate on the Estimates of the Valuer-General's Department. First of all, let me say that the Minister has worked very hard in his portfolio, and it is not because of him that I am going to make some criticism of the department. I make it quite clear that I am not casting any reflections on his ability or integrity.

I state openly that the problems associated with local government generally today can well and truly be laid at the feet of the Valuer-General's Department, and I say that as a former chairman of a shire council for some time. Local government today finds itself in more trouble than it has ever been before in its entire history. For some reason or other, local authorities throughout the length and breadth of the State face a problem, and I do not believe that they manufactured it. Because of the inconsistencies in the way in which the Valuer-General's Department carries out valuations, the department has created many problems for itself. As I said, I know a little about local authorities. A period of five to eight years between valuations of shires is far too long. I am pleased to see that the Minister is trying to shorten the period and to get it down to five years. I believe that if it can be reduced to five years, that will greatly assist local authorities.

I wish to talk briefly about the affairs of one shire in particular, the Livingstone Shire in which I live. It is a very small shire with some 6,655 ratepayers. Prior to the last Valuer-General's official valuation, it was valued at about \$9,756,000. Following a small land boom on the Capricorn Coast, the overall valuation of the shire increased by over 500 per cent to \$47,400,000. It must be borne in mind that we are only a handful of ratepayers.

The Minister stated earlier that the Valuer-General did not determine the values for rating purposes—that that was a matter for the council. That is very true. But he forgot to state that a council may wish to increase its revenue received by way of rates. In the case of allotments that have had their valuations increased from \$800 to \$11,000 or \$12,000, as happened in my own case, in most cases the rates have increased by between 50 and 80 per cent in the last 12 months.

At the time of the valuations meat prices were at a low ebb, and naturally many rural properties were given a low valuation. That

placed the Valuer-General's Department in an invidious position. Of 6,000 ratepayers in the area, 1,200, or 20 per cent, lodged objections to those valuations. That showed that there was great dissatisfaction within the shire. Eventually the shire council did strike a rate in the dollar, but there was so much dissatisfaction with it that approximately 2,250 people signed a petition seeking the appointment of an administrator to the Livingstone Shire. The dissatisfaction was so great that the petition was organised and signed within three days.

Mr. Austin: Would any of these people sell their land for less than the Valuer-General's valuation?

Mr. HARTWIG: That has little bearing on it. That is a question which reflects a very great lack of knowledge of valuation principles. Valuations are made on the unimproved value of the property, not on the improved value. If the honourable member wants land valued at the improved value, then he should try to have it done.

When one speaks of unimproved value, one has to think of the land in its natural state.

Mr. Austin: I agree with you.

Mr. HARTWIG: Well, we agree on that.

The situation is that some of the new valuations are almost equal to the improved value of the property. Sometimes, when land is being valued, I wonder if it would not be a good idea to use the improved value instead of the unimproved value. When one looks at a property today, it is very hard to visualise what the land would look like in its unimproved state.

The total of valuations objected to in the Livingstone Shire was \$11,600,000, which is 25.26 per cent of the total valuation of rateable land. By way of appeals, a reduction of \$705,000, or 6.4 per cent, was achieved. I appealed against the valuation placed on my own allotment. It has a sewerage main under it and an inspection hole approximately 20 feet from the corner. Of course, that means that a building cannot be constructed over that part of the sewerage main. When I pointed that out to the officers of the department whom I met on the site, they argued that the fact that there was an inspection hole 20 feet from the corner of the allotment did not decrease the value of the land. They said that even though nothing could be built over the inspection hole, there was no reduction of valuation on that allotment.

I believe that we are going about valuation in the wrong way. We have to come to grips with it. The Minister touched on this in his comments. He himself is not satisfied with the present arrangement. We want to see more frequent valuations—perhaps at maximum periods of five years—and the Minister advocates that. We should appoint a committee to consider local government

boundaries. They were drawn in the horse-and-buggy era, so we are persisting with boundaries set 50 years ago.

Mr. Frawley: A committee of back-benchers?

Mr. HARTWIG: That is right. We need people with experience in local government to handle these problems.

Provincial cities are flowing over into rural local authorities, which are based on farm-lands and grazing properties. Pineapple farmers and small-crop farmers are being invaded by this spill-over from provincial cities; yet we as a Government wonder why, when it comes to valuation time, we have to increase values of land adjoining a provincial city. It becomes very valuable, and the Valuer-General has to value it accordingly. Someone living at Ogmoo cannot see rhyme or reason in having to pay rates based on increased valuations because something is happening on the Capricorn Coast or at Parkhurst, which is on the outskirts of Rockhampton. Therefore, I repeat that the boundaries have to be altered to get some rhyme and reason back into the valuation of land for rating purposes.

We have rural residential land, rural urban and so on. These categories lead to all sorts of problems. As I said, 10 years ago local government did not have these problems, but we could see them coming. We could see them coming in the provision of services such as water and sewerage. Small centres find it difficult, for they have to pay for the provision of services or bring them in from the provincial city at tremendous cost.

Subdivisional allotments are often used as a basis of valuation. Again, that is wrong. We advocate unimproved value as the basis; but when land has a bitumen street in front of it, kerbing and channelling, and water and sewerage laid on, it is said that the land is worth so much because it has those services. Those services are to be paid for by the purchaser of the allotment; yet unimproved value is set according to those services, and then that valuation is used as a yardstick a little further out where there are pineapple farms and small-crop areas. The pineapple growers at Yeppoon have a real case. Where there are two 50-acre blocks alongside one another and one fellow develops his, he is penalised. If the other fellow does nothing, he pays less in rates.

Mr. Davis: I suppose the Iwasaki scheme will make it a lot dearer, too.

Mr. HARTWIG: The member for Brisbane Central has never been up there to see what is happening.

We must sit down and look into the Valuer-General's Department and ensure that at no time will shires have their valuations increased by 500 per cent at one hit. I believe that the Beaudesert Shire rates rose by approximately that much. The north coast

is also having development problems. We must admit that it is development that has caused the problems.

How do we overcome them? I believe that it can only be done by consultation round the table, as was done recently when the Minister's committee, the committee of the Minister for Local Government and the executive of the Local Government Association met here to find ways and means of doing something about increases in valuations. If land is valued at \$1,000 and rates are set at 10c in the dollar, and then the valuation goes to \$10,000 and the rate is set at 2c in the dollar, the land-owner's rate bill doubles.

Local authorities themselves have this problem. They are finding it increasingly difficult, as are Governments, to balance their budgets. Therefore, shire budgets must increase each year. If increases continue at their present level—on the last occasion, the increase was about 500 per cent—what will the position be in five or ten years? A great many homes at Yeppoon are owned by pensioners and elderly people who are having difficulty in paying their rates. If the council strikes a rate that will bring in X thousand dollars and there is a shortfall of 15 per cent or 20 per cent, in the following year that must be made up by the people who can afford to pay their rates. Because of that, they face a much heavier financial burden.

The Valuer-General's Department has done a very good job over the years, but I believe that it has got away from the concept of unimproved value. Today, rating is certainly not based on unimproved value—nothing like it! In my own case, I had an allotment the unimproved value of which was \$11,000. I did quite a lot of work on it—levelling and so on—and I sold it for \$12,000. The unimproved value of it was fairly high.

Finally, I wish to touch briefly on the work of the Department of Mapping and Surveying. Great strides have been made in aerial photography, and I pay a tribute to the department for the work that it has done in that field. Mr. Cook is in the lobby, and I know that he is very satisfied with the work of the section of the department that is responsible for aerial photography. It certainly makes the job of councils much easier when they have access to accurate information.

Surveyors' fees seem to have got out of hand. Recently I received a complaint from a man who wanted to subdivide his property down the middle. It was 40 chains in length and about 80 acres in area, and he was quoted \$2,000 for a subdivisional survey. He even cleared the line for the surveyor, saying to himself, "I will break it down and make it easier for the surveyor. That will ensure that he does it for \$2,000." Later he received a bill for \$3,600 for a half-mile survey. I am not a surveyor. If those figures are any indication, I think I would be a fairly rich man if I were.

In my opinion, surveyors' fees are far too high, and there does not seem to be any avenue of redress. As I said, the person to whom I referred received a bill for \$3,600, and I think there was a discount of \$50 if it was paid within seven days. There does not seem to be any limit on fees, and I should like the Minister to comment on that.

Finally, I say to the Committee that I believe that valuers should be trained in the area in which they make valuations. It is not much good getting a valuer from Queen Street, taking him to my electorate and saying to him, "What is that farm worth? What is that pineapple farm worth?" It would be like taking me to Randwick and asking me what the land there is worth.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: You would not have a clue.

Mr. HARTWIG: That is right, I would not have a clue. Some of the valuers who come to my electorate to value land haven't a clue, either. Honourable members certainly know better than I do what their land is worth, and values can change considerably in 500 miles. Valuations should be made by people who are trained in the area that they are valuing.

Mr. AKERS (Pine Rivers) (3.5 p.m.): I rise to support the Minister in the presentation of his Estimates. The Minister's portfolio covers a fair range of responsibilities and activities that are basic to the control of development and have an effect on properties and property owners. It covers the co-ordination of surveys, deeds and leases, mapping, the registration of valuers, the registration of surveyors, surveys of Crown leasehold land, the valuation of land under the Valuation of Land Act, and the Place Names Board, which has a very important bearing on the lives of people throughout the State.

In contrast to the honourable member for Everton, I have noticed a tremendous growth over the past few years in the enthusiasm and morale of the staff of the Minister's department. I would attribute this to the fact that the department has been under the control of two Ministers who took a keen interest in the department. I refer to the previous Minister, Mr. Lickiss, and the present Minister, Mr. Greenwood. It can be attributed also to a large extent to the enthusiasm and attitude of the Surveyor-General, Mr. Mac Serisier. His enthusiasm has filtered right through his department. Not many public servants get out supporting their department and wear T-shirts with their department's name emblazoned on them. Those employed by the Department of Mapping and Surveying do just that and encourage the public to take notice of their department. Mac Serisier is well respected by the profession and he is producing good results for Queenslanders.

I refer to the department's annual report. Over the past few years, it has become one of the departmental reports that are worth

getting. It is produced in such a way as to make it interesting to read. It makes a real attempt to inform both Parliament and the people of what the department is doing and of what is available to the public from that department. I urge any member who has not read the report to do so.

The last few years have seen a tremendous revolution in technology within the Department of Mapping and Surveying. Recently I had a look at three different computer-driven drafting machines. They symbolise modern technology in what appears to the outside world to be a very dry and dour profession.

Mr. Milliner: How many jobs will they take?

Mr. AKERS: I do not think they will take very many jobs at all. They allow information to be retrievable in a much more accurate form and at a much faster rate. In the past, no-one would bother to retain certain information, and some work would have to be done again.

In Bathurst, I saw a machine with a tray measuring 10 feet by 5 feet and an arm that runs across that tray. Across that arm runs a pointer. That pointer draws on the sheets that lie on the flat of the table. It can draw straight lines at a speed of 40 feet per second. It can produce a drawing very quickly and to whatever scale the operator sets the machine.

Another machine works on a different principle but has co-ordinates that work in the same direction. It has a cylinder, which turns for one lot of co-ordinates, and a pin that moves backwards and forwards across the axis of that cylinder and produces drawings. It is a bit slower than the other machine and a bit smaller, but a little more accurate.

The third one relies on a type of upside-down hovercraft principle. The part of the machine that does the drawing does not touch anything. It is held on by suction and is moved by magnetism. It draws at the same sort of speed, in different scales. I watched a drawing that would have taken about a day to produce by hand being produced in about 20 minutes. Within seconds the scale was changed and the typical subdivision appeared, in a different scale, in about 20 minutes. The speed, accuracy and availability of the information is typical of the tremendous changes in this profession.

Stereoscopic plotters have been around for a long time, but they are now being produced so that information can be fed into a computer. The computer can then change the scale and feed the information into the plotting machines I have been referring to. When using stereoscopic plotters the operator looks through two eye-pieces to follow aerial maps and draws on a map the contours revealed by the two photos he is looking at.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: This is not a speech; this is a lecture.

Mr. AKERS: The honourable member might gain some information. It would be worth his while finding out about these matters. If we intend to speak about something we should know what we are talking about. I am sure that the Opposition spokesman has not seen these machines. I urge him to visit the department and make trips interstate to see what is available. A huge volume of material is available to let us know what this is all about.

Mr. Milliner: I would like to see through the department.

Mr. Greenwood: I will take you up on that.

Mr. AKERS: The honourable member has an invitation from the Minister.

It would be a very good idea for Opposition and Government members who have not been through the department to go there to see what is really happening in Queensland.

The stereoscopic plotters are producing information which, in the next few years, will save millions of dollars in developmental work and speed up such work in Queensland. The orthophoto-mapping system involves large-scale aerial photos with 1 m contours drawn on them. A good example is the map that has been produced for most of the Pine Rivers Shire. As the honourable member for Everton represents part of that shire I am sure that he has looked at it.

Mr. Austin: He represents it only temporarily.

Mr. AKERS: Yes, only temporarily.

This information will help development in that area go ahead much more rapidly.

It has been estimated in Canada that a dollar spent on this type of mapping saves about \$18 in development costs. In the light of the enormous sums spent on developmental work in Queensland that represents a significant saving.

Orthophoto maps are produced more cheaply and in less time than were the old, conventional cadastral maps that just showed property boundaries, and topographical contour mapping had to be done on separate maps. From an aerial photo the two types of maps are now combined to show exactly what is on the ground. The basis of the map can be seen with the contours drawn on it. A person with an experienced eye can pick very small changes. One example often quoted concerns the camber on a road which is picked out in the 1 m contours. I urge members to visit the Mapping Department to see what is available in the mapping sales section. A lot of information is available.

These maps are being used not only for development, but by people interested in orienteering and bushwalking, and those who have to know what is happening in an area and want to be able to see it easily. I even use them in my own office when people come

to me with problems. If a person comes to me about a problem with his drains, I can look at the contour maps and see what is causing the problem and then try to do something about it.

At present the department has one Klimsch Commodore camera, and I understand that an order has been placed for another one at a cost of about \$170,000. It will take negatives—not create prints—up to a metre square. With a negative that size extreme accuracy can be gained. This again shows the real drive of the Department of Mapping. A real attempt is being made to update mapping, and to increase the availability of maps. I understand that following trips to the South by departmental officers to see what is being done down there, the department is now going to establish a direct sales outlet in the Anzac Square building. I hope similar outlets will be set up in other areas very shortly.

The co-operation between Mr. Serisier's department and the private sector is well known throughout Queensland. Some time ago I gave figures comparing the use of private surveyors by the Queensland Government with the use made of them by the Commonwealth Government, and our record in that regard is very good. This support of local surveyors, at a time when they need support, is very much appreciated, and I pass on the thanks of the surveyors in my area to the Minister and the Government generally for this co-operation.

The other main section of the Minister's portfolio, and probably the more senior one, is the Valuer-General's Department. This Department comes under the general control of the Valuer-General, Mr. Neville Cook. He is another man who has gained my respect following his personal attempts to correct problems with which I have gone to him, and for his general attitude to his work. The employees of this department are very enthusiastic about what they are doing. Valuers all over Queensland are very interested in their work and doing their best to make the department work. Of course, they make some mistakes, and a lot of us think they make some very substantial mistakes, but they are only human beings, and the attitude I have seen right through the department is that they are trying very hard to do their job.

The honourable member for Callide spoke at length about the department. He blamed it for local government's financial problems. I do not agree with him entirely; in fact I disagree with him to a great extent. I do not believe that the Valuer-General's Department is creating the problem. I believe that the department's valuers are valuing the way they are supposed to value. The real problem lies with the Local Government Act and the way it requires local authorities to raise their funds. It is totally out of step with the present economic system. The Local Government Act originated at a time when local authorities were

meant to look after roads and very little else. Since that time they have been given the added responsibilities of sewerage, water supply, libraries, child care centres and so on.

Mr. Milliner: What do you think about the unimproved system? Do you favour the unimproved system or the site value system?

Mr. AKERS: I would agree that the site value system should be looked at, but I take great exception to the attitude of the honourable member's colleague the honourable member for Chatsworth, who said that we should screw all our Tory friends.

Mr. MACKENROTH: I rise to a point of order. I am sure that I did not use the expression "screw all those Tories", and I would ask the honourable member to withdraw that remark.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think the term is unacceptable. The honourable member will withdraw it.

Mr. AKERS: I will withdraw the words. But it will be noted that he did not ask me to withdraw my reference to the fact that he wanted us to "rip off our Tory mates" by introducing the property value. That is what he called for before.

Mr. Mackenroth: Mr. Hartwig called for that.

Mr. AKERS: No, the honourable member did. The member for Callide called for site values.

Mr. Mackenroth: I agreed that Tories would pay more, and I do agree with that. I just did not use the crude words that you used.

Mr. AKERS: The honourable member is quite happy that our so-called Tory mates will be ripped off by it?

Mr. Mackenroth: If people in my electorate do not have to pay as much, yes, I agree.

Mr. AKERS: Is the honourable member saying that only Labor people should have properties with small valuations? Is that what he is saying?

The problem facing local government is that it is trying to do more with the money that is raised in rates based on property values than was ever intended, and that position must be corrected. My own house site is an example. Water, sewerage and garbage services are provided to that site. There is a bitumen road in front of it that was built by the developer. The valuation of my land is based on the fact that all those services are available to it, and I am paying my general rate on the basis of that valuation. Yet, in addition to that

general rate, I pay water, sewerage and cleansing rates. The whole system by which local government obtains finance has gone totally awry. Although the member for Callide meant well, he has the wrong bull by the tail in this case. I do not think that the Valuer-General's Department is to blame for this situation; I think that the Government is to blame for it by not coming to grips with the problems facing local government.

I am suffering politically as much as anybody from the problems to which I have referred. In the recent revaluation of the Pine Rivers Shire, the valuations in some parts of my electorate were increased by as much as 1,200 per cent.

Mr. Milliner: In Samford.

Mr. AKERS: Yes, in parts of Samford. The valuations in other areas were increased by about 180 per cent. The average increase in valuations for the whole shire was about 209 per cent. So, no matter what is done—no matter if the council does as it has promised and introduces a rural rate and a rural residential rate next year—it still will not overcome the problem. The people will be hit for more money this year, and they are not getting anything more for that money. It is just that the value of their land has increased. If their rates were related to the value of the land, which is related directly to roads and so on, and if that were all they were paying for, that would be fair enough.

Mr. Milliner: Wouldn't you agree that Cambridge Credit was partly responsible for the land boom at Samford?

Mr. AKERS: No. That area would have gone ahead long before Cambridge Credit came into it. In fact, Cambridge Credit steadied down the situation by causing the present debacle.

I am as politically affected as anybody by this reaction to valuations. I urge the Government to take some very strong action very soon to try to remove this anomaly that exists in local government financing.

The Valuer-General has produced a pamphlet called "Your Valuer". It sets out certain information to enable ordinary householders to understand how the valuation of their property is set. I congratulate the Valuer-General on the production of that pamphlet.

The Minister spoke about a study being made of land data banks. I urge him to look at this matter very hard and to get something going on it very quickly. I believe that if a land data bank of some sort is established in Queensland, it will save Queensland taxpayers millions and millions of dollars. For example, I take the case of someone who is buying a block of land. If he wants to check its title, its

valuation, its zoning and whether it will be affected by any future works, he has to go to five different departments.

(Time expired.)

Mr. BLAKE (Bundaberg) (3.25 p.m.): I accept that the Valuer-General is charged primarily with the responsibility as an independent authority—I emphasise that—of making valuations for the Commissioner of Land Tax and for the rating purposes of local authorities. It is mandatory for those authorities to use the valuations of the Valuer-General. I use the following terminology of the Valuer-General—

“The valuations performed for rating and taxing purposes, being the vehicle by which such charges are levied, are the subject of public criticism, objections and subsequent appeals to the Land Court and higher appellate bodies. This is understandable because of the charges levied on the valuations but, of course, the amounts of these charges are the responsibilities of the Local Authorities and the Commissioner of Land Tax acting under the provisions of their respective Statutes.”

That statement is perfectly true. However, from the point of view of the public, that is the over-simplification of the century. Land taxation and rates are decidedly unpopular, especially when they are increasing. When that happens, the authorities concerned naturally pass the buck—and with it the unpopularity—and blame the Valuer-General for any increases.

For that reason, I do not think any information brochure has ever generated as much public cynicism as that issued by the Valuer-General's Department. It had a carpet-bagger type on the cover with a carpet-bag in one hand and a sword in the other. The caption was, “Your valuer—he's there to stand up for your rights as a land owner”. Those who copped huge increases in valuations—around 1,600 per cent in some cases—had no doubt whatever about the purpose of the upraised sword.

Mr. Akers: Is the one I have here the one you are talking about?

Mr. BLAKE: Yes, that is the one.

They had no doubt whatever what the upraised sword was for, nor did they have any doubt about what part of the anatomy they had copped it in. I can assure honourable members that it is very debatable for whom the gentleman on the brochure is sticking up.

I accept the validity of the Valuer-General's point that the more frequently valuations are made, the better they reflect land values. Constituents complained to me that it had been too long since valuations were adjusted. However, when they saw the adjusted valuations, they wished it had not happened for another 20 years. On the other hand, in fairness, some have argued that

their valuations, arrived at in boom times, are too high and that the sooner a revaluation takes place, the sooner a realistic figure—I emphasise “realistic”—will be arrived at. In some cases valuations have been made either when an industry has been doing particularly well or when land values have been booming. I am quite positive that if such properties were now put up for sale, a buyer could not be found at the level of the valuation. That makes the point, I admit, that it is better for revaluations to take place more frequently, preferably every five years. In the case of those people who wanted a revaluation, I do not know whether or not their faith in a more realistic value was upheld; but the validity of the theory still stands.

With the great increases in unimproved (or so-called unimproved) values, many people now find themselves subject to land tax. A person no longer has to be a land baron, so to speak, to find himself paying land tax. However, at the moment, I wish to deal with rateable values, which have a universal application and effect. At the outset, I express the difficulty that I have in explaining to some ratepayers that the percentage valuation increase does not reflect the percentage rate increase. It is surprising how many people come into my office—and possibly into the Minister's office—when they receive their revaluation notices, believing that their rates will rise in direct proportion to the rise in unimproved value.

Mr. Kruger: It is very confusing.

Mr. BLAKE: Yes, it is, and it is quite shattering for some of the older people.

Mr. Kruger: I think the councils set about confusing them.

Mr. BLAKE: That could be so, too. They might set out to dazzle them with science.

It is hard to explain to some that, if the local authority's valuation does not change and the authority needed to raise revenue by 20 per cent, say, an increase of 20 per cent would be made on the rate struck on the unchanged valuation. On the other hand, if the valuation increased but the council did not wish to increase its total amount of rate revenue, no greater amount would be charged on the higher valuation figure. However, with inflation, councils periodically increase their rates in order to maintain services.

For the individual landholder, the important thing is that his new valuation does not increase by a greater percentage than the overall percentage increase in valuation of the local authority in which he is situated; otherwise his relativity will be affected and his rate bill will alter proportionately, regardless of the rate in the dollar struck on the new valuation. This loss of relativity to the overall valuation of a shire or city is the main complaint I receive from property owners. They complain about their percentage increase being greater than the increase in valuation for the whole shire or city.

This appears to be particularly so in Bundaberg, where the majority of the residential land was revalued at a greater percentage increase than the total city increase of 306 per cent—from \$26,000,000 in March 1971 to \$106,000,000 in the recent revaluation. This has given rise to allegations from some Bundaberg residential landholders that the department's valuers have discriminated against them to the benefit or relative advantage of the commercial and industrial sectors of Bundaberg.

I was asked by the Bundaberg branch of the Pensioners League to determine if the Bundaberg City Council itself, if it so wished—and I am not implying that it did so wish—could object to the Valuer-General's valuation of a residential area on the ground that the valuation was too high. I made inquiries about this at the Local Government Department. The advice given to me was that there is no provision for a local authority to appeal against the valuation of a sector of its area on behalf of ratepayers on the ground that the Valuer-General's valuation for that sector is too high. However, a local authority can appeal against the valuation of a sector of its area if it deems the Valuer-General's valuation to be too low. In other words, a local authority could not appeal in respect of a residential area the value of which people deemed to be too high, but it could appeal to have the value of the commercial and industrial area increased on the grounds that it was too low.

That was my interpretation of the opinion given to me, and that was the opinion that I forwarded to the Bundaberg branch of the Australian Pensioners League. However, since then I have heard opinions expressed that my interpretation was incorrect, and I would appreciate it greatly if the Minister and his officers would give their learned opinion on the question so that, figuratively speaking, I would have it right from the horse's mouth.

While on the subject of pensioner concern about land valuing and rate levying and their ability to pay, I will refer to the intent of pensioner petitions to Parliament on this subject. In effect, they seek to show—

“(a) That the rates and charges, imposts levied by local authorities in Queensland, bear unduly heavily on those pensioners described in Section 27 (4) of the Local Government Act as being entitled to special consideration for relief from such imposts.

“(b) Some local authorities allow differing percentage reductions or a monetary maximum or minimum on varying parts of the total imposts levied but there is no uniform basis for all local authorities in Queensland.

“(c) Economic conditions could preclude uniform relief by every local authority to the degree considered reasonable. While the closer settled urban districts may not

present the difficulties attaching to the sparsely settled areas there is a real need for uniformity in the relief deemed essential for the classes of pensioners mentioned above.”

I posed a question to the Premier in September 1978.

Mr. Mackenroth: And he didn't answer it?

Mr. BLAKE: Yes, he did answer it. I will give the honourable member the answer in a moment. I asked—

“(1) Has Cabinet discussion, referred to in Press reports, taken place regarding the Landsborough Shire Council's submissions for State Government financial assistance to local authorities granting rate rebates to pensioners?

“(2) If not, when will the matter of assistance for pensioner rate rebates be considered?”

The answer was—

“(1 & 2) The question of the State Government providing subsidies to local authorities that grant rate rebates to pensioners has been considered on a number of occasions. However, the fact is that my Government provides a very generous subsidy scheme in respect of capital works such as water supply, sewerage, etc. The assistance that the State gives by way of capital subsidies exceeds \$30,000,000 annually and is higher than that provided in any other State, and this, together with the special grants of \$5,000,000 per annum, would help local authorities to provide rate rebates themselves.”

Further to that, I have heard Government members say in this Chamber that local government subsidies and special grants are such that pensioners in Queensland are not actually disadvantaged, in comparison with pensioners in other States, just because local authorities here do not receive from the State Government a subsidy relative to pensioner rate rebates. However, no calculations or evidence have ever been produced to show that under the system of valuation, rating and subsidy in Queensland pensioners are as well off as their counterparts in other States in which the State Government subsidises rate rebates allowed by local authorities. For example, in New South Wales the State Government meets the cost of a 50 per cent rate rebate to pensioners by local authorities.

I think it is about time that some Government department in this State—the expertise must be available in either the Local Government Department or the Valuer-General's Department—made a comparison between Government assistance to local authorities in Queensland and that in other States, showing whether pensioners here are better or worse off without a State rate rebate subsidy. None is paid here. If we had such a breakdown, we could wipe out all the controversy

about how well off our pensioners are or are not under the present system of subsidies that the State Government provides.

There is no doubt that the present system in Queensland is not equitable. Local authorities give varying rate rebates to pensioners. Some local authorities give rebates of a certain percentage; others give no rebate at all. A greater slice of the Federal tax cake returned to the States and to local authorities would be the answer. In the meantime, we must ensure that Queensland pensioners are not disadvantaged when compared with those in other States. Queensland is very rich in natural resources and the Government claims that it is doing a good job. So let it get stuck into proving either that our pensioners are better off under a local authority rate rebate system or that they are not.

In Bundaberg, of a total of 10,583 rateable valuations, 2,337 were subject to objection. Objections constituted 22.07 per cent of the total. Of those 2,337 objections, a total of 523 resulted in reduced valuations, 1,803 were disallowed and 11 were either withdrawn or invalid. Whether the objectors received satisfaction or not, the exercise is concluded until the next revaluation. As the Minister said, with new techniques a revaluation should come around much more quickly than in the past.

The Minister said that various systems had been investigated both here and overseas in connection with the raising of local government finance. I tip that as time goes on there will be more dissatisfaction with the system based on unimproved value.

On 9 October, I wrote to the Minister telling him that I had been asked by the electors of Bundaberg who were dissatisfied with the present system of land valuation and rate-levying to advise them of the progress made by a State Government departmental inquiry into a differential rating system. As such an inquiry would probably be the responsibility of the Minister, I asked him if he could advise me at his earliest convenience of any progress made by the inquiry or conclusions arrived at by the committee of inquiry. On 26 October the Minister replied saying that he would advise me in due course.

The people of Bundaberg are keenly interested in the findings of that committee. Quite a number of people seem to have a leaning towards the principles of a differential rating system. I would be very pleased to hear the Minister give the electors of Bundaberg and me some indication of the thoughts of the committee on a differential rating system.

As to systems of appeal—I have been approached by people who do not have a clue about how to appeal against their new valuation. They go along to meet the representative of the Valuer-General and, depending on their past experience, they are either apprehensive or not apprehensive. Some are even quite belligerent. After the interview

with the Valuer-General's representative, 90 per cent of objectors drop out of the field. Although they may believe that they could take the matter further to the Land Court, they simply do not want to go further.

(Time expired.)

Mr. GOLEBY (Redlands) (3.45 p.m.): As the Minister pointed out in introducing his Estimates, more than \$5,000,000 is set aside each year for the administration and operation of the Valuer-General's Department. We should not believe that that is the only money spent by the department. Anyone who has been associated with local government knows that virtually every local authority in Queensland contributes to the Valuer-General's Department by way of precepts levied from year to year. Local authorities do not argue about that, because in many ways they get tremendous service from the department.

I am sure that all members who have had local authority experience are very happy to know that the Valuer-General's Department carries out this work on which the councils rely so heavily. As has been said, I do not think any of us want to go back to the days when local authorities were responsible for their own valuations. That system might be all right when a local valuer knowing all the conditions is used, but years ago many valuations were not carried out by registered valuers. In some instances they were done by the shire clerk. That led to problems, and human error crept in. I am sure we all realise the problems that can be encouraged when some one other than a fully trained person is used.

Mr. Akers. There were a lot of friends to be looked after, too.

Mr. GOLEBY: I did not intend to say that, but that has been claimed over the years.

The Valuer-General's valuers come into an area and look at sales. Although basic criteria are set down in accordance with the Act, many valuers could pay much more attention to local authority town planning whilst taking note of advice from senior local authority officers relative to certain rezoning peculiarities in some of the shires.

Quite often land is valued on its potential, or the potential element at least creeps in. When a developer buys a piece of land hoping to get a rezoning—I emphasise "hoping"—when no rezoning is likely to take place, he can buy a pig in a poke. While he holds it as an investment for years to come, the adjoining land-owners suffer.

I could take the Valuer-General to my electorate and show him exactly what has happened. At Redland Bay, one property of 57 acres is for sale for \$60,000 but the Valuer-General's valuation is \$92,000. There is no way in the world that that property is so valuable, even when the valuation was done, or now. Because the property was

under option at a certain figure, the Valuer-General decided that that was the value to be applied to the land. At the time, no approach has been made to the local authority for rezoning. It is still bush country, and it will remain so for many days. In this instance the Valuer-General's value is completely absurd.

It could be argued that the owner has a right of appeal but, as we all know, quite often appeals are not lodged. Sometimes an owner is absent and is unaware of what is taking place. I realise that the Valuer-General cannot be blamed for that, and that the owner has an onus to comply with the Act and to appeal. My point is that too much attention is paid to what might happen with the land rather than what is taking place. If a closer relationship were to be established between the department and local town planners, involving a good study of the town plan, many of these problems would not be encountered.

I now want to refer to the catchment area of the Leslie Harrison Dam, which is within my electorate. I know that you are very interested in this area, Mr. Kaus. Officers of the Valuer-General's Department went through this area, but they took no notice whatsoever of the town-planning advice that was given to them about the area. Most metropolitan members would be fully aware that only domestic subdivisional development can be carried out on this land. No industrial development can take place.

The council's conditions with regard to large acreages are very stringent. The minimum subdivision is 50 acres and, as far as stock are concerned, the carrying capacity of land is restricted to the normal capacity. In other words, the land cannot be improved in any way. Pastures cannot be improved and the lot feeding of cattle is banned. This makes the land virtually useless for anything other than domestic subdivision for people who want to live in a country setting. But the Valuer-General's Department took absolutely no notice of those conditions and, although we had a good hearing from the Valuer-General and his officers, I understand that no appeals from that area were upheld.

The local authority had only one real alternative, and that was to declare the area special benefit rural and to introduce a proportional rating system, that is, five-eighths of the general rate. If that had not been done, many of the families in the area would have had to walk off their land simply because notice was not taken of the town plan and the stringent conditions laid down under it.

Under the Act the Valuer-General has to take land usage into consideration, and for this I commend the Government and the department. I am dealing with this purely and simply in the rural sense. There were very few complaints from the genuine farming community in my electorate because the

department took land usage into consideration. These farmers were using the land on the shores of Moreton Bay—it had a good view of the bay—for food production. It is prime land, but it was valued on the basis that it was being used for rural industry, in the true sense of the term. The most efficient use was being made of the land, and the Valuer-General took full cognisance of that.

If this had not been done, the farmers in these coastal areas where residential development is creeping in would have been forced off their land. This would have occurred if the old system of valuation had been used, so I commend the department on its action. Because land-owners felt they had been given fair and reasonable treatment, there were very few objections from the rural community in the electorate of Redlands. But it is in these fringe areas where developers are buying up large tracts of land and hoping something will be done to change the zoning in the near future. If people are caught in this pincer movement, they find that this is where valuations go astray. I reiterate the need for close liaison between the department and council town planners to obviate a lot of these problems.

Local authorities are also experiencing problems, and I do not know whether they can be rectified immediately. I refer particularly to split valuations where a piece of land is cut into two parcels and the owner resides on one and sells the other. There is no flow-through for rating purposes when this occurs and the Valuer-General's Department is very slow in this area. Instead of acting immediately when it is informed of the transaction taking place and the plan being registered, the department does not provide local authorities with the updated valuations for those split areas for some considerable time.

Perhaps some of the blame for this delay could be sheeted home to the solicitors involved. We know that today many solicitors acting in this field are, unfortunately, no more than glorified conveyancers and are very lax in passing on information not only to the local authorities but also to the Valuer-General's Department. Nevertheless, this affects council rating. It is quite often found that at the end of the rating period, which is the end of the financial year, and sometimes after that date, a great package of these new valuations comes through. The local authority cannot use those valuations for rating purposes, and it works on the old valuations. The previous owner is not very happy about paying all the rates on a block that he has sold perhaps 12 months previously. Somebody else should bear that burden. Unless there is an agreement between the two parties involved, there is no solution to this problem. The person in whose name the block is registered has to pay the rates.

I ask the Minister and his officers to give particular attention to this matter because it affects a lot of people and causes a lot

of harassment. It also affects, to some extent, the financial position of a local authority's budget. Delay in notifying transfers in this area is also a problem. It sometimes reflects on persons, particularly those in the legal field, who have dealt with the matter previously.

As I said at the beginning of my speech, councils and local authorities generally use the services of the Valuer-General's Department when resumptions are made. Most local authorities will not accept a valuation on resumption unless it has been made by the Valuer-General's Department. They either accept the valuation that has been made or use it as a bargaining point in negotiations. I again stress to the officers of the Valuer-General's Department who are involved in this matter that it is most important to give close consideration to the local town plan. It is not much good valuing only on sales. One has to be very sure what the land is zoned for. Quite often we find that although land has been zoned for park purposes for many years, a council only now is taking action to resume it. Although there has been this planning blight, if I might call it that, over the land, the Valuer-General's Department says that the valuation must be based on the prices paid for properties in the neighbourhood. That happens, although for many years the owner has been aware that the land could be resumed for park purposes.

It was mentioned earlier that sale prices must be taken into consideration in making a valuation, and I do not think that anyone has any beef about that. In most cases, sale prices are a very good barometer for a valuation, particularly when they apply to adjoining land or land in the near vicinity. However, a major problem arises when there has been a boom and then a decline in prices. During a boom period, land is valued very highly because of its potential; the developers are hovering around the area. Then we find that the potential, which was apparent when the officers of the Valuer-General's Department valued the land, is no longer there. The land is sold at a price much lower than the valuation. I think that it would be a very worthwhile exercise to amend the Act to provide that when this happens there should be a revaluation. What is happening is that people who buy the land are saddled with a high rating for anything up to eight years until a new valuation is made. This is iniquitous, because in most cases a person buys land in a raw state and has to develop it. That is a major cost. A high rating has been applied to that land because no cognisance has been taken of the value of land in the neighbourhood.

The Office of the Surveyor-General is another department that comes within the Minister's jurisdiction. Its functions have been updated, and I pay full tribute to the work that has been done in this area. New aerial maps are available for virtually the

whole of Queensland. They are of tremendous assistance not only to landholders and potential purchasers of land, but also to engineering staff and local authorities generally. They can save a tremendous amount of time when a person wants to look at the terrain of an area. If anybody wants to buy a large parcel of land in an unfamiliar area, he can obtain an aerial map from the department to get a quick appreciation of its contours, streams and various other waterways.

A previous speaker dealt with pensioner rebates. Every member in this Chamber is concerned about the effect of rates on senior citizens in the community. Mention was made of local government pensioner discounts and the fact that the State Government should give a 50 per cent general rate rebate to pensioners, as is done in New South Wales. It must be remembered that local authorities in that State do not receive the subsidies granted in Queensland for capital works.

A pensioner living in his own home is far better off than a pensioner in rented accommodation. Those living in rented accommodation have the real problems. As far as I know, no local authority will ever force a pensioner to sell his property because of arrears in rates. The final amount the pensioner has to pay is the important point. Some local authorities that give large discounts impose much higher rates than those that give much smaller discounts. With the varying level of rates imposed by local authorities it is difficult to establish what the pensioner discounts should be. Any benefit that is given in this regard must be equitable to all concerned.

In some of the older areas of cities a lot of homes occupied by pensioners are close to shopping centres and in some instances are in areas zoned for commercial uses. In such cases land valuations have increased dramatically, but a pensioner discount of 50 per cent would help only those who inherit the estate. Very often, as soon as the present occupier passes on, the beneficiaries use the land for a shopping complex or something of that nature. A 50 per cent discount in those circumstances does nothing more than help those who subsequently use the land for a commercial venture. The Government will have to look very closely at that before making any decision on the matter.

A large tract of land in my electorate has recently been taken over by a liquidator, and put up for auction. Land values certainly increase in boom periods. However, when they are over, land which had previously sold in the vicinity of \$8,000 an acre is sometimes auctioned and sold at prices around \$800 an acre. It is easy to imagine what effect that has on the valuation of the Valuer-General. Although the new owner has the advantage of buying the land at what he considers to be a bargain price, he is

saddled with high rates until a new valuation applies. However, the new valuation might not be made for five to eight years. Some consideration should be given to easing the burden of rates on those who have bought land at prices far below the Valuer-General's valuation made a year or two before.

Mr. AUSTIN (Wavell) (4.5 p.m.): I rise today to point out in the Estimates of the Minister for Survey and Valuation what I believe to be a gross deficiency in our system of valuation in urban and city areas.

We have heard much in recent times about gross deficiencies in valuations in country electorates, and I sympathise with my colleagues from the country, because they do have a great problem. A great inequity exists in country areas through the difference between rural rates and urban rates. I believe that the Government needs to take some bold and progressive steps in the very near future in relation to the rating system not only in country areas but also in urban areas. It is on that point that I want to enlarge today.

In doing so, I think it is probably worth while looking back a bit in history. When Christian IV of Denmark needed a church for his Navy in 1619, he converted an old anchor forge.

Mr. Burns: That's going way back.

Mr. AUSTIN: That's really going back, isn't it?

In converting that old anchor forge, he not only gave Copenhagen a building that remains one of its historic monuments but also demonstrated that industrial architecture has flexibility, substance and style to serve roles its builders never dreamed of.

Until recently, the opportunities offered by industrial buildings were mostly exploited without imagination. Cheap retail space plastered with signs or high-rise buildings have taken the place of some of our oldest and most stately buildings.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: This is a lovely history lesson.

Mr. AUSTIN: I thank the member. He will enjoy this.

The most quoted answer for this destruction is that the site is immeasurably more valuable than is warranted by the existing floor space. One does not have to go far from this parliamentary building—to Mary Street and Albert Street—to see stately old buildings which are gradually rotting away. As it happens, most of them are owned by the S.G.I.O. It is a shame that the Government allows that body to own so many buildings, which I believe are to be pulled down and replaced by vast hotel complexes. Those buildings, I believe, could have their space adequately used—except that it is no

longer economical because of the land's rateable value—but there are no returns on those buildings. This is what I plan to enlarge on in my speech today.

Recently there has been a growing realisation that old industrial building design is architecture. It is not something that ought to be pulled down; it is true architecture. I point out that as recently as Tuesday, 30 October, in an article in the "Telegraph" on the T. Tristram building, which has been refurbished at West End, one paragraph says—

"Architects are finding increasing satisfaction in revitalising our old buildings, and the old Tristram building at West End has a special romantic appeal."

Mr. Scassola: It is a very historical building.

Mr. AUSTIN: Indeed it is. It is an encouraging sign to see somebody develop such buildings.

Mr. Burns: The Bellevue was another one.

Mr. AUSTIN: I might come to that later on.

Older buildings offer opportunities to house non-industrial activities conveniently, at costs not excessive and sometimes remarkably low, and with a style that community groups are hungry for. Those groups are hungry for space throughout this city, but are starved for cash. This space could be conveniently made available at low charges—except for the valuation on the land and the rates charged thereon.

Professional people also could make great use of these old buildings with their brick balusters and wooden beams—the distinction that was earlier sought in Victorian houses. Evidence arises on numerous occasions that the standard new-building-in-the-suburbs attitude may soon not be viable and that the neglected brick box close to the city, though it needs some initial imagination, faith and understanding, may offer a much better deal and a real alternative.

Meanwhile, preservationists and students of architecture have come to appreciate more and more of the industrial legacy that we have in this city. From an early affection for the water-mill and other symbols of an agrarian past that characterised the early phase of industrial building preservation, they have widened their horizons to include the multi-storey buildings that we have today.

Mr. Akers interjected.

Mr. AUSTIN: It is on survey and valuation. I know the honourable member is an architect. He will be pleased to hear what I have to say. I am enlarging on the argument.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: You are coming to it via Cape York.

Mr. AUSTIN: That is right, but it is very significant. Perhaps in about 100 years, when the honourable member for Archerfield, who has a considerable amount of industrial area in his electorate, catches up with the times, he might be able to appreciate what I am saying.

Modern architects and artists—I call modern those from about 1920—have sensed the power and straightforwardness of concrete silos and the 20th Century factory, with its acres of steel girders, a seemingly light structure embedded in concrete. The drastic shapes of modern engineering, like the rugged timber and masonry masses of the older buildings, are now seen as honest and significant works of construction, and therefore they go down in history as industrial architecture.

At the same time, preservationists have realised that mere inert preservation saves little and that continued, not frozen, life truly preserves. While would-be owners and tenants are seeking something other than what industrial space can offer, preservationists are now seeking owners and tenants for their buildings that they wish to preserve. They will not get these owners and tenants with the current system of valuations in this city, or in many other great cities in Australia.

The following words, then, are for both these interested groups, who in the last few years have been encountering each other more and more—the developer or organisation head, who is looking for a property that will offer him practical advantages, and the preservationist, who wants to see preserved the buildings that housed Australia's industrial past.

Australia, at least in its attitude towards material wealth, may be undergoing a major psychological change. In the recent past, anything made the day before yesterday—whether it was a building, a car, or a saucepan—was liable to be scrapped. True, if it had somehow survived from a remote period of the past, it might be accepted as historical and thus perhaps worthy of preservation; otherwise, it was merely old, a hand-me-down not worth the trouble of keeping in repair if its owner could afford a replacement. A new building, for example, seemed infinitely more desirable as a company or institutional headquarters than an old one. It presented a fresh, modern image. Its plan could be tailored to the needs of the occupant; its mechanical equipment could include the latest refinements and economies. There were also certain tax advantages in building new buildings.

Mr. Burns: That is right.

Mr. AUSTIN: It is dead right.

Mr. Burns: There still is that advantage.

Mr. AUSTIN: Yes. Instead of being in the city—a place becoming less and less desirable—it could be out in some new and

prospering suburb where the environment seemed to be under control. I emphasise the words “seemed to be under control”. Home owners were attracted for similar reasons.

Mr. Burns: What about a proposal that the Government legislate to ensure that people restoring old buildings are protected?

Mr. AUSTIN: I should like to see the Government introduce what I would term heritage legislation. Perhaps it could come under the Minister for Survey and Valuation. At the moment, the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads is looking into it, but I think it would be ideal if it came under the Minister for Survey and Valuation, for the reasons that I am giving in my speech. Only he and some of his expert staff would be able to realise that some of the old buildings that have unreal valuations on them could be preserved if the valuations were reduced. I point out to the honourable member for Lytton that many old buildings will simply die if they are not used, and they need to be used for boarding-houses.

Disillusionment has set in bit by bit, and in the mid-1970s a suburb is often chaotic to look at and tedious to live in. I could say that, to the contrary, it is often tedious to look at and chaotic to live in. Building costs are rising fantastically, while affordable mortgage money is hard to get. At the same time, the cost of new buildings has risen beyond the reach of most people. From the occupant's point of view, new construction is not necessarily any better. A person dwelling in a new and thinly-built suburban house may remember with longing that the older dwelling in which he lived near the city kept noise out and gave him a fair degree of privacy.

We allowed the inner cities to rot out in our fight to get to the suburbs, but now people are again looking to the cities and the small towns. These places could be good to live in and work in if the problems of crime, poverty, and bad municipal services—such as those currently provided by the Brisbane City Council—were improved dramatically. Later I will make a few comments on the rating techniques adopted by the Brisbane City Council. As I was saying, not the least of those is industrial construction, which can often be brought back to decent condition after many years of neglect and abuse.

To top everything off, we have a taste of what is termed the energy crisis. Because of fuel and power costs, it may not be feasible to set two tons of machinery in motion as a preliminary and sequel to buying a pack of cigarettes or, indeed, to destroy and rebuild frenetically.

In the near future, then, we may see an Australia that has relearned from its past. Should this be so, a region, understood as a delicate ecological mechanism, will be developed cautiously according to a comprehensive plan, and its scenery will benefit greatly.

In the towns, vacant lots will be built upon and abandoned buildings will be rehabilitated. Those that have gone too far will be destroyed. Existing construction of whatever sort will be examined to see what further use can be made of it. Building materials, including decorative work, will be salvaged, not broken up or burned. Machines of all sorts will be simple and more versatile and will be used only where really useful.

Travel will be by foot, by bicycle or by public transport much more often than by car, but I point out that rail transport will become more popular with the people in the near-city areas.

Recently, "ad hocism" has become a fashionable word, but it refers to an ancient practice, namely, that of seeing an object not as a means to a narrow and theoretical end but as a thing with certain properties adapting it to a variety of ends. Thus, a chair is an object to sit upon as well as a platform, a ladder, a footrest, a clothes rack and so forth. The use of a chair in this way is instinctive. Our use of an industrial building as a school, an apartment house, company headquarters or what have you is not. A blend of imagination and calculation is needed to germinate the idea and make it work. But this blend is appearing more and more among the pragmatic developers as well as among the preservationists. That is the reason why I make this speech today.

Mr. R. J. Gibbs: It's not much of a speech, either.

Mr. AUSTIN: If Opposition members are not interested in the preservation of this city, I am quite pleased to note that.

I believe that the system of valuation in this city and State has to be looked at. I am deeply concerned for the preservation of our old structures. They will be preserved by use, but they will not be used if the valuations on them are not reduced.

I cannot let this opportunity go by without mentioning my electorate of Wavell and referring to the valuations and rates levied in it. Last Sunday night, during my little bit of free time, I just happened to be watching television. I saw a programme entitled "City '79". On that programme I heard Alderman St. Ledger say that the Brisbane City Council is now sewerage all new subdivisional developments. That is the greatest joke I have ever heard. The Brisbane City Council is not doing that at all; the person who buys the land is doing it. Alderman St. Ledger deliberately told an untruth when he said the Brisbane City Council is financing the sewerage work.

Wavell Heights is sewerage, and for this I give credit to Clem Jones. However, in spite of the high valuations and the high rates paid by people in the Wavell electorate, they have to contend with a little Bailey bridge in Shaw Road. Last year, money was allocated in the Brisbane City Council budget

for the replacement of that bridge. However, because Wavell Heights is represented in the Brisbane City Council by a Liberal alderman (Dulcie Turnbull) and in Parliament by a Liberal member, absolutely nothing has been done to the bridge. In the near future I plan to disclose the great tragedy that this bridge is and the suffering that has been caused as a result of accidents on it.

Mr. Mackenroth: What has that got to do with this?

Mr. AUSTIN: It has a lot to do with it. The Brisbane City Council is collecting rates from the people in Wavell Heights, yet it spends nothing in the electorate. All it does is spread a bit of bitumen before an election. Every day, the Lord Mayor, like Groucho Marx, drives through the electorate in his new big black Statesman and doesn't feel a bump. I have in my electorate plenty of people who pass over the bridge in small cars or on push-bikes. Their cars are not like the Lord Mayor's. I see him drive through there every day.

I turn now to the Mapping Department and, in doing so, I shall probably impinge a little on the responsibilities of the Minister for Maritime Services and Tourism. With the expertise available to the Minister for Survey and Valuation, it is high time that he took over navigational maps at least for the near Brisbane area, if not for the whole Queensland coast. The Mapping Department now has the most up-to-date technical facilities. As I understand it, although I could be corrected by the Minister, Landsat could be used.

I congratulate the Minister for Survey and Valuation on the photographs supplied to my office and, I presume, to other members' offices, of the Bribie Island area. I would love to see that map with contours, sandbanks, navigation points and so on shown. I am sure that the Mapping Department is capable of doing that. It is high time that Government departments pulled together. Obviously there would be great conflict between the two departments over which should do the work. Without reflecting on the Minister for Maritime Services and Tourism, it is quite clear from looking at the maps produced by the two departments that the expertise, ability, equipment and everything else is with the Minister for Survey and Valuation. I hope that in the near future a little sense prevails in these departments.

Mr. Kruger: You would like the job?

Mr. AUSTIN: I would not mind the job at all. It would mean that the Minister for Survey and Valuation got a promotion. If I got the job, I would fight like hell to take over the preparation of marine maps. It is time that the Mapping Department had that responsibility.

Mr. BURNS (Lytton) (4.22 p.m.): The last speaker spoke about valuation problems in urban areas and spent most of his time talking about old buildings and the problems confronting people in older industrial areas. I, too, am concerned about the valuation of older areas and the way in which this Government continually promises to do something about valuation and rating.

On looking through my files this morning, I sighted statements made by various Ministers. This morning, the Minister said that the valuation system needed reform. In the late 1950s, when Mr. Roberts was the Minister for Local Government—most honourable members would not recall those days—he said that the land valuation system was faulty and he wanted something done about it. In 1961, in Cairns, the then Minister for Public Works (Mr. Richter) was reported as promising a probe of State land valuations. A probe was conducted in 1966, but nothing much changed as a result of it. In 1962, a statement was made on the Gold Coast that the Government team was to act on valuations again. In 1976, the Minister for Survey and Valuation (Mr. Greenwood) and the Minister for Local Government (Mr. Hinze), at a meeting on the Gold Coast, promised to overhaul land valuations for rating purposes. On 30 December 1977, the Local Government Minister and the Minister for Survey and Valuation again promised to revamp the valuation system.

Over the past 16 or 17 years we have had plans to revamp the valuation system. One inquiry was held in 1966, but nothing has really happened.

I share the concern of local members about land valuation. Councils levy rates on the unimproved value of land, but the Valuer-General takes into account the fact that land is on the corner of a street, that it has a good view over a valley, or is on the waterfront, and increases the value of the block accordingly. In those circumstances, I fail to see how a council can charge so much in the dollar for services on the value of the block. The block next door that is not on the corner and the block in the gully, without the view, demand exactly the same services from the council. As I said before, people are charged for a view and rates are levied on the increased valuation. It is time that we had a fair-dinkum, honest review of the valuation and rating system.

I recall that a friend of mine on the Gold Coast wrote to me and the Minister for Survey and Valuation in 1976 about a block of land that he owns in the area that is now called Runaway Bay, on which he had built a house many years ago. In 1959, the block was valued at \$420; in 1964, it increased to \$1,120; in 1969, to \$3,620 and in 1976 to \$14,900. As he said, if the trend continues, when the next valuation is made it will be valued at \$75,000.

That reminds me, of course, of the problems we have faced in many of these areas in regard to valuations. People on

the North Coast have told me before today that their valuations have increased by 200 per cent, 100 per cent and 78 per cent. In Noosa, the figure was 600 per cent. Many valuations are based on land sales during the land booms in the area. I cannot find the newspaper cuttings at present, but I was reading through them before and they paint an alarming picture. In each case the valuations have increased to such a degree that we are pricing people out of their homes. We are getting to the stage where old people live in fear of the next valuation, because they know that councils will then act on those valuations and levy increased rates upon them. Valuation is a method of taxation. It is the same method of taxation that was attacked in America. When Americans spoke about tax reforms and Proposition 13, they were not talking about income tax but land tax and property tax levied on land valuations.

I have some questions about the department that I hope the Minister will answer when he replies. What are the advantages in economy and efficiency in dividing the Valuer-General's Department into district offices in Brisbane? What has been the total cost of dividing the department into district offices in Brisbane? What is the total cost of introducing the A.D.P. system into the Valuer-General's Department, and were the persons who introduced the system qualified to do so? What is the total cost of internal building alterations in the Valuer-General's Department in each of the past two years?

I know I am not allowed to mention Russell Island because that matter is sub judice, but was Russell Island valued by the Valuer-General's Department and did it then have to be revalued because the first valuation was incorrect? Are clerks being replaced by general assistants to avoid the cost of promoting them to classified positions in the department? Are valuers required to account for time spent outside the office, and how is this time assessed and checked? Will the Minister give a breakdown—

Mr. Greenwood: Go a little slower.

Mr. BURNS: The Minister has officers present. This is a debate on the Estimates of his department. We are entitled to question him on the Estimates and on the expenditure of his department. Is that not what an Estimates debate is all about? The Minister has asked us to approve the expenditure of hundreds of thousands of dollars for the running of his department.

Mr. Greenwood: I don't do shorthand.

Mr. BURNS: I will pass the Minister over these notes. He has two advisers present. Next time he should bring down one who can take shorthand.

Will the Minister give a breakdown of the costs in relation to the salary paid to the secretary of the Valuers Registration Board and the time he spends on secretarial duties

during his normal duties as a clerk in the department? How much is paid to the secretary of the board over and above his clerical salary per annum? Will the Minister give a detailed estimate of costs for clerks in preparing appeals to the Land Court, alterations to values under sections 21A, 13 (2) and 11 (1) (vii)? Is there any provisions in the Valuers Registration Act to reprimand or suspend incompetent valuers? As Land Court decisions show that valuers have been thousands of dollars out in their valuations, were those valuers ever reprimanded, suspended or dealt with by the board?

They were all questions that came to mind this morning when I was thinking about what I would say in this debate when I knew I would not be able to mention John Andrews, Russell Island or the Morgan report. The Minister, of course, did mention the Morgan report. In the case of Mr. Andrews, he seems to be the only one who knows that he was found innocent by that inquiry, because we cannot get a copy of the report. It is not available for members at this stage, yet Mr. Andrews is able to make the statement that he surveyed blocks that were under water. He is the self-confessed low-tide surveyor—

Mr. Greenwood: I made that statement. I read a passage in answer to a question at one stage.

Mr. BURNS: The point I am making is that we should have had the report by now. I believe that when Andrews can make the statement that he is innocent—

Mr. Greenwood: I did that.

Mr. BURNS: He did. In answer to a statement from me, he said, "I have been found innocent by Mr. Morgan" or words to that effect. I do not know whether he has been found innocent of surveying land under water—

Mr. Greenwood: Well, he has.

Mr. BURNS: He has admitted now to surveying five blocks. First of all, he said he did not survey any at all, but now he admits to five and then he says, "Morgan has found me innocent."

Mr. Greenwood: That's right.

Mr. BURNS: I think if he is entitled to know that, every member of the public and every member of this Parliament is also entitled to know it.

Mr. Greenwood: I will table it in this Assembly as soon as I possibly can. I cannot do it yet.

Mr. BURNS: I accept the Minister's assurance on that.

I now want to discuss the Department of Mapping and Surveying and its guaranteeing of work on behalf of the Association of Consultant Surveyors. On page 18 of its April 1979 newsletter, the A.C.S. spoke about

overseas consultancy opportunities. It made the point that they have been investigating the possibility of getting overseas work for surveyors in this State. Paragraph 4 on page 19 stated—

"Literally millions of dollars are being spent on Consultancy services in the Middle East and South East Asia and, although competition is extraordinarily stiff, it is felt that a Consortium as described above, whose services are guaranteed by the Queensland Government..."

I would like some explanation of this. I do not know how many other professional bodies or groups form associations and then have the State Government guarantee their services to foreign organisations. The honorary secretary of the A.C.S., Mr. P. E. Jolly, on 26 March 1979 wrote to Mr. Graham Baker, the Deputy Director (Technical) of the Department of Commercial and Industrial Development and, in the first paragraph, stated—

"I would like to recap on the broad details of the services available through the Association of Consulting Surveyors, Queensland, as one aspect of the total service available from, and guaranteed by, the Queensland Government Department of Mapping and Survey."

How can the A.C.S., which is just a body of surveyors like any other body of surveyors in this State, give such a guarantee? It says that it has a membership of 80 and that there are 202 survey parties involved in A.C.S. How can this consultant body write letters to various groups in the community here and throughout the world saying that its service is guaranteed, and that the department's services are available through this group or that? I can show that some of the people who are members of A.C.S. subdivided land under water on Russell Island. In fact, I can show that some of the members of the Surveyors Board were involved. For example, there was a fellow named Saunders. Let us have a look at Saunders's subdivision on the island. Some land there was, as far as the council was concerned, unfit for development and building. It was marked "drainage problem". Last year Saunders was a member of the Surveyors Board. He is Mr. K. S. Saunders. How can the Government recommend or guarantee these people? How can it give carte blanche to an association without close checks on its members and their staff? Is the Government involved in a consortium of this type?

Mr. Greenwood: I should say at this stage that one of the surveyors who was looked at on Russell Island with all the rest of them was Mr. Saunders, and once again Mr. Morgan found him completely clear of any misconduct whatsoever.

Mr. BURNS: I suppose that I cannot debate Mr. Morgan's findings, but I am concerned about the fact that Mr. Morgan was appointed by the Surveyors Board. I am not happy about the composition of that

board. Honourable members know that for some time I have been concerned about the Liberal Party domination of the department, through Mr. Davies, Mr. McDonald, Mr. McGhie and other people, including the Minister and the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General, who have made this department a domain for Liberal ticket holders, including prominent local Liberal office bearers. The A.C.S. and those people have used the Surveyors Board and the surveying profession through the Minister's management of the department, and these people have been protected. In the case of Morgan, I would like to talk to him in relation to the matter.

Mr. GREENWOOD: I rise to a point of order. I will have to ask the honourable member to withdraw the suggestion that there was some form of abuse by the A.C.S. of the Surveyors Board through me as the Minister. I find that quite offensive and I ask the member to withdraw it.

Mr. BURNS: I will withdraw it. I am not going to get into a long argument with the Minister while time is ticking away. I have only nine minutes left.

Let me refer now to the question of mapping control for Utah, the mining company. It called tenders for survey of control for mapping an area covering SCML 210 in the Peak Downs area and received proposals from five surveyors. They were: J. F. H. Murray & Associates; Saunders, Havill & Associates; R. C. Todd & Associates; Davies, McGhie and Associates; and O'Donohue & Associates. Utah sent the proposals to the D.M.S. for advice. I do not know why, but it did. A letter to Utah signed by Bernie McDonald of the Minister's department stated—

"We have assessed the proposals. The proposal by J. F. H. Murray is too indefinite. We believe that any of the other four would be capable of doing the work—but the proposal of Davies, McGhie & Associates is considered the best."

Here we have the Minister's department picking out Davies, McGhie and Associates. Let us have a look at Davies—K. J. Davies. Isn't he the Deputy Director (Technical) of the Department of Mapping and Surveying? Isn't he the man who was a Liberal Party campaign director at the last election? Isn't he the man whom the union itself complained about when he was appointed to the job?

Mr. Nutter, the general secretary of the Professional Officers' Association, wrote to the Minister on 5 October 1978 and said—

"A number of members have expressed their extreme concern with regard to the appointment of Mr. Kevin John Davies from outside the Public Service to the position of Deputy Director, Technical & Administrative Services, Department of Mapping & Surveying.

"The members who spoke to me expressed the opinion that there were suitably qualified persons in the State Public Service or who had worked in a Public Service who would have been more suitable than the appointee and believe that one of those persons should have been appointed to the job."

The information given to Mr. Nutter was that Davies had only a base degree in surveying, a very limited experience in the Commonwealth Public Service in his early years of employment, and had spent the remainder of his time in partnership in a survey firm with a relatively small number of staff.

I read from the letter that Mr. Nutter wrote to the Minister—

"I am told that he has little experience in the control of an area of operation as extensive as the Survey & Mapping Department.

"It has been put to the Association that because of the political activity of Mr. Davies that there was some political motivation behind his appointment."

That is the same Mr. Davies who was previously involved in the company that was recommended by the Minister's department, the same Davies that was recommended by the same McDonald in relation to Wivenhoe Dam and his control over the surveying in that area. It is the same Davies who was involved in a royal commission called the Robinson royal commission.

Mr. Greenwood interjected.

Mr. BURNS: Let me finish. I have six minutes left and the Minister has considerable time in which to answer me. It is the same Davies whom the Liberal member for Fadden (Mr. Don Cameron) mentioned in an article in "The Courier-Mail" of 18 May 1978. This article referred to evidence in the royal commission. It reads—

"Mr. Cameron claimed a man named Davies told him that, during the redistribution two of the commissioners had brought in a map and had said to the other commissioner: 'This is it.'

"He (Davies) told me one of the commissioners was so concerned about the redistribution, he virtually refused to sign it for two days."

Wasn't Mr. Serisier, the Surveyor-General in this State, one of the commissioners? That is the K. J. Davies who was a member of the Liberal Party; the K. J. Davies who is the Deputy Director (Technical) of the Minister's department; the K. J. Davies who was the Liberal Party campaign director; the K. J. Davies who told Mr. Cameron about that. Later on, Cameron gave information to the State Minister and attempted, through three different avenues, to alert the Federal electoral redistribution commissioners of the political danger to the Liberal Party to the proposals on the new boundaries of Bowman.

If evidence of Liberal Party interference is needed, there was Mr. Cameron going to the Minister and asking the Minister to get to Serisier, who was in his department. There was Davies, the Liberal public servant, telling Cameron, the Liberal member of Parliament, what was happening in a redistribution, which is supposed to be fair and impartial. I say that it was not fair for the Minister and his colleagues to interfere, nor was it impartial.

Mr. GREENWOOD: I rise to a point of order. I hesitate to interrupt the member for Lytton, but this latest passage in his speech has nothing whatsoever to do with the Estimates debate before this Chamber. It is a political tirade directed towards Federal politics on events which took place a long time ago and which have been the subject of a royal commission. I ask that the honourable member's remarks be ruled out of order.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gunn): Order! I ask the honourable member to return to the Estimates under debate.

Mr. BURNS: I desire to refer to the editorial in the March and June 1979 issue of "Metes and Bounds". It comes back to a question that has bedevilled people in relation to Russell Island and other subdivisions for some time. That is the question of the Government's involvement in registering the titles of land on that island. If those titles had not been registered by the Government nobody could have been robbed, no-one would have been in court today and there would have been no problems at all. On 32 different occasions a public servant (Mr. Henry) recommended against the registration of those titles, but on each occasion he was overrudden and the Titles Office finally registered the subdivisions, the deeds were given and people were sold land that was under water.

The Government must come clean on this particular matter. It is not good enough merely to charge 16 or 17 salesmen, a couple of lawyers and one surveyor. Let us have a look at the involvement of the Government. I understand the editor of "Metes and Bounds" is Mr. Henry, the gentleman who made visits to Russell Island on 30-odd occasions. The editorial of the publication reads—

"This Society would like to know what are the responsibilities and duties of surveyors carrying out subdivisions for registration of a plan, and issue of certificates of title therefrom, in the Titles Office.

"As is well known, the Registrar of Titles was so concerned about receiving plans of non-surveys showing subdivisions, sworn to by authorised surveyors, that he sent a letter to all surveyors practising in Queensland in April 1973, quoting the

words in the relevant statutory declaration, and referring to section 194 of the Criminal Code.

"The bald fact is that surveyors had made statutory declarations on their plans which had been lodged with the Registrar of Titles for registration and issue of certificates of title. They did not carry out the surveys, or even have them carried out by somebody else.

"Did the Government actually take responsibility for surveys carried out and sworn to by the surveyor in accordance with the regulations?

"And does it take responsibility for disciplining surveyors who prepared for registration and issue of certificates of title plans which were in fact only designs?

"If not, who does?

"What does the future hold for surveyors who displayed such behaviour and lack of integrity by making false declarations on a plan before a Justice of the Peace?

"And what standing had statutory declarations by a staff surveyor who swore that surveys were not carried out?

"These are questions that nobody wants to be asked."

They need to be asked. They need to be answered because they are questions that go to the nub of Russell Island and the land deals at that time. They are the questions that people who lost their money want answered. We want to know how those title deeds were registered and why they were registered. At the same time, I would like to ask that in future a list be prepared of the work handed out by the department through the Minister. A list should be prepared and presented to Parliament of all the jobs given to surveyors, along with the totals, just as a list is prepared for barristers and solicitors.

I return to the editorial I mentioned. I understand that Kevin J. Davies himself surveyed land that he had not measured and marked on the ground. I am sure that Mr. Henry would, in a case in which Mr. Davies was called before the Surveyors Board, give sufficient evidence for Mr. Davies to end up in trouble, too.

The morale of the Minister's department is affected by the political manipulations in the department; the use of the department to recommend friends in the A.C.S.; the use of the department to attack fair-dinkum people like Murray, who is a supporter of the National Party on the north coast, not a supporter or friend of mine; the use of the department to promote Liberals such as Davies and others who would be flat out making a quid in the industry.

(Time expired.)

Hon. J. W. GREENWOOD (Ashgrove—Minister for Survey and Valuation) (4.42 p.m.): I wish to answer immediately a few

of the comments made by the member for Lytton. Once again he has reverted to a topic that he has raised in this House again and again since the appointment of Mr. Davies to the position of Deputy Director (Technical and Administrative Services), Department of Mapping and Surveying. Every time he makes these points, I have to make the same points in reply. I apologise to honourable members, because by this stage it must be becoming terribly tedious. However, might I just make them again?

Point No. 1: Mr. Davies has never had anything to do with surveys on Russell Island.

Point No. 2: There has never been any secret about the fact that Mr. Davies was a prominent member of the Liberal Party and a member of the State executive.

Point No. 3: When he was appointed to the Public Service, he thought it proper to resign from the State executive of the Liberal Party.

Point No. 4: His appointment to that position of deputy director was made after advertisement of the position and consideration of all applicants—from memory, there were about 14 of them—by a select committee appointed by the Public Service Board, and that committee unanimously recommended Mr. Davies as far and away the best-qualified person to take the job.

Might I say once again—I think I have mentioned it before in the Chamber—that in conversation with the senior public servant who applied for the position—

Mr. Burns: Mr. Gardiner?

Mr. GREENWOOD: No, it was not Mr. Gardiner. He had retired. It was his retirement that made the position available.

The senior public servant who applied for the position later said to me that if he had known that Kevin Davies was applying, he would not have applied. That was the extent of his confidence in the ability of Mr. Davies. So, no matter what the honourable member for Lytton says, has said and continues to say, this was a man who was appointed on his outstanding merit. I might say that since his appointment he has done an outstanding job in the department.

Dr. LOCKWOOD (Toowoomba North) (4.45 p.m.): Earlier in this debate on the Estimates presented by the Minister for Survey and Valuation, we heard the member for Pine Rivers say that there could be many advantages in amalgamating all branches of mapping and charting in the State under this ministry. Because the Minister and his departments have the most up-to-date equipment in Australia and are capable of producing excellent maps, and because their facilities are not presently being used to the maximum, I think it would be marvellous if they took over all the marine charting that is required for this great State.

Honourable members would be aware that some of the charts in use today were prepared by none other than James Cook, R.N., in 1770. Great navigator though he was, the charts that he made are not good enough for today. Some of the charts that I used when I visited the Great Barrier Reef were up to four miles out. There were reefs where there was said to be clear water, and vice versa. The only way in which ships can navigate safely in those waters is by day, when the sun is high and there is full visibility.

Mr. Moore: Or by swinging the lead.

Dr. LOCKWOOD: Or by swinging the lead, perhaps. In the islands of the Torres Strait, some skippers have resorted to anchoring their own radar-reflecting buoys at various points on reefs so that they can pick their way through the waters there.

The annual report of the Department of Mapping and Surveying and other publications indicate that the department has actively been surveying the waters of Torres Strait, and it is not before time. However, with the facilities available up till the last three or four years, such surveys would have been a mammoth task and many man-years of work would have been required to prepare the charts. With the aid of modern technology—satellite photographs, aerial photographs, and other equipment now becoming available—the work could be done in much less time and with much greater accuracy. The fact that the charts have not been prepared to date will ultimately be to our advantage, because the new charts will be extremely accurate.

The department will benefit from the use of the green laser, which can penetrate water to a depth of 30 metres or so and be reflected back to a camera. It will enable extremely accurate recording of shallow reefs and mid-depth shoals—shoals 30, 40, 50 or 60 ft. deep that are found off the coast—and it will clearly show water that is more than 100 feet deep and suitable for navigation by the larger ships travelling along the coast. The accurate pinpointing of these features will be of immense value to shipping, and particularly to local pilots, and, of course, they will be invaluable to fishing fleets.

It has been said to me with full sincerity that the Australian Navy should not chase poachers off the Barrier Reef because it, too, lacks accurate charts, particularly in the region of the Swain Reefs. Many of the reefs there, as are the reefs in Torres Strait, are up to three or four miles from where they are officially recorded on charts. That is simply not good enough for people engaging in high-speed chases on the water. If the skipper of any vessel is to proceed at speed at night, he has to have very accurate charts, and I look forward to the completion by the Minister's Department of extremely accurate charts of those waters.

Some of the more accurate charts available are the navigation charts used in conjunction with some of the surveys that were

done in connection with the various offshore oil exploration leases in the region of reefs off the coast. Without entering the controversy about whether or not the Great Barrier Reef should be drilled, I point out that oil exploration companies have taken the time and spent the money to find out exactly where the reefs are. They have had to produce charts that would enable them to undertake underwater seismic surveys. With a combination of all the available information, we can prepare accurate charts, which will be of value to the fishing fleet and the Navy.

Many aspects of the Minister's portfolio are especially worthy of comment. I want to touch briefly on some of the advances made in modern technology. A good deal is said through the media about the disadvantages of technology. However, in the Minister's department, technology is a success story. It is applied in photography, mapping and surveying.

The department is capable of carrying out all types of aerial surveys. They are extremely accurate. Besides showing features at correct angles and distances, they accurately depict contours. From these surveys, contour maps can be prepared. This technology was first developed overseas and had wide application in defence. However, it is now being applied to everyday use and it is used to a great extent on the Darling Downs.

Contour maps are of great value in planning to prevent soil erosion. Farmers can have such a facility made available to them through the Department of Primary Industries. Contour maps show farmers how to plan their contour banks to minimise soil erosion, which has been a great problem on the Darling Downs. In some areas, as much as 2 ft. of topsoil has been lost over the past 80 years as the result of general farming. All of us are aware of the need to maintain the soil. Maps prepared with the help of facilities at the Minister's disposal can help achieve that and also improve farming productivity on the Downs.

Maps can be prepared from the extremely spectacular photographs taken by Landsat and other satellites. Those photographs reveal a great many features that people are not aware of. As the Minister has said on an earlier occasion, they reveal gigantic rivers in unexplored countries and, at sea, the presence of huge waves in expanses of what people regarded as calm water.

Recently, the Minister's department has adopted the policy of hiring its equipment, its facilities, its staff and its expertise to private enterprise. By doing this, it is, in effect, becoming an export industry for Queensland. It is one of the few industries in Queensland that export technology. We all know about the export of coal, primary products and a few manufactured articles. However, very few Queensland industries

export brains, skill and expertise. I congratulate the Minister on the implementation of this export industry within his department. I hope that it goes a long way.

The equipment that is hired is used to prepare photographs. People can tender for the contracts that are available in South East Asia and Indonesia and they can help those countries, which in many areas are very rugged, conduct exploration and, in some instances, mapping. People from Toowoomba have been involved in this activity from the early days. The Army has carried out a good deal of this work in Indonesia. Private contractors are now carrying it out, thereby developing this small export industry of ours.

This in no way places the department at a disadvantage in terms of usage of its machinery. The equipment involved is so expensive that the department has adopted the attitude that, to make the best use of it, it should be used not eight hours a day but 24 hours a day, seven days a week. In this way usage would be increased fivefold. Five shifts could be used to keep the equipment operating at maximum capacity throughout the year.

The department has 400 experts working in the various essential aspects of processing photographs and other data. Any contracts won overseas mean jobs in Queensland. I support the Minister in making the resources of his department available at a contract price to private contractors.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gunn): Order! If honourable members were to leave the Chamber and hold their conversation outside, it would be more pleasant.

Dr. LOCKWOOD: Tomorrow a conference is to be held in Toowoomba between officers of the Minister's department and more than a dozen invited local authorities to discuss mapping requirements for perhaps the next 10 years.

Three or four years ago a scheme was instituted whereby local authorities could apply to the department on the basis of 40 per cent local authority contribution and 60 per cent Government contribution for mapping of their local government areas. It was so successful that the department was promptly swamped with orders and had to end the scheme. With the equipment now available the department will be able to cope with the work and prepare low-height photos showing in great detail all aspects of towns and cities, with higher photos showing greater areas, even to the extent of offering Landsat and other satellite photos of a region.

Local authorities will make great cost savings. They will not have to ask a surveyor to look physically at what is on the ground. A quick reference to a photo will disclose exactly what is there. As other honourable members have said, not only will boundaries be shown much more accurately, but the

maps will depict all water, trees, buildings, roads and other improvements. These photos have already been used by many landholders when freeholding to estimate the quantity of millable timber available. I have seen them and know just how accurate they can be. The trees can be counted and their size estimated. The forestry value of each tree can be determined from an aerial photograph. A photograph measuring 10 x 8 will cover a sheep station and allow everything to be determined accurately.

By participating in this scheme most of the shires around Toowoomba save \$20,000 a year. In a city like Toowoomba that means that each person will be \$1.50 a year better off. It will also mean better future planning of facilities which local governments wish to provide. They will be able to make better decisions on the siting of services, including reservoirs, essential sewerage works, garbage disposal facilities, incinerators and so on. When a town is large enough to be bypassed the department's expertise again will be invaluable. Overlay maps will result in minimal disruption to a town, its services and the other things that are established in and about it.

As I said, the man on the land has had an early indication of the type of benefits to be gained from the Minister's department. For example, black and white Landsat photographs reveal 20 or more different shades of grey. This facility has been expanded by the inclusion of colours.

By interpreting the shades of the many colours very accurate assessments can be made of the type of crops in various fields, their density, their ripeness and their anticipated yield. The United States has been leading the field in this area, and has been able to make extremely accurate predictions about the size of the Russian wheat crop. One might perhaps call this type of information agricultural intelligence, but it is necessary to enable countries to plan their wheat sales.

I am pleased to see that the Department of Primary Industries and the Minister's department are extremely interested in this field, and are seeking to gain benefits for Australia from an accurate assessment of our crops. Because the Americans are getting it, we might as well have it. They know all about our crops and are able to tell us how much we will harvest before we actually do so. They knew about last year's bumper wheat crop before we did, and they set about unloading their wheat on the market before we could get ours there. Landsat photographs can also be used to accurately assess flood damage to crops. They can also be used to identify burnt-out areas or areas that are still burning. Such information is extremely valuable to the man on the land, and to those people who work to keep the man on the land going.

There is a new aspect to satellite photography that will become apparent in the next few years. If the Minister's department

is able to go ahead as planned with the mapping of the Darling Downs in detail, for example, then for a small once-only outlay of perhaps \$2,500,000, the Department of Primary Industries will be able to obtain a more accurate picture of land use in the area. It will then be able to make all sorts of recommendations on farm improvements. It will be able to implement soil management schemes and improve the design and layout of farms. This could result in increased productivity from the land, perhaps amounting to \$10 or \$20 per hectare per annum.

These are the types of advantages that advanced technology can bring to our people. Increased productivity would, of course, mean a great deal to farmers. It would be a stimulus to the transport industry and to the service industries that support the man on the land. It would also mean higher gross income for this country, which would be welcome news to the Commonwealth because it seems to have been overestimating the nation's income the last three or four years. I support any proposal to increase this type of activity.

I make a plea to the Minister to establish an outlet in Toowoomba for the various high quality maps and photographs his department produces. There are some booksellers in Toowoomba that would love to have the opportunity to sell them. The department's display at the R.N.A. show in Toowoomba was not just a curiosity gimmick of, "Come and see what we make." Once people found that the various products on display—the maps, aerial photographs and satellite photographs—were for sale, they bought them like hot cakes. It was the same when the Minister's department took a caravan display around Queensland. They were inundated with requests. I would like to see outlets for the maps established in Toowoomba and all other major centres. I would like to see the department produce recreational maps of the various districts. Certainly we would like to have a map of Toowoomba showing all the areas in which people could spend their leisure time. Such maps will become more and more important as time goes on. They will be of great help to those who go bushwalking and those who motor around the countryside trying to spend their leisure time more profitably.

(Time expired.)

Mr. BOOTH (Warwick) (5.5 p.m.): In speaking to the Estimates of the Valuer-General's Department I intend to deal principally with land valuations in the rural setting, although I will not confine my remarks entirely to that area. However, before I do so, I wish to say that I agree with everything that was said by the member for Toowoomba North, particularly in regard to recreational maps. Today many people like to enjoy their week-ends by bushwalking, trail-bike riding or some such activity, and it is probably very desirable

for them to have a recreational map. I only hope that if an outlet for the sale of maps is established in Toowoomba, other outlets can be established throughout Queensland.

Before I refer to land values, I do not think I would be talking out of school if I said that throughout Queensland, and perhaps throughout Australia, many people are disenchanted with the rating or taxing of land based on land valuations. I agree with what the member for Lytton said, that it is a tax. It is a form of taxation, and I think that everyone would have to agree with that. But I would be very cautious before I started to discard a system based on land valuations, because I believe that some of the other systems that have been suggested might not work.

One suggestion is that rates should be levied on the basis of the services provided. That might be O.K. in an urban situation, but I do not think it would work in a rural situation. The same services may well be provided to landholders in both situations. Roads, power and telephones might be provided in both situations. One could say that everyone should pay the same amount of rates, but that would not be right, because one person would have a much larger property than another and, therefore, a greater ability to earn income. There has to be relativity between the area of land that a person owns and the services provided. I sound that note of caution.

Before we discard the present system of levying rates, there should be extensive research into both the rural situation and the urban situation. I would like to see reference to a large number of cases, because that is the only way in which we can ascertain whether another system would be fair. A new system could be applied to 300 or 400 properties, or even 3,000 or 4,000 properties, throughout Queensland to see what sort of result would be achieved. Another system might work in a rural situation, but I am extremely doubtful about it. I am somewhat doubtful about its working in an urban situation.

The equitable valuing of land is particularly difficult, because the human element comes into it. I do not think anyone would argue that valuing land is an exact science. I know that it is difficult. I know that the Minister's department has improved its techniques in valuing, and that it is coming up with valuations which, to some extent, are more equitable than those of some years ago. I am not being critical here; I am merely sounding a note of warning.

One of the traps that valuers, particularly young valuers, sometimes fall into is that they see one or two sales, or even a dozen sales, which are extremely high, and they say, "That is the new value." It might be, but very often it is not. Frequently, some extenuating circumstance has caused the high-priced sales. When land was purchased in

my electorate 15 or 20 years ago, it was bought, in almost every case, for its agricultural value, and used for agriculture, grazing, smallcrops, etc. Today many professional men prefer to live in the country and work in the city. Sometimes they use their property as a small farm or hobby. Even if it is a large property, they may want to farm it at week-ends.

Mr. Kruger: They ruin the market.

Mr. BOOTH: They might do that, too, sometimes. But, generally speaking, these people do not produce a lot, so I doubt whether they do much harm.

Mr. Kruger: Selling poor quality products is another problem. They are not there full time to keep the grubs out.

Mr. BOOTH: That is true. There are disadvantages there, and I would be the last one to deny that. I am not attacking the fact that they own these properties. That is another story which I might touch on in a primary industries debate. I would agree with the honourable member on some of those things.

Mr. Kruger: We generally agree on those things.

Mr. BOOTH: We do normally agree.

I do not say that they do any harm to land valuations, as long as it is not thought that that is the norm. I do not think it is the normal situation for a man to purchase property simply because he likes living in the area and wants to do some farming as week-end recreation. In such circumstances valuers should be particularly careful and observe what the land is being used for after it is purchased. If they did that they would not fall for the trap that so often catches them. Some of the valuers have done an excellent job because they have watched the situation.

Earlier in the debate the member for Lytton said he saw no advantage in having district valuers in the city of Brisbane. I am not contesting that, and I do not know what answer the Minister will give. However, I certainly believe it is a great advantage to have district valuers throughout Queensland, because they become conversant with valuations in their own areas, even though they may not always be perfect and sometimes are criticised. I have to admit that district valuers have been a great improvement to the system of valuing throughout Queensland. I am certainly much happier since we have had district valuers. One of them in my electorate recently retired. He did an excellent job. He was certainly able to place values on farms which were used as a hobby. He arrived at more equitable valuations because he lived in the district and understood what was going on. I cannot comment on the matter raised by the member for Lytton, but I assure the Minister that I want district valuers based in areas where they have an idea of what is going on.

In my electorate I have a problem which is perhaps unique. Some land there was cleared 80, 90 or perhaps 100 years ago. When valuations are made of that land allowance is still made for the clearing of timber. In some instances it has not been established whether the land ever had timber on it. In other instances, farmers are continually ploughing up roots on land which supposedly never carried timber. I wonder whether the records are accurate. The areas must be looked at objectively when allowances are made for them.

In introducing his Estimates the Minister said that if objections were not allowed there was ample opportunity to take them to the Land Court. I agree that that procedure has been streamlined to a great extent. It is a tribute to the Valuer-General and his staff. I am not contesting that. However, sometimes people are not aware of the fact that they can lodge an objection and then, if it is disallowed, go on to the Land Court. I commend the fact that in future a booklet setting out the rights of land-owners will be forwarded with the valuation notice. That should help when people feel aggrieved about their valuations.

I now mention a trap that is sometimes fallen into by inexperienced valuers, experienced valuers and even purchasers. Some people think that because an area has always had a high valuation, then it should remain high, and if it has always had a low valuation, it should remain low. Valuers are being paid to do a job, and they should make a completely new objective valuation. They should not be influenced to any great extent by what a valuer did on a previous occasion. I suppose that if a valuer works along the same guide-lines as his predecessor, then he must come up with a similar valuation on many occasions. However, that is a trap that some valuers fall for. When a valuer goes on to a farm to make his initial inspection, if possible he should make an appointment for the landholder to accompany him when he inspects the land. The landholder can point out things that the valuer should look at.

Once again, I commend the Minister for trying to educate the community. After all, if people in the community want to know their rights, there is only one way in which that can be done: by educating them to the best of their ability. Whether that is done by brochure or seminar, we should do everything possible to help them.

As I said earlier, valuation is not an exact science. I do not suppose it will ever be possible to evolve a system of valuation that will be free of grounds on which somebody can attack it. However, the plea I make is that valuations be carried out to the best of the valuer's ability, that they be completely objective, and that they be looked at as new valuations. I ask valuers not to be carried away by extreme sales.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER (Archerfield) (5.17 p.m.): In rising to speak to the Estimates introduced by the Minister for Survey and Valuation, I should first like to congratulate the Minister on his retaining the Liberal pre-selection for the electorate of Ashgrove. However, I am reliably informed by one of the 91 delegates who were present at that committee meeting that 21 delegates voted "No"—even in the absence of any other candidate. The Minister is very fortunate indeed that he was not opposed for endorsement. The people he can thank are those known as the "Greenwood Mafia". I refer to Alderman John Andrews, the Minister's private secretary (Mr. Howard Stewart) and the director of maps, or whatever he is now—Mr. Kevin Davies—who has been appointed by probably one of the most blatant acts of political nepotism that this State has ever seen.

The Minister for Survey and Valuation must surely hold the record for verbosity in this Chamber. He took 90 minutes to introduce his Estimates for the current financial year. That is an extremely long time when one is mindful that his portfolio is a tinpot one and certainly of no great importance. It should be returned to the Justice Department, whence it came.

We all know the history of this portfolio. It was brought in after the 1974 election so that the Premier could find a place in Cabinet for one of his proteges, the present Minister for Justice and Attorney-General (Mr. Lickiss). I think that most honourable members would agree that the portfolio of Survey and Valuation is about as useful as an udder on a bull.

The section of the Minister's portfolio that I want to discuss today is the Place Names Board. We all agree that, with the ever-increasing urban sprawl, there is a pressing need for new names. I am of the opinion that over the last few years the board has done a very good job in bringing some order into defining particularly the boundaries of Brisbane suburbs. I pay particular tribute to Alderman Len Ardill. He has been very helpful in this matter. From the research that I have done, I have discovered that the Brisbane City Council has proposed 171 names to the Place Names Board and had 168 accepted.

Mr. Kruger: That is a good record.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: It is a phenomenal record and it speaks volumes for the efficiency of the Brisbane City Council and Alderman Ardill in particular.

Mr. Lane: Do you think Inala should be renamed "Hooperville"?

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: Possibly after my demise—in 30 or 40 years' time—there will be strong agitation by the community to have the name changed in that way.

Having said that, I feel that I should point out a few instances where the board

has not been forceful enough in its decision-making. What the board should do—this is very important and I think that all honourable members would agree with me on this—is resist pressure by prominent members of the Establishment to have suburbs named after them. I make it quite clear that I am opposed to people having suburbs named after them during their life-time.

Mr. Davis: What about “Shady Town” over there?

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: That rolls nicely off the tongue. Perhaps we could name a suburb in the electorate of Merthyr in that way. “Shadyville” also rolls off the tongue. As a matter of fact, I like it. If the honourable member for Merthyr agrees, I will join him in making representations to the Place Names Board to have a suburb in his electorate change its name to that one.

I have been told by a reliable source that prominent Government supporters are seeking to perpetuate their names by having new suburbs named after them. This is a new twist. It is not a case of jobs for the boys, but names for the boys.

In May 1976, the Place Names Board renamed as Durack a section of the suburb of Inala. I point out that 75 per cent of the new suburb consisted of undeveloped land owned by a very large multinational company. Previously the area had preferred to call itself Oxley South. Actually, it had no relationship to Oxley. One of the gentlemen responsible for the change had a small business in Inala. I would class him as a 20c snob. Although he was quite prepared to take the money of the people of Inala, he did not want to be classed as living in Inala.

Mr. R. J. Gibbs: The gentleman to whom you are referring did not have a barber's shop, did he?

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: He did have a barber's shop in Inala.

Mr. R. J. Gibbs: You are talking about Mr. Alan Goss.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: That is true. As the honourable member for Wolston says, it was a gentleman named Mr. Alan Goss.

Mr. Moore: Are you talking about the old Archerfield Estate?

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: No, it is a long way from the old Archerfield Estate. The honourable member for Windsor will have to get his geography straight.

The gentleman to whom the honourable member for Wolston refers as Mr. Goss did not want to be classed as living in Inala, so he hit on the idea of calling the area in which he lived Oxley South, which had a very euphemistic ring about it and rolled nicely off the tongue.

I point out to the Committee that, for the privilege of having their suburb named

Oxley South, the people living there waited an additional 24 hours to have their mail delivered. A letter addressed to Oxley South would be forwarded to the Oxley Post Office, and 24 hours would then elapse before it would be forwarded to the Inala Post Office for delivery.

Then the Thiess company bought a large area of land to subdivide and sell as building blocks. The area was given the nice name Durack Village. When the company purchased that land, it did not want to market it as being at Inala. Having a great deal of influence with the Government, Thiess had the name of the area changed to Durack. I do not think that very many members on this side of the Chamber would disagree with me about the amount of influence that Sir Leslie Thiess has with the Government, and in particular with certain members of Cabinet. To show the influence that Sir Leslie has with the Government, I need only instance what occurred in the recent buying by C.S.R. of Thiess shares. The Premier and some of his Cabinet colleagues tried to rush to the defence of Sir Leslie Thiess, but their efforts were of no avail.

I remember quite vividly that in 1976, after the funeral of the former member for Port Curtis (Mr. Marty Hanson), while two of my colleagues and I were waiting to board the plane to return to Brisbane, I saw the present Minister for Lands, Forestry and Water Resources (Mr. Nev Hewitt) and the then Minister for Works and Housing (Mr. Norm Lee) boarding the Thiess private plane. So it is quite obvious that there was then a tie-up between Thiess Bros. and members of Cabinet.

Mr. Bourke: He didn't offer you a lift?

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: No. As a matter of fact, he did not offer me a lift because he knows that I am opposed to some of the actions of the multinationals. He knew that I, being a humble member of the Opposition, would be of no use to him financially.

What makes the situation so ridiculous is that within the boundaries of the suburb of Durack are the Inala State School, the Inala State High School, the Inala Special School, the Inala Sports Centre and the Serviceton State School. The Education Department shows much more sense than the Department of Mapping and Surveying. It realises the link that these schools have with the older residents of Inala, and it has stood firm and not allowed the schools to be named Durack.

Mr. Bourke: If they changed the names, most of the people there could not find their way to school.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: I only hope that the people of Inala read that interjection by the honourable member for Lockyer. It will certainly increase my vote by 3 or 4 per cent at the next State election, whenever it is held. Instead of having a humble 68 per cent, I will go to 71 or 72 per cent.

As I was saying, those sections of the suburb of Inala were renamed Durack, and that was just to suit the whim of the heavy supporter of the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation, Sir Leslie Thiess. When Thiess was advertising Durack Village, he did not suggest to prospective buyers that they enter Inala along the main entry road, namely Rudd Street/Rosemary Street. He channelled them into the area through the back door, which is Blunder Road. In my opinion, that is advertising deception at its worst. Anybody who drives into the western end of the Thiess estate will see that it borders on Rosemary Street, which is the main entry road into Inala.

As I have pointed out in this Chamber on a number of occasions recently, real estate agents exert a great deal of influence on this Government and particularly on the Minister for Survey and Valuation.

Mr. Fouras: While you are on names, what do you think of the Norm Lee Cultural Centre at Yeronga High?

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: Heaven forbid! The mind boggles.

As I was saying, the real estate developers, particularly the Harry Londys from the South, give exotic names and fancy names to their estates. "Whispering Pines" and "Silver Dale" are good examples. One that comes to mind is the Vienna Woods Estate in the electorate of Redlands, which is represented by Mr. Goleby. The last time I saw that estate, it did not even have a blade of grass on it. If ever there was a misnomer, Vienna Woods is one for that estate. These real estate agents advertise extensively and then come whining to the Minister that they have spent a lot of money in promoting the name of the estate.

Mr. Greenwood: This sounds more like "A Midsummer-Night's Dream" than "Vienna Woods".

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: I did not know the Minister knew the difference. One is Shakespeare, and the other is Strauss.

An Opposition Member: He's a nursery rhyme man at heart.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: His mental capacity would not go past nursery rhymes.

As I was saying, the developers come to the Minister whining that they have spent a lot of money on the estate and then suggest that the name of the suburb be changed to suit the estate. I would not be surprised to see the suburb of Loganholme changed to Hollybank. Southern developers are selling land at Loganholme under the estate name Hollybank. Some of the old settlers in the area are afraid that the Minister will change the name Loganholme, which has a whole host of historical connections, to Hollybank.

If the Place Names Board has spent so much time in clarifying the boundaries of the suburbs, the Minister should stand up and support it. He remains silent.

A case in point involves an area that is close to your electorate, Mr. Warburton. In fact, it may even be in your electorate. I refer to the Bald Hills College of Advanced Education. I am reliably informed that it is located in Bracken Ridge.

Mr. Kruger: That is right.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: The honourable member for Murrumba says I am correct.

A classic example of the Government's ignoring the Place Names Board can be found in the name of the location of the Queen Elizabeth II Hospital. It is stated to be in Mt. Gravatt. It is nowhere near Mt. Gravatt. I can see the honourable member for Mansfield nodding his head in agreement. I would hate to be dragged by the hair from Mt. Gravatt to the new hospital. If I were, I would probably finish up like the honourable member for Windsor, with a nice head of skin. The hospital is well and truly located in Coopers Plains.

Mr. Bourke: Who suggested it? Rosemary Kyburz?

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: I was just about to mention the honourable member for Salisbury. I would have thought that she would have screamed long and loud on this one. I know the fawning attitude of this Government to royalty, so I can well understand the hospital's being named after the Queen. However, to insist that it is in Mt. Gravatt is pure fraud.

The hospital should be named after the late Dr. Cowper, who was the first surgeon in the colony of Queensland. Although it is spelt incorrectly, the suburb of Coopers Plains is named after him. The hospital should have been named to commemorate his work and not after the Queen. But I suppose that Dr. Edwards has to get his knighthood somehow!

Through the Minister, I suggest to the Place Names Board that in future it give up its slavish dedication to English names. It is ludicrous to have areas in Queensland named after places in England. Localities should be given Aboriginal names or district names. Some suburbs should be named after well-known pioneers.

Dr. Lockwood: What about Biala?

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: That is rather a nice name. The honourable member shows a glimmer of sense at times.

The Government should not pander to the whims of the wealthy land-sharks who contribute to the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation.

Mr. Davis: What does Inala mean?

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: It means place of water.

In view of the Government's track record in racism, I cannot see Aboriginal names getting a guernsey. The Minister gives the impression of being a racist of the worst type.

I contrast our attitude with that in New Zealand. The Kiwis are proud to give their suburbs Maori names. I urge the Minister to stand up for once to the real estate developers and to support his Place Names Board rather than the land-sharks who contribute to the Government's coffers at election-time.

A number of serious allegations have been made in the top echelon of the Survey and Valuation Department concerning the misuse of a Government car and the exorbitant cost of furnishings in the Minister's office. I have in my possession a document that I am prepared to table which says—

"Mr. Greenwood is the Minister, Mr. Serisier is the Surveyor-General and Mr. Davies is the Deputy Surveyor-General.

"The megalomaniacs Serisier and Davies have been scheming, with the connivance of the Minister, to obtain for themselves, rooms in Watkins Place (Edward Street) which are far in excess of the areas to which they are entitled. I am told that Mr. Greenwood already has a spacious office in Watkins Place plus an office and bedroom in the new Parliament House.

"The room Mr. Serisier will get is so large that it would be allocated, normally, only to a Minister or head of a very large department. The one Mr. Davies will get is so large that it would normally be allocated only to a I-26, but Davies is only a I-15 in the Public Service.

"Mr. Serisier and Mr. Davies are deceiving the Public Service Board and Works Department by showing them floor-plans of the rooms which show a lot of space taken up by lay-out tables, security cabinet etc.—but the Public Service Board and the Works Department are not happy; so Mr. Greenwood is leaning on them.

"Many senior public servants are aware of what is going on. They say it is just one more thing to increase their disgust at the misconduct of Messrs. Greenwood, Serisier and Davies."

Finally, I pose these questions to the Minister—

1. What was the total cost of furnishing and decorating the Minister's office?

2. Does the Valuer-General use a Government Statesman De Ville motor car with private plates, and what is the annual cost of running the vehicle for private purposes?

I shall be very interested to hear the Minister's reply to these allegations.

Mr. SIMPSON (Cooroora) (5.34 p.m.): It gives me pleasure to support the Minister for Survey and Valuation in presenting his

Estimates. The valuation part of his portfolio is a most difficult area. Valuation is not a precise art, yet it must be defended in court at a moment's notice. The valuation system used for local authority rating and land tax purposes has been criticised because it is believed that problems associated with it could be overcome by the substitution of another system, or another set of accepted valuation principles.

In Queensland unimproved land is the basis of valuation. The land is assumed to be in its original state, with services provided to the boundary. The system allows a valuer to note the improvements that have been made at the time of valuation. He then works back from sale price determinations, or the market-place value of the property. Some other States use site valuations and capital value. The capital value of a property is the improved valuation including improvements; in other words, what it would be worth in the market-place.

There are problems with all these various forms of valuation, but basically the advantage of the unimproved value system that we have adopted in Queensland is that it encourages people to develop a site. With the capital value system, there is a disincentive to people to develop. They will leave it undeveloped because they know that that will attract a lower rating.

With the increasing number of sales and the automatic need for a greater number of valuations and their cost, I believe that we must look at a system which will allow for computerisation in the future. This would overcome some of the anomalies in the present system, where we revalue every five to eight years. I believe this could be done by taking our present system, tying it to a town planning or land use system, and then evaluating and adjusting the new system annually for inflation. Initially the owner would have the normal right of appeal against the valuation, but eventually we would be looking at a system under which the valuation was increased annually by an amount somewhere between the increase in the C.P.I. and what the local authority considers is necessary for funding purposes, but not an amount greater than that figure. The need to increase a valuation by something less than the C.P.I. increase would in fact occur only where there were insufficient sales to indicate movements in the base formula. Under this system valuations would automatically increase each year and would in fact be a fairer guide to the market situation.

Mr. Davis: We preferred the sailing boats; they were a lot more interesting than this.

Mr. SIMPSON: I cannot understand how what the honourable member is trying to say has any relevance to valuations.

Mr. Prest: I can't, either.

Mr. SIMPSON: I cannot understand the honourable member's mumbling.

On the question of the right of the land-owner to object—as we evolved a system of automatic increases, perhaps the land-owner could be given the right to appeal every three years if he could show that his valuation was out of line with C.P.I. movements or market changes, or where there had been a rezoning in that period or any other action that had been found necessary to keep property values in line with the formula.

The system could then be computerised. I believe that whatever period was decided on for objections, whether it be three or five years, it should be related to a system of spot checks of zonings and land use in a local authority area. We would thereby streamline the whole system. I believe that if we paid attention to overcoming anomalies, either at the time of the establishment of the base valuation or during spot checks, we would in fact overcome a lot of problems associated with the present system. Obviously the changes suggested by other members have to be put to the test to ensure that people and businesses are not disadvantaged.

That part of the Minister's portfolio that deals with surveying is very interesting. The first maps of Queensland were produced by Flinders and Cook. Not only did they survey the coastline; they landed and surveyed areas a short distance inland. Maps have been the basis of all our property planning. In fact, they have been the basis of all orderly planning in our civilised community today.

New instruments are being used in the survey field today. The Minister and his department are to be commended for their forward-thinking and innovative procedures in this area. They are helping to keep costs down in the survey field, and this is of great assistance to those authorities that depend very much on the facilities provided by the department. The maps provided by the department are used to identify flooded areas, and for town-planning purposes. They are also used for dredging estuaries and for planning canals and drainage systems. We can use aerial maps and satellite photographs to get a complete picture of drainage systems, rivers, tributaries, and so on. This helps people, particularly in local government, in their planning. The saving that this brings in the long term is quite obvious. These aerial maps and satellite photographs can also be used in planning for new railway lines and mining ventures.

Maps are very necessary, and I believe that the Minister is encouraging their use by establishing commercial outlets for their sale. I believe that the old saying "buyer beware" could be applied to many people who come to my office with problems. I believe that many more people, before they purchase a property, should carry out their own search. They can get a lot of information from maps and surveys. I think that that is an important consideration.

Maps can also be used for recreational purposes. Here I refer to people who engage in orienteering or are involved with scout groups and others. They can use maps to develop their independence and their ability to look after themselves in an unusual or unexpected circumstance. Also, students can gain a great deal of knowledge from maps. Maps can be used as the basis of their submissions on many regional projects.

Tourism is a very important industry in Queensland. People who visit a new area want to know where the various tourist attractions are so that they can get the maximum benefit from their tourist venture. Invariably, they refer to maps to get this information. We find that more and more information is to be found on maps today. They are very pleasant to look at and are very interesting. I believe that the new satellite maps of areas, such as the Sunshine Coast, will be readily saleable in those localities. The Minister has been involved with the local development boards in these joint ventures. I think that is very good.

In the report of the Valuer-General appears a photograph of one of the department's branch offices with a sign showing the words "North Coast" and "South Coast". People coming into that department do not know whether those signs refer to the Gold Coast or the Sunshine Coast, or just what they mean. The Minister should have those misleading terminologies replaced with something clearer.

Another part of the Minister's portfolio is the Place Names Board. In the early history of the State many places were named by surveyors.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: Was that cadastral surveying?

Mr. SIMPSON: That is right; that was cadastral surveying. The early surveyors named rivers, creeks, peaks and so forth. Roads that were later established and parish maps that were drawn up often bore the name of the early settlers of the area.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: After their death?

Mr. SIMPSON: Not always, but that often was the case. In many places several generations of a family lived on the one farm, so there would be a Jones Road or Duke Road or whatever it might be. I find that an acceptable way of naming such features as roads, as it indicates some of the history of the early pioneers.

When consideration is given to naming new places, emphasis should be placed on Aboriginal names, which would certainly complement some of the place names in my area such as Maroochy, Yandina, Eumundi and Cooroy. That is a delightful aspect of the area and I would like to see it encouraged.

One area of Nambour is called Burnside. However, the Education Department has named the new schools in the area Nambour West. Nambour West is in another part of

Nambour altogether. I have had to go to many Government departments in an effort to overcome that problem. The road on which those schools are situated is named Puddles Road. The local authority did not like that name, as it thought the children would say, "This is Puddles Road. We'll walk through every puddle on it." The local authority also did not like the suggestion that it had any puddles on its roads. Of course, Puddles Road was named after a pioneer. However, the name of that road was changed to Windsor Road—a right royal name. That is an interesting example of some of the things that occur in that section of the Minister's department.

I now alert the Committee to the fact that there are moves, which I hope are not successful, to change the name of the airport on the Sunshine Coast from Maroochy Airport to Maroochydore Airport. More and more people are identifying the Sunshine Coast as an area which stretches over varying distances. Some people say it extends from Caloundra to Noosa; others say from Bribie Island to Double Island Point. A new air service from Brisbane to Townsville has recently been commenced by BPA. Their timetable has on it the words "Maroochydore Airport". However, one of their brochures has "Maroochydore Airport" and in brackets underneath "Maroochy". Of course, it is the Maroochy Airport. A far more suitable notation for their brochures would be "Maroochy Airport", and then in brackets "Sunshine Coast". They could even reverse the order if they wished. We would then keep the place name, what it means, where it is and how it identifies with a whole region, instead of using the lesser area that is one particular settlement on the Sunshine Coast.

The other name that has recently been changed is that of the Borumba Dam. I notice that mention has been made about this in a report from the Place Names Board. It is a delightful dam on Yabba Creek, which is in my electorate. The local shire and residents who are promoting it and highlighting it to the public as a delightful playground have renamed it Lake Borumba. I think that that is very fitting. There is shortly to be a tourist development on the side of the lake.

The lake was stocked with spotted barramundi by Hamer Midgley. The week-end papers referred to "barra"—barramundi. They are not like the ordinary barramundi. They are spotted barramundi, which were released there eight or 10 years ago. Recently some 30-pounders have been caught there, which it must be agreed are really big fish.

In all things, we go from one extreme to the other. The people promoted the area and, the next thing they knew, anglers were racing up there to get into the action. Now it is a matter of concern that the lake will be fished out. It is hoped to close some of the tributaries of Lake Borumba so that a breeding area will be kept intact and the

breeding of that sporting fish will be protected. We have better table fish, but I am sure that most people who catch a fish that size would certainly tuck into it with great delight.

I commend the Minister on the way in which he is handling his portfolio and on the work he has done to bring its activities before the public.

Mr. BOURKE (Lockyer) (5.52 p.m.): It is with pleasure that I rise to support the Minister on the presentation of his Estimates. In my dealings with the Minister, I have always found him to be totally courteous and helpful. The same applies to his staff with whom I have had dealings. As I have said in previous Estimates debates, it is all very well for politicians to claim the credit for the running of the State; but, without an efficient and honest Public Service, no modern State could function. That applies very much to the gentlemen in these departments.

Mr. Milliner: You should know a lot about valuation, the way you jack your prices up in the chemist shop.

Mr. BOURKE: That is not strictly true. I believe that I know a little about valuation, since I completed a course by correspondence from the technical college with a view to obtaining qualifications as a real estate agent.

Mapping today is very much a scientific business. In the interests of the community, it has to be kept very much up to date. We heard from the member for Everton, who led the debate for the Opposition, the usual bleat that we hear from the extreme elements of the union movement nowadays that jobs must be protected at all costs. As I once heard it put, it was said during the Depression, when somebody looked at men using excavation machinery on construction work, "Wouldn't it be wonderful to create a lot of work for men with shovels?" The obvious counter to that was, "We would create work for a vastly greater number if the men used spoons."

Members of the Opposition feel that, instead of using the technology available today with satellites and high-flying aircraft for mapping purposes, we should use men in box-kites who could perhaps note details from great heights. The point I make is that if any modern country is to progress, efficiency has to be encouraged. If men are displaced, we must make jobs available for them elsewhere. Jobs ought to be meaningful and creative of something. It is useless to talk about protecting jobs in the sense of padding only.

Mr. Milliner: We are not against automation. What we would like to see are benefits such as a reduction in working hours.

Mr. BOURKE: Opposition members would like to see selfishness. I would like to see the benefits of automation and efficiency

spread over the whole community, instead of the community being blackmailed by a small group.

The department in Queensland is very much up to date—and all credit to the Minister and his departmental officers for seeing to that. We have seen the introduction of cadastral maps and orthophotos. I know that in Toowoomba our officers were very keen to obtain them for the use of the council. The council then wrote the necessary allocation for the relevant maps to be obtained. It has been proved in Toowoomba that being able to place pipes and other services accurately has been of great advantage in town planning. The officers of the town planning section appreciate that. The cost was high, but the Government did provide a generous subsidy, and the council very gratefully took advantage of it.

Mr. Davis: What was the subsidy?

Mr. BOURKE: I think it was 40:60. The honourable member can read the report for himself. I do not have to stand here and answer silly questions asked by him. It is all right for him to come in here and make a fool of himself, but I do not wish to be part of the process.

Accurate mapping is essential, and I believe that the department is playing an important role in the planning for the future progress of the State.

Of course, surveying also comes under the Minister's control. It is obvious to everyone that accurate surveying is essential in a modern community. There must be no question about the identification of parcels of land, and accurate surveys determine who owns land and give people security to plan for the future. Security is one of the basic needs of citizens in a modern society, and people must know that they have control of their own destiny through ownership of land. Therefore, the control of standards of both private and Government surveying is essential.

At this stage, I compliment the department on its past publication "Queensland Resources Atlas", which is an excellent publication. I managed to obtain some copies for schools in my electorate, and I am assured by teachers and pupils that they find it very useful. I understand that it was produced during the term of office of the former Minister, but the present Minister can take some of the credit if he wishes. I should like to see a follow-up to it in due course.

The public has long been fascinated by maps, and I support the suggestion by the honourable member for Toowoomba North (Dr. John Lockwood) that maps should be more readily available in towns throughout Queensland. They would be useful to the public—and provide a worthwhile source of revenue to the Government. The department would be providing a service and making a few dollars and cents at the same time.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. BOURKE: Even members of the hopeless Opposition would also support that suggestion.

Other honourable members have spoken about the historical aspect of certain maps. Recently I happened to read an article about old Portugese and Spanish sailing maps. I think it was in a publication put out by the State Government Insurance Office. Perhaps the Government could do something about obtaining modern facsimiles of those maps. I think they were called the Dieppe maps. They are held in England, but they were held in France at one stage. At the time they were made, they were relatively accurate maps of the Queensland coast made by Portugese and Spanish sailors who remain unidentified. The article said that they had been moved because of the destruction of the Casa de India in Lisbon during an earthquake.

In recent years there has been a great deal of discontent in the community—perhaps it is traditional; perhaps it predates my experience—about valuation, particularly as it applies to local government authorities and their use of it for rating purposes.

Mr. Moore: It has nothing to do with the value; it is simply the rating.

Mr. BOURKE: I do not quite accept that. I shall deal with that later. In my opinion, there are faults in the Act.

Mr. Moore interjected.

Mr. BOURKE: I will digress at this stage and say that the problem is that, although the valuers of the Valuer-General's Department apply the Act quite fairly and professionally, they are blamed for the results. I believe that the fault could lie with the Act itself.

Mr. Milliner: You will agree with me—

Mr. BOURKE: I doubt very much that I will agree with the honourable member about anything, but I will accept his interjection.

Mr. Milliner: You will agree that the Act is outdated and the method is outdated?

Mr. BOURKE: The method is not necessarily outdated, but the Act could well have faults in it. I will go as far as that in meeting the honourable member in a spirit of—

Mr. Milliner: Compromise.

Mr. BOURKE: Yes, compromise. The value is used also in assessing land tax, and I should like to comment briefly on land tax. I think it is an outdated, unfair tax. It is more an annoyance to individual citizens than something of value to the community. I understand that it gives the lowest return of any State tax. By and large, the Government has sought to abolish taxes, and I should like to see it make

the abolition of land tax its next target. I accept that pay-roll tax is an unfair tax and that perhaps it is more harmful; but the money involved would give land tax a higher priority for abolition. In most instances, land tax would not be worth the annoyance that it causes to citizens who are obliged to fill in returns and, ultimately, pay the tax assessed. The cost of collection would represent a very high percentage of the tax collected.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.15 p.m.]

Mr. BOURKE: Another aspect of the operations of the Minister's department is the allocation of place names throughout the State. I join with those previous speakers who decried the mundane names that are given to streets in particular. Some of them many have been named after early settlers. We must not forget that we owe a great debt to the early pioneers and should commemorate their names. However, I support those members who suggest that we should look more to Aboriginal names, not because they are Aboriginal and the Aborigines have any prior claim, but because many of them are pleasing to the ear as well as being unusual. The use of Aboriginal names should be encouraged. Dullness should be avoided in the names of towns and streets.

During the speech of the honourable member for Archerfield, I interjected to the effect that the good citizens of Inala would not be able to find the State schools in their area if the names of those schools were changed. Perhaps I should have said that only the good citizens of Inala who were silly enough to vote for the honourable member for Archerfield would have difficulty in finding them.

Mr. Austin: Do you know that he puts his address in the phone book as Inala Heights?

Mr. BOURKE: I wouldn't be at all surprised if he did. Since he was elected member for Archerfield, no-one who lives in the area put his address as Archerfield. We could do something about it. The election of a new member might upgrade the area. Perhaps the name of the electorate could be changed in the next redistribution.

The Minister's department is also concerned with the valuation of land. It is quite obvious that the revaluations that occur every five or eight years are not happy events for the ratepayers, the local authorities or the local parliamentary representatives. My electorate contains two shires, about half of another shire and part of the city of Toowoomba. The revaluations in those local authority areas occur more often than they are welcome, that's for sure.

Recently, the Crow's Nest Shire was revalued. The Valuer-General's Department officers were very professional, most courteous and made a good impression on the local

people. They talked to the local people and listened to them. The local people have said that the department's officers could not have been fairer. The word is that even the shire officers cannot offer any criticism of the departmental staff. Perhaps this is just the softening up. We must look at the results of the revaluation.

It was claimed that the revaluation was carried out totally within the confines of the Act. Crow's Nest was formerly a totally rural shire, but it has been affected by the spill-over from Toowoomba. The shire council examined the rating structure, and after three months' solid, hard work it came up with 12 separate levels of rating in order to ensure that it was not pricing some poor devil out of existence. A man who had a piggery on a small block would have been up for \$12,000 a year. As I say, the shire came up with no fewer than 12 sets of rates to cover the little settlements, the semi-residential 5 to 10-acre blocks, the township itself and the distant primary-producing areas. Then it had to go to the Department of Local Government. Apparently when the constraining provisions of the Act were applied, the number of sets of rates was reduced from 12 to six or seven. People are discontented, and apparently the system has not been totally successful. As the law stands, however, that is the best the shire council can do.

I am quite convinced that the Valuer-General's Department has operated entirely within the provisions of the Act. Obviously, for that result to be achieved, something must be totally wrong with the Act. We cannot walk away from that. The honourable member for Everton criticised the Act, and I half agreed with him. It must be said that something is wrong with the Act.

Valuation is, after all, only a relative thing. Strictly speaking the valuation of a block of land is what a willing buyer will pay for it and what a willing seller will sell it for. The departmental officers can only work within the law. In the past two or three years we have passed a number of amendments to the Local Government Act to allow councils to alter the way in which they apply rates.

The honourable member for Windsor raised a point about how rates were applied. I dispute his contention. Councils can only apply rating to the valuation supplied, but they should do what the Crow's Nest council did to mitigate the effects of a valuation. Obviously something is wrong with the whole system. A council should not have to devote three months' work to get around the drastic effects. We should be able to devise an Act that provides a fair system of valuation.

One provision in the Land Valuation Act allows two or three blocks of contiguous land to be lumped together for valuation purposes. A citizen of Toowoomba had two 6-acre blocks valued as one block and an adjoining

6-acre block valued separately. He got two different valuations on the three blocks. When he brought that to the department's notice he was told that the department had made a mistake in the valuation, that the combined valuation of the three blocks was only half of what it should have been. He was then told that the department intended to issue a new valuation. When he pointed out quite validly that it was a bit vicious for the department to have two goes at him (thinking that it was a little strong that they could have even one go), he was told that a section of the Act provides that in the event of a mistake the department can make another valuation. I should think that in the true spirit of the Act the department should say that a mistake had been made in adding up figures, not that it should be given another bite at a good, honest ratepayer.

An Opposition Member: Why don't you name him?

Mr. BOURKE: I will not name him, but I will say that the Valuer-General (Mr. Cook) was very polite. He was good enough to explain personally what was to be done. The ratepayer felt that there was not much point in his being polite when he was being ripped off in that fashion. However, Mr. Cook certainly lived up to the highest level of Public Service tradition.

Mr. Davis: I will tell you who that ratepayer was; his name was T. Bourke.

Mr. BOURKE: I will not dispute or confirm that.

Our system of valuation on the unimproved value of the land is subject to current usage, which is a fair restriction, and the legislation also provides for the merging of blocks. However, it does not go far enough. The system should be altered to allow for improvements, with some method of discounting improvements over the years. It is artificial to have a block of land valued on the basis that it was cleared of timber 80 years earlier.

Mr. Booth: It is ridiculous.

Mr. BOURKE: It is.

The timber may have been cleared 80 years ago, yet the property is valued artificially as if the timber were still there, and the cost of clearing is estimated.

On the Gold Coast there are some islands that have been reclaimed from sandbanks, one of which, I understand, is worth \$1,000,000. The owner of that island pays virtually nothing in rates because its unimproved value is based on its being a mangrove swamp. That is the height of artificial figuring with values. It is completely unfair. Local authority rating returns have to be worked out, and rates are relevant to the Estimates because they are based on valuations. Rates are worked out to reflect ser-

vices, and when an owner of a \$1,000,000 island pays next to nothing in general rates, it is too artificial for words.

As I see it, the main purpose of valuation relates to rating.

The honourable member for Lytton asked why adjoining blocks should be rated differently. I cannot see why a person with a view who, naturally, has a more valuable block of land, should pay higher rates than his neighbour without a view. The view is not relevant to the rates he pays. The rates should be relevant to the services he gets, and there should not be such wide variations in rates. The honourable member for Lytton made a valid point, but I object to his system because it is based on a socialist principle, namely, that the rich should pay and the less rich should get it for nothing. I was surprised that the honourable member should propound that theory, but I support him.

Mr. R. J. Gibbs: Why should you talk about socialism? You favour introducing legislation to stop company take-overs.

Mr. BOURKE: I challenge the statement that I wanted to introduce legislation to prevent take-overs. That is a total fabrication. I have no designs in that area at all.

It must be understood that local government pays a precept towards the cost of the valuation, but I would support the proposition that this task should be undertaken by an impartial body. The point I make is that to value a block of land down to the last dollar is artificial and unnecessary for the purpose of rating. It should be possible to value land in a shire or other local government area on a scale of, say, from 1 to 10. We could start with a basic scale of 1 to cover the very lowest level of service, and then move progressively up to level 10. We do not have to value on a dollar basis of most recent sales. We could have a fixed valuation that could be altered from valuation period to valuation period, but it should not be necessary to come up with a valuation down to the last dollar supposedly based on the cash value were the property to be sold. We hear a lot of arguments about valuations, but there are very few people who would be prepared to sell for the valuation that is made. They are only relative to each other.

In summing up, I would like to once again congratulate the Minister and his staff. The Minister has always been efficient. He is coming to Toowoomba tomorrow to address a seminar, and we will be very happy to have him there. He reflects credit on the Government when he visits our electorate. This department is another example of good management and good government, from the Minister down through to the public servants who are, as I said, a credit to the Public Service of this country.

Mr. PREST (Port Curtis) (7.26 p.m.): It is not a very important department that we are debating here tonight. In the past we

have debated the Estimates of the Departments of Health, Local Government, Education and so on, but tonight we are stuck with this department which, as far as we are concerned, is not very important. It does not deserve so much attention.

I should say at this stage that I wish to thank the officers of the department for the work they have done and the manner in which they have carried out their duties. They have laboured under a Minister who, I am quite certain, has not done the very best for them or been of great assistance to them. In that regard, they have laboured under some difficulties.

The survey section of the department must have caused the Minister some restless nights. If the reported reshuffle of Cabinet had taken place, it is very plain that the Minister would have been one of the first to go, but, as he is a true-blue Liberal, Mrs. McComb instructed the Deputy Premier to delay his announced reshuffle to allow the Minister to clean up the mess that had given the Government and his department such a rotten image. The Deputy Premier wanted a Cabinet reshuffle because he wished to promote Liberals with some ability—if there are any—but he had to do what he was told to protect the Minister and again delay his reshuffle.

After persistent attacks and a lot of hard work by the honourable member for Lytton, the Government, in particular the Minister for Justice and the Minister for Survey and Valuation, has now taken action against certain individuals who have “dudded” people not only in this country but throughout the world. Unfortunately, we are not able to elaborate on that matter at the moment, but great credit must go to the honourable member for Lytton for the enormous amount of work he put into achieving the result we now see. Action is now being taken against people who until now have been protected by Government Ministers, particularly the Minister for Survey and Valuation. This Minister is not the smartest in the Government, or its greatest asset.

It has been said, “If you could buy him at his price and sell him at yours, you would make a profit.” Unfortunately, the hardest part of it would be to find a buyer. I am quite certain that the buyer would not be anyone in the Queensland Local Government Association. I remember that at the Queensland Local Government Association conference in Townsville in 1978 the delegates were ready, and prepared, to move a vote of no confidence in him. They would have had every right to do so, because of his attitude and his outspoken comments—

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Miller): Order! Mr. Speaker indicated last week that he would not tolerate personal attacks on any member in this Chamber. I intend to carry out that ruling. I have listened very intently to the honourable member. I believe that all he has said so

far has not dealt with the department under the Minister's control; rather, it has been an attack on the Minister personally. I will not tolerate that.

Mr. PREST: Thank you very much, Mr. Miller. As I was saying, he is really not the brightest. The comments that he made were not in the interests of the good administration of local government in this State. In fact, they were backward. His ideas were very outdated; they were not progressive. No doubt, if they had been implemented, they would have placed hardship on local government and only protected those who wanted to subdivide and make greater profits. Unfortunately, the department still has a Minister to whom one would apply the term “a square peg in a round hole”.

Mr. AKERS: I rise to a point of order. Mr. Miller, I draw your attention to the fact that the member is reading his speech. He is far too nice a bloke to say that sort of thing off the cuff. It must have been written for him, and I ask him not to read it.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Port Curtis will continue with his speech.

Mr. PREST: I am very pleased to see that the member for Pine Rivers thinks so highly of me. I can assure him that what I have to say will be brief and to the point.

We find that in the whole of the Treasurer's Financial Statement for 1978-79 there was not one mention of the Department of Mapping and Surveying or the Department of the Valuer-General. But we find in the Estimates of the Probable Ways and Means and Expenditure of the Government of Queensland that an increase of 15½ per cent has been allowed for in the appropriation for 1979-80 over the appropriation for 1978-79. Yet we are told that inflation is running at under 10 per cent. We also note that, although the appropriation of \$15,400,000 is up 15½ per cent over the figure for last year, there is no provision for extra employees. The number of employees remains the same as for 1978-79, that is, 879. The Estimates show one more employee in the Department of Valuer-General, making a total of 316, and one fewer in the Department of Mapping and Surveying, making a total of 563.

Talking of valuation—the Minister in his address to the Committee spoke at length about the rates charged by local authorities. Rates have no bearing on valuations, but valuations have a great bearing on the general rates paid. The inequality arises because the present method for valuing a piece of land is outdated. The Minister stated that there is to be an exchange of personnel between the Queensland department and the corresponding New Zealand Government department. I am sure that if the exchange is to make any change at all, it will be only for the better.

We are conversant with the rights that people may exercise, should they desire, in appealing against valuations. But what about the cost involved and the sort of hearings that these people get? First of all, before they go to an appeal court they have to meet with officers of the department. I understand they are told that, as only one or two of the people living in the area intend to appeal, they are so few in number when compared with all the people in the area that an appeal against the new valuation would be a waste of time and money. I believe that in some areas in my own city pensioners or retired people who have chosen to live in the area, and have in fact lived there for many years, can be priced out of it. A spec builder or some wealthy person, group or company buys a block of land at an inflated price to build units or flats or a palatial home. By paying an inflated price, they give the Valuer-General a reason for increasing the valuations of all properties in that area. The local authority then fixes a new rate in the dollar and receives funds based on the new unimproved value of the property.

Hardship is then caused to retired people, pensioners and even the unemployed. People have no say in the rates that are levied by the local authority, but higher rates effect them greatly. They have to pay those rates or move out of the area. I know of recent cases of pensioners who have lived in the one place for many years and who now find that their valuations have increased by 400 per cent. Some of these were properties on perpetual leases. Once the valuation is increased, so, too, is the rental. That causes great hardship to pensioners. At the next valuation, no doubt that will be taken into account; the local authorities will want their share, and the people will face big increases in their rates.

Valuations in an area should not be based on a purchase by one person at an inflated price. I am quite certain that that does not indicate the real value in the area. The Valuer-General's Department should look at that. Valuations should be based on overall sales, not the sale of one property only. In the last valuation that took place in my own city, my property was revalued from \$1,400 to \$6,200. I believe that was caused by the purchase of a club one block away by businessmen in the town.

There is also an instance of the local authority paying a price far in excess of market value. They did not resume the property, and they did not go to court to have a price put on it. They needed the land urgently for one of their projects and they paid a very high price for it. That has certainly increased the unimproved value of nearby land and will place a financial burden on the residents of the area in future years. Those people will be priced off their land.

As the member for Callide said this morning, it is time that there was a redistribution of local authority boundaries. I agree with the member for Callide. At least there is one wise person on that side of the Chamber who can see that it is not good housekeeping to have the boundaries as they presently are. I hope that those boundaries are changed to bring about a more equitable distribution of land uses and to give more reliable valuations. I hope the Government has that distribution made in a much fairer way than it has had electoral redistributions done in the past.

Mr. KRUGER (Murrumba) (7.39 p.m.): I enter the debate this evening to mention a few problems, as I see them, in the Valuer-General's Department. Some problems have been caused when people have purchased land in times of inflation. Admittedly, in the last few years there has been a tendency for land prices to ease off somewhat. That has helped to relieve the earlier situation. A few years ago land was being purchased at very high prices—much higher than it was worth. Officers of the Valuer-General's Department take those sales into account when making the next valuation. If the upward trend continues, the problem is not as great; but, if in fact there is a downturn, people will be paying rates for a number of years at a valuation calculated on a few sales in the area. It seems to me that most valuers know their job well. However, others do not seem to have had the practical experience that they need in specific areas. Whilst they might know the built-up and farming areas, some of them seem to be somewhat lost in the categories in between. The results of that lack of knowledge are damaging to property owners.

I turn now to the matter of variations in valuations. I will cite the last valuation for the Pine Rivers Shire, because, as most honourable members know, that is where I come from. One property of 10 acres or 10 ha—I am not sure which—on the high side of the road on the hill at Kallangur attracted a valuation of only half that given to land on the lower side of the road. It was of the same area and shape. For the life of me, I could not see why there should be a higher valuation on the lower land. There seemed to be nothing to indicate why those property owners should have been valued at a higher rate than those who had what appeared to be a better block of land. The services are the same; there is the same gravel road with the same amount of dust; as there is no town water, there is the same problem of buying water when the tanks go dry. Examples such as that worry me. I suggested to those people that they appeal—and they did. Many people to whom I explained the system of appeal were satisfied with the results they achieved. They received reasonable reductions from the department. In this instance, I am not quite sure how it turned out. However, I make this point: why was there a need for them to appeal? Why wasn't there

a system under which the valuer appreciated the difference between the two blocks? There seems to be a problem. It could have been that different valuers valued the opposite sides of the road. I am not sure of the details. The guide-lines of the department seem to be well settled. However, there is a possibility that some valuers interpret the guide-lines differently from others. That leads to difficulties at times.

I ran into problems, and I lodged an appeal. I have an area of land surveyed separately from the area that I farm, for the usual reason that if the farm changes hands I will have my own home on my own block of land. That is a reasonable thing to do. In actual fact, however, I operate the farm from that block of land. When the chap came out to listen to my appeal and to look over the area, he said, "We have valued this as a house block." I said, "I have no amenities and I am not likely to get them." The Pine Rivers Shire Council would not see fit to extend the water main. I said to him, "I haven't got kerbing and channelling. I haven't got those things that generally lead to increased valuations."

Mr. Gunn: Is it a separate portion?

Mr. KRUGER: It is a separate portion of land, but I have that block for the purpose of working the farm. Somewhere along the line we should be looking at the realities. I do not believe that I deserve any favoured treatment; many other people would be in a similar position. A family might own a block of land that was worked by share-farmers. I pointed out my thoughts to the fellow who came out. He listened to my appeal and, although he was sympathetic, I received a note saying that nothing could be done.

Another problem in the recent revaluation of the shire arose in what could be classed as the rural residential area. I felt sorry for the people concerned. I refer particularly to a piece of land of 8 or 10 acres that had been used as a small farm 10 or 15 years ago. It became uneconomical for those people to farm, so they got a job. As you know, Mr. Miller, because of the Queensland Government's policies even farmers on big farms have difficulty in staying on the land, and small farmers have been forced out in the same way as small businessmen and others have been forced out. If you are not big, Mr. Miller, the Government does not want you.

Mr. Davis: It is crushing them.

Mr. KRUGER: Yes, it is crushing the people of Queensland. The point I am making is that those people remained there and lived on the land because their house was there and they had lived there for many years. The valuation of properties in that area increased by about 800 or 900 per cent because they were classed as rural residential. I have sympathy for those people, but I do not have sympathy for the people who caused the problem. I am speaking about those who come into an area and build the

biggest brick home possible on the best-mown 10 acres one could see. They have four or five ponies, as well fed as any pony one has ever seen, and two or three horse floats. They go to the pony clubs and the kids enjoy show-riding. I like to see people having amenities such as those and doing those things. However, other people are being penalised in valuations because the people to whom I am referring own land solely for the purpose of getting into a top-class situation.

Mr. Davis: Snobby rich.

Mr. KRUGER: One could say snobby rich, or possibly two-bob millionaires. In some instances people do not have the money to own the properties on which they live. They are getting by, but possibly they would not rattle very much if one shook them up and down. In fairness, I do not believe that people who are living there because they are forced to should be penalised. Because of the restraints imposed by the Government of Queensland, it is difficult to sell land at present. Young people who wish to buy a block of land are battling and having hell's own job to get the deposit together before they can even think of building a home.

Mr. Bourke: Why don't you sell them a cheap block? You have all the land in Murrumba tied up.

Mr. KRUGER: It is all very well for a chemist with two or three shops to say that. He would not know the hardships that kids are facing today. All he is worried about is selling them the pill so that wives do not get pregnant and can go out to work. He does not want them to have the problems that he had when he was a young fellow.

Mr. Underwood: He is selfish.

Mr. KRUGER: Of course he is selfish. He has another job. He is raking money out of the Toowoomba City Council, too.

Let me turn now to mapping. The honourable member for Pine Rivers mentioned that he had had a look at maps showing the layout of the shire, and said that one could pick out the contours and so on. That is exceptionally good. However, he knows as well as I do the drainage problems that occur in the Pine Rivers Shire between one developer and another. Admittedly, the matter does not come under this portfolio entirely, but with all the knowledge that we have and with all the information that is available in relation to layout, drainage, and so on, I wonder why we cannot overcome some of the problems and achieve some harmony. As I said earlier, certain Governments prefer to look after a select few when subdivisions take place, and then fights occur between two developers.

Mr. Bourke: Do you think that the new train line will affect valuations out there?

Mr. KRUGER: The new train line would be a good thing, of course, but it would not

alter the valuations greatly in the immediate future. It would eventually, but I am not very much concerned about that. Until the route of that line is designated, development in the area is going to be awfully untidy, and that is my main concern at present. The valuation will look after itself, and I trust that the Valuer-General's Department will take into account the things that make the Pine Rivers Shire a better place in which to live.

Another problem arises when new valuations are issued and people begin jumping up and down. You know what it is like, Mr. Miller; you have been round the ridges. They complain bitterly that their valuation has increased by 800 per cent and they have to pay eight times as much in rates. Quite a few honourable members have spoken about that. In my opinion, problems arise because aldermen and councillors express differing opinions. One explains it to a land-owner in one way; another explains it in another way. People become very confused. I have heard about the booklet that has been put out; in fact, I have seen it. However, most people still are not quite sure what the situation is. Statements appeared in the Press after the last valuation of the Pine Rivers Shire. Some councillors spelt out the situation very clearly and must have eased the minds of many people, but some did not. Although it was only a slight difference in interpretation, it made people quite confused. I believe that the problem could be overcome.

We all know that if a valuation rises by 300 per cent, and the valuation is the average, it makes no difference to the rates—provided the council is honest and does not want to get more money. It does not affect the rates if everything is taken into account. If everything is explained, people understand; if not, confusion sets in.

A further problem arose in the Pine Rivers Shire with A.P.M. Forests. When I was a councillor on the shire, it made sure that no appeals had been lodged before it struck the rate. After it struck the rate, objections were lodged by A.P.M. Forests, the objections were heard and the valuation was decreased. That was a bit of a set-back to the council, because it did not obtain from the company's land the rates that it had budgeted for. This aspect should be tidied up. The Valuer-General's Department should have a fair indication of whether appeals are likely to be upheld or not, and there should be no need for a shire to find itself in that position.

I believe that the land held by A.P.M. is valued on a primary industry basis. Its timber-growing operation will be a secondary industry and the forests that are growing on land that it occupies around Petrie contain one-crop pine. I believe that subsequently the area will be subdivided—provided land values rise and the company can be assured of taking a good deal of money out of the district. All those things should

be taken into account in the valuation of an area. If a company is able to get away with that type of valuation and rating, John Citizen has to make up the difference in the budget and pay the additional money. It imposes a heavy burden on him.

I want to raise again a matter that I referred to during the discussion on the Estimates presented by the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Water Resources. I was talking about an area of land owned by the Stradbroke Waters organisation and associated companies. Some of the articles that I quoted at that time show quite clearly that the local authorities had intended to let the development take place in the area and that certain things happened. The project never got off the ground.

I want to read from a statement that was sent to me, as follows—

“In September 1976, following representations by the landholding Companies, the Hon. the Premier wrote to the Albert Shire and Gold Coast City Councils confirming that it had not been Cabinet intent that the 1970 Cabinet Decision restraints be applied to freehold and Crown leasehold lands.

“As no apparent action resulted, landholding Companies with the Premier's knowledge and consent, referred to the Parliamentary Commissioner for Administrative Investigations (Sir David Longland) the matter of their complaints. In March 1977 the Parliamentary Commissioner apparently reported to Cabinet that some administrative actions taken by Government Departments and the Albert Shire Council the subject of the Companies' complaints, ‘could be subject to criticism.’ As a result, Cabinet reconvened the Working Committee under the aegis of the Co-ordinator General.

“According to the investors the findings of the reconvened Working Committee, as recorded in its Minutes (referred for comment of the landowner Company), confirmed that the Working Committee had made erroneous findings and recommendations in respect of their lands.

“However, the Working Committee, having been appointed to sit in judgment on itself, apparently found itself free of any fault as following a meeting on the 26-6-77 between the Hon. the Premier, Albert Shire Councillors, Mr. I. Gibbs M.L.A. and Mr. Don Young of the Department of the Co-ordinator General (the Chairman of the reconvened Working Committee) Cabinet decided (on the 5-7-77) that the Report ‘will not be altered.’”

The valuations would be affected by some of the land deals that were made at the time. Because of the bungling between the shire, the Gold Coast City Council and this Government, the genuine land-owners will now be paying much higher rates than they would have paid if this had not been started. Either the Government should have

acted correctly when the applications were made or the Valuer-General should have considered those people who were speculating, in contrast with other landholders in the district.

I shall now quote from a letter written to the manager of Co-Ownership Land Development Pty. Ltd. by the Albert Shire Council. It reads, in part—

“re: South Stradbroke Waters

Application for Subdivision of Pors. 7 & 43, Subs. 1 & 2, Por. 1 & Lease Areas, P/Currigee.

“Further to your above application for subdivision on the 9th February 1973, I wish to advise that Council are agreeable to extend the approval given on 9th November 1965, on Por. 3 and Sub. 1, Por. 1, P/Currigee, to include the area above under the following conditions:—

“The subdivision of the entire area totalling 175 ha., will be considered as one approval.

“The density of the development shall be approx. 3000 people and will consist of a hotel and commercial centre, boatel, sports facilities and associated management buildings, 555 single residential lots and 420 units.”

With that type of development approved by the local authority, I can guarantee that the valuation of adjacent properties will be based on the sale price of the land. When the sale fell flat, the land could not be sold at anywhere near the price obtained, and the machinery is rusting because development has stopped. But the main point is that the valuation is not a true indication of values in this area.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (Ipswich West) (7.56 p.m.): I rise principally to speak about mapping and associated matters. A good map is a useful tool and a wonderful source of information, but a bad map is dangerous.

In 1974 a number of areas in my electorate were seriously affected by flooding. Quite a number of homes were swept away and a large number of homes were inundated. Yesterday, several years after the flood, I released a media statement warning people about rebuilding on blocks where homes had been swept away in Sydney Street, Brassall, or on land that had been completely or partially inundated, because I thought they were unaware of the true facts. If I wanted to build a home, I would not build it in Sydney Street, Brassall. The river literally swept away homes that looked quite safe. Because my warning was well received by the media, it was run several times.

As well as warning people about purchasing certain land in Ipswich and telling them how to check land and homes to see whether they were flood affected, I included information supplied to me by the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads on 8 August 1978 in answer to a question that

I had asked. The question and answer were in these terms—

“(1) With reference to the Karana Downs Estate, Mt. Crosby, how many of the blocks of land are subject to flooding?

“(2) What is the frequency and type of flooding and in what portions of the estate are these blocks?

“Answer:—

“(1 & 2) I am advised in relation to the Karana Downs Estate that—

“(a) The estate is subdivided into 422 residential and park residential allotments.

“(b) Of these 422 allotments, 17 were completely inundated in the 1974 flood, while 127 were partially affected. These allotments are located mainly in the Stage I development area of the estate.

“(c) The number of allotments that could be completely inundated in a 1 in 20 frequency flood is estimated to be nil, while it is estimated that 80 allotments would be partially affected.

“(d) The main areas of the estate affected by flooding are adjacent to the river and the main gully running through the centre of the estate.”

Dr. Lockwood: I have seen the 1893 flood of Ipswich—

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I thought you were rather decrepit.

Dr. Lockwood: I have seen photos of it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Yesterday I was contacted by a person named Peter Toohey, the sales manager of Karana Downs Estate, who informed me that he was the general manager supervising the estate. In fact, he is the manager for Estate Sales & Management Pty. Ltd. The sales office is situated at Mt. Crosby Road, Karana Downs. He was rather upset about my reported statement in the media, particularly that part in which Karana Downs was mentioned. Naturally enough, because there is a large development there he thought he was going to lose business over it.

I raised this matter to warn people. I used this example of a large development in the Ipswich area where the full facts of the flooding situation have not been brought to the attention of the buying public. I will draw to the attention of the Committee this evening some excerpts from the large billboards on the estate advertising the land and facilities available. One reads—

“Flood-free building sites all blocks. Exclusive park land (including 50 acres on the river bank)”.

Of course, part of those 50 acres on the river bank are Crown land and do not belong to the estate. Any proper map would show that. The map on the billboard, however, does not make that distinction. It does not show any flood levels. In fact, Mr. Peter Toohey denies that the land he is selling has been flooded. He told me

that he took up his present position about 18 months ago. He assures me that at that stage he made inquiries about the land being flooded and discovered that none had been flooded. Naturally enough, he questions the information supplied to me by the Minister. I have no reason to doubt the Minister's information, and in fact I will substantiate it very shortly.

Another billboard on the same estate reads—

"Absolute river frontages flood free."

Another billboard depicts village allotments in a yellow colour. But some of the sections shown on that particular map are not flood-free allotments; they were definitely flooded. The quotations on those two billboards are definitely in conflict with the information shown on Government maps, which I think are excellent, and the information supplied by the Minister for Local Government.

To substantiate the Minister's information about the land being flooded, I have here a cadastral map for Kholo Creek, sheet No. 9442-141. This map was printed in April 1977 and shows the Karana Estate subdivisions up to that stage. Unfortunately it does not contain more recent subdivisions. This map is drawn to a scale of 1:10,000, the same as the flood map supplied by the Minister. There is a wealth of information on the back of that flood map which was printed in 1975.

Fortunately, records of the flood levels for this section of the Brisbane River were kept. If one of the maps was transparent and could be laid over the other map, we could see that quite a number of the subdivisions on the Karana Downs Estate, including the park residential area bordering streets named Billagall Drive and Tanderra Way, which are shown on this map, were definitely inundated in the 1974 flood. In addition, the allotments in the area known as Karana Village were totally or partially inundated. I recently visited the area with the intention of taking some photographs, but unfortunately my Polaroid camera was not working.

Mr. R. J. Gibbs: You should have had a Box Brownie.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Of course, the Box Brownie was infallible. Technology pushed it out the door.

I also took some soil samples and gathered some information which I will supply shortly. When compared with the flood map, this cadastral map definitely shows—

Mr. Moore: What does "cadastral" mean? You keep using the word. Tell me what it means.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The honourable member has been in Parliament a long time. He should know what it means.

Mr. Moore: Tell me what "cadastral" means. Do you know?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Come and have a look at it later.

Mr. Moore: Tell me what it means. You're using the word all the time. You don't even know what it means.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Why does the honourable member not make a speech and ask the Minister what it means if he wants to be informed? I am not here to inform him about map titles. The map is definitely correct. There are a number of allotments which begin on high ground and run down very steep banks to the river. Consequently, in most floods these lots are partially inundated. Lots to the east of the village have been partially or totally inundated by floodwaters. The information on the flood map is not totally correct, but there is enough margin for error to say definitely that a large number of allotments were partially inundated and a small number of allotments were totally inundated.

As I said before I was interrupted by the member for Windsor, I have made several inspections of this area. I made one just the other day to check my facts. A street named Wandoo Court in a new subdivision, which is not shown on this map, is definitely only a bituminised gully. I have here a sample of soil from the allotments bordering this particular area. Most people who have been down to the banks of rivers picnicking would recognise river alluvial black soil when they saw it. I have here a sample, which I will table with the other samples shortly, that members can inspect. This is a sample of the soil taken from lot 257. Many of the adjacent allotments are on a similar level to this lot. These allotments are on an isthmus between the gully and the river. They are definitely on one of the lowest sections of the estate. If there was a fairly large flood, two things could happen as a result of the power of the Brisbane River at that point. The ground on which these dwellings are constructed—there are two under construction at the moment—could be washed away, or the buildings themselves could be swept away. The house on lot 9 bordering Billagall Drive is built on a mound of earth. It is surrounded by very low level ground. I will not waste the time of the Committee by opening up the map and reading out the figures, but it is there for all to see. There is a similar situation with lot 257. Even if the soil was not washed away in a flood, there could be subsidence.

Because of what I was told by the manager of this particular real estate company on two occasions, because of the information contained in the signs and because of the lack of information supplied on the maps provided by the real estate company, I would urge the Minister and his department to take some measures to ensure that maps and diagrams provided by real estate developers and agents contain legitimate information so that people purchasing land are aware that it is in a flood-prone area. I am not saying that all flood-prone areas should not be developed, but I am saying that people who buy such

land should be fully informed about it beforehand. They may not be aware that the land they are buying is in a flood-prone area. A number of the areas to which I have referred this evening do not appear as if they have ever been flooded. I feel that something should be done so that people are made fully aware that certain areas are flood prone.

I have another map here that was put out by a real estate agent in about 1972 or 1973. It is titled "Yarrowalla Charolais Stud". I spoke about this in an earlier session of the Parliament. The map was prepared by V. B. F. Nichols, Authorised Surveyor, of 303 Adelaide Street, Brisbane. It is another Glyn Moore Pty. Ltd. Development. The map of the land supplied by the vendors to the purchasers has subdivisions dotted on it. The subdivisions have never taken place, and never will. I inspected this land some time back and found that most of it was river flats. The ooze coming out of the ground could be smelt. That is the second case where floodable land has been put on sale.

Another case is called "Millmerran Woods—the alternatives". It is a Development Equity Corporation project, a subsidiary of the Bond Corporation. I worked in the Millmerran area and spent my early years there, so I know a little about it. The glossy brochure I have contains four maps of the area, stages 1 to 4. It includes visual descriptions of the area, acreages and lot numbers, but that is all. No gullies or creek beds are mentioned. Also, there are no rainfall statistics, which are very important. The project is written up as "the alternatives", a place where people are encouraged to take up lots as an investment, and to go out and build themselves a log cabin and run a few goats or whatever else they want to do—freeze in the winter nights and die of thirst in the summer days!

In the early days Millmerran was a dairying area and had its own dairy factory. However, the poor rainfall in the area caused that industry to die out. The brochure should contain information such as the soil type and rainfall statistics so that a person wishing to invest would not be buying blind. If a person from Sydney wished to invest in this land—a number from Sydney have purchased land in this development—he does not have the time or the money to venture out to Millmerran to inspect it. Some people might consider the area attractive as a retreat from the city. Once they got out there they may have a few good seasons, but a lot of bad ones would follow, and they would find that they could not continue living their alternative life-style. In fact, they would find that they had been had, just as the people who purchased flood-prone land were had. This is caused by the fact that real estate agents are not forced to give proper and full information.

Mr. Davis: A lot of the Liberal members are laughing. They have their finger in the pie.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I guess they have.

Not only is it the responsibility of developers and vendors of land to make sure that purchasers are supplied with the correct information, it is also the responsibility of finance companies who finance the projects. As well as the people who purchase the land, finance companies also carry liabilities. They have a responsibility to the people to whom they make loans and to their investors. We have witnessed the recent collapse of A.S.L. That was caused by its irresponsible approach to lending during the period of the land and building boom.

I now refer to the Karana Downs establishment. The United Dominion Corporation Limited is the financing organisation for that project. I presume that that company has financed the purchase of land and houses in flood-prone positions on that development. Even though the 1974 flood can be regarded statistically as one in 50 years, there is no guarantee that it will be another 50 years before there is a similar flood. One only has to read the information contained on the flood map to see that the frequency of high flooding in both the Bremer and Brisbane Rivers is not, on average, one every 50 years. Even though the Wivenhoe Dam is now under construction, there is no guarantee that it will be completed on schedule. There is always a possibility that a major flood may occur between now and the completion of that dam. It has been calculated that after the completion of the Wivenhoe Dam there will be a 2 m fall in the level at the Brisbane port. However, there is no correlation between that and the level in the area of Ipswich, the Karana Downs Estate in particular.

I have here three other samples of soil taken from the area, which the map shows to be a flood-prone area. I have inspected it and believe that it is prone to flooding. I have a sample from lot 263, a sample from lot 40 and a sample from lot 44. As honourable members will see when I table them, these samples of earth are quite definitely sandy and heavy loam—alluvial soils. Two of the samples contain river stones. Anyone who has a sprinkling of geological knowledge will recognise their smoothness. The village area of the Karana Downs Estate is built on a bend of the Brisbane River. It is on the inside bend of the river. Any member who remembers his geography will know that on the inside of a bend the water slows and drops its alluvial debris. The evidence is there for all to see. Before I conclude on this subject, I allude once again to the maps and diagrams supplied by this company.

(Time expired.)

Whereupon the honourable member laid the soil samples on the table.

Mr. R. J. GIBBS (Wolston) (8.16 p.m.): I enter the debate this evening to raise a matter which is of extreme importance to the people in my electorate—a matter that I

find very disturbing, because ultimately it will affect valuations in the area bounded by Mill and Bertha Streets, Goodna.

I raise this issue tonight because of happenings in that part of the Wolston electorate over the last few weeks. A gentleman by the name of Mr. Ted Callander previously operated on this site a business known as Goodna Auto Ports, which in itself was a drive-in help-yourself type of repair service. In other words, a person could take his car in there seven days a week, borrow the tools and equipment for a set fee and carry out repairs on his own motor vehicle. The reason I was concerned about that type of business was its effect on valuations. Particularly at weekends, the area seemed to be fraternised by, if I could use the term, a lot of hoons using souped-up cars. They were causing a great disturbance. At the time a number of houses were for sale, and I know that estate agents encountered difficulties selling them because of the effect that disturbance was having.

Since then, because of lack of support of the business, although the company has not gone into liquidation, it has incurred heavy debts. I am reliably informed that its indebtedness at this stage is of the order of \$20,000.

Mr. Austin: Are you talking about survey and valuation?

Mr. R. J. GIBBS: I am indeed. I am very concerned not only at the effect that Goodna Auto Ports had on the valuation of the area but also about the future proposals this gentleman has for that same property.

A number of weeks ago Mr. Callander floated the idea of applying to the Ipswich City Council to have the area rezoned so that he could set up a pin-ball and disco establishment, in which he claimed he would invest \$200,000. I make one thing very clear to the Committee, as I have already made it clear to the people in my electorate: I will vehemently oppose any such application for the rezoning of that site. I am concerned about the influence such an establishment would have on the area, which I will touch on shortly, and I am also worried that it would affect valuations to an even greater degree than the previous business.

Mr. Milliner: My word it would!

Mr. R. J. GIBBS: I appreciate the honourable member's expertise, and I agree with his interjection. It certainly would.

Last week I was so concerned about the matter that I issued a statement to the local Press pointing out that, in my opinion, the establishment of a disco and pin-ball centre in the area would affect valuations adversely, and that, in the light of evidence given to the inquiry in New South Wales that disco and pin-ball machine areas lent themselves to youth crime, the encouragement of youth crime also concerned me. There is high unemployment in the Goodna area of my electorate, and it must follow that many

young people will be there all day putting their money in pin-ball machines. One then asks the question: How are they going to finance this compulsive habit that they have acquired?

Mr. Scassola interjected.

Mr. R. J. GIBBS: I know that the honourable member is interested. If he will hear me out, I will take his interjection. This afternoon, I had a ring from the local police in my area. They advised me that they, in company with two members of the Juvenile Squad, had just been to visit a young lad at Inala who had stolen \$700 from his father, who had been saving for a holiday. The lad had lifted the money out of a drawer and put it through the pin-ball machines in a little over four days. That frightens me, because I believe that it could have an effect on my electorate. Valuations will certainly be affected if there is an incidence of crime of that type.

Mr. Scassola: Don't you agree that that sort of thing is clear evidence that these machines are addictive?

Mr. R. J. GIBBS: I definitely believe that they are addictive. In fact, I am going to suggest to the Minister that, under his portfolio of Survey and Valuation, there would be a reasonable case for saying that centres of this type should be classified as noxious industries because of their effect on an area.

To re-emphasise my concern, I bring to the attention of honourable members the fact that because I objected to this establishment being erected in my electorate, this morning I received through the mail a solicitor's letter from the person concerned alleging defamation. I assure the Committee that it will have absolutely no effect on my efforts to ensure that the application for rezoning is rejected. In addition, he committed one of the most dastardly deeds that I have heard of.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Miller): Order! I remind the honourable member that we are dealing with Survey and Valuation. Although I agree with the honourable member that certain industries may affect valuations, I would appreciate it if he would refer to the valuation of properties that are being affected by the rezoning.

Mr. R. J. GIBBS: I agree with you, Mr. Miller, and I shall be guided by your ruling.

In spite of the fact that the centre may represent an investment of about \$200,000, I have had a number of complaints since its establishment was first mooted. In fact, last night my phone ran hot with people ringing me and saying that they objected very strongly to the centre being built because the valuation of their properties would be effected adversely by the noise that would emanate from it. At the moment, I am organising a petition in the area, which I hope to present to the Minister personally, accompanied by a number of the residents of the area, and make representations to him.

There could be an adverse effect not only from the noise but also from crime associated with the centre. There is a hotel only about 50 metres from the proposed site of the pin-ball parlour and disco centre. It goes without saying that young people of 18 years of age and over will be frequenting the hotel, going back to the disco and causing undue disturbances during the evening. This will no doubt bring the police into it, thereby tying them up after hours. All this will greatly affect valuations in the area.

I urge the Minister to consider classifying pin-ball parlours and disco centres as noxious industries. I hope that they are not allowed to be built, but if they are they should be built well out in the bush where they will not do any damage or harm to anyone in the community.

Mr. SHAW (Wynnum) (8.26 p.m.): The subject of valuation is one that is very close to the hearts of most people. Unfortunately, it is very much misunderstood by many.

I am concerned that a very small section of the community seem to be able to take advantage of the law to have their valuations reconsidered. A great number of stories and old wives' tales are told about what is taken into consideration when valuations are arrived at and what can be done about them. When a great deal of sewerage work was carried out in Brisbane, I even heard that anyone who had a sewerage manhole in his property simply had to notify the Valuer-General to obtain an automatic discount in his valuation. A great number of stories of that kind have been circulated, with the result that many people misunderstand the manner in which valuations are arrived at.

It would do a great deal to clear up some of the misunderstanding if valuations were equal to the market value. I know that some people would immediately object to that because they believe if their valuation is high their rates will be correspondingly high. That, of course, is not true.

A valuation attaching to a particular property is not important from the point of view of rates. What is important is the relativity between a valuation and those of similar properties in the area. If other properties in an area are valued at a low level and one landholder's property is valued at a proportionately high level, his rates will be higher than the others. The actual value attaching to the property does not affect the contribution made by way of payment of rates on it.

It would be much better if the valuations that were applied very closely followed the market value. If that were done, people would be able to judge in a much more certain fashion whether the contribution they were making by way of rates was higher or lower than it should be. Human nature being what it is, if it is lower, they will not complain; if it is higher, they will.

There is a great deal of evidence to support the very strong belief that in applying valuations the department differentiates in favour of some sections against others. The belief that is very strongly held is that people in residential areas have valuations closer to the market value than those applied to land that is used commercially. If that is so, that is the wrong way to grant concessions. If there is to be any reduction in rates levied on particular properties, those reductions should be brought about not by way of the valuations but by the local authorities concerned and on a basis that is clearly seen and understood by everybody. This would enable the public to judge whether or not the rebates that are granted are fair and reasonable.

I am not arguing in any way that in many instances reductions should not be granted. Provision is made for valuations to be reduced subsequent to a rezoning of property. But compensation paid in a lump sum at the time of rezoning would be more effective than the fixation of a lower valuation by the Valuer-General's Department. Quite often the Valuer-General's adjustment is not made until some time after a rezoning. It is very difficult for people who are not well versed in buying and selling real estate to establish to what extent their property has been devalued. I repeat that compensation by way of a lump sum would be much better than the setting of a lower valuation fixed by the Valuer-General's Department.

The Minister told us that he believed the unimproved valuation system was inappropriate and that it needed reform. I am sure that, like me, many other people wholeheartedly agree with him. The principle of rating of unimproved valuation is completely wrong. In fact, we do not have true unimproved valuations. The Valuer-General considers improvements when fixing values.

It is very difficult to understand why people who have had the foresight or good fortune to buy in an area in which the values increase should be required to make higher contributions to the cost of running the city. On the other hand, a widow or an elderly person who has raised a family and lived in a home for a long time quite often does not want to live elsewhere. However, when development occurs and valuations rise because others want to live there or wish to redevelop blocks, the older residents are forced to leave their properties because of high ratings. That is a fact of life which, I am sure, the Minister agrees is most unfortunate, and something that we should be trying to avoid.

I repeat that our valuation system is not really based on unimproved capital values. That statement is borne out by the effect of the coming of sewerage to an area. All the properties in the area are immediately revalued. If our system is based on the unimproved capital value, it is hard to see why valuations should increase when sewerage is provided.

The system is unfair to small land-owners not only in the way in which valuations are fixed but in the way they are treated when they seek an alteration in valuation. People in business, and those who deal in land and understand the law, are better equipped to apply for lower valuations than normal house owners.

This year's departmental report supports my contention. Most applications for reduced valuations are rejected. Where they have been granted, the reductions have been of a fairly small amount. The two notable exceptions in the report were in the Maroochy Shire and the Redland Shire. The reasons given for the reductions are very interesting. In the Maroochy Shire the percentage reduction was 25.6. In most other cases the percentage was .8, .9, 8 per cent, 1.5 per cent and so on, which is a fairly big difference from 25.6 per cent. The department has seen fit to point out the reason for that difference, and I think most people would appreciate its action. The report states—

"The reduction in Maroochy Shire arose primarily from large reductions in two valuations where the granting of concessional valuations for land exclusively used for the business of primary production was determined in the owners favour."

I think this bears out the argument I am putting forward that large reductions occur only in isolated cases where people know what it is all about.

Without going into it in great detail, I think that the whole argument in favour of a reduction for primary producers is reflected in what I am saying, that reductions of this type would be better granted as reductions in the rate in the dollar for the particular purpose by the local authority concerned. The local authority is in the best position to see whether in fact the areas concerned are still being used legitimately for primary production, and to see that those reductions are continually updated. In most cases home owners wonder whether primary producers are receiving that sort of reduction or whether they are receiving both a reduction on their valuation and a reduction from the local authority.

Turning again to the report, we see that the second significant reduction was one of 37.13 per cent in the Redland Shire. The explanation given by the department was—

"Substantial reductions were made in a small number of valuations in Redland Shire for lands with subdivisional potential. The Land Court considered that a more conservative valuation should be determined due to market uncertainties for land of this type."

Without knowing the particulars of that case, I venture to say that the claim was made by people who are well versed in the values of subdivisional land.

That is not the case with the average person who, perhaps even in that shire, may have a large block of land which does have

some subdivisional potential and has been valued accordingly. Those people would not realise that the opportunity existed for them to make that sort of appeal to have their valuation reconsidered. What I am trying to say, and I think the Minister would agree, is that there is a continuing need to keep people informed of their rights as far as land valuation is concerned and to give to them an understanding of just how a valuation is arrived at. They could then decide whether or not to make an appeal.

At the same time, I think it would be of advantage to the community at large if the people were able to judge for themselves whether they were making a relatively fair contribution. This is something that is exercising the minds of people. Whenever valuations are sent out, I receive phone calls from people, as I am sure other members do, in which they ask, "Are these things true? Can we get compensation for all these other points?"

I recall that, following the amendment to the Act in 1977, statements were made, sometimes by politicians, to people in the Brisbane area telling them that the amendment provided that their valuations could be adjusted if their house was built on two allotments. I think the amendment appears in the Act as section 13 (2) (k). People were given to understand that if a house was built on two 16-perch allotments, the owner would be able to have the valuation reconsidered.

The Valuer-General's Department must have been flooded with applications. I know that I received hundreds of phone calls from people who wanted to know how they could apply for a reduction in their valuation. They had been informed that if their house was built on two 16-perch allotments, they could get a reduction in the valuation. In fact, that was not the case. The people must have been very disappointed when they found that their valuations remained as they were.

I think that the present system of valuation operates very much in favour of the wheeler-dealer. That brings me to a statement made by the Minister. He took great pride in saying that the costs charged by his department were low. He said that his department provided a very good service to the people. They could go to it and have searches carried out for any property in Queensland.

I submit to him that in the boom years this system was misused, and it will be misused again if there is an uplift in land values. Estate agents used the facilities provided by the department as a means of ripping off people who had been living in an area for a long time and did not understand that the value of their homes had increased. Real estate agents used the department's facilities to have searches carried out. They found out the owners of properties, then went along to them and

said, "We offer you a figure for your property." The amounts seemed very attractive to them. They signed sale contracts, but all too often they found, when they went to purchase a new home, that they did not have sufficient funds to buy it. The facilities of the department should be used for legitimate purposes only.

Another facility provided by the department which can be misused is aerial mapping. Aerial maps are of benefit, particularly to local authorities and to people compiling legitimate statistics. They can provide departments with information as to where houses are sited on properties. We do not know, for instance, how many swimming-pools there are in Brisbane. We could find that out from detailed aerial maps. These maps have many legitimate uses, but they are also put to some uses which I think should be avoided. One practice which should be avoided is that of salesmen getting maps in order to obtain details of homes. They then go and pester owners of the homes. In order to sell their product, they can use the service to give their particular business an air of authority. They come along with information that impresses the householder. They have found out something that gives the householder the impression that, because they have this information, they have some sort of standing in the community. I urge the Minister to ensure that such services are not misused in that way.

Hon. J. W. GREENWOOD (Ashgrove—Minister for Survey and Valuation) (8.45 p.m.): First of all—

Mr. Scott: This will be a dissertation.

Mr. GREENWOOD: It will be as short as I can make it.

First of all I should acknowledge the contribution made by the honourable member for Everton. He was the first speaker on the Opposition side and made a number of fundamental but useful points. He began by saying that he knew that the levying of rates had nothing to do with the Valuer-General's Department. I welcome that remark because, of course, it represents a widespread fallacy in the community. He made some complimentary remarks about the inclusion of the pamphlet in future valuation notices, and the provisions in this State for objection conferences. Each of those was a valuable comment, and I shall certainly pass them on.

He also referred to the setting up of a tribunal in the place of the Land Court. I simply say that in my view the Land Court is probably a much better tribunal than the one he suggested. It is a tribunal composed of experts on land values, men of considerable experience. Indeed, the operation of the Land Court has met with widespread satisfaction. I do not really know of any serious criticism of the professional standards demonstrated by the members of that court.

He also made the point that in his view it is important to abolish legal representation.

He said that many people refrain from going to the court through fear of costs. I have already mentioned that the practice of the court is not to award costs, so that people can go there without any fear of costs being awarded against them. I also made the point that people are free to appear in that court in their own right; there is no requirement that they brief a barrister or solicitor to appear for them.

I add that if the right to brief counsel or a solicitor to go to court is abolished, then the rights of the uneducated, the uninformed and the humble people of this world are seriously diminished. That is a point that should be remembered. A big company can afford to have lawyers on its staff. In fact, it can afford to have a team of lawyers. If the Cambridge Credits of this world are not allowed to brief outside solicitors, they will smile and say, "We have plenty on our own staff". A situation such as that puts the ordinary man at a disadvantage. I commend that point of view to the honourable member opposite.

The honourable member for Everton also made the point about a valuation notice he received in November 1978 in respect of land he did not own. I have had that matter checked. It apparently results from a notice given to the Valuer-General's Department by a firm of conveyancers, Milliner & Garde. It must have been given in mistake. It has been rectified.

The member for Callide was the next speaker in the debate. He is a member of my committee—an extremely hard-working member. He always draws attention to any land valuation problems in his electorate. I thank him for his contribution and for the work that he has put in to that committee. He made a useful point on fees which I should reply to.

He questioned a situation where a surveyor quoted \$2,000 for the survey of a line which the owner cleared, and then charged \$3,000. I would simply point out that the new legislation controlling the practice of surveying does enable surveyors to perform their work at the least cost. It is very different from the earlier legislation, which enforced detailed procedures, irrespective of the needs of a particular survey or of the owner of the property. I would, however, add that estimating the cost of a survey is not a simple matter. If the marks of earlier surveys are not readily available and cannot be found, it may be necessary to spend a considerable amount of time finding the original marks. In Government surveys, of course, officers of the department would be available to investigate the performance of Government surveyors; but for private surveys the Queensland Division of the Institution of Surveyors has a fees assessment committee, which will arbitrate between an owner and a surveyor on application. If that sort of thing should happen to one of his constituents in future, the honourable member should bear that in mind.

The honourable member for Pine Rivers, who spoke next, is also a member of my committee. I thank him for the description of the modern plant and technology presently being used in these fields in different parts of Australia, particularly his description of the flat-bed and drum plotters.

The member for Bundaberg spoke about the problems of pensioners. This is a matter which I think is close to all our hearts, because it really is a very serious problem, particularly in coastal areas. As the Committee knows, there is power given to local authorities under the Local Government Act for the remission of rates. It is largely a matter for those local authorities whether they choose to exercise it. I should not make further comment on this. It is really a matter for the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads, but I will say that I fully appreciate the problem that he has referred to.

The member for Bundaberg further asked that some mention be made in my reply to differential rating and the progress that is being made in that direction. He will recall that the Minister for Local Government introduced a number of amendments to the Local Government Act last year. They give councils a great deal of flexibility—flexibility that they did not previously possess in levying differential rates. This resulted from a continuing review by both of us of some of the problems concerned with valuation and rating.

The member for Redlands was the next speaker in the debate. I thank him for the complimentary remarks he made about the department and the valuers. The point that he made about the town plan is certainly taken by me. I think that it could be summed up this way: the likelihood of obtaining a consent use with respect to a block of land is something that affects its value. It is often extremely difficult for a valuer or anybody else to assess the likelihood of obtaining that consent. Frequently the best guidance can be obtained not from the town plan itself but from the policy plans or the strategy plans that lie behind the official town plan. Certainly the remarks he made that valuers should concentrate on those strategic plans are well taken on board and will be passed on.

The member for Redlands referred also to the problem of split valuations, the delay in providing split valuations and the hardship that it causes to people who may have already sold the land. This is a problem of long standing. I simply say that I am very conscious of the problem. It has proved intractable, for the reasons the member gave. We are at present doing all we can to remedy the underlying cause.

The honourable member for Wavell was the next speaker. His was a scholarly speech, ranging from King Christian IV of Denmark and referring to old buildings and the rating problems associated with them, the desirability of rehabilitating old buildings, and the fact that high valuation inhibits that rehabilitation.

I cannot help thinking of, for example, the National Bank when a point such as that is made: a bank of about three or so storeys on a site where one could, under existing town plans in Brisbane, put a building of 27 or 28 storeys. Obviously, the Valuer-General, bound under his Act to value all land at the highest and best use when he selects an unimproved value for that site, has to select a value that reflects the potential earning capacity of a block on which one could erect a 27 or 28-storey building, and that, of course, is very much more than the actual earning capacity of that site with its three or four-storey building on it.

The answer obviously is to value such sites not in accordance with their potential and their zoning but in accordance with the actual use to which an unimproved site is currently being put. It is a solution that involves a number of problems, but it is a solution that I assure honourable members has been under active consideration for some 12 months. It is one of a number of solutions that are under consideration, and I should mention in that regard the practice in New York City in the United States of America, which uses Transferable Development Rights in order to achieve the same end.

The honourable member for Lytton was the next speaker, and the first points in his speech concerned a reform of the Act. He asked why there were not more reforms forthcoming. I simply suggest to him that he look at the statute-book in recent years, and he will certainly see that if the reforms have not been as numerous as he would like they have certainly not been non-existent, and quite substantial and significant reforms have been introduced since the major ones of 1971.

He then posed a long series of questions, and if I may trespass a little on the time of the Committee at this hour of the night, I will try to answer them very quickly. You will forgive me, Mr. Miller, if I cannot do so with the same rapidity as that with which Mr. Burns asked them.

His first question was: What are the advantages in economy and efficiency in dividing the Valuer-General's Department into district offices in Brisbane? The second was: What has been the total cost of dividing the departments into district offices in Brisbane? In reply, may I say that district valuers have existed throughout the State since 1946. However, in 1975, following a survey by officers of the Public Service Board in conjunction with officers of the Valuer-General's Department, the Brisbane office administration was divided into the central administration and four district offices. The senior officers of the department believe that this has facilitated the administration of the department and rendered it much more effective.

His third question was: What is the total cost of introducing the A.D.P. system into the Valuer-General's Department, and were

the persons who introduced the system qualified to do so? The A.D.P. section was established by Messrs. Ditchburn and Drysdale in 1967 and the conversion of all records was completed at the commencement of 1976. Messrs. Drysdale and Ditchburn were both accepted, after training, as members of the Australian Computer Society, having satisfied the requirements of that body. Mr. Drysdale is still a member but Mr. Ditchburn relinquished membership after transferring to another section of the department. The present officer in charge of the branch gained his position by experience and testing by the Public Service Board. One programmer has similarly been trained, and a graduate programmer was appointed this year. Conversion to computer has been a gradual process and costs are not available. However, the department is now recovering a large part of its computer-hire costs paid to the State Treasury by services to the general public and other Government departments. This statement does not include the salaries of the branch members and the like. In 1978-79, the cost of computer time was \$67,000 and in the same year, collections of computer fees totalled \$63,000.

The next question was: What is the total cost of internal building alterations in the Valuer-General's Department in each of the past two years? I am afraid that I cannot answer that question, as that work is performed by the Works Department and is not included in our records of expenditure.

Next: Was Russell Island valued by the Valuer-General's Department and did it then have to be revalued because the first valuation was incorrect? In answer, may I say that Russell Island was valued when it was first included in the Redland Shire in 1973, and the relevant date for the valuation was 31 March 1968. When the Redland Shire was revalued, Russell Island was revalued with the rest of the shire, that is as at 31 March 1976, effective from 30 June 1977.

Next: Are clerks being replaced by general assistants to avoid the cost of promoting them to classified positions in the department? In answer, clerks have been replaced by general assistants, mainly in the records and dispatch section, because of the nature of the work. The appointment of these general assistants has been successful and acceptable to people, particularly those not blessed with a Senior examination pass.

Next: Are valuers required to account for the time spent outside the office, and how is this time assessed and checked? In answer, valuers are covered by the Public Service Act and Regulations and, in the same way as other officers in the Public Service, have to account for their time. They have to furnish monthly returns of work performed.

Next: Will the Minister give a breakdown of the cost in relation to the salary paid to the secretary of the Valuers' Registration Board and the time he spends on secretarial duties during his normal duties as a clerk in the department? How much

is paid to the secretary of the board per annum over and above his clerical salary? In answer, may I say that the secretary to the Valuers' Registration Board is paid \$1,200 per annum allowance over and above his salary for work performed for the Valuers' Registration Board outside normal working hours. This amount is paid not from Consolidated Revenue but by the board from its own funds. The amount is fixed by regulations. The Valuers' Registration Board is not dependent upon Consolidated Revenue. The allowance was fixed and not very long ago, after consultation with the Public Service Board, it was increased.

Next: Will the Minister give a detailed estimate of costs for clerks in preparing appeals to the Land Court and alterations to values under sections 21A, 13 (ii) and 11 (1) (vii)? I am afraid that I cannot at present give detailed estimates of those costs.

Next: Is there any provision in the Valuers' Registration Act to reprimand or suspend incompetent valuers, as Land Court decisions show that valuers have been thousands of dollars out in their valuation? Were those valuers responsible ever reprimanded, suspended or dealt with by the board? In answer, I would quibble at the implied statement that the Land Court decisions show that valuers have been thousands of dollars out in their valuations. Certainly, Land Court decisions may have disagreed with the estimates of valuers from time to time. However, it must be remembered that valuation is not an exact science; it depends largely on opinion. When we are trying to estimate the clearing costs of land cleared 100 years ago or the filling costs of a gully that was filled in over 100 years ago, it is extremely difficult to envisage what was there. There is plenty of room for honest differences of opinion in such a case. I might say that a disciplinary provision is contained in section 20 of the Valuers' Registration Act, but no valuer from the Valuer-General's Department has ever been charged under that section.

Those were the specific questions that the honourable member for Lytton asked. His next point concerned overseas consultancy in South East Asia and other places. I would like to say a few words about that because there is a lot of work in South East Asia presently funded partly by the World Bank and partly by the Governments of the nations themselves. Many overseas companies from Europe and North America are tendering for that work. In many instances they are supported by their Governments in many ways. In other cases they are multinational companies with enormous cartographic resources at their disposal. The problem, as it seemed to me, was how we, in Queensland, were to give our Queensland companies that did not possess a \$250,000 cartographic camera or \$100,000 worth of special photographic development equipment, help to put in successful tenders for these jobs.

The policy that Cabinet adopted is two-fold. Firstly, we said to our Queensland companies, "When you tender, you can tell them that you have access to the most sophisticated equipment. You can list it, and we will make sure that you have access to our departmental equipment. Secondly, if you need specially skilled personnel who are not available in your organisations, we are prepared to second members of the Public Service with those skills to your organisation should you win one of these big contracts in South East Asia." That is the way we are trying to help Queenslanders.

Mr. Burns: Does that relate to every surveying group or only members of the A.C.S.?

Mr. GREENWOOD: It applies to every surveying group. I will not mention names, but I know that the honourable member for Lytton gets information from a certain source. However, I would say to the honourable member, "For goodness' sake, don't rely on it, because it is not very reliable."

Mr. Burns interjected.

Mr. GREENWOOD: The same man criticised the amount of work that he got. He said that work went only to members of the institution or A.C.S.

Mr. Burns: Mr. Serisier said that at Surf-air, you know. He said that you would only give it to A.C.S. members. He read that from the release. I will show you a copy of it.

Mr. GREENWOOD: I am telling the honourable member what happens. The man who gives the honourable member for Lytton a lot of information got \$46,000 worth of work. He is not a member of the institution or the A.C.S. He makes more noise than a dozen members of the A.C.S.

Mr. Burns: Will he get that assistance, the same as a member of the A.C.S.?

Mr. GREENWOOD: Yes, every Queensland taxpayer gets the assistance.

Mr. Burns: With due respect, I think that is a bit of bulldust.

Mr. GREENWOOD: The honourable member talked about figures earlier. The figures are kept very carefully and they are all available.

Honourable members will forgive me if I skip over fairly briefly some of the points that have been made, but I want to make one very quick point on Utah. That company came to the department asking for advice on certain suitable consultants. Advice was given. I might say that the selected consultant was not McGhie & Associates.

Mr. Burns: Are you saying that McDonald did not write a letter saying that Murray was no good and that Davies, McGhie & Company was the best of the other four?

Mr. GREENWOOD: I am not saying that at all. I am simply saying that the consultant selected by Utah was not McGhie & Associates.

Mr. Burns: I am saying that McDonald from your department picked out Davies, McGhie & Company. I do not believe that it is the responsibility of a member of the Liberal Party to promote one of his mates.

Mr. GREENWOOD: The honourable member can look at it that way if he likes. One can look at anybody giving somebody a bit of a compliment who they know is a good man. It will always be said, "Oh, they are only doing that because he is one of their mates."

Mr. Burns: But is that the job of your department?

Mr. GREENWOOD: I will give the honourable member the background to the case of Utah. One of the major responsibilities of my department, as the honourable member knows, is the co-ordination of surveys. The Survey Co-ordination Act placed certain responsibilities on everybody who is conducting a survey in this State. The department was informed by Utah that they intended to have surveys carried out in the Peak Downs area. The company informed the department that it was willing to perform the work to the department's specifications and make the resultant work available to it. The company sought the assistance of the department to advise on the most suitable consultants from a panel of companies which had submitted proposals to it. That is the background of the way the thing came to us and, quite frankly, I do think that is part of our job, if people ask for our professional opinion in a technical field, to give them honest advice. That is what we have done in this case.

I thank the honourable member for Toowoomba North for his contribution to the debate. He mentioned green laser technology.

In passing, may I pay a tribute to Australian enterprise and the Woomera research establishment and what they did in the development of the green laser technique.

I should also pay a compliment to the honourable member for Warwick for the contribution he made to the debate. His was a speech full of common-sense suggestions, and they will all be passed on to the appropriate authorities.

The honourable member for Archerfield is the next gent on the list. I have taken note of his request not to have anything named after him until after his death. That, too, will be passed on through the appropriate channels. There were three points he made with which I should deal. The first concerned the cost of furnishing my office. I am afraid I do not know what it was. I took the office over from my predecessor. Doubtless at some time in the distant past this work was carried out by the Works Department, and very nicely carried out, too.

The honourable member also referred to Mr. Davies and Mr. Serisier. It was suggested that they had offices that were too big

for them, and there was a document which the honourable member read to us at great length. I will simply say that when the Surveyor-General moved to the 18th floor of Watkins Place he moved into the office previously occupied by the Under Secretary of the Mines Department. Mr. Davies, the deputy director, moved into the office previously occupied by the assistant under secretary of the same department. Presumably these gentlemen had what they were ordinarily entitled to. I think I answered in detail a question about this subject in this Assembly on 2 October. I suggest the honourable member reads it.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: What about the car?

Mr. GREENWOOD: I am glad the honourable member mentioned that, because I think that was rather a reprehensible thing to say. I do not mind the honourable member having a crack at me.

It is completely untrue to say that in his use of the car the Valuer-General was in some way out of line. May I say that the Valuer-General is one of the most public-spirited men I know. He is provided by the Government with a vehicle registered in the same way, and on exactly the same terms, as the vehicle provided to every other permanent head in the State.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: Private plates?

Mr. GREENWOOD: Exactly the same as the vehicle provided to every other permanent head. Might I just point out to the honourable member that if he worked as hard as the permanent heads of our Public Service, we would all be a great deal better off.

Without mentioning in detail the other contributions to the debate because I am told that time is up, I simply thank all the honourable members who entered the debate and made such useful contributions.

At 9.16 p.m.,

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Miller): Order! By agreement, under the provisions of the Sessional Order agreed to by the House on 9 October, I shall now put the questions for the Vote under consideration and the balance remaining unvoted for Survey and Valuation.

The questions for the following Votes were put, and agreed to—

		\$
Survey and Valuation—		
Department of Valuer-General		5,512,430
Balance of Vote, Consolidated Revenue and Trust and Special Funds		10,862,842
Progress reported.		

STOCK ACT AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. W. D. Hewitt, Greenslopes, in the chair)

Hon. V. B. SULLIVAN (Condamine—Minister for Primary Industries) (9.18 p.m.): I move—

“That a Bill be introduced to amend the Stock Act 1915–1978 in certain particulars.”

The majority of the proposed amendments to the Act relate to disease control in livestock, with a few others of a minor machinery nature.

Among the principal amendments is a proposal to enable regulations under the Act to refer directly to relevant standards of such outside authorities as the Standards Association of Australia, the British Standards Institute, the National Biological Standards Laboratory or those approved by the Standing Committee on Agriculture. Its inclusion in the Stock Act would complement action taken when the Act was last amended to control the activities of veterinary laboratories in Queensland.

Regulations framed under the Act would then refer directly to relevant provisions of the Code of Good Manufacturing Practice for Therapeutic Goods, under the Commonwealth Government Therapeutic Goods Act 1966, which is administered by the National Biological Standards Laboratory. The code lays down standards for the construction, equipment and operation of laboratories producing biological preparations.

It also specifies the procedures and safeguards to be observed in order to ensure the efficiency of vaccines and other biological preparations and their freedom from cross-infection with extraneous pathogenic organisms.

The proposed amendment would simplify the drafting of regulations to control laboratories and obviate duplication of legislative material which is readily available. In addition, it would enable adoption of any of the standard definitions and rules of the Animal Health Committee of the Standing Committee on Agriculture, which relate to the national brucellosis and tuberculosis eradication scheme.

This is also relevant to another proposed amendment to the Act, which will make provision for regulations relating to disease eradication programmes. At the same time, the proposed amendment will allow reference to the relevant rules and codes of other bodies or organisations.

As honourable members may be aware, progress in the eradication of brucellosis and tuberculosis in this State has been excellent, due largely to the willing co-operation of the vast majority of owners, despite the recent recession in the industry.

I want to express publicly my gratitude for the co-operation received from farmers and graziers in such difficult times. Honourable members on both sides of the Chamber

are aware that people were hard pressed to employ labour because of the depressed nature of the industry in the last three or four years. Nevertheless, the scheme was not impeded and I have nothing but praise for the co-operation received from beef producers in this regard.

Of the 36,000 herds in the State, some 70 per cent have been tested. Of these, 250 are T.B. infected and 1,329 brucellosis infected, with a further 2,099 herds suspected of having brucellosis disease. The majority of the T.B.-infected herds are undergoing eradication testing, but some 30 to 40 are not, either because of isolation and lack of facilities and staff, or because the owners are unco-operative. Of the 3,428 brucellosis-infected and suspect herds, only four or five owners have refused to implement control and eradication measures.

This is of very great concern, because these herds are in more closely settled areas and, as brucellosis is much more infectious than tuberculosis, it can be readily spread by infected cattle. Such owners hinder the progress of eradication measures, and their herds present a continuing threat of reinfection to neighbours and others who have fully complied with such requirements, often at very considerable inconvenience and expense.

Mr. Burns: What happens if they refuse to co-operate?

Mr. SULLIVAN: We hope that common sense prevails. After all, this is a national scheme. It is to the benefit of beef producers that T.B. and brucellosis are eradicated. The Government will not allow a small number of people to jeopardise the scheme. We have power to do the job and make a charge against them. It is to be hoped that we will not have to resort to that.

In this regard it may be pointed out that total expenditure on eradication measures to the end of the financial year 1978-79 was in the vicinity of \$23,000,000, of which just over \$16,000,000 was provided by the industry and the remainder from Government funds. That was a considerable amount paid by the Government, and indicates what it is doing to assist the industry in this regard.

Failure of all owners to co-operate in eradication measures could place much of the expenditure on eradication thus far at risk. Furthermore, such failure also lessens the possibility of Queensland's meeting the 1983-84 deadline for provisionally free status for brucellosis and tuberculosis under the terms of the national eradication scheme. If we do not, our access to the United States meat market, at present worth some \$830,000,000 annually, could be placed in jeopardy. This is a matter that those people not co-operating—as I say, they are very much in the minority—have to bear in mind.

I point out that I have consulted the industry representatives on my Pastoral Advisory Committee concerning these matters and they have indicated their full support

for any measures that my department may take to require non-co-operating owners to comply with the requirements of the eradication scheme, particularly if there is any suggestion of infection in the herd. Some of the difficulties experienced in obtaining the co-operation of owners have resulted from a lack of adequate facilities on the property to inspect, test or treat stock.

I feel certain that honourable members would support the policy of my department that its officers and other persons in its employ should not be exposed to undue risk of injury when examining, treating or testing livestock on behalf of owners because of inadequate or insecure facilities. Furthermore, it is very difficult and time-consuming to ensure the efficiency of examinations, treatments or testing carried out with inadequate facilities.

Wherever possible in such circumstances, arrangements are made, with the co-operation of neighbours, for stock to be removed to some convenient and available yards with adequate facilities to enable their safe and efficient testing or treatment. This has been a considerable concession on the part of these stock owners whose herds in many cases were already cleared, and I heartily commend them for their co-operation.

However, in a recent case the owner of a brucellosis-infected herd, without facilities of his own, refused point blank to travel his stock to a neighbouring holding whose owner had consented to the use of his yard to allow them to be tested. This was despite a verbal agreement by the owner of the infected herd to make use of the yards, after the local inspector had made all the necessary arrangements. Honourable members will appreciate that this incident has resulted in extreme pressure from local producers who have obtained clean-herd status for my department to take positive action to compel the owner concerned to test his herd.

At present there is no provision in the Act to compel such an individual to take advantage of an offer to use an outside private facility or to travel to a centralised facility such as a clearing dip. This is considered to be a serious deficiency in existing powers to control and eradicate disease and it is proposed that this be overcome by an appropriate amendment to the Act.

There still remains a problem with the non-co-operative owner of an infected herd who has no suitable facilities of his own and no access to a suitable facility outside his holding. To meet these very exceptional circumstances, a proposed amendment will enable the Minister to authorise an inspector to require the erection of a suitable facility on the property by the non-co-operating owner. Of course, due cognisance will be taken of the financial capacity of the individual to carry out these requirements. This may include a holding or forcing yard as well as a crush or race.

It is regrettable that such powers are necessary, but in order to keep faith with the many thousands of owners who have

co-operated, and in order to maintain the momentum of the eradication scheme, such a provision is inescapable. It will, of course, be applied only as a measure of last resort, after all other measures to obtain co-operation have failed.

Somewhat similar circumstances prevail in relation to isolated outbreaks of cattle tick in tick-free areas of the State. In this regard, recent outbreaks of ticks at Isisford and the persistence of ticks in the McKinlay area are matters of concern.

It is considered that the powers to require an owner to remove stock to some available facility for treatment or to install suitable facilities to treat them may well be necessary in order to clear up these outbreaks with a minimum of disruption, effort and expenditure for all parties concerned. However, they will only be invoked as a last resort. The Act provides for the participation of authorised veterinary surgeons in disease-eradication programmes.

An amendment provides an indemnity for authorised veterinary surgeons against legal action in regard to any services to owners rendered under the provisions of the Act, provided these are carried out in good faith and without negligence on their part. Another amendment places certain restraints and requirements on them in relation to their performance of these services for the State.

One aspect of testing under the national brucellosis and tuberculosis eradication scheme has been a matter of concern. Cases have occurred where owners have disposed of stock that have given suspicious reactions to brucellosis testing before the animals could be retested or ordered to be destroyed. A proposed amendment will make it an offence to travel suspect cattle without written permission, as is the case with diseased stock, which include, of course, positive reactors to such testing. The written permission consists of a special permit, usually issued for movement direct to a point of slaughter, in which the disease-status of the animals is clearly indicated.

Conditions applying to permits and way-bills are to be amended to strengthen and clarify the existing provisions, which require the drover to have these in his personal possession while actually travelling stock and to produce them immediately on demand by an inspector, police officer or authorised property-owner. In cases where an inspector has granted permission for movement without a permit and the drover has in his possession a way-bill endorsed with the number of the permit issued to cover the movement, the name of the issuing officer and the date, this will meet all the legal requirements of the above provisions. The responsibility of owners to comply with all conditions entered on a permit, whether printed or written on it by an inspector, and the right of an inspector to amend or omit such conditions are more clearly defined by other proposed amendments.

It is also proposed to provide for the issue of concessional permits to horse-owners who move regularly between certain locations for the purpose of competing at pony club or similar equestrian events.

Under existing provisions of the Act, quarantine is declared because of disease in an area. It is proposed that this be amended to relate to disease in stock on an area, and to provide controls on the entry of stock to quarantine areas as well as on their removal. This is important in order to protect from reinfection through contact with introduced animals stock in quarantine areas where eradication measures have been carried out.

Other proposed amendments flow from recent action to declare bees to be stock for the purposes of the Act and to place controls on their introduction into Queensland. This resulted from the spread of European Brood Disease of bees in southern States. As a corollary, honey and other products of bees are to be listed as animal products in order to control their introduction and movement in Queensland.

The Bill also contains a few other matters of a minor machinery nature, and I commend it to the Committee.

MR. BLAKE (Bundaberg) (9.34 p.m.): The Minister said that the majority of the proposed amendments relate to disease control in livestock. If, as the Minister said, the principal amendments are designed to enable regulations under the Act to refer directly to relevant standards of such outside authorities as the Standards Association of Australia and the British Standards Institute, we must look at them very constructively.

Disease, or continuing threat of disease, in rural industry is indeed very serious. I hate to think what could happen if we neglected to use any avenue available to us to take measures to control diseases in stock. The return to the nation from exports of our rural livestock industries is a major force in the Australian economy. It appears to me that most of the Minister's comments referred mainly to the control of brucellosis and tuberculosis in stock. Those two diseases are salient features in the acceptability or otherwise of livestock exported for sale overseas. Anything that can be done to extend the control of brucellosis and tuberculosis in livestock is a constructive move. As I say, we must therefore look constructively at this measure.

The Minister said that the code lays down standards for the construction, equipment and operation of laboratories that produce biological preparations. This is necessary. In fact, I am surprised to learn that we do not already have legislation to control the standardisation of such laboratories.

I suppose the salient point in the Minister's speech is his concern about people who do not co-operate in disease-eradication programmes. This is indeed a matter

of concern. I have experienced problems in the eradication of pests and diseases in the sugar industry. It has been a matter of wonder to me that in the sugar industry we have grub control and beetle control, yet it is not compulsory. Cane beetles can fly over boundaries and infest adjoining properties with grubs. We do have control on the transfer of cane plants. This is designed to prevent the transfer of diseases. However, it is not mandatory to control mobile pests.

I agree emphatically that, in areas where disease eradication is being carried out or is determined by the authorities to be desirable, it should be mandatory that people comply with the overall standards. I realise, of course, that these comments are quite dangerous because all of us value our own individual rights and freedoms. However, the livestock industry is of paramount importance to Queensland, which is the major livestock State, and to Australia as a whole. The Opposition does not object to the proposals brought forward by the Minister in terms of forcing people to do what is desirable.

I express some concern at the fact that, as I understand the Minister's comments, people can be forced to erect suitable yards and other facilities. I realise that that is desirable, but after a spell of bad markets or seasons it could well mean the end of certain landholders. From what I know of primary producers, I am quite certain that the responsible ones will agree to the use of their own facilities for the purpose of carrying out any procedure that will help eradicate disease. After all, this will give further protection to their own herds.

I was pleased to note that the Minister said due cognisance will be paid to the financial capacity of an individual to comply with the requirements, which include the construction of holding or forcing yards as well as a crush or race. It does not cost much to build those facilities, as long as they are not permanent structures.

The Minister spoke about the control of the cattle tick. Although the cattle tick may be described as an old-hat problem in the beef industry, it should not be underestimated. I cannot estimate the millions of dollars lost by the livestock industry because of the cattle tick. What is more, it is a continuing problem. We can put men on the moon and bring them back—thank goodness the technology for that was not the same as that used for the lifts in this Parliamentary Annexe, or they would not have come back.

Mr. Scott: But we cannot get rid of the common cold.

Mr. BLAKE: That is true and, unfortunately, we cannot eliminate the cattle tick.

Ticks have developed immunity to the acaricides, which once we called insecticides. Chemical companies and livestock producers face a continual problem in trying to control the cattle tick. Because it has a facility to adapt, I do not think we will ever control it unless we discover something like the

cactoblastis insect. Producers, understandably, are now turning to tick-resistant cattle breeds. If I were to start dealing with the merits of the different tick-resistant breeds and the propensity of some of them to jump right over the crush and surrounding fences, I would get into serious trouble with the various breeders, and I do not wish to do that.

Mr. Davis: As soon as you mentioned that, the honourable member for Callide got his pencil out.

Mr. BLAKE: The honourable member is a cattleman who is familiar with the problems associated with tick eradication. It surprises me that he would try to stab them with his pencil. It would be a very tedious way to try to eliminate them.

Because we are used to the cattle-tick problem we have come to accept it. However, it is a continuing serious problem.

I understand the reactions of those who are trying conscientiously to control cattle ticks when their neighbours do not treat the problem seriously and refuse to co-operate.

While we have not had time to consider the full implications of the measure, I assure the Minister that it interests us. We realise the constructive nature of the proposals, and I certainly hope that we will be able to present far more informed views at the second-reading stage.

Mr. HARTWIG (Callide) (9.44 p.m.): In dealing with the amendments proposed by the Minister, I shall deal with upgrading laboratories to ensure that the vaccines and inoculants will be better than those we are getting today. I have always been amazed that, while one property owner controls ticks on his property, his neighbours can more or less allow their cattle to become infested and the department has no control over them.

There is something wrong with this country when, following a recent outbreak of disease in Tasmania, we had to send specimens across the world for analysis. We pride ourselves on being one of the chief primary producing nations of the world and take great pride in our livestock industry, yet the Commonwealth Government has not taken steps to establish a laboratory to analyse such specimens. And 1980 is almost here!

Don't we value our livestock industry to the extent that we feel it necessary to provide a laboratory in this country, with scientists who can detect foot and mouth disease within a matter of hours, not days or weeks, which is what we have to put up with now? I believe it is up to the State to force the Commonwealth to expedite the construction of the laboratory that is required to conduct tests into these exotic diseases.

It is not good enough to have to wait a week, 10 days or two weeks. In that time a lot of herds on other properties could become infected with the same disease. It would only need a wrong diagnosis for

Australia to be labelled as a foot and mouth disease infected country, and this would place all our primary export industries in jeopardy. All of our export markets could be lost.

I do not think we should trust other nations to decide whether or not foot and mouth or any other exotic disease is present in this country. Surely it is up to the Commonwealth Government to get on with the job. When the Minister attends the next meeting of the Australian Agricultural Council, I believe he should impress upon the Commonwealth that, as a great primary industry exporter, we should not have to send disease specimens across the world for testing. I would like to be sure that we will have these facilities available in this country.

I commend the Minister on the other necessary changes contained in the Bill. We know that he is interested in the department he administers and is always trying to improve it. I do not always agree with him, but on this occasion I agree that these amendments could be timely.

Mr. BURNS (Lytton) (9.48 p.m.): The Minister spoke about undue risks to staff because of inadequate facilities, the non-co-operation of owners of infected herds and the transport of stock that were shown as brucella reactors.

Tonight I want to make the point that this is one area where there is complete unanimity between rural industries and the trade union movement. After all, it is probably the meatworkers more than anybody else who have suffered as a result of brucellosis and the other zoonosis diseases such as Q fever and leptospirosis. I would like to quote from a letter received by the honourable member for Rockhampton North, our spokesman on industrial affairs, from Jack O'Toole, the assistant federal secretary of the federal council of the Australasian Meat Industry Employees' Union. He laid down the details of a national policy and said to his members—

"It is crucial that members of the A.M.I.E.U. grasp the importance of the Brucella Abortus eradication campaign in much the same way as Tuberculosis (T.B.) was and is seen today. The eradication of that disease is now almost complete.

"It must be understood that stock infected and declared as reactors by veterinary inspectors be treated. Some processors have managed to confound the issue . . ."

I think the Minister made this point—

" . . . by declaring that they are assisting meat workers by refusing to treat such stock. Nothing could be further from the truth. A declared reactor can be treated with greater safety than stock of which nothing is known. The processing of declared reactors is slowed down to maximise safety and to ensure that no spillage occurs on hides or carcasses."

The disease is highly contagious and because of the concern of the meatworkers themselves, they have laid down that they are opposed to the possibility of spreading the disease by transporting reactors from the farm gate more than is necessary. I think that the Minister made that point tonight. The letter continues—

"Therefore, to ensure that members have access to personal hygiene facilities Brucella Reactors should be slaughtered at the nearest meat processing establishment that has a certificate from the Department of Primary Industry to process meat for export."

In talking about the vehicles used in transporting these reactors—and the Minister spoke about transferring them from one farm to another for testing—the letter states—

"After unloading infected stock at a registered meatworks transport vehicles are to be thoroughly washed down and suitably disinfected prior to leaving the works. Branches are urged to take the necessary action of encouraging members to refuse in the future, to unload vehicles where such a safety precaution has not been complied with."

Tonight we are talking about containing this particular disease on the farm or the property. As has happened in the past, in the future it will still be the meatworker who will finally have to face the problems caused by this disease. We are moving to eradicate the disease because it could stop our exports to America and other countries. They have said that if we do not eradicate the disease by a certain time they will not take any more of our beef. It is time that the Government had a closer look at the problem facing these meatworkers.

In September this year the New South Wales Government introduced compensation provisions that will provide N.S.W. meatworkers with the same type of compensation as Federal meat inspectors. The procedure followed with the Federal meat inspector is that if the blood tests confirm the presence of brucellosis, or, even in the absence of positive laboratory tests, if it is the opinion of the doctor with special experience of the disease that the person probably has brucellosis, that shall be sufficient evidence for the determination of the claim.

What happens to Queensland meatworkers? Being in the tropical zones, workers in Queensland probably have more problems with these diseases. These are the symptoms experienced by people suffering from brucellosis—

Fever (undulant) in 100 per cent of cases; sweating in 84 per cent of cases; shivering in 77 per cent of cases; weakness in 100 per cent of cases; bronchitis in 45 per cent of cases; anorexia in 45 per cent of cases; headache in 60 per cent of cases; insomnia

in 50 per cent of cases; orchitis (testicles) in 5 per cent of cases; large spleen in 35 per cent of cases; involvement of motor apparatus (i.e. walking and moving) in 35 per cent of cases.

Other symptoms are—

Large liver; involvement of nervous system; mastitis; abortion; rash.

All these symptoms are experienced by meatworkers with brucellosis. A meatworker in Queensland who has a cold or a fever could say to himself, "I might have meatworks fever." If he goes to an ordinary G.P. who is not aware of the zoonoses diseases, he could have a problem. The Minister talked tonight about undue risk to the staff. The staff in meatworks finally handle the brucella reactors. If they go to a doctor who says, "Oh, you have a cold.", and he sends them away, that is the end of it. They will never receive any compensation and they will never receive any financial and medical assistance at all. The doctors in my area are aware of these diseases now because of the large number of people who have had to leave their jobs. The doctor could send them for a blood test, but if they do not have a blood test at first, there is no chance of checking the teeter reading to see that it multiplies four times. If it is a reading of four, it has to go to 16, or if it is a reading of eight it has to go to 32, before any compensation is paid. So a worker who has a bit of a fever or some of the other symptoms I have mentioned can go along to a doctor and be given a few pills. Many workers do this, because they want to stay at work. They are not interested in getting off work. In most cases they will miss out on compensation and proper medical care. Later, the disease will affect them again. If a worker goes to the doctor at the meatworks, the doctor will send him for a blood test. He will send him for another blood test in a fortnight or in three weeks or whenever the disease begins to clear up. Then the doctor will check one blood test against the other. I am told that a multiplication of the reading is an indication of whether the worker has the disease or not.

To my mind, that is unfair, because the Commonwealth pays the meat inspector, who has less chance of catching the disease. He spends less time working close to the beast, where he could be splashed or could breathe in the material in the air—the splashings and the aerosol, as they call them. Inspectors spend less time in that position than meatworkers, but the Commonwealth Government and now the New South Wales Government are prepared to pay them compensation for the contraction of that disease when a doctor says that the meatworker has brucellosis.

A Commonwealth meat inspector could be standing beside a Queensland meatworker who was cutting open the bladder or uterus of a cow and both could contract brucellosis as a result of the splashings. The meat inspector is paid, but the meatworker has to prove, through a couple of tests, that he is eligible to receive compensation. This is a

matter of hygiene. I know that in many cases it affects the staff of the Minister's department.

The Victorian Government introduced legislation 20 years ago to ensure that meat processors provided fresh, clean clothing each day for the meatworkers they employed. That has had to be done in other areas. Not so long ago in Forbes, meatworkers took Q fever into the community. For some time the doctors were unaware of what type of fever it was and called it a "mysterious" illness. Later it was found to be Q fever. It was realised that meatworkers had taken the fever into the community by taking home their bloody clothes. Those clothes were washed in the normal wash and the disease was passed on to children and others in the community.

This disease causes major problems for meatworkers. As I said before, Jack O'Toole and others in the meatworkers' union want to see it eradicated. I have had a number of meetings at Borthwick's and the M.P.A.B. with Terry Mackenroth, Eric Shaw and others. We have been involved on a number of occasions in the brucellosis campaign by local A.M.I.E.U. officials.

I am alarmed and concerned that the Minister said tonight that a few people on farms and properties are refusing to co-operate and participate in an eradication programme that will not only ensure that our market is protected overseas but, in addition, will protect the decent working men and women who work for those producers. I remind members that meatworkers do not get high wages. After they have worked in the industry for 20 years, they may get only two days work a week from companies such as Borthwick's at Christmas-time and during the holiday period. They are put on short time. Meatworkers on compensation can hardly make up pay, because half the time they do not average up to \$50 or \$60 a week for meatworks wages in the 12-month period. They are on and off the job for limited-kill seasons and for various other reasons.

This is an important amending Bill being proposed tonight. On behalf of the meatworkers in my area, I support it.

Mr. BOOTH (Warwick) (9.58 p.m.): I do not want to buy into the argument raised by the member for Lytton.

Mr. Scott: He handled it quite capably.

Mr. BOOTH: Yes, he did handle it quite capably. I am not attacking him in any way at all.

I am concerned at his suggestion that the stock-owners of this State are not co-operating in the campaign. I can assure the member for Lytton that they are. I accept, as the Minister said, that there are five or six who are not, but I would like to know what percentage they represent. In any event, there may be special circumstances.

Mr. Burns: I wasn't having a go at them; I was taking what the Minister said.

Mr. BOOTH: Yes, but I have to tell the honourable member the inconvenience that stock-owners have had to go through. When they found reactors, they had to continually bleed them once a month. That is an irksome task. I have been involved in it and I know it is an irksome and expensive procedure. To my knowledge, every person in my electorate co-operated to the best of his ability. The Minister would know better than I, but I think the disease has almost been eradicated. I assure the member for Lytton and other members in the Chamber that it is not an easy task for the stock-owner. There certainly has been co-operation, and I would not like to see it reported in the Press that there has been a lack of co-operation by stock-owners in Queensland.

Mr. D'ARCY (Woodridge) (9.59 p.m.): Unlike the member for Warwick, I would like to congratulate the member for Lytton on his contribution. I take the member for Warwick to task for what he had to say, as the Minister said in his opening remarks that some stock-owners in the State have been reluctant to co-operate in the campaign for the eradication of brucellosis. It is disgraceful that that situation should be allowed to continue.

I was most concerned when the Minister stated that it would be only as a last resort that some of the provisions of the legislation would be introduced.

Mr. Moore: He did not.

Mr. D'ARCY: I have a copy of his speech here.

Mr. Moore: You are dumb.

Mr. D'ARCY: I have in writing what the Minister said.

It worries me that it would be only as a last resort that some of the provisions would be implemented. Does it mean, as it usually does with this Government, that members of the National Party or donors to the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation will receive preferential treatment? If it does, the Minister has not put the health of Queenslanders first. That is the most important thing.

Mr. Elliott: That's the most stupid thing I've heard.

Mr. D'ARCY: That is the fact of life.

The Minister seems much more concerned about the great Yankee dollar. He gave the figure as \$830,000,000. He stated that we have to clean up brucellosis, tuberculosis and Q fever by 1983, or our beef will not be acceptable on the world market, particularly in the United States of America. However, never once did he mention the problems that exist for meatworkers. The member for Lytton covered that aspect admirably. As the shadow spokesman for Health in this Parliament, I can say that it is a problem. A tremendous number of cases of brucellosis and Q fever are not properly diagnosed. It is a problem for Queensland workers. I believe that the Minister in introducing this

Bill is making a serious attempt to come to terms with this problem; but as I said there are aspects of it that concern me.

We in the A.L.P. realise that the investment of Queensland graziers should be protected, but surely the health of Queensland workers should be taken into account, too. Meatworkers find it very difficult to get an accurate diagnosis of these recurring diseases. The member for Lytton pointed out that brucellosis is difficult to diagnose because the symptoms range from sweating and cold conditions right through to aborting in women. I am concerned for Queensland workers. I think that the Minister overlooked that section of the Act dealing with the health of Queenslanders. I am also concerned that some stock owners are not co-operating at present. They should do so in the interests of all Queenslanders.

Mr. ELLIOTT (Cunningham) (10.3 p.m.): I will make a few brief comments on this amendment to the Stock Act. In particular, I ask the Minister to outline to us when he replies just where we stand with the facilities for testing for brucellosis and tuberculosis. Some concern has been expressed in my area and others as to the standard that is considered to be sufficient. Everyone on the land who is running cattle has an obligation to become involved in the eradication scheme. I do not hold a brief for people who are not prepared to co-operate, but I do feel that we should have a reasonable assurance that people will not be railroaded into building extremely elaborate sets of yards, cattle crushes, sword bails or something else when they may run only two or three, half a dozen or 20 head of cattle. These doubts and fears are expressed by some small landholders and stock-owners on the Darling Downs and in some of the inner areas where people are not necessarily dependent on cattle for their total income.

That is the only point I wished to raise, and I think it ought to be clarified. I should not like to see an inspector come onto a property, perhaps take a dislike to someone—although that is a fairly rare occurrence, it could happen—and force him to build facilities far in excess of those really required for the property. My understanding was that an inspector would ask someone to co-operate and then find out whether he had facilities for testing. If he did not, it would be suggested to him that if a neighbour was willing to have the stock tested in his yards, those yards should be used. If he would not co-operate, then—and only then—an inspector would be in a position to force him to build yards or build some facilities of his own and charge for them.

I should like the Minister to consider the use of some sort of portable facility that could be moved round in an area in which there are many small landholders. Perhaps transportable yards could be used.

Mr. KATTER (Flinders) (10.6 p.m.): I, too, would like to make a brief comment. I am very worried—and it seems to have

slipped past me at the party-room stage—that the building of the yards appears to be at the discretion of the department. It would not please me to have some departmental official come out and tell me how to build my yards, or, to be more specific, tell people in my electorate how to build their yards, purely for his own convenience. That would not be a very happy situation.

Let me give the Committee one example that leaps to my mind. First, I compliment the Minister on reducing the requirements relating to tail tagging. However, tail tagging has become a very onerous burden for many people moving small numbers of cattle. In one instance that I know of, the tail tags had to come from Western Australia and the stock and station agent had not done anything about them. The cattle producer had his cattle in the yards, and he had to leave them there and go to the very big expense of buying hay while he waited for the tail tags to arrive from Western Australia.

That may be all right if tail tags are serving their purpose. But what is happening on the meatworks floor now is that the tail tag is simply ripped off by the person on the chain before the carcass gets to the hide puller. It is thrown into a plastic bag, which is then thrown on the floor. The carcass then moves farther along the chain. If an inspector looking for brucellosis finds a reactor or a beast with some other disease, he goes back to the bag and has to sort through the tags. He comes up with eight or 10 different tags, or perhaps 20 or 30 different tags, from the day's work. In fact, he has just as much, if not more, work than he had when he was working only with brands. Discussions that I have had with men on the meatworks floor indicate that this requirement has not been a step forward, although it is very costly and onerous. It appears to have achieved very little.

I ask the Minister to keep a very close eye on the situation and ensure that the provision in the Bill does not create similar problems.

Hon. V. B. SULLIVAN (Condamine—Minister for Primary Industries) (10.9 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for their apparent ready acceptance of the measures proposed in the Bill.

The honourable member for Bundaberg, as spokesman for the Opposition, indicated that the Opposition favours any measures aimed at reducing the incidence of disease in the livestock industry.

The honourable member for Lytton expressed concern at the dangers to the health of meatworkers, as did his colleague the member for Woodridge. I shall reply to those comments at the second-reading stage.

On the Government side, the member for Cunningham specifically asked what the standard of yards is to be and the honourable member for Flinders expressed concern. We are not going to lay down regulations

setting out the standard of yards. I hope the honourable member is not advocating that we should.

Any landholder who has cattle on his property should have some kind of yard. As the honourable member for Cunningham is driving home tomorrow, he should look to the side of the road just the other side of Toowoomba. There he will see three or four little yards that could contain half-a-dozen cattle each. If young fellows such as the member for Cunningham and the member for Flinders couldn't put up one of those yards before lunch, he is not as fit as Mr. Wharton and I used to be at their age. In the old days we used a crowbar and a shovel; these days the fellows use post-hole diggers. I hope that the honourable members do not advocate that landholders be penalised. A man who has cattle should have some kind of facility to handle them.

I know of a man who will not have his cattle tested. The departmental officers made arrangements to take them to his neighbour to have them tested and the neighbour has agreed. The owner of the cattle is a cranky bloke and he has refused point-blank to have them tested.

Mr. Casey: He must be a member of the National Party.

Mr. SULLIVAN: I wouldn't know whether he belongs to the National Party or the Labor Party. The member for Woodridge says that fellows who don't do it are probably contributing to the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation. That shows the thinking of some members of the Opposition. I wouldn't care what his politics are; if he does not do the job, we will deal with him.

At any rate, I do not intend keeping members out of their beds by talking about minor matters such as that.

Motion (Mr. Sullivan) agreed to.

Resolution reported.

FIRST READING

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr. Sullivan, read a first time.

POULTRY INDUSTRY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. W. D. Hewitt, Greenslopes, in the chair)

Hon. V. B. SULLIVAN (Condamine—Minister for Primary Industries) (10.16 p.m.): I move—

“That a Bill be introduced to amend the Poultry Industry Act 1946–1975 in certain particulars.”

As the hour is getting late I hope that, in my introductory speech, I do not ruffle too many feathers.

The Bill to amend the Poultry Industry Act has two aspects, one financial and the other relating to disease control.

Honourable members will no doubt remember the successful High Court challenge by Logan Downs Pty. Ltd., concerning the right of the State to levy stock assessments. This also raised some doubts as to the validity of poultry precepts levied on egg producers, who supply the egg marketing boards. To obviate any possibility of challenge in this regard, it is proposed to amend the Act to relate such levies to a direct charge on producers in order to meet the administrative expenses of the boards.

Precepts levied on producers outside the Egg Marketing Board areas and on the owners of poultry slaughterhouses are considered to be a direct charge for services rendered by my department, and are therefore not in contention in so far as their validity is concerned.

Income expected from precepts in 1979-80 is as follows—

	\$
Egg marketing boards ..	58,560
Poultry abattoirs ..	34,800
Holders of egg quotas ..	6,500
	99,860

The above amount will meet some 20 per cent of costs for research, extension and diagnostic services provided for the poultry industry out of the Poultry Industry Fund. At the producer level, it is estimated that precepts will be equivalent to a charge of .217c per dozen eggs supplied to boards, 3.65c per quota bird and .116c per broiler processed. The above figures can be related to an estimated total income for the industry in 1979-80 of \$88,500,000, comprising \$31,500,000 for eggs and \$57,000,000 for slaughter birds. Precepts would equal only .113 per cent of the above total.

In regard to other aspects of the Bill, members will appreciate that the control of poultry diseases is most important because of the intensive nature of the industry. Vaccines are therefore widely used to control such diseases as fowl pox, infectious bronchitis, infectious laryngo tracheitis (I.L.T.) and Marek's disease. There are also proposals to use a vaccine to control infectious bursal disease of poultry.

It is essential that such vaccines be produced under the most rigorously controlled conditions in order to ensure that they are of the highest quality and potency and free of cross-infection. Other States have therefore introduced legislation to control the manufacture of poultry vaccines, based on the standards laid down by the National Biological Standards Laboratory (N.B.S.L.). It is proposed to introduce a similar provision into the Poultry Industry Act to allow regulations to be framed which refer directly to relevant provisions of the Code of Good Manufacturing Practice for Therapeutic Goods, which is administered by N.B.S.L. Apart from simplifying the drafting of the regulations, it will obviate the need to duplicate legislative material which is already published.

Provision will also be made to permit the regulations to refer to other recognised authorities such as the British Standards Institute, the Standards Association of Australia and the Standing Committee on Agriculture. A similar provision has also been included in proposed amendments to the Stock Act.

In other amendments, it is proposed to update the list of poultry diseases to take account of some changes in the names of certain diseases and to include some diseases not previously listed. Opportunity is also being taken to list diseases according to causal agent such as bacterial, fungal or viral diseases and those due to various types of parasite.

The remaining proposed amendments are of a machinery nature. The definitions of "prescribed" and "regulations" are to be deleted, as both are included in the Acts Interpretation Act.

A definition of "sell" is to be inserted to apply generally throughout the Act. At the moment it relates only to the sections dealing with pasteurised egg pulp. The amendment will help clarify the position concerning certain offences relating to the sale of poultry products other than pasteurised egg pulp.

Although this is only a short Bill, it contains important financial and disease control provisions, and I commend it to the Committee.

Mr. BLAKE (Bundaberg) (10.22 p.m.): I understand that the Bill has a financial aspect and a disease-control aspect. The successful High Court challenge by Logan Downs Pty. Ltd. concerning the right of the State to levy stock assessments has necessitated amendments to relate such levies to a direct charge on producers in order to meet administrative expenses of the boards.

Precepts levied on producers outside the Egg Marketing Board areas and on owners of poultry slaughterhouses apparently are not in question in this Bill. We expect the move to tie up any legal loopholes in the levying of precepts within the industry, as these levies meet some 20 per cent of the cost of very necessary research, extension and diagnostic services for the welfare of the poultry industry. This can be illustrated by the figure of \$88,500,000 that the Minister has given as the estimated total income for the industry in 1979-80. This is quite a considerable sum, and measures to provide research and extension services for an industry of such magnitude can scarcely be argued with. As I say, the precepts are infinitesimal if, as the Minister says, they represent only about .1 per cent of the total return from the industry in one year.

Again, as in the previous Bill, we have the important aspect of disease control. The onslaught of disease is well known to anyone who has had anything to do with poultry. The modern flock techniques of raising birds, whether it be for the chicken-meat industry or for egg production, are very intensive indeed and, as a result of these techniques,

the birds are very susceptible to the spread of disease. I doubt that we can, or would want to, object to any measures that led to rigid control and the policing of diseases.

The Bill also deals, as did the previous Bill, with standardisation of vaccines and the provision of vaccines. I think this is elementary good sense. It has been adopted in other industries, and it is probably a bit belated that such standards are only now being enforced by legislation in the poultry industry. In such a highly organised industry, such standards should have been adopted long ago.

Until I see the Bill and am better informed about it, I will say no more.

Hon. V. B. SULLIVAN (Condamine—Minister for Primary Industries) (10.25 p.m.), in reply: I thank the honourable member for Bundaberg for his acceptance of the measures contained in the Bill. He mentioned that the Bill contains financial matters and disease-control measures. The Bill will benefit the industry, so it is understandable that it is acceptable to the Opposition.

The member for Bundaberg also said that he will reserve any further comments until he has had an opportunity to study the Bill. Other members might wish to enter the debate at the second-reading stage.

Motion (Mr. Sullivan) agreed to.

Resolution reported.

FIRST READING

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr. Sullivan, read a first time.

LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

SECOND READING

Hon. L. R. EDWARDS (Ipswich—Deputy Premier and Treasurer) (10.27 p.m.): I move—

“That the Bill be now read a second time.”

I outlined to the Committee at the introductory stage the principles of the Bill. Honourable members will recall that this was a Budget measure, and our intentions have been previously outlined in the Budget speech.

As outlined at the Committee stage, the proposed amendment will be effective as from 29 June 1979 so that the new levels of exemption will apply for assessments to be made in the 1979-80 financial year. I think that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition asked on what date it would come into operation. It is 29 June 1979.

I believe that our policy in relation to land tax is very fair. The tax is an important source of State revenue and it must be maintained so that adequate funds are available to provide the services which the public demands of the Government. However, we have, of course, progressively changed the

impact of the tax over the years so that only in very exceptional circumstances now does it affect the ordinary citizen.

For example, the residential exemption means that all parcels of an area not in excess of 1.05 ha, or approximately 415 perches used exclusively for residential purposes by the owner, are not taxed. For residential areas in excess of 1.05 ha, the general exemption applies so that a residential parcel would need to be in excess of approximately 415 perches and extremely valuable before land tax is applicable.

Special consideration is also given to primary producers. Leasehold land is completely exempt from land tax. Farmers, graziers and dairy farmers who personally work their land will be exempt from tax on land with a value of up to \$112,500.

The fact is, as has been pointed out on previous occasions, that land tax mainly falls on companies. In 1978-79, 90.06 per cent of total land tax collected was paid by companies. A large proportion of this amount was attributable to land in the central business area of Brisbane.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has expressed fears that the impact of land tax on inner city retail shops in particular will mean that costs will be increased or, alternatively, that jobs will be sacrificed so that the existing level of profits is maintained.

I feel that this is a rather simplistic view to adopt. The amount of land tax paid by companies in the inner-city area would in fact be a very, very small percentage of their total costs and it is extremely difficult to see how a relatively minor increase in such a small percentage of their total costs could have any significant effect on either their total costs or the level of employment they are able to sustain.

There has been some criticism that the increase in the level of exemption has not kept pace with the increases in valuations by the Valuer-General. However, I feel that the position over the last couple of years has in fact been very reasonable.

The difficulty is that the Valuer-General revalues each area at intervals of about five to eight years. It is impossible for him to revalue the whole State on each occasion so that groups of new valuations become effective each year and, overall, the situation across the State is that the valuation date in varying local authorities varies considerably. That might answer one of the questions raised by the Opposition.

The lack of a common valuation date throughout the State does create problems in establishing exemption levels. Periodically, we review the situation and establish new exemption levels which, as far as possible, counter the effects of new valuations. However, it is impossible for the perfect situation to be achieved each year. For example, the situation now is that some valuations are up to five years old and some valuations have just come into effect. A substantial

increase in the exemption levels each year will have a significant effect on the valuations which are up to five years old.

The effect of the exemption levels which we have established over the last three years has been very reasonable. Over the period 1977-78 to 1979-80, land tax has increased from \$15,122,706 to an estimated \$18,370,000 this year. Over this three-year period, this amounts to a compound annual rate of increase of 10.21 per cent. I think that all honourable members would agree that this is a reasonable rate of increase for land tax.

The matter of the number of primary producers liable to pay land tax was also mentioned. The estimated number in 1979-80 expected to be liable to pay land tax is 454. It is recognised that there is therefore an effective increase over the actual number in 1978-79 of 237. However, the point remains that the increased exemption levels will mean a significant reduction in the number of primary producers who would have been liable to pay tax under the old exemption levels. There has been some confusion caused by the number of people who own land both in the city and in the country. That is where the figures have become confused. I apologise to the honourable member opposite if I have misled him in any way.

If the exemption levels had not been adjusted, the number would have been over 600. The increased number is due to the fact that the Valuer-General has made major revaluations in rural areas this year. I believe that honourable members will recognise that the new exemption levels are reasonable.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba) (10.33 p.m.): The Treasurer has outlined the case with regard to land tax. I think he will agree that at the introductory stage I did not object to land tax as a tax. Perhaps I can take issue with the honourable member for Lockyer; I am surprised the Treasurer did not. If all taxation such as land tax and pay-roll tax were eliminated, as he suggested, I do not know where the State would get its money from, unless it relied entirely on the Commonwealth and became virtually a Commonwealth puppet.

No-one likes increased taxation but certain taxes are unavoidable as they are needed for the running of the State. The only criticism I have to offer is when taxes are imposed inequitably in the community.

No figure was given by the Treasurer for city properties, but we could be talking in terms of \$100,000 for the larger properties. Each fact on its own may not have a large effect, but when all of them are combined it does or could have an effect on employment. I will agree that in recent years there has been a change by retail management in the servicing of the customer. There had to be a reason why it looked for this change, particularly when we know that for accounting purposes it brought in computerisation and

the like that tended to cut down the cost of employees. However, it is not in that field that it has been saving. It has been saving in the field of the shop assistants themselves. This has caused a reaction in other industries.

The number who will be paying the tax this year compared with two years ago has increased by almost 100 per cent. I wonder how much of that increase has been caused by the aggregation of holdings. We know that some years ago the Government advocated in the dairying industry, for instance—and backed it up by legislation—

Mr. Elliott: Amalgamation in the dairying industry was very successful.

Mr. HOUSTON: What it did was to give some dairy farmers an added area of land, as a result of which it would naturally increase the total value of the land. As we know, cattle properties have been freeholded in recent years. I do not want to go into that aspect or the number involved; but the Budget showed quite significantly that there have been a number of land sales involving substantial amounts—millions of dollars. I believe that this also has an effect on the value of land. If this Act is amended again next year, it would be interesting if the Treasurer were to look at what significant factors brought about the change in numbers. I think we have reached the stage—and I indicated this two years ago when I spoke on this legislation—that when the number is reduced to 203 primary producers, one must ask whether they should be included in taxation at all. I know that the number has risen to 400, which then takes on some significance.

I do not want to go into the matter of valuation. We have just had a long debate on land valuation. I do not think that anyone would doubt that the amount of change required in this legislation from year to year has a direct relationship to the valuation of land and the policies and principles adopted by the Valuer-General's Department. The Treasurer is virtually compelled to follow that line.

Although the Opposition would like to see a higher exemption level in some areas, it accepts the legislation.

Hon. L. R. EDWARDS (Ipswich—Deputy Premier and Treasurer) (10.38 p.m.), in reply: I thank the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for his comments. We will see whether during the next few weeks we can clarify the matters he raised and forward the information to him.

Motion (Dr. Edwards) agreed to.

COMMITTEE

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. W. D. Hewitt, Greenslopes, in the chair)

Clauses 1 to 5, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

THIRD READING

Bill, on motion of Dr. Edwards, by leave, read a third time.

PAY-ROLL TAX ACT AMENDMENT
BILL

SECOND READING

Hon. L. R. EDWARDS (Ipswich—Deputy Premier and Treasurer) (10.40 p.m.): I move—
“That the Bill be now read a second time.”

At the introductory stage, I outlined the contents of the Bill in some detail. Briefly, we are providing for an increase of 20 per cent to \$150,000 in the level of pay-roll below which no pay-roll tax is payable and an increase in the minimum pay-roll tax exemption from \$27,000 to \$30,000 per annum.

The purpose of the Bill is to provide additional concessions to businesses in the payment of pay-roll tax. All businesses will benefit from the proposed increased exemptions. However, the major relief will be for small businesses. Many more small businesses will pay no pay-roll tax as a result of the proposals contained in the Bill.

I feel sure that all honourable members appreciate the concessions that the Government is providing in this field, particularly for small businesses. Queensland has led the other States in progressively increasing the maximum exemption level. The level of the Queensland exemption will be substantially higher than that in any other State.

The comments of the honourable members who spoke on the Bill at the introductory stage centred mainly on the financial effects of the tax on business firms. A point that I think ought to be recognised—and it is often overlooked when the effect of pay-roll tax on a firm's overall finances is considered—is that pay-roll tax does not really represent a very significant part of any firm's total costs.

The rate of pay-roll tax levied is at the uniform level of 5 per cent for all businesses. Because of the effect of the exemptions allowed under the Act, the amount of pay-roll tax actually paid is less than 5 per cent of the wages bill in all cases, and in many cases the effective rate of tax is substantially lower than 5 per cent. The percentage that pay-roll tax represents of a firm's total costs is, of course, substantially lower than this.

A particular aspect of the comments that were made is that we should adopt additional concessions and variations in pay-roll tax to encourage such things as—

- * New industry and development in the State;
- * The employment of additional apprentices; and
- * The geographic decentralisation of businesses.

We believe that there are many difficulties in attempting to utilise the pay-roll tax provisions to achieve such goals. We believe

that it is better to adopt specific direct policies in relation to these matters, and we have done so with great success.

As to attracting new developments—the results speak for themselves. Our coal, bauxite, alumina and other mineral developments have made us grow faster than other States. The future looks even brighter, with two aluminium smelters, four new coal-mines and developments such as the Rundle oil-shale project in sight.

Incentives offered through the Department of Commercial and Industrial Development to encourage industrial development and decentralisation in the State are of great value. They include—

- * The provision of land in Crown industrial estates throughout the State on concessional terms and conditions;
- * The construction of factory buildings by the Government for use by pioneer industries at low rentals;
- * The provision of Government guarantees for pioneer industries in certain circumstances;
- * Rail transport concessions for the haulage of both raw materials and finished goods within the State on a contract basis;
- * Preferences to local industry in the Government's purchasing policy;
- * Advisory services on a wide range of matters relating to the establishment of industry in the State.

As to decentralisation—Queensland is already the most decentralised State in Australia. Many of our most viable industries are in decentralised areas. I therefore feel that pay-roll tax concessions are not essential to the promotion of decentralisation.

As to apprentices—the Commonwealth and State Governments provide substantial incentives to employers to encourage the employment of apprentices. For example, the Commonwealth Government has in operation the CRAFT scheme, under which employers may receive grants where apprentices from their business attend training classes. In addition, the State provides generous travelling and accommodation allowances to apprentices who are required to travel some distance to attend classes of continuous training or block-release training. These training classes have meant that the apprentice receives intensive training in his particular trade under conditions that produce long-term benefits.

While these forms of financial assistance are made available to both the employer and the apprentices, the State also provides services such as apprentice welfare officers who work in the field maintaining consistent contact with and interest in the apprentice during his term of indenture. Further, an apprenticeship promotions officer is employed full time to promote and encourage apprentice-training in Queensland.

It has also been suggested that the applicability of pay-roll tax should take into account the profitability of a business. I

point out that any variation in the basic structure of the tax to take the profit and loss situation of a business into account would run counter to the standing arrangements whereby the States are not entitled to impose taxes on business profits. This area is reserved for the Commonwealth's income tax. Further, if the profit and loss situation of every taxpayer had to be considered, an enormous increase in the cost of administering the tax would result.

At present, pay-roll tax is relatively easy to administer and low cost in collection. I see no point in changing this when the additional goals referred to above can be achieved by alternative means.

Being set at a uniform rate of 5 per cent for all employers without discrimination, pay-roll tax is generally equitable as between various types of employers. Once we start to give exemptions to specific classes of employers, we would quickly find that many other employers would have equally convincing arguments for exemptions and the system would become inequitable.

It was also pointed out that pay-roll tax collections during the 1978-79 financial year were 6.57 per cent higher than during 1977-78, despite the further concessions which have been made. I have had the reasons examined. Briefly, cost inflation has forced wages up during the year and the number of people employed in the State has also increased. Over the 12-month period from July 1978 to July 1979, the civilian labour force in Queensland grew by 2.94 per cent. Accordingly the pay-roll tax base in the State increased.

Clearly, the concessions have had their effect. The increase in pay-roll tax collections of 6.57 per cent is substantially below the increase in the combined effect of cost inflation and the growth in the number of persons employed in the State.

The honourable member for Greenslopes yesterday mentioned a specific case where he feels that the application of the grouping provisions of the Act to a particular taxpayer has been unjust. I agreed some time ago to meet with him and a principal of the taxpayer firm involved, and such meeting is to take place next week. I can assure the honourable member that the proper steps will be taken and the circumstances of the case will be examined to ensure that justice is done at all times.

I am sure that, overall, all honourable members will welcome the proposals for the increased exemptions.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba) (10.47 p.m.): At the introductory stage, I outlined the general feeling of the Opposition to pay-roll tax. I do not intend to state it again. However, I want to comment on a few of the points made by the Treasurer tonight and also in his reply at the introductory stage, wherein he suggested that Opposition

members were intent on imposing an extra burden on those people who are successful in business.

I am afraid that the Treasurer used the English language to suit his own purposes. I do not think he would be so dumb as not to understand that I referred particularly to those who were not making a profit and were finding the going a bit hard. When I suggested that we should take into account the profitability of a company, I meant that encouragement should be given to an industry whose profitability is below a certain level.

The Treasurer said that we should not have sectional legislation or legislation that isolates certain areas. This legislation does just that. It says, in effect, that any employer with fewer than 15 employees is exempt. What I suggest is that a further exemption could be applied to those businesses that, although their wages bill is high enough to bring them within the provisions of this legislation, can show that they are entitled to concessions or exemptions. Those that are above the base would pay the normal 5 per cent tax on the scale. The Bill contains certain algebraic formulas. I think an industry would need a computer to be able to work out the amount of pay-roll tax that it has to pay.

I do not want the Labor Party to be misquoted. We are concerned for those employers whose financial return is below what is considered to be par. Employers whose return is above that level would normally pay the tax. The Treasurer referred to a uniform rate of 5 per cent. If a company pays just over \$200,000 in wages, which would just make it liable to pay-roll tax contributions, 5 per cent of that would be \$10,000. That represents the wages of another employee. If the employment of another employee means that an employer becomes liable to pay-roll tax contributions, I am sure that that will influence his decision. An employer can calculate his cost structure a certain distance ahead, but the engagement of an extra employee could in effect break the camel's back and make him decide against it.

It is appropriate to recall that the honourable member for Greenslopes made certain submissions about apprentices. We could increase the number of apprentices employed by granting certain exemptions. The honourable member was supporting completely the submissions made not so long ago by the Leader of the Opposition about encouraging apprenticeship employment. While he did not use the same terms, that is what his speech meant. I noted that the Treasurer was highly critical when that statement appeared, but today, he is not so critical. He is finding reasons why the State need not use pay-roll tax exemptions to encourage the employment of apprentices.

It is significant that the Commonwealth's attempts, good as they are, are not accomplishing what is desired. Far too many young

people are out of work and there are far too few skilled tradesmen in the community. We lack tradesmen because insufficient apprentices have been coming through. Despite all the modern training methods and financial assistance—which we accept—the State has certain other responsibilities.

The other details of the tax structure appear to be in line with what has been happening for the past two or three years, and at this stage I see no reason to suggest any alteration.

The Minister said that Queensland was the most decentralised State. No-one denies that, but we should not forget that Queensland was the most decentralised State before the present Government came to power. The Government is not responsible for the decentralisation. On a proportional basis, prior to 1957, under a Labor Government, Queensland was more decentralised than it is today. Through the coal and nickel developments new towns have been created, but there has been a decrease in the population of so many once-thriving Queensland towns. Government members representing towns in the central and western areas are aware that well-known towns had populations large enough to hold their own industries. Today they have lost industries and services. In fact some towns have lost medical services. All this happened because the population was insufficient to pay for them.

While new towns have been established, the population of many older towns has decreased significantly. The only way to bring the population back is to develop secondary industries based on minerals and other primary products. If the Government could encourage people to develop secondary industries based on the primary industries in the older-established towns, their populations would increase. It worries me to see homes and shops vacant, with property values decreasing, simply because there is a lack of secondary industries to provide employment for young people when they leave school.

With those remarks, I indicate that Opposition members accept the second reading of the Bill, although we do not agree with some of the Treasurer's submissions.

Hon. L. R. EDWARDS (Ipswich—Deputy Premier and Treasurer) (10.55 p.m.), in reply: I again thank the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for his comments. I guess we agree to disagree on some interpretations of the reasons for certain decisions on both sides.

But I must say that I share his very marked concern about the downturn in some country towns. I am not sure, however, that a decrease in pay-roll tax would lead to the redevelopment of those towns. I know that he has spent some time visiting those areas in the past, and I do share his concern for them. I think that in the development of new towns such as Moranbah and Black-

water there needs to be some planning to ensure that the main emphasis is not just on the mining industry. I think the honourable member has discussed that subject with me before. We must ensure that secondary industries develop alongside the mining industry so that the young people who cannot get jobs in the mining industry can be employed in industries associated with it. But I disagree that a pay-roll tax exemption would be sufficient incentive for the development of those industries. I thank the Opposition for its support of the Bill.

Motion (Dr. Edwards) agreed to.

COMMITTEE

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. W. D. Hewitt, Greenslopes, in the chair)

Clauses 1 to 13, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

THIRD READING

Bill, on motion of Dr. Edwards, by leave, read a third time.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Leader of the House): I move—

“That the House, at its rising, do adjourn until Tuesday, 20 November 1979.”

Motion agreed to.

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Leader of the House): I move—

“That the House do now adjourn.”

Question put; and the House divided—

AYES, 28

Akers
Austin
Bishop
Booth
Dounany
Edwards
Elliott
Goleby
Greenwood
Gygar
Hartwig
Hewitt, W. D.
Innes
Kaus
Knox

Lane
Lee
Lickiss
Miller
Scassola
Simpson
Sullivan
Tomkins
Warner
Wharton
White, P. N. D.
Tellers:
Moore
Katter

NOES, 22

Blake
Casey
Davis
Fouras
Gibbs, R. J.
Hansen
Hooper, K. J.
Houston
Jones
Kruiger
Mackenroth
Milliner
Prest

Scott
Shaw
Underwood
Vaughan
Warburton
Wilson
Yewdale

Tellers:
D'Arcy
Burns

Resolved in the affirmative.

The House adjourned at 11.6 p.m.