TUESDAY, 6 APRIL 1982

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

PARLIAMENTARY REPORTING STAFF

Statement by Mr Speaker

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I regret to advise that last week rumours were circulating implying that, owing to excessive work-load, the Hansard staff was contemplating strike action.

I wish to refute this rumour in the strongest possible terms. Never has there been the slightest suggestion about going on strike because of an excessive work-load. All members of the Parliamentary Reporting Staff are conscious of their responsibilities to the House, and indeed I commend the Hansard reporters and typists for their co-operation and effort during the past week.

Honourable Members: Hear, hear!

Mr SPEAKER: May I repeat that at no time was there ever any suggestion of strike action.
MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Semi-trailer Accidents

Hon. D. F. LANE (Merthyr—Minister for Transport) (11.5 a.m.): Members will be aware of the recent spate of road accidents involving trucks and heavy articulated vehicles. Quite a deal of publicity has been given to these accidents and many members of the public and the transport industry have contacted my office and, no doubt, other members' offices, expressing concern.

Last Friday I received an interim report of a study that was commissioned at a cost of $15,000 by the Road Safety Council into articulated vehicle accidents during 1968-1978 in Queensland. The report is being undertaken by Geoff McDonald and Associates under the supervision of the chairman of the Road Safety Council's research committee, Dr Barry Smithurst, who is a reader in social and preventative medicine at the University of Queensland. The basis of the study was to examine in detail all crashes involving articulated vehicles during the period 1 July 1977 to 30 June 1979. This involved examining all police records, Main Roads records, Department of Transport files and other relevant data from other Government departments as well as from the Australian Bureau of Statistics. The study is extremely detailed and, on its completion, will be the most comprehensive of its kind in Queensland.

The interim report which I have received, as well as the report which my road safety officers have undertaken into the recent accidents on our highways involving trucks and other heavy vehicles, already indicates that a number of changes are desirable. Some of the early findings are valuable and would be of interest to members of the House. Approximately 10 per cent of accident reports indicate some sort of mechanical failure, including trailer couplings, brakes, steering, tyres, suspension and lights.

When the interim report was being presented last Friday at the Road Safety Council research committee meeting, I took the opportunity of viewing a research film of truck-braking tests. The tests showed how some braking systems cause jack-knifing under emergency situations and how others eliminate this practice. Quite clearly, there needs to be a review of the Australian Design Standards on truck brakes and also an examination of the need for secondary braking systems for large trucks; also the design rules for tyres and lights need urgent examination.

A significant number of accidents involved passenger vehicles colliding with turning trucks. In 95 cases out of 135, this involved vehicles both travelling in the same direction. The interim report clearly indicates that there exists a communication problem with drivers receiving information on the whereabouts and intentions of other road users. This points to the need for clearer signalling indicator intentions and the suitable fitment of rear-vision mirrors to cover vehicles close to the sides of trucks.
Abilities, developed skill, and diligence vary considerably among people working in the trucking industry. A high standard of professionalism is required in the industry, particularly from the truck drivers.

In answer to a question last week in this House I said that a study in 1977 by the Traffic Accident Research Unit in New South Wales by Dawn Linklater showed that truck drivers experience more fatigue than other motorists. A report entitled "A Profile of Long Distance Truck Drivers" showed that truck drivers demonstrated more open aggression than other motorists and even suggested that truck drivers fear their vehicles. The interim report which I have received supports that but suggests that it could be alleviated by changing licensing requirements and undertaking greater professional training within the industry. Better vehicle design is obviously a critical component not only in primary safety but also in reducing this fatigue.

Other road users play a significant role in articulated vehicle accidents and the reasons are not fully clear. They have breached "stop" and "give way" signs in angled approach accidents, crossed over the centre line in opposite-direction accidents, turned across semi-trailers in turning accidents, run out of control into trucks and run into the back of parked trucks.

The report shows that a greater effort must be made to have motorists understand the special problems of semi-trailers so that their driving may allow for the large vehicles.

In addition to the interim report of the study into articulated vehicle accidents and also the report by Road Safety Council officers on the recent accidents, I have asked that a meeting be convened by the Acting Commissioner for Transport of representatives from the motor and trucking industry, the Transport Workers' Union, driver groups and other interested bodies to examine a range of options to provide for the safer movement of road transport.

These options, which will be circulated to these groups prior to the meeting, will include—

- Stricter driver-licence testing for trucks and semi-trailers;
- A system of graded licences for trucks and semi-trailers based on experience;
- A minimum age limit for heavy vehicle operators, that is, semi-trailers;
- The need for design rule changes for braking systems, tyre standards and placements;
- Re-examination of the current allowable driving and rest hours provided for under the State Transport Act;
- A need for reduced speed limits in certain areas for semi-trailers; and
- A review of the present log-book system, including the possibility of compulsory tachographs (blackboxes).

In addition to these systems I have directed my transport police and weighbridge officers to undertake a blitz on log-books to help eliminate the possibility of driver fatigue.

As well, the Road Safety Council is doing a Statewide canvass of fleet owners and transport firms to increase the number of driver-training schemes available to truck drivers.

Mr Speaker, any accidents on our roads are a cause for great concern. Obviously, when semi-trailer accidents occur there is a greater chance of multiple fatalities. All members in this House share my concern about reducing the road toll, and I assure you, Mr Speaker, that I will continue in my endeavours to reduce the carnage that takes place on our highways.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr CASEY (Mackay—Leader of the Opposition) (11.10 a.m.), by leave: I have noted the sudden interest of the Liberal Party in electoral redistribution in Queensland based on a single quota for the whole of the State.

It is my belief that matters of great community interest should be the subject of regular debate in this Parliament which is, after all, a public forum—

Government Members interjected.
Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition is very well aware that his remarks do not constitute a personal explanation. If he has a personal explanation to make, I will hear it, otherwise I will insist that he resume his seat.

LEAVE TO MOVE MOTION WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr CASEY (Mackay—Leader of the Opposition): I therefore seek leave of the House to move that so much of the Standing Orders as is necessary be suspended so as to allow the honourable member for Wolston to move General Business—Notice of Motion No. 14 standing in his name on electoral redistribution.

Question put; and the House divided—
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Resolved in the negative.

PETITIONS

The Clerk announced the receipt of the following petitions—

Electoral Redistribution
From Mr Scassola (59 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will amend the Electoral Districts Act 1971-1977 to provide a uniform electoral quota for all electoral districts.

Funding for State Schools; Class Sizes
From Mr Akers (224 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will restore the education share of the Budget to the 1975-1976 level, employ sufficient teachers so that the class sizes do not exceed the select committee recommendation, and provide sufficient funds for necessary school building and maintenance.
Questions Without Notice

From Mr Hartwig (333 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will implement the recommendations of the Ahern select committee and negotiate a suitable timetable to reduce class sizes.

Traffic Lights, Taylor and Tor Streets, Toowoomba

From Dr Lockwood (259 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will install traffic lights at Taylor and Tor Streets, Toowoomba.

Petitions received.

QUESTION UPON NOTICE

A question submitted on notice was answered as follows:—

1. Rezoning of Land, 32-34 East Street, Burleigh Heads

Mr Casey asked the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police—

With reference to premises at 32-34 East Street, Burleigh Heads, situated just behind the Berkley Square development carried out a few years ago by his private company, Lowana Developments—Although a rezoning application for these premises was rejected by the Gold Coast City Council, has the Government over-ridden the wishes of the council and changed the zoning of this land to residential C to allow the construction of a three-storied block of units in the new Gold Coast town plan?

Answer:—

I am not aware of any decision by the Gold Coast City Council on an application for the rezoning of the lands referred to by the honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

However, my inquiries show that, when the new town planning scheme for the city of Gold Coast was placed on public exhibition pursuant to the Local Government Act, objections were lodged by the owners of the subject lands to the inclusion of their lands in the residential B (duplex) zone. The owners stated that lands immediately to the north of their lands were included in the residential C zone and that, having regard to the topography of the land, they would be disadvantaged because of the level of development that could occur as of right on the residential C zoned land.

The council, in its representations on the objections, stated that, although the objector's lands might be suitable for inclusion in the residential C zone, such inclusion would, in its view, need to be effected by a formal application for rezoning. However, I am advised that, in a considerable number of cases, the council, when considering objections, recommended alterations in advertised zonings that were similar in impact to the matter raised by the honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

As honourable members would be aware, one of the principal purposes of placing a town-planning scheme on public exhibition is to enable interested persons to draw attention to inconsistencies that they consider exist in the scheme so that these can be examined and rectified if need be. Under the Local Government Act 1936-1981, the Governor in Council, when approving a town-planning scheme, may make all such alterations to the scheme as he deems fit, having regard to the provisions of the scheme, objections thereto and the council's representations thereon.

In the case referred to by the honourable the Leader of the Opposition it was considered that there was substance in the objections lodged and the Governor in Council, on my recommendation, approved that the objectors' lands be included in the residential C zone in conformity with the zoning of lands immediately to the north.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Electoral Redistribution

Mr Casey: In asking a question of the Deputy Premier and Treasurer, I refer to the new Liberal Party policy on electoral redistribution and ask: Does he support the new proposal, will it be put into effect this year, or does he still stand by his comments made in the Parliament on 28 October last year when he said—

"I do not support a redistribution in the term of this Parliament."?
Dr EDWARDS: I have made my position very clear, and I unlike the Leader of the
Opposition, who continually changes his mind about all things, do not depart from that.
At all times my position has been made very clear. There will be no redistribution by
the Government in the term of this Parliament.

Staffing, Titles Office

Mr CASEY: In asking a question of the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General,
I refer him to reports of critical staffing problems in the Titles Office that have caused
members of the public and the business community to experience very long delays in the
transfer of titles and the approval of plans. I now ask: As this office will earn $15m
profit for the Government this financial year, why has the Government refused to appoint
adequate staff to cope with the demand for the services of the Titles Office in all offices
throughout Queensland?

Mr DOUMANY: The problems of the Titles Office have been the result of the great
boom in property sales in Queensland because of the migration to this State, which holds such
attractions for the rest of Australia, in contrast with the Labor State of New South
Wales, which is stagnating and does not have sufficient power to service its requirements.
The reason for the pressure on the Titles Office is a very positive one. The problems
of staffing, resources and the difficulties posed by the backlog of applications have been
constantly under review within the constraints of budgetary limitations. This is a
responsible Government. We do not squander public money, but fulfil our role as effectively
as possible. In the very near future an announcement will be made indicating a positive
move within budgetary restraints, involving my colleague the Minister for Environment,
Valuation and Administrative Services (Mr Hewitt). A marked improvement will result
from the changes following that announcement and some of the critical delays experienced
in the past few weeks will be significantly alleviated after Easter.

TAB Subsidy to Radio Station 4BC

Mr CASEY: I ask the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police: Can
he outline the sliding scale of the TAB subsidy to radio station 4BC and its associated
country stations which now provide racing coverage? Despite the $100,000 that 4BC will
receive from the TAB this year, the last radio survey showed that its ratings dropped by
a quarter. As the Minister has set a precedent by subsidising racing coverage, would he
extend the subsidy to other media, including newspapers, which provide pages of form
guide and comments, or is the TAB just propping up a radio station that previously
provided racing coverage without being subsidised by punters' money?

Mr HINZE: Before I answer, I pose a question, the answer to which everybody on
this side of the House would like to know. Did the Leader of the Opposition get big
Vinnie in and tell him to stand with his back to him or put his hands out so that he
could give him the cuts? What did he do to big Vinnie this morning? The Leader of
the Opposition has silenced him. Did he give him six cuts on each hand?

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order. I ask the Minister to answer
the question.

Mr HINZE: My statement was nearly as silly as the question.
Mr Jones: Not only that, but you don't know the answer.

Mr HINZE: If I had a Dorothy Dixer, I would not have asked the Leader of the
Opposition to ask it. All he has done is to give me ammunition that I could use, if I had the
time. If he had sufficient knowledge to comprehend the arrangements made by the TAB
to broadcast through 4BC, I would inform him that they have been a wonderful asset to
the TAB and profits have jumped considerably. We propose taking them a stage further
to make sure that those in the northern part of Queensland will receive a similar service
to those in the southern part so that they receive almost a complete broadcast.
The Leader of the Opposition talks about ratings falling off and other silly things.
4BC knew very well before it entered into the arrangement with the TAB what it was
doing. Its management will be watching the position closely to see that its business is
not affected. However, every time I discuss the matter with 4BC management and personnel from where I sit it seems that they are all very happy with the relationship. Those engaged in the racing industry in the southern part of Queensland have been extremely happy to have complete broadcasts. Obviously, the Leader of the Opposition does not know what he is talking about when he asks such a question. To those in the print media who want to sell their newspapers and give the people something readable, I point out that at least a person can read the guide to form, knowing that it is true.

Population Shift from Southern States to Queensland

Mr LESTER: I ask the Premier: Is it true that the people of Victoria, and the people of New South Wales, which is the most disastrously run State in Australia under a Labor administration, will make Queensland their Mecca and their promised land, and that will provide a solution to many of their troubles?

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: The people of New South Wales, Victoria and Tasmania are discovering that Queensland has the type of government and the political and business climate necessary for them to succeed in life. That is borne out by the statistics that are available. I point out to the honourable member that one of the best places to which they could go, apart from the Kingaroy district, would be to the Emerald district, where so many opportunities for employment exist. Of course, those persons are, without question, making the right judgment.

Queensland's Share of Overseas Coal Market

Mr LESTER: I ask the Minister for Mines and Energy: Is it true that Australia faces a large challenge to its overseas coal sales? What further action can the Government take to ensure that Australia, and Queensland in particular, obtains, and continues to obtain, its fair share of the overseas coal market?

Mr I. J. GIBBS: The Premier has referred already to the problems experienced by other States and to the effect of those problems on Queensland. New South Wales has experienced problems in the electricity industry; also, between 30 and 75 ships are standing off the harbour——

A Government Member: Wran's navy.

Mr I. J. GIBBS: Yes, Wran's navy. It is unfortunate that overseas businessmen making decisions on investment in Australia are unaware of the difference between the various States and of the problems peculiar to New South Wales, especially in the shipping and electricity industries. Queenslanders must work hard to separate their State from New South Wales. Queensland's problems with shipping and power supplies are minor. Its industrial record is better than that of other States. There will be a deterioration in the situation in Victoria as there has been in New South Wales. The Government must work hard with private enterprise to ensure that Queensland's problems are totally separated from those of the other States and that the problems are identified with the State in which they occur. The problems of a particular State should not be broad-brushed over the other States.

Queensland's future is assured. Although an expansion is taking place in the coal-mining industry, the world demand for coal is decreasing. This year the Government will be working hard to bring that to the notice of overseas customers and investors in Australia. It will point out to them that Queensland is the best place in the world to invest their moneys. The Government will continue to provide encouragement to private enterprise. It will prove to the world that Queensland is a democratic State with a great interest in private enterprise. It will be pushing to make sure that Queensland's future coal sales are maintained in competition with the rest of the world.

Government's Alleged Moves to Force Churches out of Aboriginal Communities and Reserves

Mr WARNER: I ask the Premier: Are allegations that the Government has forced the churches out of the Mapoon and Weipa missions and also out of the Lockhart River, Edward River and Kowanyama church-sponsored communities, as has been claimed consistently by members of the Opposition, true?
Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: No. Contrary to the impression that certain people have tried to create, they are not correct. Over the years the Government has invited and encouraged the various churches to become involved in the conduct of Aboriginal missions and reserves. For many years I myself was so involved through the Lutheran Church. Our church worked with the Government, as other churches did. However, it is becoming increasingly difficult to get people from the churches to go to live and work on Aboriginal reserves and communities. Because of the difficulties created by drink and other factors, the churches seem to have vacated the field to a large extent and to have left the management of the reserves to the Government.

I shall table a letter from a reverend gentleman at Mapoon who says quite clearly that the Government did not ask the churches to leave but rather encouraged them to stay and to work amongst the Aborigines. Church leaders are expressing their views on Aboriginal land rights and on ways of helping the Aborigines. I suggest that the churches play the role that they are designed to play, namely, preach the Gospel and become involved in the management of Aboriginal communities. They should send church workers and missionaries to the reserves, as they did in the early days. That is the job that the churches should be doing. I regret to say that the churches are not becoming involved in that aspect of their work, nor are they participating in the management of reserves to any great extent. The Government has always encouraged the churches to stay and work on the various reserves and missions.

Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the letter on the table.

Purchase of Wreath to be Laid at Rats of Tobruk Memorial Service

Mr JONES: I ask the Premier: Is he aware that, after receiving an invitation to be represented at the Rats of Tobruk commemoration ceremony last Sunday at the Cenotaph, the Government advised the Rats of Tobruk Association that only if the association supplied and paid for a wreath would a representative of the State Government be in attendance? Is that correct?

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: I am surprised that the honourable member would even dare to suggest such a thing. I thought he would be big enough and have sufficient vision to know that such a suggestion is totally and utterly untrue.

Mr Jones: I only want your assurance.

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: I am disappointed that the honourable member, who says he only wants my assurance, should try to capitalise on an issue such as that. But, of course, that is typical of the Labor Party; it continually tries to capitalise on matters such as that. The suggestion is totally absurd and despicable.

Cairns Airport Development Environmental Impact Study

Mr JONES: I ask the Minister for Northern Development and Maritime Services: When will the Cairns Airport development environmental impact study, which was promised in August and October 1980, be conducted? Who are the personnel who were appointed to conduct the study? When is it expected that the results of the study will be made available?

Mr BIRD: I am sure that the honourable member does not expect me to be able to answer that question without prior advice of it. I therefore suggest to him that he give me an outline of the information that he seeks so that I can provide it to him at the earliest possible opportunity.

New South Wales Motor Vehicle Repair Industry Council

Mr JONES: I ask the Minister for Employment and Labour Relations: Has his attention been drawn to a new authority that has been established in New South Wales and is known as the Motor Vehicle Repair Industry Council, which is a body of appeal for motorists against shoddy mechanical and body repairs on their cars? Is he aware that motor mechanics, panel beaters, spray painters, auto electricians, body makers, brake mechanics, front-end specialists, transmission specialists and loss assessors must now be registered, that contingency funds are required to be established to cover costs of faulty repairs and that the maximum penalty for unregistered trading is $2,000? If the Minister
is so aware, is it expected that parallel legislation will be introduced in Queensland? If not, will he have investigations carried out with a view to introducing such legislation in Queensland?

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: I am aware of the move to be made in other parts of Australia to register the persons mentioned by the honourable member. We are watching that move with considerable interest. So far, there seems to be no indication of a decrease in the number of complaints people have made, or will make, about shoddy work in these areas. It is interesting to note that over the last three years, in Queensland, without registration, there has been a reduction in the number of complaints. A number of operators in Queensland are not registered under the Factories and Shops Act. We have taken action to see that, if qualified to be registered, they are registered and, if they are not qualified that they are prosecuted under the Act.

Local authorities can play an important role in relation to what might be termed "unlicensed operators" Very often, "backyarders", as they are commonly called, operate under the nose of local authorities without any action being taken to prevent their operating commercially outside the zones normally allocated to persons in such industries.

Protection for Parents Supervising School Sports

Mr HARPER: I refer the Minister for Education to a recent court action in which a teacher at a private school was found liable for injuries suffered by a student playing supervised sport, and his statement that the Governor afforded protection for its teachers against such claims for damages. I ask the Minister: Does such protection extend to parents who are assisting State school teachers either at school or at sporting events?

Mr GUNN: The statement I made was to the effect that in all cases involving a teacher in a State school who had acted responsibly, my department had stood by the teacher. I also said that I would not support legislation that would deny an injured student his day in court.

I am prepared to look at cases of parents seconded to assist teachers. When supervising sporting events, they are usually covered by a public risk policy.

Tourism, Cania Gorge Area

Mr HARPER: I ask the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts: Will he take action to ensure liaison between officers of his departments of Tourism and National Parks towards retaining existing improvements at the site of the Cania Dam so that an opportunity is given for those improvements to be utilised in the development of the tourism potential of the Cania Gorge area.

Mr ELLIOTT: Later this year my officers and I will be out in that area. Together with the honourable member we will be looking first-hand at the Cania Gorge and the facilities there. I look forward to the opportunity to have a frank and full discussion with the honourable member and all the people involved in the tourist industry in that area. Many of the potential tourist attractions of the inland areas of Queensland are very underrated. The Cania Gorge, and the Cania Dam, which are well known, could be utilised to great advantage. I look forward to the opportunity of being with the honourable member in his area so that we may try to further develop tourism centred on this facility.

Unsubstantiated Allegations by Member for Archerfield

Mr STEPHAN: I ask the Premier: Do the statements made by the member for Archerfield on "State Affair" last Thursday, 1 April, in which he claimed, amongst other things, to have been appointed Assistant Police Commissioner, verify his ability to consistently play act and misrepresent factual situations without batting an eyelid? In view of the honourable member's unsubstantiated accusations against many people, do those statements confirm his ability to consistently play act and, like most other actors, to make outlandish claims and allegations in order to attract personal attention?

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: For a considerable period all members on this side have been deeply concerned about the way in which the Opposition, and particularly the honourable member for Archerfield, have sought to use the special privilege and protection of the House
to cast aspersions on and make allegations against different people. Honourable members on this side of the Chamber very much deplore the way in which the honourable member for Archerfield has directed his attention to the Police Commissioner, the Assistant Commissioner and others in the Police Force generally. It was interesting to see his colleague the member for Wolston categorically deny the truth of the statements by the member for Archerfield. That denial makes it clear that the accusations made by the member for Archerfield have no substance or foundation——

Dr Edwards: Mr Casey is caught sitting on the fence.

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: As the Deputy Premier said, it is interesting that the Leader of the Opposition has not said anything in support of the Police Force, which clearly indicates that the ALP as a whole are violently anti-police. I have not heard or seen one word in the media from the Leader of the Opposition in support of the police.

Dr Edwards: Anti law and order.

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: Yes, he is very anti law and order; that is clear.

Mr Doumany: He is not even in the Chamber.

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: No, he is not in the Chamber, but I appreciate that he might have other matters to attend to.

I reiterate that I deplore the despicable actions of the member for Archerfield. He makes no contribution of any value or importance, but simply adopts a destructive attitude and tries to denigrate people who have no opportunity to reply. It is clear that the Labor Party has once again been caught out. It does not know where to go, or what to do. It certainly has nothing constructive to add to the work of the House. It is obvious that it is very anti police.

Rehabilitation and After-care Services for Psychiatric Patients

Mr UNDERWOOD: I ask the Minister for Health: What after-care services are being offered for discharged psychiatric patients, and what is the process of outside rehabilitation? Are any changes proposed and, if so, what are they?

Mr AUSTIN: My department does offer a service within the community for discharged patients. We are in the process of revitalising that service and trying to expand it. I have made some announcements, and Cabinet has approved the drafting of legislation that will allow the separation of psychiatric patients from other handicapped patients.

The Government is taking progressive steps towards separating the two. In fact, when I was in England recently, I had discussions with a member of the House of Lords and found that it has been well and truly established in Britain that there ought to be separation of the types of handicapped persons in institutions. The department is developing programs that will allow continuing care for those people discharged from psychiatric institutions in an attempt to maintain them in the community and keep them out of such institutions. I believe that every member would approve of that goal. The essence of the exercise is to keep people out of psychiatric institutions and public hospitals for as long as possible. We want to keep them an an effective part of the community.

I assure the honourable member that programs are available, and although they might not be as large as the honourable member might expect, they are expanding and developing, and they will continue to do so in the future.

Pecuniary Interests of Ministers; Colwal Pty Ltd

Mr UNDERWOOD: In directing a question to the Premier, I refer to the pecuniary interests requirements that, in the past, he has said that he applies to his Ministers. I ask: Did the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police disclose to the Premier his involvement in the $45m Gold Coast high-rise development with Sir Leslie Thiess? Was he aware that the Minister's company, Colwal Pty Ltd, is a trust company for the Hinze family trust and that Colwal has a joint venture with a dummy Thiess company, Nathan Investments Pty Ltd, and the Thiess family company, Drayton Investments
Pty Ltd, by which the Minister will share in the profits of Gemini Court, although Thiess put up all the money and the Minister put up only a $2 company? When Cabinet decided the controversial Winchester South coal deal and the awarding of the Gold Coast casino licence, both of which went to the Thiess company, Drayton Investments, did the Minister disclose his extraordinarily generous business venture with Thiess? Will he stand the Minister down if he did not make such a disclosure and hold an independent inquiry to determine the Minister's full financial association with, and benefits from, Gemini Court?

Mr HINZE: I rise to a point of order. It is obvious that all that the honourable member is doing is pushing the barrow for a person who has been in the Press gallery for the last week or two and who, I think, is carrying out a personal vendetta against me. Of course, I refer to a person by the name of Mark Oliver Plunkett. Previously he had made statements—

Mr CASEY: I rise to a point of order. Surely the Minister is making a statement. Mr Speaker, you have the authority to determine whether a question is in order or out of order, and I think that you should so determine.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The question, in the initial stages, was suspect in the extreme. However, if the Minister chooses to throw some light on the issue before the House, I propose to allow him to do so.

Mr HINZE: This person is carrying on a vendetta, so much so that his newspaper had to publish a public apology to me about another matter. The same thing applies in this instance. I see him in the Press gallery again this morning hawking his wares. I believe that all that the honourable member is trying to do is ask further questions on this person's behalf.

The simple facts of the matter are that a statement was made to this House, I believe last week, indicating that I have no interest in a company by the name of Colwal. I think it was also mentioned in the House that Colwal is a shelf company, put together by a solicitor from the Gold Coast. It had no relationship to my previous Press secretary, Mr Col Walker; and I believe that writs have been issued accordingly.

All that I wish to say to this Chamber and to this gentleman who seems to be prying into my affairs—frankly, I do not care what anybody else in this House does—is that the Premier would have no reason whatsoever to make any suggestion to me. A search of the Corporate Affairs office will indicate that I have no interest whatsoever in the company. As a responsible member, I would have advised Cabinet had I had any relationship at all with that matter or the granting of the Winchester South coal deal.

To try to indicate that I used my office as a Minister is untenable and not acceptable to me. Frankly, if the honourable member had any guts he would withdraw the question, be he will not do so.

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: The question was directed to me. The other day, a similar question was answered by the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General, and the question today has been answered by the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police. The Government has a policy, which it always maintains, that if a Minister has an interest in anything that comes before Cabinet—it happens very rarely—he should announce to Cabinet that he has some interest in the matter and withdraw from the discussion. That has been traditional. Because of the reasons outlined by the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General and the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police, that did not happen in this case.

In conclusion, I point out that this again demonstrates the low depths to which the members of the Labor Party will sink, obviously in their private lives and also in this Chamber. They cannot get above the level of the gutter at any time. They cannot come forward with any constructive policies or anything that is of interest and value to this State. They have always got to try to undermine someone. I was about to say that they would make good underground miners; but that would be an insult to mineworkers, for whom I have a great admiration. That is the way in which they operate and live. I regret the state of the Labor Party today and the way in which it operates, which is not in the interests of the people or in the interests of this Chamber.
Pecuniary Interests of Ministers

Mr UNDERWOOD: I ask the Premier: Does he have a complete list of all the public and private pecuniary interests and investments of Ministers so that, when any decision is made in Cabinet, he is sure that his Ministers do not breach that Cabinet code?

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: The Labor Party would have to do that because its members do not trust each other. That is the way they operate. I trust my Ministers and I am not suspicious of them. I hold them in high regard and have every confidence in them.

No, I do not have a list. I have never asked for one, because I know I can trust my Ministers.

Optometrical Contract, Maryborough Hospitals Board

Mr POWELL: I ask the Minister for Health: Is he aware that last Saturday tenders were called for optometrical services at the hospitals controlled by the Maryborough Hospitals Board? Is he further aware that on the last occasion the recommendation of the hospitals board that a local contractor be awarded the contract was overruled? In view of the many complaints received, especially from pensioners, can the users of the system be assured that when the new tender is considered that the quality of service and local concern for good service will be given priority and that the board's recommendation will be accepted?

Mr AUSTIN: I am aware that last year the successful tenderer was not from the local area. The Health Department has a policy of asking hospitals boards, where possible, to accept the lowest tenderer. The service in the area to which the honourable member refers has been criticised, and I am concerned about that criticism. However, I point out that not all criticism related to the service provided; there was some criticism of the type of spectacle frames provided.

Sometimes when private optometrists offer special frames, the people to whom they are offered have to purchase them. Some practitioners within the hospital system have been what could be termed less than honest with some of their patients. In fact, they have encouraged them to have specific types of frames, which generates more business for their private practice. I take the honourable member's comments on board, and I will do my best to ensure that a satisfactory service is provided. However, in general terms, the department will continue to recommend the lowest tenderer in any specific area.

Qantas House Demolition

Mr AKERS: I ask the Minister for Employment and Labour Relations: Will he advise the House whether conditions at the Qantas House demolition site in Queen Street are now safe for workers on the project and for pedestrians in the area? Has any person been prosecuted for any breach of regulations that cover demolition projects?

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: As a result of a number of safety shortcomings at that demolition site, an injunction was taken out. All those objections have been overcome and the injunction has been cleared. As from 11 o'clock yesterday, special conditions apply to that building. Save for human error, the safest working conditions possible now apply to the demolition of that building. The matter of prosecution will be considered by other people in the course of time and in the light of the evidence in the hands of my officers and of the Solicitor-General's Office.

Normal work has resumed at the site. I make the point that demolition sites, because of the nature of the work, are indeed very dangerous areas. A number of very regrettable accidents have occurred, some of them fatal. Because of that, special interest has been shown in what is going on. On this occasion the department found reason to take some action. I hope that such action will not be necessary in future, but I assure honourable members that the demolition of major buildings will receive very special attention from the inspectors of the department.
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Titles Office Delays

Mr AKERS: I ask the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General: In view of the cost to business and the difficulties for private people being caused by delays in the Titles Office in the transfer of titles, will he consider the introduction of an interim certificate system similar to that successfully in operation in Western Australia?

Mr DOUMANY: At present several options for the Titles Office are being considered. As I mentioned earlier in answer to a question from the Leader of the Opposition, both my colleague the Minister for Environment, Valuation and Administrative Services and I will make announcements about a co-operative scheme for the immediate future that will help a great deal. However, I will certainly take on board the suggestion made by the honourable member for Pine Rivers and look at it very carefully. It could be an innovation worthy of introduction in Queensland.

Drug, KH₃

Mr AKERS: I ask the Minister for Health: Has his attention been drawn to recent newspaper articles about the beneficial effects of the drug KH₃? Has his department carried out any investigations into it? Is KH₃ on the restricted list? Will he give consideration to removing it from that list so that it will be available to the general public?

Mr Moore: Tell us what KH₃ is, for a start.

Mr AUSTIN: KH₃ is the youth drug, and it is obvious that the honourable member for Windsor and I have not been taking it.

Although it is currently under investigation by it, at this stage KH₃ has not been reported by the therapeutic drugs committee of the National Health and Medical Research Council. All sorts of allegations have been made that the drug is not available. In fact, it is available by prescription through general practitioners, who can arrange it through the Commonwealth Health Department.

My department has a policy of not approving drugs onto the market in Queensland until they have been passed by the drugs committee of the National Health and Medical Research Council. For our guidance we use the findings of that expert body, and will continue to do so. When it clears the drug and it is included in a specific schedule in the Commonwealth Health Act and the State Health Act, the drug will be available. However, until then, we propose to adhere to the guidelines that have been tried and tested over many years, that is, the findings of the National Health and Medical Research Council.

Iwasaki Tourist Complex

Mr KRUGER: I ask the Premier: Can he advise the House if the first block of units at the Iwasaki resort is occupied? If his answer is “Yes”, by whom? If it is “No”, why not? As the construction of the block was commenced in about June 1980 and is possibly not occupied, does he expect Mr Iwasaki to meet the terms of the franchise agreement, as set out in the schedule that Stage I works are to be completed by March 1984?

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: I am not sure whether the honourable member is seeking to ascertain whether there is a vacancy for him and his family. I assure him that the Iwasaki project will be of great benefit and advantage to Queensland generally and to its tourist industry in particular. Mr Iwasaki has an overall plan to build a number of units, and plans are before the local authority for approval, prior to tenders being called.

Mr Hartwig: $20m worth.

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: Yes. As the honourable member for Callide said, $20m worth. That of course is an indication that the project is proceeding. It is certainly a very large project.

I assume that everything has to be co-ordinated. When the accommodation is made available is a matter for Mr Iwasaki to determine. He is doing a very good job. It is inspiring to see it. I wish the honourable member would go there. I am sure that if he did he would book a unit when the resort is opened.
French Nuclear Testing, South Pacific Area

Mr KRUGER: In directing a further question to the Premier, I refer him to the evidence that continued French nuclear testing in the South Pacific has caused atolls to crack and sea-water to become contaminated, with the result that marine life is being mutated and poisoned. As the world’s marine ecosystem is finely balanced and interconnected, will he protest strongly to the French Government about the continued testing, as Queensland’s coastal areas may eventually be affected? Further, I ask the Premier to explain his recent statements on nuclear testing and legislation for safeguards. Will he explain where he really stands on the issue?

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: The ALP should direct its questions on nuclear matters direct to the French Government, because it is very close to it. It has the same socialistic objectives and outlook. We are all unhappy about the thought of nuclear war. There are many uses to which nuclear energy can be directed in a peaceful way. The world needs nuclear power to overcome the high costs of providing other forms of energy. The greatest transgression is taking place in the field of atomic warheads by the Communist countries, particularly Russia. The people who try to stop nuclear war never direct their attention to the Soviet Union. They are always against the free world. They say, “You mustn’t do it, but let the other sides do it.” That is the situation that exists in the world today.

I admire the realistic way in which President Reagan recognises the danger to the free world. I give him full marks for his determination, as far as the United States is concerned, to counter the threat that overshadows the whole world, namely, the Communist countries’ disregard for general safety in that area.

Gazettal of South Stradbroke Island as a National Park; Completion of South Stradbroke Island Canal Development

Mr KRUGER: I ask the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts: Does the Government intend gazetting South Stradbroke Island as a national park, as recommended in the long-range planning report adopted by Cabinet and tabled in Parliament on 29 November 1974 and, if so, when?

Does the Government intend taking any action to facilitate the completion of the partially constructed and now derelict canal development on South Stradbroke Island and, if so, what action is proposed?

Mr ELLIOTT: The matter of policy on declaration of national parks is one for consultation between my department and other departments. It will make its decision when it sees fit.

Free Hospital System

Dr SCOTT-YOUNG: I ask the Minister for Health: Would he inform the House whether he has seen an article in “The Townsville Daily Bulletin” dated 5 April in which Dr Blewett, the ALP Federal spokesman for Health, stated that the Queensland Government intends to abolish the free hospital system in Queensland? Would the Minister confirm or deny that allegation?

Mr AUSTIN: I have a copy of that article in my possession. It contains a photograph of Dr Blewett, Alderman Margaret Reynolds and the honourable member for Ipswich West. That is a good likely treble, Mr Speaker. The shadow spokesman for Health in the Federal Parliament is rather ineffective, but he is quite a nice fellow. Margaret Reynolds is a well known socialist-Left supporter from Townsville. Mr Underwood is the man who castigated the Leader of the Federal Opposition, Mr Hayden, over federal intervention. One would expect that Mr Underwood is now courting the socialist Left in portraying himself in Townsville. It is quite obvious that the Hayden health plan is an embarrassment to the ALP and that members of that party are doing their best to go through Queensland trying to sell it and at the same time making false allegations.

Sir William Knox: The Cain Government has increased fees in hospitals.

Mr AUSTIN: I have not reached that yet.
The article contains a statement that the State Government intends to abolish the free hospital system. I ask honourable members: What right has the member for Ipswich West to speak on behalf of the State Government? None whatsoever! The ALP is trying to instil fear into the people of Queensland by suggesting that this Government is about to abolish the free hospital system. The State Government has given an undertaking that it will continue the present hospital system in Queensland. My colleague the Minister for Employment and Labour Relations quite correctly suggests that the first statement made by the past shadow spokesman for Health in Victoria, Mr Roper, who is supposed to be the new Health Minister in the Victorian Government, was, "We will increase hospital fees."

I point out to the people of Queensland that Labor Governments, both State and Federal, have a record of increasing taxes wherever and whenever possible. Again I cite the example of the New South Wales Health Minister, Mr Brereton, who this year has already increased hospital fees in New South Wales by 20 per cent. There has not been a 20 per cent increase in hospital fees in Queensland.

Dr Edwards: They have closed more beds than any other State.

Mr Austin: The Deputy Premier is quite correct. New South Wales has closed more hospital beds than any other State. That is an indictment of that Government. Although it is charging patients, it does not have sufficient money to run its health system. It is closing beds all over that State. In contrast, the Queensland Government offers free hospital beds and has not been forced to increase charges. It certainly has not closed beds.

Some time ago the Jamison report correctly pointed out that Queensland was the most cost-efficient State in the conduct of the health system. That has been proved to be correct. As times got tough—times are tough everywhere—Queensland survived very well indeed. By comparison, other State Governments are closing hospital beds.

The vast majority of the comments in the article are absolute lies. The people of Queensland are entitled to know that if the Australian Labor Party is elected to office at the next Federal election a health tax will be imposed on all Queenslanders. At this stage it is suggested by the Federal Labor Party Opposition that it will be 0.75 per cent. Every indication is that the health levy will be at least double that. Honourable members and the people of Queensland ought to be made aware that all the Labor Party does throughout Queensland in an attempt to prop up its health plan is try to denigrate the hospital system. Fortunately, it cannot sell its plan to the people of Queensland.

I am making it my business to distribute every piece of information that I can to advise the people in my electorate that the Labor Party in Queensland supports the abolition of the free hospital system. I hope that all Government members remind their constituents that that is the Labor Party's policy and that the Labor Party is locked into it.

Staging of Prestige Racing Event in Queensland

Mr Hartwig: I congratulate the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police, as Minister in charge of racing, on the stand that he is taking for the racing industry. He is fast making Queensland the best racing State in the Commonwealth. As it is expected that at some time in the future Queensland will stage a race that will make the Melbourne Cup small by comparison, can he give an indication of when the race is likely to take place, the prize-money and the distance over which the race will be run?

Sir William Knox: The horses as well as the people will be leaving Victoria.

Mr Hinze: As my colleague the Minister for Employment and Labour Relations said, even the horses will be leaving Victoria.

The plan to conduct Australian international races is in its very early stages. Perhaps the question should have been directed to the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts, as the suggestion emanated from the Tourist and Travel Corporation. It is proposed that upon the conclusion of the successful Commonwealth Games Brisbane should offer an international event that would attract people to Queensland year after year. A committee has been formed. It appears that it will have generous support from sponsors.
in Queensland as well as from the Minister for Tourism and me. Although the Melbourne Cup will continue to be held dear by all Australians, it certainly will not continue to wear the mantle of Australia's premier race when Queensland has organised something just as good.

Central Queensland Petrol Prices

Mr HARTWIG: I ask the Minister for Commerce and Industry: Is there any reason why petrol is 8c a litre or 36c a gallon dearer in Central Queensland that in Brisbane? As Central Queensland has the ports of Gladstone and Port Alma, that is outrageous.

Mr SULLIVAN: I am well aware of the difference. Petrol can be bought at certain Brisbane service stations for as low as 32c a litre. When I filled the petrol tank of my vehicle at Gayndah, which is in the area represented by the Minister for Works and Housing, it cost me 42c a litre. That seems to be absurd; it is a rake-off. The freight factor should be the only factor influencing the difference in price.

The State Governments and the Commonwealth are looking very closely at petrol pricing. I repeat that, in my view, the only difference between the cost of petrol at the port and in country areas should be the cost of freight. As the honourable member for Isis said, included in that is the mark-up; but no-one can tell me that there should be a difference of 10c between the price of petrol in Brisbane and the price in Gayndah and other places.

Rosslyn Bay Boat Harbour Improvements

Mr HARTWIG: In asking the Minister for Northern Development and Maritime Services a question, I draw to his attention that recently when he announced improvements to the Rosslyn Bay boat harbour he omitted to advise me, the elected member for the area, of the proposed improvements. I should now like him to tell Parliament what the proposed improvements to the Rosslyn Bay boat harbour are. In future, I will take stronger measures if the Minister's departmental officers do not send me the relevant information.

Mr BIRD: It is rather strange for a member of Parliament who shows no particular interest in the things going on in his electorate to castigate a Minister——

Mr HARTWIG: I rise to a point of order. In no way did I castigate the Minister. I merely pointed out that I am the member for Callide and that the Minister did not advise me of the proposed improvements at Rosslyn Bay. I ask the Minister to inform the Parliament of them.

Mr BIRD: I give the honourable member an assurance that when courtesies are extended to me, they are returned. I make statements from time to time, but it must be appreciated that although Cabinet approval is given for certain work to be carried out, one can never be absolutely sure when the finance will be available for them. When Cabinet approval is given, Ministers do their best to advise all of those who are concerned and interested what work is to be carried out.

Shortage of Rental Housing

Mr FOURAS: I ask the Minister for Works and Housing: Although the Government skites about the large influx of southern people to Queensland, and talks of the benefits without referring to the costs, is he aware that a large number of intact families are breaking up because of the acute shortage of rental housing in Brisbane, which is evidenced by the fact that the vacancy rate declined from three per cent to less than half a per cent in the last two years? Is the Minister concerned about this callous disregard and inability of the Housing Commission to do anything to meet the shocking housing crisis?

Mr WHARTON: I thank the honourable member for his question, which gives me an opportunity to make several points. Firstly, I wonder which side of the fence the honourable member is on. He continually asks for rental housing, but his leader often asks for more mortgage finance. Where does the honourable member stand? The honourable member raised another matter——

Mr Fouras: Just answer the question.
Mr WHARTON: I will answer the honourable member's question; he need not worry about that. He will have to give me a little time. He took up a lot of time asking it. He read the question. I am not worried about that; he can read a book to me, if he wishes to do so. I know that the honourable member does not like anyone who has answers to his questions.

I point out to him that the Queensland Government has done more to provide housing than has any other Government in the nation.

Mr Fouras: I would debate that.

Mr WHARTON: The honourable member may debate it. He could argue that black was white.

We have always had the lowest wait-list in the Commonwealth, and the honourable member knows that that is true. We have looked after the needy people. That is our job.

Mr Fouras: You don't know what you are talking about.

Mr WHARTON: I know what I am talking about. The honourable member is talking about—

Mr Fouras: I am talking about families breaking up because they can't find houses in this city.

Mr WHARTON: That is the honourable member's story. He has not informed me what families these are; he just made a bald statement about families breaking up. There is accommodation available; there are crisis centres which help. There is a wait-list, and some people remain on that list for some time because needy people go to the top of the list. The honourable member has forgotten that the Government has provided mortgage finance to assist people to obtain housing. The Government has spent $88m on housing this year, $55m on mortgage finance and $33m on rental housing. Most of that money has been provided by the State, although some has been provided by the Commonwealth. There is a shortage of housing throughout the Commonwealth. It is a very important issue, and I am glad that the honourable member—

Mr Bjelke-Petersen: There are so many people coming here all the time.

Mr WHARTON: That has increased the length of our wait-list, but we are doing more in Queensland to provide welfare housing than is done in any other State. In the circumstances, we are doing very well.

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

COMMONWEALTH GAMES (MODIFICATION OF LAWS) BILL

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 25 March (see p. 5134) on Mr Elliott's motion—

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

Mr WARBURTON (Sandgate) (12.22 p.m.): The Bill provides for a temporary modification of Queensland laws relating to health, liquor and local government activities, as well as giving a protection to the Commonwealth Games Foundation and its commercial sponsors from those who may choose to improperly gain financially from the title "Commonwealth Games" or its derivatives.

Although the latter-mentioned provision is aimed solely at those who desire to cash in on the title "XIIth Commonwealth Games Brisbane 1982", presumably by using the title on such things as shirts and other forms of apparel and carry-bags, it is interesting to reflect upon some of the unfortunate things that have been allowed to occur following the granting of licences by the Commonwealth Games Foundation to manufacturers and distributors for the use of the official symbol on souvenir objects. I refer to the stylised kangaroo in full flight, this being the symbol chosen in a competition held in 1978.

Mr Hugh Edwards, a graphic designer, was responsible for the design of the symbol, and because it was a local design of a symbol highlighting a sporting event, that was seen, quite sensibly, as being strike one for a good slice of badly needed national pride at
that time. The foundation went through the usual copyright procedures, and licences to manufacture and distribute articles bearing the flying kangaroo symbol were issued, subject to the foundation receiving a specified return on sales.

Pendants, key-rings and many other types of jewellery started to appear in souvenir shops in the Brisbane area, and in a number of other retail-type outlets in other parts of the State. A much favoured pin-badge featuring the flying kangaroo symbol was selling in Brisbane for $1.50. Anita Jewellers of Surrey Hills, New South Wales, was the official distributor of the pin-badge, and inquiries I made at that time established that I could acquire an unlimited supply at 88c each. When asked where the pin-badges and many other jewellery items were manufactured, Anita Jewellers advised me personally that all items were manufactured in Hong Kong. Souvenirs will be available to visitors to the Commonwealth Games, many of whom will come from the South-East Asian region, and here we are selling them what they have manufactured and partially designed.

The foundation's responsibility, or what it declares to be its responsibility, ends with the issue of the licence. As far as I am concerned, the fact that items bearing the Commonwealth Games symbol were allowed to be manufactured outside Australia for sale in Australia on this very special occasion is an absolute disgrace. The Queensland Government should have insisted that only Australian-made goods bearing the Commonwealth Games symbol are allowed for sale.

The proposed modification of health Acts is reasonable, considering that many of the sporting contingents from visiting overseas countries will have, travelling with them, their team medical practitioners, physiotherapists, nurses, etc. Normally, under Queensland law, they would not be able to carry out their responsibilities. I believe it to be reasonable and sensible that they should be able to attend to their team members within the confines of the Commonwealth Games village and the Games venues for the limited period specified. I note that an amendment to include chiropractic manipulative therapists has been foreshadowed and the Opposition will have no objection to it.

I turn now to the Bill's effect on local government responsibilities. It would seem that the proposed modifications will allow the billeting of visitors in domestic premises, and car-parking at places usually unauthorised. Again, the relaxation of normal requirements will apply for only the Commonwealth Games period, and a little longer in some cases. The intention to disregard council ordinances and town planning requirements to the extent that they affect land, buildings and structures for residential purposes, coupled with a lack of any requirement to make application for the relaxation, could cause undue problems.

I note that land and structures to be used for car-parking must be covered by a permit after application, except in the case of a local authority using land held in trust or owned by it for car-parking purposes. The intent of the provision is no doubt to enable residents to legally billet non-family visitors. However, there is nothing in the Bill that prevents a resident from covering his property with caravans or tents. I have no objection to an application not being required in the case of billeting for a reasonable number of visitors in domestic premises or, for that matter, in a caravan or tent on a resident's property, but I firmly believe that an application should be required to be made to council where a resident seeks to allow more than one other type of dwelling, such as a caravan, to be temporarily sited on the property.

Overtaxing of the city's services, whether it concerns health or otherwise, can have serious consequences. Although I cannot envisage the problem being widespread—I accept that position—even isolated instances could cause a degree of havoc and discontent; I would like the Minister to comment on that matter. I think that there is a deficiency in the Bill inasmuch as the proposal that we are being asked to accept would in fact allow the exact thing that I have mentioned to happen. By virtue of the overriding of, for example, the Brisbane City Council's ordinances, town planning requirements and other provisions, there could be a proliferation of caravans or tents on a person's property.

Regarding the proposed modification of the Liquor Act—the best that we can hope to salvage from the brief period of civilised living under liberalised liquor laws is that we will be able to show tourists that we have the capacity in Queensland to live with the times, even though we might not exactly practise what we preach and even though the relaxation might be for a very limited period.
Perhaps the Government has seen fit to apply the same concept, even on a temporary basis, that it applies to gambling in Queensland. The Bjelke-Petersen Government sees gambling as the scourge of the earth and, in order to ensure that Queenslanders realise that fact, the Premier and his Government provide nearly every means of gambling possible.

So that honourable members will be well aware of the thrust of the Bill, I point out that it provides that for a period of weeks during the Commonwealth Games, and perhaps for a week or so longer, Brisbane will have liberalised liquor laws, which will be completely in the hands of the Licensing Commission. A remarkable point about the Bill, which, amongst other things, will enable the Licensing Commission to extend hours of trading for such places as restaurants, cabarets and bistros, is that the whole operation is for a large number of visitors to Brisbane, and to the State as a whole, who, we are told, will expect to use the State's facilities in a reasonably liberal manner. In other words, apparently the Government does not realise that hundreds upon hundreds of Queensland's visitors, who come here for reasons other than the Commonwealth Games, also expect the State's liquor laws to be liberal enough to enable them to enjoy and obtain the greatest benefit from the facilities of the State.

The Minister who has been landed with the responsibility for the carriage of the Bill is none other than the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts, and I am sure that he is somewhat embarrassed by it. It seeks a relaxation of certain liquor laws so that the State's facilities will meet visitors' expectations over a limited period. At present, the Government fails to offer those facilities, and they will cease approximately four weeks after their introduction later this year. When the Commonwealth Games visitors begin to wend their way home, the typical Queensland shutters will come down and the State, with its tourist potential, will drift back into its antiquated ways.

Although I have no hesitation in supporting the relaxation of the laws, I cannot support a facade that, in my opinion, constitutes one of the most incredible admissions ever made by the Government. In the Minister's very brief second-reading speech, the House was not informed about a host of matters that require clarification. Honourable members know that the licences referred to in the Bill could be for an hotel, a registered club, a major sporting club, a bowling club or a golf club. The licensees of all of those operations will be entitled to apply for a relaxation of the liquor laws. Numerous licence-holders can also apply for exemption from the provisions of the Liquor Act that now restrict their activities. Persons presently unlicensed may apply for a certificate that will allow them to sell liquor at approved premises. That part of the Bill probably will apply to such premises as are thought necessary within, for example, the confines of the Commonwealth Games village or at Games venues. That is one matter that needs clarification.

To date the Minister has given no indication of the extent to which the Licensing Commission will exercise its new-found and extremely wide powers. The commission will have temporary power to exempt the holder of a licence from the operation of all or any of the provisions of the Liquor Act that restrict the circumstances in which a licence holder is allowed to sell or supply liquor. Will it, therefore, be too much to hope that the commission will allow bottled liquor to be sold at or taken away from, for example, a bowling club? Certainly the Bill seems to provide the commission with that power. Nothing would please me more than to be able to buy bottled liquor, even in limited quantities, at Moorooka Bowling Club, which is the venue of lawn bowling for the Commonwealth Games, if I wished to act as a host to visiting bowlers during the course of the Games. That would be a sensible proposal, and that is what the Bill seems to provide for.

Mr Burns: You will buy a dozen bottles and take them home?

Mr WARBURTON: Of course I will. In his reply, I ask the Minister to expand on that matter.

Surely the Parliament ought to be told what guide-lines, if any, the Licensing Commission is expected to follow. The Bill does not provide those guide-lines. All the Bill does is give the Licensing Commission the new powers that I outlined earlier. I point out that there are no geographic restrictions in the Bill. For example, I ask the Minister: In what areas will the Commission relax the laws? The Gold Coast, for example, will certainly be saturated with Commonwealth Games visitors. I have no doubt that other areas such as the Sunshine Coast, Ipswich——

Mr Burns: Lizard Island.
Mr WARBURTON: As the honourable member for Lytton says, Lizard Island and other tourist centres in Queensland will have Games visitors, although I will elaborate on that point in a moment. Because of the lack of geographic restrictions in the Bill, at least those places can apply on the basis that they are hosting people connected with or involved in the Commonwealth Games.

The other question that I ask the Minister is this: What redress has a licensee if what is regarded as a reasonable application for a relaxation of the liquor laws is rejected? I believe that, in its present form, the Liquor Act does not allow for appeals. What happens if a request reasonably made under the Bill is rejected? Does the person concerned have a right of appeal to anyone? Can the licensee say, “I have been treated unfairly. The hotel down the road has been given a restricted licence: Why not me?”

I reiterate that I welcome the provisions contained in the Bill. However, it is incumbent upon the Minister to give the House a much clearer understanding of how the Commission will administer the powers. I repeat that the provisions before us certainly give wide-ranging powers; but, so that there is no misunderstanding, I ask how the Licensing Commission will be requested to implement them. Honourable members have not been told that. Personally, I do not think it is good enough for the Government, without first coming to the Parliament and giving us a clear indication of how the powers are to be used, simply to lay down guidelines so that the commission can act upon them in the future.

Mr BURNS (Lytton) (12.37 p.m.): The Commonwealth Games Foundation has said that 3 per cent of the Games patrons would be from overseas and that it will try to increase that to about 5 per cent. So it expects that five in every 100 persons who come to Queensland for the Commonwealth Games will be foreign visitors. The other 95 in every 100 will be Australians, and I presume that a large percentage of those will be Queenslanders.

Twelve months ago the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts (Mr Elliott), speaking at a meeting of the Brisbane Visitors and Convention Bureau, said that Brisbane was “stodgy and dull” and should be competing with Sydney’s “naughty lady” image. He was talking of the need to brighten up our image for the 1982 Commonwealth Games.

Six months before the Minister wanted to turn Brisbane into a “naughty lady”, Syd Williams from Bush Pilots told the same bureau that Brisbane was a boring city, that it virtually shut after 8 p.m., and that after sunset it was dark and lonely. He added that Brisbane’s image was “one of wowserism, street violence and a dominant Police Force.” I wonder what he thinks of the new police powers for the Commonwealth Games.

The point I make is that the Bill is supposedly the answer to the criticism of Mr Elliott and Mr Williams of dull, stodgy, wowserish Brisbane! To entertain our visitors and smarten up Brisbane, this Bill is being introduced by a Government led by a Premier who is reported in Volume 220 of “Hansard”, for the 1957-58 session, in the early days of the coalition Government as saying—

“Honourable members opposite have spoken in support of licensing of cafes where people could obtain drink with their meals. That may be all right for those who want it, but why should other people, particularly young people be subjected to this temptation in places where they usually have meals?”

Now, a Government led by a Premier who did not even want liquor with meals will allow hotels to open longer, drink to be available in restaurants without patrons having to have a meal, and other facets of the State’s licensing laws to be set aside for 29 days. As I have already said, 95 per cent of the visitors will be Australians. Will they be fooled into thinking that this 29-day release from wowserism that will disappear, never to return again after the Games are over, is fair dinkum? The reasoning behind this move is the idea that visitors to the Games must take away a good image of Queensland.

I have been to many countries in the world, but I cannot remember one set of liquor laws from any of those countries. I can remember marvellous scenery, meeting interesting people, visiting interesting towns and places of great historical significance, but never did my impression of a particular country or its potential to have me return centre on the availability of grog.
Visitors to this State should be met at airports, bus terminals and railway stations by local musicians (not police, as they are at South Brisbane Railway Station), our bright, intelligent, young, good-looking, educated men and women, who can generate the excitement, the pizzazz—to make the visitor want to see more—our white sandy beaches, our surf, our islands, the Great Barrier Reef and the sunshine, the vacation themes of swimming, fishing, tennis, golf and racing; the mining, sheep and cattle towns; the Outback; our native flora and fauna; Lone Pine and the Currumbin Bird Sanctuary. We ought to be selling all of those things. People will not return to Queensland because the pubs are open for an extra hour. An exciting, lively, enthusiastic welcome will set them in the mood to see more of Queensland and its attractions.

Sham alterations to our liquor laws that give a false front, like a heavy made-up tart, are not the answer. Australians from the other States know how wowserish and old-fashioned the National Party and its leaders are. They know that during the Games basic rights will be denied the local population. They will not be fooled by this hasty 29-day charade. I want to know why Queenslanders and regular tourists to Queensland will have the clock turned back after the Games are over.

The National-Liberal Party coalition Government obviously believes that Games visitors from Lesotho, Uganda, Zimbabwe, Belize, Guyana, Gibraltar, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Jamaica, Canada and the United Kingdom will be more sophisticated, more able to hold their liquor, more able to drink longer into the wee hours of the morning, or all day Sunday, than the thousands of Australians from other States who visit Queensland at times other than the Games, or, more importantly, the million Queenslanders who live here.

What difference is there between a tourist who visits Queensland to go to the Great Barrier Reef and a tourist who comes here to attend the Commonwealth Games? What is the difference between an Australian who visits Brisbane for the Commonwealth Games and a person who lives permanently in this State? The law is being changed for a few people who will be attending the XIIth Commonwealth Games. It seems to me that the Government is not fair dinkum, especially in the light of some statements made in the past by Government members.

Obviously Government members do not think there are any dangers in these relaxations, or they would not be introducing them. A week or so ago we had to accept Government assurances that it was necessary to resort to toe prints and other colourful and extremely doubtful steps to control a Communist plot to put Aboriginal land rights protesters trained in Libya on the streets to destroy the Games.

The Premier brought out that fellow McDonald, the ex-Communist, to speak about the Communist plot to set up a new nation. I can remember the last time that the Premier spoke about Communist plots. In 1961 he stated—

"The amendment seeks to extend (Sunday) drinking facilities within the 40-mile radius. We often say that Communists are trying to destroy our way of life. The amendment of the Leader of the Opposition would have a tendency to destroy the sanctity of Sunday and to break down the invisible barrier that we have through the teachings of Christianity. In that respect the amendment seeks to destroy our way of life."

We still have the same Premier who said that Sunday drinking for a couple of hours during the session was a Communist plot to destroy our way of life. My God, we do have a number of Communist plots—

Mr Vaughan: "My goodness me!"

Mr BURNS: Yes, "My goodness me!"

Mr Davis: "My goodness gracious me!"

Mr BURNS: Well, "My goodness gracious me!"

The man who said that it was a Communist plot for us to drink for a couple of hours on a Sunday is the leader of a Government that says that for the 29 days of the Games all the visitors, including the 3 per cent from overseas and the 90-odd per cent from the other States, can drink for 24 hours a day, seven days a week, Sunday included, and that is no problem at all.

Mr Booth: Are you opposing that?
Mr BURNS: No. I am supporting it. I want the relaxation of the licensing laws to be continued after the Games. I make no bones about that.

The only reason why the Government is interested in changing the law is to make a quick buck. It is not interested in extending tourist facilities. It is saying that the only people who should be allowed to drink for 24 hours a day or be allowed to drink at a restaurant without partaking of a meal are visitors to the Games.

The fellow who every year comes from either America or down South to the Gold Coast is not allowed those privileges. They are not given to a tourist in Townsville or in Cairns, but they will be given in Brisbane for 29 days during the Games. I ask why. Why during the 29 days of the Games will I, as a Queenslander, be allowed to drink seven days a week at Mt Gravatt, whereas the day after the date specified in the Bill I will not be allowed to do it? Suddenly, on the day after the Games finish, I become a second-class citizen.

Mr Booth: You would not want to drink 24 hours a day for 29 days.

Mr BURNS: I could not do that.

An Opposition Member: Some members on the Government side can.

Mr BURNS: I do not want to cast aspersions on anyone's drinking habits. It is not a matter of drinking 24 hours a day; it is the availability of drink 24 hours a day. The 29-day provision is the essence of stupidity.

If it is believed that there is a need to change Queensland's touristic image and that visitors to the State are entitled to more liberalised drinking laws during the 29 days of the Games, Queenslanders are entitled to expect that privilege for all days thereafter and in all areas of the State. The honourable member for Surfers Paradise would know that, year after year, tourists come to the Gold Coast looking for more relaxed licensing laws and cannot find them. Now the Government is providing that hotels, and, presumably, bottle shops, motels and residential, will be able to sell liquor for 24 hours a day in certain areas.

I shall ask my local bowls club to apply under that provision in the Bill for permission to sell bottled liquor 24 hours a day. The Bill provides that a licensee is authorised to keep his licensed premises open for the sale of liquor and to sell and supply liquor and—I emphasise "and"—to permit liquor to be drunk or consumed on his licensed premises. First, he can sell liquor; next, he can permit it to be drunk on his premises. That means that local bowls clubs on the Gold Coast, out at Cannon Hill or up at the Sunshine Coast will be able to have bottled liquor on sale for 24 hours a day. That is a great extension to the law! As for the Premier's couple of hours' drinking on a Sunday and his statement that the Communists would get us if we drank on Sunday—he has now greatly extended the licensing provisions.

Mr Warner: Times have changed.

Mr BURNS: Times certainly have changed. I am sure that the Premier will find another Communist under the bed. He found one in relation to Sunday drinking, and he found another in relation to the Commonwealth Games. I wonder where the next Communist will come from.

As I have said, obviously the Government has thought this matter through, studied it carefully and, after discussion with Games officials, the Queensland Hotels Association, the police and so on, decided that no harm will come to the community as a result of the relaxation of the liquor laws. Only a fortnight ago the Premier claimed that a team of people would be coming here from Libya and that trained Aborigines would be coming from the South to take over the streets. When they get here the Government will sell them grog 24 hours a day. All that will do is incite them even further. But the Government's top priority is the money that can be made from selling grog. The Premier's other antics were a good political stunt; but now the dough is coming into it. I should image that the Government has sent someone down South to recruit Aborigines for the purpose of having them come to Queensland to buy grog.

Mr Powell: They are coming up here, anyway.
Mr BURNS: This morning the Premier said that people were coming to Queensland. Let me tell him this: every white-collar crook and loan shark in Victoria will be leaving town today with his bags packed and heading for Queensland. I can see you heading for the microphone, Mr Deputy Speaker; I shall return to the Bill. However, I was about to say that when the Labor Government in Victoria introduces decent credit and consumer protection legislation, those crooks and sharks will be heading for Queensland, which is the "white-collar crook" State of Australia.

Mr Akers: Don't you think this will eliminate the problems that we have after the pubs close?

Mr BURNS: I am in full agreement with an extension to the licensing laws. After all, Scotland permits drinking 24 hours a day, seven days a week and Tasmania allows drinking 24 hours a day. Too many licensing laws in Queensland are made to suit the publican and the liquor industry rather than the patron. When a licence is issued to a hotel or to a restaurant, it should be issued on the basis of what the customer is entitled to receive, not on the basis of what the management or the controlling interests in the industry want.

Finally, I again ask that the people of Queensland be considered together with the visitors who will come here for the Games. It has been claimed that approximately 30,000 people will come from overseas to the Games. They will be allowed to drink 24 hours a day for the 29 days of the Games. If the Government is providing for extended drinking for 29 days, why not for the next 29 years?

Hon. J. A. ELLIOTT (Cunningham—Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts) (12.50 p.m.), in reply: I shall deal first with some of the matters raised by the honourable member for Sandgate. As to his point relative to where things are made, which many people feel strongly about—I can only say that the foundation is autonomous and has its own charter. The simple facts are that the foundation's main concern is to keep the cost of the Games within the reach of the ordinary person in the street. To do that, it decided to opt for the cheapest prices it was able to obtain. If the Government says to the foundation that it should not follow that policy, additional costs will be incurred and the lower commensurate return on the sale of the products will not offset the overall costs for the people.

I am pleased that the honourable member for Sandgate agreed totally with the proposal relating to health matters. He suggested that the Games could be responsible for a proliferation of caravan parks and of tents and caravans in people's backyards. Apparently he overlooked the point that the Bill does not override the provisions of the Health Act. People will not be able to breach the health regulations willy-nilly. In the circumstances, I do not think that the honourable member's predictions will come true, although I do not doubt that some people in back streets may try to do as he suggested.

Mr Shaw: How would you police that under the Health Act?

Mr ELLIOTT: The Health Act covers sanitation and everything else. In no way will people be able to set up communes in backyards and expect to get away with it.

The honourable member visualised certain problems in relation to the liberalisation of the liquor laws. He should realise that that is a sunset provision, which will operate for 29 days. The Minister for Justice has made no secret of the fact that he has the liquor laws under observation on a continuing basis. Over the years, the laws have progressed gradually. I am sure that he will closely examine the running of the Games under the proposed liberalised conditions. Obviously, he will see how those conditions work, and see whether problems arise. I take on board the honourable member's suggestions and I know that the responsible Minister will keep an eye on what happens with the idea of implementing some of them.

Unfortunately, I cannot give the honourable member an accurate, on-the-spot answer about the redress available to a licensee whose application is refused. I will check on the matter and give him an answer later.

The honourable member for Lytton quoted very closely from the speech that I made, but he was slightly off the mark.

Mr Burns: It was straight from your speech notes; you may have read it wrongly.
Mr ELLIOTT: If the honourable member for Lytton reads my speech carefully, he will see that I was indicating that many southern people who come here——

Mr Warner: Australians.

Mr ELLIOTT: Yes, Australians.

If the honourable member for Lytton reads my speech carefully, he will see that I said that they could be looking at us and saying that we have a stodgy image. I was not strictly saying that I believe we have a stodgy image; I was saying that southern people say that. I am suggesting that these things should be done, particularly in the central city area, to overcome the sort of mental block that southerners may have as far as this is concerned. So there is a slight difference between what I said and the words used by the honourable member for Lytton.

My department will be selling all those attributes to which the honourable member referred; it is something we do continually. In fact, for the duration of the Games the corporation will, at my request, be placing kits in hotels and other places to make the most we possibly can out of what is available in Queensland, not just the metropolitan area, so that all the visitors to the Games will hopefully go away as ambassadors for this State. It is very important that we do this because we have here the opportunity of a lifetime to sell the whole of Queensland. Many of the visitors will be representatives of the travel industry, and we hope to reap the benefits of the good impression they gain. Those remarks probably cover the most important aspects of the matters referred to by the honourable member.

Motion (Mr Elliott) agreed to.

Committee

Mr Powell (Isis) in the chair; Hon. J. A. Elliott (Cunningham—Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 4, as read, agreed to.

Clause 5—Licensing Commission may modify the Act——

Mr WARBURTON (12.58 p.m.): This a tremendously important piece of legislation, and we cannot afford to allow it to be brushed under the carpet. Even though I respect the fact that the Minister is basically not normally responsible for the provisions of the Liquor Act, quite frankly I do not think he has paid due attention to the initial points that I raised.

These provisions are very important from my point of view, because I support the philosophies propounded by the honourable member for Lytton. I believe in more relaxed liquor laws, and I do not take too kindly to hypocrisy in any form. It is hypocritical of this Government to be relaxing the liquor laws for a period, particularly the type of relaxation I want to see, and then, as I said before, bringing down the shutters so that we revert to the old, draconian ways.

We need to know exactly what guide-lines will be used by the commission. If the Minister wants the Opposition to give cart blanche recognition to this provision, we need to know whether, as we believe, it is to be a very wide-ranging provision. It gives the commission complete power to relax all of the liquor laws that apply in this State. I want to know what the commission will be told to do and what it cannot do. We have not yet been told, for example, whether it will relax the law relating to the sale of bottle supplies from golf and bowls clubs during that period. If it is, good on it, I am all for it. But is that the sort of guide-line that the Government intends to lay down? As far as the geographical situation is concerned, there are no limitations in respect of how far the relaxation can extend.

Mr Elliott: Can I answer the geographical one?

Mr WARBURTON: I will sit down at this stage if the Minister prefers.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Powell): Order! It will be whether the Chair prefers. I call the Minister.

Mr ELLIOTT: I think that I should quickly answer that point, because I overlooked it previously. The Bill does not spell out the geographical area. At this stage, it is not known how many people will attend the Games or whether they will be staying in areas such as Toowoomba, the Gold Coast, the North Coast——

Mr Booth: Or Warwick.
Mr ELLIOTT: Or Warwick. The Commonwealth Games Foundation and the Licensing Commission will be able to exercise their discretion and initiative in this matter.

[Sitting suspended from 1.1 to 2.15 p.m.]

Mr WARBURTON: Prior to the luncheon recess I put certain matters to the Minister. My understanding of his response is that the Licensing Commission has wide discretionary powers over the granting of exemptions under the Liquor Act during the months of September and October this year. Provided that a person from, say, Toowoomba—that is one of the examples used by the Minister—who holds a current licence under the Liquor Act can give valid reasons why he should be able to extend his trading hours or to do other things that normally he is not allowed to do under the Act, the restrictions can be lifted in his case. I think it is important that that goes into the record. There is no doubt that the powers under that provision are very wide and I hope that if the Licensing Commission errs, it errs on the positive side.

The community at large must understand that the Government is relaxing the liquor laws for a period of four or five weeks for certain visitors who will come to Queensland specifically for the Commonwealth Games. I hope that if it chooses to use this as an experiment, the Government will see the error of its past ways and, perhaps in the future, give tourism the rightful boost that it deserves, and that we will see more relaxation in the liquor laws in operation after the period of the Commonwealth Games.

Mr ELLIOTT: I shall answer a question that I was not able to answer previously. The honourable member asked what redress a licensee would have under the circumstances. He will have the usual redress to the Licensing Court, which is presided over by a judge.

Clause 5, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 6 and 7, as read, agreed to.

Clause 8—Modification of certain laws during Games period—

Mr WARBURTON (2.18 p.m.): As I said earlier, problems could arise with the overriding of the Brisbane City Council's town planning requirements in relation to, say, health. It could apply to other local authorities.

The Minister said he felt that, if there is a health problem, the provisions of the Health Act and the regulations thereunder may give the State health authorities the right to intervene. This provision certainly allows a person, without making any application, to have numerous caravans on his property. There might not be a health hazard because perhaps the people will use the one or two toilets that are available, but it could cause problems with the services in the area. I suggest that the Minister look at this matter. Perhaps something could be done before the Games commence to ensure that a person will have to make an application if he wants to have more than one mobile premises on his property.

Mr ELLIOTT: I have misled the honourable member slightly. Clause 5 contains overriding powers in relation to billeting, and so forth; but a local authority will be able to invoke its regulations to ensure that people do not carry out an exercise such as the one to which the honourable member referred. I am sure that that will be spelt out specifically in the regulations and that the Subordinate Legislation Committee will ensure that the regulations are in keeping with the aim of the Act.

Clause 8, as read, agreed to.

Clause 9, as read, agreed to.

Clause 10—Limited right to practice medicine—

Mr WARBURTON (2.21 p.m.): At the second-reading stage I indicated that I fully support the clause, which allows medical practitioners, nurses, etc., to carry out their responsibilities to team members within certain confines. Was any thought given to the possibility of an overseas athlete being seriously hurt and requiring the attention of the team's medical practitioner at a hospital? That hospital would be outside of the boundaries of the venue and of the Commonwealth Games village. If an overseas team member is seriously hurt and wants his team doctor to treat him in a hospital, what will happen?
Mr ELLIOTT: The Minister for Health has indicated that all team members are entitled to free hospitalisation. If an injured team member gives a sufficiently good reason for wanting to be treated by his team doctor, the superintendent of the hospital will be in a position to grant that physician access to the patient. I will have the matter investigated and advise the honourable member accordingly.

Clause 10, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 11 and 12, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—

Mr ELLIOTT: I move the following amendment—

"At page 8, insert the following new clause to follow clause 12—

"13. Limited right to practise chiropractic manipulative therapy. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Chiropractic Manipulative Therapists Act 1979 it is lawful for a person who—

(a) is not registered or conditionally registered under that Act; and

(b) is officially appointed to a national team to perform duties of a chiropractic manipulative therapeutic nature,

during the Games period for this Part, to practise chiropractic manipulative therapy or to take or use the name or title of chiropractic manipulative therapist, chiropractor or osteopath or any other name, title, designation, addition or description of whatsoever nature (including initials or letters placed after his name or otherwise) which, having regard to the circumstances in which it is taken or used indicates or could be understood to indicate that he is a chiropractic manipulative therapist or is qualified to practise chiropractic manipulative therapy if—

(c) he so practises in respect of only the members of the national team to which he is officially appointed, within the Commonwealth Games Village or within any Commonwealth Games venue; and

(d) the taking or use referred to occurs only within the Commonwealth Games Village or within any Commonwealth Games venue."

Amendment agreed to.

New clause 13, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 13 to 16, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, with an amendment.

Third Reading

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

STAMP ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 25 March (see p. 5144) on Dr Edwards's motion—

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

Hon. L. R. EDWARDS (Ipswich—Deputy Premier and Treasurer) (2.27 p.m.), by leave:

It is proposed to provide for a concession on stamp duty on certain instruments in relation to family law proceedings. For the time being, these special provisions will be administered by the Commissioner of Stamp Duties and they will be formalised in the August sitting of Parliament.

Honourable members are aware of the history of this matter and how the application of duty in this area arose from a decision of the High Court of Australia holding that section 90 of the Family Law Act 1975 (Commonwealth), which had purported to provide for exemption in this area, was constitutionally invalid in certain regards. The practical effects of this have now been considered and it is proposed to provide for a concession in the area.
In broad terms, the concession proposed is that nominal duty of $4 apply to transfers of property between spouses pursuant to divorce arrangements in respect of which there is a decree absolute where the following items are transferred between spouses and no other party—

A place of residence (including household furniture) for use as the principal place of residence of the person to whom it is to be or is being conveyed;

A motor vehicle registration in respect of a motor vehicle for use for private purposes by the person to whom it is to be or is being conveyed; and

A policy of life assurance upon the life of the person to whom it is to be or is being conveyed.

The concession is for nominal duty of $4 rather than the total exemption that has been proposed in another State. In other States, such as New South Wales and South Australia, the exemption is in respect of all property transfers, including businesses and investment property. It is considered by the Government, however, that a concession is only warranted in respect of domestic property. The requirement of the decree absolute having to be issued before the concession applies is to prevent the recurrence of duty avoidance in this area that prevailed while section 90 was thought to be valid.

It has been suggested that a concession should also be available in cases where, because of religious grounds, actual divorce proceedings cannot be instituted and there is only a legal separation and property settlement. However, because of administrative difficulties associated with duty avoidance, we must insist on the decree absolute test, which will certainly provide for the majority of cases.

In addition, it is proposed that the commissioner be empowered to make refunds of duty where, in the course of Family Law proceedings, a transfer of the kind specified in the concession is made before the issue of the decree absolute and a decree absolute is later issued. The refund in such case is to be the difference between the ad valorem duty paid on the subject transfer and the nominal duty provided for in the concession.

Certain administrative arrangements are planned to provide for refunds in cases where ad valorem duty has been accounted for between the handing down of the relevant High Court decision and 5 April 1982 in cases where the criteria for the giving of the concession or for subsequent refund on the issue of the decree absolute are met.

That is a broad outline of the principles involved. I thank the House for granting me leave to convey the information. A detailed statement specifying the exact procedures will be available from the Commissioner of Stamp Duties in a few days.

Mr D'ARCY (Woodridge) (2.30 p.m.): I am pleased that the Treasurer has seen fit to further comment on the Bill. The Bill did not deal with the taxing of the family tragedy of divorce in Queensland. It gave an exemption to certain businesses. Since the end of last year, because of a High Court ruling, it has been possible for the Government to tax the transfer of property on divorce settlements. Had that continued, it would have been a tragedy. In his statements to the Press the Treasurer indicated that the Government was proceeding with the tax that would have raised approximately $4m a year. It is completely iniquitous that the present Government in Queensland could have had such little feeling for the people in broken homes in the State when the same Government is responsible for a reduction in taxes paid by the very rich. The Government claimed great credit for abolishing death duties.

Mr D'ARCY: Death duties were imposed on the very rich, because a situation existed where a limit of $200,000 was imposed. The member for Sherwood is supposed to be a lawyer. One would think that he would know something about the laws of this State.

Mr D'ARCY: Although the present proposal was not part of the original Bill, there is a need for its inclusion. Some of the grandstanders in the House have discovered that the Bill could not be amended to make that provision. The Treasurer is able to give the 6,500 families affected in this State a reassurance that no stamp duty will be collected when such family tragedies have occurred.

The hastiness of the Government's decision last week has led to some confusion. Although the Treasurer has attempted to outline the Government's policy on exactly how the tax will be implemented, he may have left us with some bureaucratic nightmare.
The imposition of the $4 fee to which the Minister has referred seems rather ridiculous. Once a fee is established in this State, the Government has the knack of being able to raise it to any level it likes.

Mr Moore: All documents are costly to process, and it is reasonable that they should pay for the processing of the documents.

Mr D'ARCY: The member for Windsor should go back to sleep. He cannot tell me in this day and age of rising costs, when a tradesman charges $25 an hour for his services, that a $4 fee will be anything more than a bureaucratic nightmare.

We all know full well that the Government will turn round and raise that tax whenever it feels like raising it. If the Government wants to justify the tax on cost grounds, it will be increased to $25 or $30 before anybody can blink.

Mr Moore: There is nothing wrong with that.

Mr D'ARCY: The honourable member for Windsor might not think so. A tragedy situation which would not normally be taxed is now being taxed. That is typical of the iniquities perpetrated by the Queensland Government on the public, particularly in the form of taxation. The Premier and the Treasurer continually get up on their hind legs and speak about the population drift to Queensland. They do not tell the truth. They continually say that Queensland is a low-tax State. However, the Government spends less money than other States and in very few areas are taxes lower than those charged by other States. In most areas the Government collects more tax per head of population than is levied by any other State in the Commonwealth. The Government knows full well that it lies to the media to such an extent—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Miller): Order! The honourable member has used an unparliamentary word. I ask that he withdraw that word.

Mr D'ARCY: I withdraw that word.

It would be more correct to say that, as usual, the Premier and the Treasurer tell the Government half-truths and keep repeating those half-truths to an unsuspecting public until they eventually believe some of the things they are told. The Premier and the Treasurer never tell the whole truth, particularly in relation to taxation matters.

The amendment that the Minister has foreshadowed is being brought forward hastily and it is clumsy, iniquitous and positively unjust. Nevertheless, the Opposition is pleased to accept it and I am sure that families will accept it.

The breakup of a marriage is a tragedy. The Government might believe that it has no financial effect on a family. I can assure him that it does, especially in electorates such as mine. Perhaps the effect is minimal. The most expensive item that a family purchases is a house. In my electorate, most houses were purchased within the past eight years. Up till now, because of the high interest rates that the Government has forced onto the public through the building societies and other financial institutions, all that people have paid off on their homes is the interest.

In a house that was purchased for $30,000 the equity can be as low as $8,000 to $10,000. I see instances of that time and time again. With a marriage breakup, that equity is split up between the husband and wife and, in some instances, the children. In many instances, children of a broken marriage can never expect to live in a family-owned home again.

The amendments to the Act provide further evidence of the iniquity, confusion, irregularity and total regressive nature of stamp duty taxation in Queensland. The Government claims that it has the interest of the community at heart. It has shown by this Bill that it is not above rigging the Act for its own financial benefit. The Treasurer admitted that last July, when increases in bank personal loan rates were lagging behind those in respect of other types of lending, an increase in the prescribed rate would have resulted in a loss of duty from bank personal loans. Therefore, to get at those persons who were fortunate enough to obtain a personal loan from a bank—we all know how hard that is at present—the official prescribed rate for personal loans was kept down so that the borrower could be slugged with stamp duty. The Treasurer admitted that. That action is indicative of this Government's financial manipulation.
Equity and fairness play no part in determining taxation in this State. The redistributive effect of taxation in the instance of stamp duty is not even considered. If the Government thinks that it is about to lose revenue because of a uniform application of a prescribed rate of interest, it then adjusts the prescribed rates according to its own type of loan. For personal loans from banks, the official prescribed rate was kept at 15.75 per cent, whereas the overall prescribed rate was 17 per cent. Even though the borrowers are finding themselves slugged by almost usury rates of interest, the Government insists on getting its chop as well through the manipulation of the rates at which the stamp duty becomes applicable. That is more the action of robber barons and loan sharks than of proper administration by a supposedly responsible Government.

Inflation itself has made stamp duty an intolerable burden on many borrowers and families. Many people find it impossible to obtain any housing finance at all, and those who manage to scrape through are slugged by ever-increasing stamp duty.

I agree that there is a need to adjust the prescribed rate upwards as interest rates in the market increase, but the Government is ripping off millions of dollars by not restructuring the whole stamp duty apparatus in accordance with the inflationary impact.

As I argued last year when amendments to the Stamp Act were before Parliament, first-home buyers in Queensland pay four times as much in stamp duty on a $40,000 home as their counterparts in South Australia pay. In Queensland, on a $40,000 home the first-home buyer pays $400 in stamp duty, whereas in South Australia, he pays only $100. So far the Government has done absolutely nothing to reduce the stamp duty burden on first-home buyers. I have continually questioned the Treasurer about this, and he has never been forthcoming with any sort of scheme to help the first-home buyer. All he does is label and criticise other Governments, most of which impose lower rates of stamp duty than those imposed in Queensland.

The Treasurer is complacent about the high cost of repaying loans and the high rate of interest. He blames the Federal Government for these problems. He has done absolutely nothing to reduce the burden of stamp duty, over which he has direct control. Only recently, the Federal Treasurer (Mr Howard), told him to put up or shut up, but he has still done nothing. The Treasurer has displayed a two-faced approach. He wants to blame Canberra for everything but he will not do anything to reduce the burden imposed by stamp duty.

Inflation has been used as an easy way to increase State Government revenue. On credit transactions, with which the proposed amendments largely deal, Queensland already has the second-highest charges, on a per capita basis, of all Australian States. Only Western Australia, the other resource-rich State, receives higher revenue from stamp duty on credit transactions. In 1975-76, receipts from stamp duty totalled $74.5m. In 1979-80 receipts rose to $160.1m. In 1980-81 they increased to $218.7m. In percentage terms from 1975-76 to 1980-81, stamp duty receipts increased some 200 per cent, while in the same period inflation increased by only 70 per cent. In the past year, receipts increased 36 per cent, yet inflation was only about 11 per cent.

No further figures are needed to prove the great stamp duty rip-off by the State Government. I challenge the Treasurer to cease using Canberra as a smoke-screen, or a scapegoat for the iniquitous, unacceptable financial rip-off by the State Government. Canberra has much to answer for, but the Treasurer cannot expect to fool all the people all the time by continually blaming Canberra.

The ordinary Queenslander is waking up to this Government’s financial practices as he sees his ability to obtain finance for a home or other purpose being cruelly eroded by inflation under the Federal Government’s monetary policies. The ordinary Queenslander, who is beset by Commonwealth policies, then has to face the State Government as it comes in for its increasingly large chop. The Treasurer tries to blame Canberra for the inflation that has pushed up stamp duty charges in real terms.

The Treasurer and the Government have displayed their bias against the ordinary Queenslander in another amendment that makes business transactions which result in amalgamation or reconstruction of a group of companies exempt from stamp duty. We have no objection to that procedure which is, indeed, sensible. However, I am glad that criticism of the Government’s crude attempt to introduce a tax on divorce has forced it to back off. It was totally unacceptable to the Opposition that the Bill did not contain an
amendment scrapping the stamp duty payable when assets are transferred after a marriage break-up. That stamp duty provision was totally iniquitous. It showed the Government in its true light. The tax should never have been considered, let alone introduced.

The Government's approach to taxation has nothing to do with equity and fairness. Its aim is to grab money from those who are unable to pay—the weak, the disadvantaged and the unfortunate. The taxation structure in Queensland is totally regressive. Tax concessions are handed out to the rich and special-interest groups engaged in mining and other areas.

Stamp duty on homes in Queensland is weighted heavily in favour of the rich and the wealthy. Compared with the other States, less stamp duty is paid in Queensland on more expensive homes. That is the sort of taxation the Treasurer likes talking about. Conversely, the cheaper the house, the more a person pays in stamp duty in Queensland. That clearly indicates the stand of the Government.

I repeat that the retention of the $4 charge for the transferring of property between divorcees is amazing and completely nit-picking. How ridiculous is this charge! Why should the Government impose $4 stamp duty? Why should it not abolish the duty altogether? The Opposition knows why—the Government wants to increase the charge when it thinks the time is appropriate. Divorcees already have to pay hundreds of dollars in solicitor's fees, and building society fees if they have a home loan. Surely that is burden enough.

The talk about Queensland being a low-tax State is truly a myth. Joint property would have been taxed and court orders would have forced Queenslanders to pay high stamp duty rates. We agree with the Treasurer's proposal to give relief to divorcees when property is transferred.

The Opposition has no objection to the other amendments in the legislation. I challenge the Treasurer to get his officers to undertake a complete review of the structure of stamp duty charges in Queensland. I have outlined the tremendous rate at which receipts have escalated through property sales in Queensland, and how iniquitous the stamp duty charge has become. Stamp duty is regressive in impact and iniquitous in its operation at the present time. The Treasurer has the power to do something about it. It is not a problem that can be pushed onto Canberra.

As I said, the Treasurer stands indicted by his own words when he suggested that the tax be increased in other areas. In fact, John Howard in Canberra called the Treasurer for what he is. Mr Howard said that he would not be a scapegoat for the Treasurer's attempt to introduce crudely placed taxes and that he could not continually blame incompetence on Canberra. It is a problem for the State Government. The Treasurer should stop the great stamp duty rip-off through some form of inflation indexation, and he should give immediate relief to first-home buyers through stamp duty concessions.

Although we are talking about divorcees, the Government has still done nothing for first-home buyers. One never hears the harping women in this House mention the first-home buyer or the underprivileged.

Although the Opposition will not be opposing any of the proposed amendments, they do little towards improving a chaotic and unacceptable situation with regard to stamp duties in this State. As I have said, an urgent review of stamp duty is needed so that the anomalies and iniquities can be removed.

Mr INNES (Sherwood) (2.46 p.m.): One constantly hears from the Opposition paranoid criticism of the type honourable members have just heard from the Opposition spokesman on Treasury matters. The pathos of the exercise is that, quite clearly, the member for Woodridge, who, I understand, knows something about land development, knows little about the financial ramifications of what he said—either that or he is in every stamp duty or tax-evasion scheme under the sun, because anybody who had been active in land development would know more about it than is revealed by the contribution that he made.

Constantly throughout his speech honourable members heard catch-phrases such as "rip-off", "favoured the rich" and "disadvantaged the poor". If the honourable member knew anything about the subject, he would have written his own speech rather than stumbling over somebody else's. He would have realised that stamp duty is in fact an area in which there is a progressive rate of tax that hits the rich, or those involved in large-scale transactions, very heavily.
The speech of the member for Woodridge seemed to be directed principally towards conveyancing duty. It is a reality—and I mentioned this in the Budget debate last year—that there is a progressive rate of stamp duty in relation to conveyancing. I think that you were in the chair during the Budget debate last year, Mr Deputy Speaker, and you will recall that I pointed out that one of the consequences of the abolition of death duties was that the previous flat rate of conveyance stamp duty of 1.2 per cent per transaction changed to a minimum of 1.5 per cent, increasing to 3.5 per cent for transactions over $500,000. If anything destroys the contribution made, or shows the complete lack of knowledge of the Opposition spokesman in this area, it is the simple fact that on the larger transactions, those towards which he directed most of his remarks, there is a progressive rate of taxation.

Those involved at the upper end of the range would say that that is a savage impost on people spending large amounts of money. The system is very much loaded in favour of the small person. When one thinks of the difference between 1.5 per cent at the lower end of the scale—and there are exemptions to remove it completely in certain circumstances—and 3.5 per cent on transactions above $500,000, one realises that there is absolutely no truth in the arguments put forward by the Opposition spokesman.

In a speech that I made almost a year ago, I said that I thought there were some reasons for adjustment the other way and that at the opportune time there should be a possibility of fine-tuning.

Mr Akers: He had to read that speech to say those things.

Mr INNES: He could not even read it. He stumbled at every word of three syllables or more.

I rise today to support and applaud the initiatives taken to make this legislation reflect the current economic conditions and to raise the threshold for credit transactions. The Opposition spokesman must realise that stamp duty varies according to the type of transaction. The conveyancing duty varies from 1.5 per cent to as much as 3.5 per cent.

Mr D'Arcy: Are you in favour of taking conveyancing from solicitors?

Mr INNES: That interjection has as much relevance to this debate as the honourable member's speech. It completely missed the point, as did that interjection. That matter has nothing to do with the amount of revenue created by conveyancing transactions.

I applaud the increase in the threshold for credit transactions to 17.75 per cent which reflects the realities of the market-place, that is, the rises in interest rates and also the bringing of bank personal loans into line with other credit transactions.

On a previous occasion when we discussed this matter, I said I felt that, because of the duty advantages, some fine-tuning was possible in this area to stimulate Queensland's attraction as a place in which to do business.

I pointed out that the abolition of death duties had stimulated economic activity in Queensland, that it had brought people and their money to this State, which in itself gave a financial boost to activity. That, to some extent, offset the loss that was incurred by the abolition of death duties. Prior to death duties being abolished, the revenue received from that source was about $25m. The amount received in stamp duty was about twice as much. As I said previously, people get nothing for nothing. One of the consequences of the abolition of death duties was that stamp duties were increased. I pointed to an instance involving a small business in which 6 per cent of the gross proceeds in a year went in stamp duty in one form or another.

I did say that, as the Government had reaped the benefit of having abolished death duties, one of the consequences of which was an increase in stamp duties, it should look for the opportunity to adjust stamp duty incidence and reduce its burden on small business and other business generally. The reality was that the Victorian Government, in its last Budget, reduced stamp duty. Originally, stamp duty on credit transactions was 2.1 per cent, which was 0.6 per cent higher than the rate in Queensland. The Victorian Government reduced stamp duty on credit transactions to 1.2 per cent, which was then lower than Queensland's rate of duty.

As I said on the last occasion, the Victorian Government's policy, which was designed to bolster its flagging commercial activity and its flagging attraction as a place in which to do financial business, might influence the Queensland Treasury to make adjustments in stamp duty.
In the last two or three Budgets presented to this House by the Deputy Premier and Treasurer, some sense of reality and response to the market had been demonstrated, and adjustments had been made. I look forward to further fine-tuning to overcome the very real burden that stamp duty imposes, particularly on small business.

Every small business transaction—the raising of money, the purchase of land, the leasing of premises, hire-purchase or other credit transactions to sell produce, the leasing of computers and other equipment and the signing of cheques—attracts stamp duty, and it is a very significant burden.

In fact, other factors have reinforced Queensland's attraction as a place to do business. Last year my concern was that financial business—the tertiary industry, the service industry, the financial institution business, the merchant banking, the accounting, the legal work and the office work—which was necessary to raise funds for Queensland projects was taking place in Melbourne and Sydney. I have no doubt that a Labor win in Victoria will hasten the migration to this State of people and enterprise, and the place to do business will become Queensland. It is fascinating that as soon as the Labor Party gets into power it speaks of increasing duties. Socialist policies cannot be implemented without increasing taxes. Increased taxes impose heavier penalties on business, heavier penalties on people who do business with business and heavier penalties on small business and big business, and they create further stagnation. That is the reality!

All of the proposals in the legislation are beneficial. They provide for the closing of loopholes that should be closed. Those adjustments are necessary.

Mr Burns: He is a smooth-talking, Pommie policeman.

Mr INNES: Well, Mr Burns—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I give the member for Lytton his final warning.

Mr INNES: One does not know whether that is the voice of the dry-cleaner or the SP bookie. What we do hear is the excessive noise created by that single neurone that struggles to divide. The only trouble is that when it finally divides only the lack of knowledge rather than its capacity will double.

I applaud the responsiveness reflected in the legislation. I look forward to further adjustments and to further reinforcement of the commercial enterprise of the State by the attraction of the sorts of transactions and business that an up to date, responsive and reduced stamp duty will bring.

Mr SIMPSON (Cooroora) (2.58 p.m.): I thank the Treasurer for giving consideration to stamp duty on property transfers following decisions of the Family Court.

Mr D'Arcy: That will be in August.

Mr SIMPSON: The speech of the honourable member for Woodridge displayed the Opposition's hypocrisy. He criticised the Government about this tax, which applies in every other State.

The Labor Party has recently come into power in Victoria and already it is speaking of the reintroduction of probate duties. That is typical of the Labor Party's attitude. That is exactly what Labor would do in this State if it came into power. In an endeavour to help the people in need, the Labor Party taxes those responsible for productivity and revenue-earning. Killing the goose that lays the golden egg is typical of the stupidity and short-sightedness of the Labor Party.

In my opinion a nominal stamp duty of $4 in cases when a property transfer is ordered by the Family Court shows compassion.

Mr Moore: It doesn't even pay for the book work.

Mr SIMPSON: That is so. It would probably barely cover it.

I raised this matter with the Treasurer some months ago when I was involved in assisting a lady who had property transferred to her as a result of a divorce proceeding and had no money to meet the stamp duty payable as a result of the High Court's decision that the Federal law directing the States not to impose duty was invalid. The hardship faced by the lady and her children was genuine.
Although the Treasurer has made a statement to the House, consideration could still be given to alleviating the hardship caused by the payment of duty prior to the granting of the decree absolute. There are still anomalies. The directions of the Federal Family Court might not always be carried out and those who have the capacity to pay might not feel the full effects of the stamp duty law. However, I am pleased that the Treasurer has given consideration to the proposal that I put to him on the imposition of stamp duty in this State.

Across-the-board exemption would have been the easiest way to solve the problem; but I appreciate that, if that could not be done, and someone had to pay, it should be those who may be well off and whose transfer of property in accordance with a decision of the Family Court could be effected in spite of the duty payable.

Perhaps the Minister will give consideration to some other matters before the final details of duty on divorce settlements are implemented. Such duty will not fall evenly in the community. For example, if a divorce settlement includes property involved in agricultural pursuits, a great deal of money could be involved. Agricultural pursuits involve large amounts of capital not evident in other forms of business. Similarly, the court may order a business to be transferred in various forms. It could be that hardship will continue to be felt by people involved in those settlements and the Family Court will have to give consideration to the stance adopted by the various States since the High Court ruling. There will be a settling-down period during which the Family Court will consider what is fair and equitable.

The moves made by the Treasurer in relation to internal adjustments made by businesses often ensure that major projects get off the ground in this State. They are commendable. However, more consideration needs to be given to property transfers in families involved in agricultural pursuits, where assets of high capital value are involved. The imposition of high levels of duty could jeopardise agricultural business arrangements and result in a loss of expertise and family knowledge on a property. In other words, it harks back to the effect that probate had on various businesses. Those businesses that were capital intensive were often disrupted and sold because of the imposition of a State tax that was not fair and equitable.

I commend the Treasurer on the introduction of the legislation and for his recent announcement to help those in need following property transfers ordered by the Family Court.

Mrs Nelson (Aspley) (3.5 p.m.): I rise to speak to the amendments to the Stamp Act. I support the Treasurer in his specific recommendations that will clarify certain sections of the Act not clearly defined at present.

Clause 6 will clarify a substantial interest in a company seeking an exemption from duty. Whilst I am concerned that companies are exempt, it is necessary for the Act to be specific. It will be specific as it will refer to an interest of not less than 90 per cent.

I support the Treasurer's attempts to make it possible for debts owing to the Commissioner of Stamp Duties to be collected by that department. I applaud the Treasurer for his efforts in that regard.

The spokesman for the Opposition (Mr D'Arcy) engaged in pathetic and discursive ramblings on this matter. He ought to be condemned by his party. He clearly has no knowledge or understanding of the Stamp Act. His speech was a vindictive and vituperative attack on the Treasurer as an individual. I found it quite offensive. Had not the Treasurer leapt to his feet on a point of order, I certainly would have done so. The honourable member for Woodridge clearly does not follow Budget debates in this House. He is shadow Treasurer, but he clearly lacks the knowledge that in the last two Budgets, more particularly during his 1980-81 Budget speech, the Treasurer was able to say quite clearly to the people of Queensland that there would be no increase in taxation and further concessions in certain areas.

The Treasurer allowed considerable concessions in the land tax and pay-roll tax area. Amendments were made to the Stamp Act to provide for further exemptions from mortgage duty. They provided a saving to first-home buyers or principal-dwelling purchasers of at least $480 on a $30,000 loan.

In 1981-82, the Treasurer was able to say, "There will be no increases in taxes in this Budget." He was able to say also that certain taxation concessions would apply. The cost of the land tax concessions was $750,000. The stamp duty on the fire brigade levy component...
of insurance premiums was abolished. That concession will cost the Government $2.5m. The member for Woodridge is totally unaware of the contents of the last two Budget speeches made by the Treasurer. I find it incredible that he is the shadow Treasurer.

Mr Akers: His speech writers are unaware of it.

Mrs NELSON: His speech writers are also unaware of his lack of intellectual capacity.

He made other inaccurate statements when he delved into the subject of stamp duty imposed in Victoria and other States on the transfer of property in matrimonial breakdowns. He is also clearly uninformed in that area. I gained the impression that, as usual, his speech was a little too late. He is clearly unaware that nominal charges are imposed by other States. For instance, Western Australia charges $5; Tasmania is yet to set a charge, but a nominal charge of $1 or $2 will be imposed. Under the Matrimonial Causes Act most States charge $1 on property transfers.

It was decided that no duty would be imposed under the Family Law Act because the Federal Act was deemed to override the State Stamp Act. The High Court decision on 24 December last year threw the legislation into a state of confusion. It is my belief that at the time the Queensland Cabinet decision was made, it believed in good conscience that all the States had intended to charge stamp duty on transfer of matrimonial property. Mind you, that did not make it any more acceptable, but the decision was made on that basis.

I applaud the Queensland Treasurer for being prepared to respond so quickly to the constructive statements that were made by honourable members of all political parties. The comments made today by the honourable member for Woodridge were both pedantic and pathetic. He was only making a personal attack on the Treasurer. The Treasurer has made it clear that those people who would have been affected by the High Court decision will now know exactly where they stand.

I join issue with the honourable member for Woodridge when he said that the State could increase the stamp duty quite easily. He ought to know that that simply is not true and that considerable publicity and effort on the part of the Treasurer would be needed before the rate of duty could be increased above the nominal sum of $4.

There is a general lack of understanding about the great emotional and financial distress that is caused to couples whose marriages break up. As a member of a warm and secure family, I have been saddened by the large number of people who, over the past 16 months, came to my office in grave emotional and financial distress. Most of them were women, but some were men. In one or two instances, the wife had gambled or spent the money and then disappeared, leaving the husband with the task of rearing the children and paying off substantial debts and the mortgage.

One constituent of mine waived her right to maintenance through the Family Court in order to obtain title to the marital property. That placed her at a considerable disadvantage, because it meant that over a lengthy period she would lose financial support for herself and her children.

Incidentally, I am glad to see that the member for Woodridge is back in the Chamber, even though he has absolutely no interest in the debate. At least he has been replaced as shadow Treasurer by the member for Brisbane Central. That is a distinct improvement, because although he may not say very much he is at least amusing to listen to. That is more than can be said of the member for Woodridge.

To return to my constituent—her settlement did not take place until after the High Court decision. Because she was in a parlous financial state, she was barely able to scrape the money together to have the divorce go through. Her husband was not present to pay portion of the costs. She certainly could not have found the several hundred dollars necessary for her to obtain title to the property. Again I applaud the Treasurer for his response to statements made concerning a matter such as that.

That brings me to people who have problems based on religious grounds. I realise that some people, particularly those in southern States, have taken advantage of the stamp duty exemptions to avoid paying the tax. They disperse their property through their family and, although they have not separated in real terms, they pretend to separate. Perhaps they separate in terms of property. The Treasurer would face a problem in dealing with couples that engage in that practice. However, certain people because of religious grounds are unable to divorce. Moslems, some Anglicans and most Catholics would find it against their
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religious beliefs to divorce. It now appears that if they agree to separate and obtain a legal separation and a property settlement through the court they will be charged the duty. I hope that some appropriate amendment can be made to the legislation to cater for them.

I have some comments to make on the inane remarks made by the honourable member for Woodridge who tried to make a personal attack on another member and drag solicitors and their conveyancing charges into it. He, of all people, should know the worth of getting a solicitor to do conveyancing. How many members have been approached by people who have done their own conveyancing only to find that a bond or mortgage is held over a property which prevents their getting full title to it? Searches made by them are often inadequate. They should employ professionals who are liable for any mistakes that they make. I pay tribute to the Queensland Law Society and the members of the legal profession. Their charges are minimal compared with those in other States. Their professional integrity and efficiency is of a high order.

I wish to reply to some of the references made by the honourable member for Woodridge to taxes imposed in other States. I find his comments about Queensland being a high-tax State faintly amusing. He was not present when Government members spoke about his lack of knowledge of the two earlier Budgets, but he will now hear some comments about New South Wales and Victoria, the States that he champions. New South Wales motor vehicle registration fees are the highest in Australia. That State also has the highest mortgage dues in Australia. Duty charges throughout New South Wales are very high. Victoria has already moved to reintroduce death duties. Opposition members need not try to tell us that Queensland is a high-tax State. If it were, why would half of the people in New South Wales, and a third of those in Victoria be moving to live here?

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs NELSON: I suspect that some of the people from New South Wales are coming to Queensland to get some light, for clearly they are in the dark. When the Latrobe Valley project comes up for renegotiation with the new Labor Government in Victoria, I wonder how long Victorians will have electric power and how many of them will feel the bondage of socialism and come to Queensland with its beautiful climate, low taxes and the prospect of employment.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Brisbane Central will have an opportunity to speak if he wishes, but he will not constantly interrupt.

Mrs NELSON: I would be delighted if the member for Brisbane Central, who appears to be acting shadow Treasurer, were to ask a question.

Mr Davis: The question is this: Didn't Mr Fraser——

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Brisbane Central under Standing Order 123A.

Mrs NELSON: Once again I applaud the Treasurer's even-handedness, and his open-minded approach to the problem that the honourable member for Salisbury and I spoke to him about last week. I also applaud the proposed amendment to the Stamp Act. I sincerely hope that this State never falls into the clutches of the ALP, which would mean that we would be faced with the prospect of having the honourable member for Woodridge as Treasurer.

Mr BURNS (Lytton) (3.19 p.m.): I was interested to hear the honourable member for Aspley say that half the people of New South Wales and a third of all Victorians would be shifting up here. Maybe the Treasurer and other Government members will be able to tell me what the Government intends to do about providing Housing Commission accommodation and how it intends to reduce the list of thousands of people waiting for homes. Unfortunately people cannot get a home and they cannot get a loan to make a start.

Mrs NELSON: I rise to a point of order Mr Speaker, aren't we discussing the Stamp Act amendments, not the Housing Commission?
Mr BURNS: I thank the honourable member for Aspley. After listening to her speech I did not think we were discussing the Stamp Act amendments. The next time we are dealing with this legislation, she may care to speak to it.

I noted with some interest that section 49C of the Stamp Act provides that the transfer of property or a substantial interest therein, necessitated by reconstruction or amalgamation of a group of companies, when the subject property has always been in the beneficial ownership of a group of companies, is allowed to escape stamp duty. Yet I read in the newspaper that the Liberal Party spokesman, in this case the Treasurer himself, was saying that in a divorce, if the husband and wife had a 100 per cent interest in the property—not 90 per cent as will be provided for companies by this amendment—that they would pay tax. I, too, was very keen to see why such a rich State would have to bludgeon the kids of the 6,500 broken marriages in this State every year.

Dr Edwards: As usual you are about a month behind the times.

Mr BURNS: No, the Treasurer made a statement this morning. The Bill has not yet been introduced; it will be introduced in August. The Treasurer should not worry about me being a month behind the times——

Mrs Nelson: You didn't hear the Treasurer's statement.

Mr BURNS: I did hear it. Is there to be an amendment to this Bill today?

Dr Edwards: No, but the administrative arrangements are taking place from the date of the High Court decision.

Mr BURNS: That is right, but nothing is being done today. It will be done by regulation, and a Bill will be introduced later on. Why is the Bill not being amended today? I read the story in this morning's newspaper—the bull that is consistently put out by the Liberal Party—that this Bill would be amended. There is no amendment so far as I know. If no amendment is to be introduced the Treasurer should ring "The Courier-Mail" and deny this morning's story.

Dr Edwards: If you would talk to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition you would know he understood fully the reason why——

Mr BURNS: No, I am not arguing that point.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I will have some common sense in this debate, and the sooner I have it the better, or a number of members will be leaving the Chamber.

Mr BURNS: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. That will mean the end of interjections from the other side because I am the only one from whom one hears common sense. I thank you for your assurances that the interjections will cease.

One has to look at this Government's track record on financial matters. The only Bills that are ever introduced by the Government that have to be passed quickly are those that increase charges. Since the Rogerson report in South Australia in 1969 there has been a demand for some action on consumer credit legislation relating to the types of activities on which stamp duty will be levied. In 1969 the Rogerson report recommended sweeping changes to the nation's credit laws, but Queensland did nothing. In 1972 the Molomby report recommended sweeping changes to the nation's credit laws, and again Queensland did nothing. The Government can increase taxes and charges, and levy new charges here and there, but when it comes to doing something for the little bloke who is affected by the white-collar crook and the "shoddy dropper", it does nothing. One of the reasons why a lot of loan sharks are leaving New South Wales and Victoria is to get away from decent consumer credit legislation.

Dr Edwards: What utter rot!

Mr BURNS: This is a white-collar crooks' paradise. I can cite example after example of crooks ripping people off and nothing happening to them. The Treasurer knows it, and I know it.

Dr Edwards: You have never drawn it to the attention of the authorities. When did you write to me about such incidents of stamp duty evasion?
Mr BURNS: Today I wrote to the Minister for Justice about a shoddy-dropping
white-collar crook about whom nothing has been done. I am saying that these crooks
come here because they know that the laws in relation to credit and consumer control
in this State are the weakest in the nation. The National and Liberal Parties are fighting
to get a quick quid for their campaign funds and are bending over backwards—

Mrs Kyburz: Why would they be coming here?

Mr BURNS: Because our laws are so weak. They do not mind paying tax to the
Commissioner of Stamp Duties because stamp duty is nothing. They want to dodge the
possibility of being convicted for their illegal activities, and that does not happen here.

The honourable member has challenged me so I will refer to a few notes I have
here—a Dorothy Dixter—because I was waiting for someone to challenge me. In 1973
the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General set up a committee on credit laws—

Dr EDWARDS: I rise to a point of order. Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to
the fact that the honourable member is not referring to the Bill. He is referring to matters
that are not related to this legislation.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I take the Treasurer's point. I ask the honourable member to
return to the Bill.

Mr BURNS: I shall return to the Bill. With due respect—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There will be no "with due respect". The honourable member
will return to the Bill.

Mr BURNS: Mr Speaker, as you have warned me a couple of times and I do not want
to be thrown out on the last sitting day of the Parliament, I shall speak about the Stamp
Act Amendment Bill. I return to the proposed amendment to section 49C, which is the
provision that allows companies to escape paying stamp duty but does not allow divorced
couples to escape paying it. I read the newspaper article in which the Queensland Law
Society said—

"Liberal backbenchers are planning to 'embarrass' the State Government over
the new duty's introduction following unsuccessful protests to the Deputy Premier,
Treasurer and Liberal Leader, Dr Edwards."

The Deputy Premier and Treasurer caved in only at the end when the Law Society and
many other people began saying to him, "Why are you bludging on the kids in the broken
homes?" Honourable members hear that this rich State always has a great deal of money,
that thousands of people are coming here, and that millions of dollars are pouring in;
yet the Government has to hit the 6,500 families that are being broken up by divorce each
year. If the Deputy Premier and Treasurer wants to engage in personalities, as many other
honourable members have done, I should read the statement by John Hodges or John
Howard on the performance of the Queensland Treasurer. However, I shall not do that.

It seems to me that the Government regularly introduces into this Chamber Bills that
increase charges. It does nothing about consumer credit. I watched the Minister for
Justice and Attorney-General when reference was made to interest rates of 162 per cent
being paid by ordinary people buying household furniture. The average interest rate on
cars is 29 per cent. Does the Government do anything about that? Of course it does not!
It fiddles around with the stamp duty law so that it can get a few more dollars for its
Treasury from the people who are borrowing money at interest rates of 29 per cent, 50
per cent and 162 per cent. The Government does not do anything about the shoddy
businessmen who are selling kids cars that they do not own. It does nothing about the
companies that are thumbing their noses at the laws in this State. The policy of the
National and Liberal Parties is clear. They are not worried about those people. They can come
here and rip off our workers as much as they like, as long as their Government can get
the extra one-half per cent duty out of them.

Mr Moore: I may be a little bit hard on you, but when you talk about members of
Parliament with a pecuniary interest debating legislation, are you sure that you should be
debating this legislation?

Mr BURNS: Why?

Mr Moore: There is some interest in it for you.
Mr BURNS: What interest?
Mr Moore: Enough said.

Mr BURNS: I cannot get the honourable member’s point.
Mr Moore: I am not going to elaborate on it.
Mr Hooper: Ignore him.

Mr BURNS: No, I will take any interjection. In the past I have taken them all, and there is no reason not to take them now.
Mr Innes: Are there any honest businessmen in this State?

Mr BURNS: Yes, there are, but they are the ones who are disadvantaged by the Government’s failure to do something about the laws. A fellow can sell shoddy cars or lend money at an interest rate of 150 per cent, and the Government does nothing about it. It is the same story with police and with politicians. If one politician is found to be crooked or lazy, we all have to wear the badge.
Mr Innes interjected.

Mr BURNS: I do not know why I have to get up here and speak of Government supporters in glowing terms. I wish to speak about the problems confronting people, not to pat people on the back. Government members get up and congratulate the Treasurer. I heard one Government member congratulate the Government; but, as he did not know what the Bill was about, he did not know why he was congratulating the Treasurer.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to return to the Bill.

Mr BURNS: Yes, I shall return to the Bill. I want some action taken on stamp duty, particularly on transfers.
Mrs Kyburz: Is money really being lent at 150 per cent?

Mr BURNS: Yes, and reports have shown that. If that is being done in the southern States, it is being done here. Our own consumer affairs people are saying that an interest rate of 29 per cent is being charged on used cars.
Mrs Kyburz: I don’t believe it.

Mr BURNS: Mr Speaker, may I answer her inquiry?
Mr SPEAKER: Briefly.

Mr BURNS: A survey found that money-lenders were charging up to 162 per cent on loans. No action has been taken to stop those extremely high charges. Because this legislation will put money into the State’s coffers, it is introduced in a rush. Why cannot the Government legislate to restrict interest rates to no more than 30 per cent or 25 per cent? Why cannot the Government introduce restrictions such as that? Nobody has ever told me.

Dr Edwards: You obviously want total Government protection for everybody in the community. They have to sign a document to be part of that program.

Mr BURNS: But many people do not understand it, do they? Many people find that document incomprehensible. Much of the document is drawn up by legal eagles in an effort to protect the loan company.

Dr Edwards: But they know how much a week they have to pay.

Mr BURNS: They do not. The Parliament should be doing something about that; that is what this place is all about. Its purpose is not to enable members to argue about who made the best speech. The Parliament should be protecting people who are being disadvantaged or misused by the system.

For 23 years, all sorts of committees of inquiry have recommended to the Government that it do something about consumer credit, but it has never done anything. That cannot be denied. Under those circumstances, it is right for the Opposition to challenge the Government on its priorities. The Government’s priorities are to protect companies under section 49C and to ignore the divorced wives and their families. The Government has finally done something about that only after being subjected to pressure from outside.

Mr Innes: The Money Lenders Act in Queensland prescribes a limit on interest rates. In New South Wales any corporate lender is outside of the provisions of the Act.
Mr BURNS: Is that right? I do not know who he is, but a bloke by the name of Doumany was quoted in “The Courier-Mail” as saying—

“Queensland moneylenders were not legally restricted on the interest rates they could charge for loans, the Justice Minister, Mr Doumany, said yesterday.”

The honourable member for Sherwood tells me that that is wrong. That statement was made by a Liberal Minister, the one whom the member for Sherwood supports against Dr Edwards. That statement by the member for Sherwood is similar to the rubbish spoken by the member for Aspley (Mrs Nelson), who said that Queensland would gain a third of the population of Victoria and a half of the population of New South Wales. Honourable members opposite should stick to the facts.

Mr Eaton: The only restriction is that companies are not allowed to advertise interest rates of 150 per cent.

Mr BURNS: That is right.

For the benefit of the ordinary people, I want the form printed in such a way that everybody can understand it. How much people have to pay should be spelt out. There should not simply be a statement of a flat rate of interest. The overall interest repayments should be stated.

The Government should do something about the fellow who buys a car with money from a hire-purchase company and sells it to somebody else, who then has to carry the can for that fraudulent act.

I am aware that the Federal Member for Petrie (John Hodges) and others got stuck into the Deputy Premier about interest rates.

Mr Innes: We are supposed to be speaking about stamp duty.

Mr BURNS: It was the honourable member for Sherwood who invited me to speak about interest rates and money-lenders. I had been speaking about stamp duties, but he raised other matters. Now the honourable member wants to get me away from money-lenders. He told me that there were restrictions on the interest rates, but the Minister for Justice, a Liberal, said that there were not.

Dr Edwards: He did not say “restrictions”.

Mr BURNS: Yes, he did say that.

I do not mind the honourable member for Sherwood’s pretending to be a learned fellow on legal matters; but I do object to his making statements that I can prove immediately, with newspaper cuttings quoting one of his fellow Liberals, are incorrect and then accusing me of getting away from the subject of the Bill. He was the one who made statements that were not related to the Bill.

I do not believe in fiddling around with the $4 provided for in the Treasurer’s statement today. If a company can avoid stamp duty on a transfer of assets because it has a 90 per cent interest, there is no reason why a family that has broken up should not be able to do exactly the same. A State as rich as Queensland should not impose any duty on divorces. There is something wrong if the State has to score off the kids, the broken families and the heat and hurt that come from a broken marriage.

Mr TURNER (Warrego) (3.34 p.m.): I congratulate the Treasurer on the introduction of the legislation. Members from both sides of the House have said much in relation to the stamp duty levied on the transfer of property ordered by the Family Court. I support that far-reaching proposal, which needs no further public debate.

The matter to which I direct my attention concerns many people in my electorate. It is something that I have brought to the attention of the Treasurer on numerous occasions, and I raise it in the Chamber today. I refer to the iniquitous and unfair imposition of stamp duty on the transfer of rural land from a parent to minors. In many instances stamp duty has been levied and paid. By law, the parent must act as a trustee. At a later date, when the property is transferred to the children, further stamp duty is levied although no sale has been effected and no money has changed hands.

I ask the Treasurer to reconsider the imposition of that iniquitous tax, which is proving a hardship to people in rural areas. The duty levied on the transfer of title from a parent to a child when the parent has acted only as trustee can in some instances amount
to $3,000, $4,000 or $5,000. It is a hardship and the matter should be investigated. I would like an indication—a commitment, if possible—from the Treasurer that the matter will be considered with a view to removing it from the statutes.

Mrs KYBURZ (Salisbury) (3.36 p.m.): Although the member for Lytton is not in his seat, I wish to make some comments that relate to him. I intended to thank him for his kind comments in yesterday's "Courier-Mail". It shows that, when both sides of the House are in agreement, results can be achieved.

I wish to raise certain issues with the Treasurer while the stamp duty officials are here. Certainly I hope that, when the amendment relating to Family Court settlements is introduced in August, some of the matters that I am concerned about will be rectified.

The member for Lytton raised some very valid points. The Bill will provide further revenue for the Government. Whilst his points may not have been strictly related to stamp duty per se, they nevertheless touched on revenue-gathering for the Government—for any Government.

He mentioned housing, which is of grave concern to me. It is a problem in every electorate and concerns each and every member, because nearly all people have a house that is owned by a bank or a building society. Quite a few members have had discussions with Ministers; but, as has been made clear, it is a problem for every tier of government.

One issue that the honourable member for Lytton raised, which does not involve revenue-raising by the Government, is interest charged on loans. I will make a point of reading the Press cutting mentioned by the member which sets out that some people are paying up to 150 per cent. If that is so, it concerns me greatly and I will take it up as an issue, because it is very important.

Some questions I raise relate to stamp duties on Family Court settlements. I appreciate the effect of the Minister's statement this afternoon. However, I feel that the amendments will have to be wider than those foreshadowed by him. I do not agree that only stamp duty on the matrimonial home should be abolished. Any and every piece of joint property should be exempt. I illustrate, for example—and I am sure that the Treasurer is well aware of such circumstances—a man and woman jointly owning a farm as a business. If as a result of a Family Court action that property is divided, will one or other of the partners have to pay stamp duty? That would be extremely unfair.

I also ask the Treasurer to explain what will happen to small shopkeepers. A fruit shop or other small business would have nothing whatever to do with the principal place of residence. If as a result of a Family Court decision it is decided to sell the business, or if it is sold by one partner to the other, would that amount be subject to stamp duty? I do not think that any property in joint names, either for investment or business purposes, should be liable to any form of stamp duty as a result of a marriage breakup. Those property divisions are private and personal.

I do not believe that Government stamp duty should intrude into that area. There is already enough intrusion in the area of the Family Court. Some people demand intrusions because they are unable to arrive at an equitable agreement. Those persons need the assistance of professionals to intervene in the disputes that occur. Some people are able to make equitable decisions. It is an intrusion into a person's privacy that those matters should be determined in the Family Court. Some farmers may be liable for the payment of stamp duty. There could be instances in which the amount of stamp duty payable is quite considerable.

In the event of a family breakdown in which a professional partnership of a solicitor or a doctor is involved, if one party buys out the other party, will that person be liable to stamp duty even after the amendment takes effect in August?

I have heard that many people are involved in the collection of stamp duty. I would like to know the number of persons directly involved in the collection of stamp duty and the cost of maintaining the Stamp Duty Office in comparison with the amount collected by it, if it is possible to determine that.

It is obvious that the Treasurer is concerned about those persons who evade the payment of stamp duty. However, I am concerned about the religious grounds issue. Although some people would normally have sought a legal separation only before the Family Court, I fear that those people will now be forced to apply for a decree absolute so that they will not have to pay stamp duty on property transfers. I do not understand
why some people have not applied for a decree absolute. Some people, such as Moslems, may have religious convictions, as mentioned by the member for Aspley. Some people will not pay stamp duty on their property division. Does it now mean that in order to avoid the payment of stamp duty, those people who normally would have sought a legal separation will now have to get a decree absolute to be exempted from the payment of stamp duty?

I have read the various High Court decisions and listened to honourable members. It is obvious to me that some people show a complete lack of understanding of marriage breakdowns. I can only slate publicly the mentality of some High Court judges. Some of their judgments have been appalling. Their lack of sensitivity has been revealed by their words and their lack of forward thinking. I was absolutely appalled at the High Court decision that has been referred to today. Many members realise that it could have been a far-reaching decision if the problem had not been rectified. One hopes that it will indeed be rectified.

The honourable member for Lytton failed to understand that as from December last year transactions involving the Family Court will be exempt from the application of stamp duty. I think I understood the Treasurer's statement correctly. Therefore a precise amendment is not needed now; all that is needed is a correcting or enabling amendment in August. It is obvious that the Stamp Duties Office will not be applying stamp duty as from December last. That is what the Treasurer was stating.

This whole issue has allowed me to witness some of the absolutely petty jealousies that are displayed in this Parliament. Everyone knows that politics can be sordid and that political and philosophical divisions occur. Heaven knows, we have seen a divided House before! The ALP displays publicly a positive discrimination policy. I am waiting to see which member of the ALP will be kind enough to move over for a more intelligent woman. I am waiting with bated breath.

I take umbrage at the comments made by the Opposition spokesman, Mr D'Arcy. At least the member for Lytton, who participated in the debate, has some shred of gallantry. But only the member for Woodridge would have the hide to come up to me in the corridor and say, "What would you two girls know about stamp duty?" I looked at him askance and I thought that if ever there was a patronising male chauvinist in this place the member for Woodridge is it. He knows what I think, because I told him what I think. I did not want to cripple the man—obviously he has difficulty getting around now—so I did not kick him in the shins as I should have.

He even had the hide to blame a somewhat corpulent and good-natured neighbour of mine for having leaked information from the Labor Party caucus. That is absolutely the height of pettiness. Just because members of the Government stole Opposition members' thunder by making speeches similar to those that Opposition members wrote a couple of weeks ago, it does not mean that a Labor Party member has come out of caucus and said to us, "Listen, girls, guess what's going on. Mr D'Arcy is going to say this and that." I assure the honourable member for Woodridge that nobody in the Labor Party leaked information to me, nobody ever has and I am sure that nobody ever will. But if ever that does happen I will not tell the honourable member for Woodridge. Mr Hooper does not do that sort of thing, no matter what the honourable member for Woodridge may think.

A Government Member: Mr Hooper is very quiet.

Mr Hooper: I am waiting with bated breath.

Mrs KYBURZ: I am waiting with bated breath to see which intelligent woman in the Woodridge/Springwood area will contest Mr D'Arcy's seat. It will be interesting to see which woman, displaying wit and intelligence, wins over the supposed charm of the nouveau riche.

The abolition of stamp duty on the matrimonial home alone is not good enough. Every item of joint property should be exempted. I hope that the Treasurer, in giving consideration to the future amendment, will think about all the ramifications of the Bill. As I said before, it is a monetary Bill and one that allows the Government to raise revenue. Frankly, if the Government can afford a statue of the Queen to sit somewhere in a garden, as announced in the Press last week—

Mr Moore: Don't kill that, otherwise I will have to speak.
Mrs KYBURZ: I know what the honourable member for Windsor thinks. I am expressing an opposing point of view. The honourable member for Windsor supports the erection of a statue of the Queen. I am not arguing with him, but I am arguing against him. I repeat: if the Government can afford a statue of the Queen, which I believe to be a ridiculous waste of money, it can afford not to charge stamp duty on property transfers as a result of Family Court applications. I do not care what the honourable member for Windsor thinks. Obviously he can say what he thinks, but I wish he would afford me the same opportunity. I do not really care what he thinks about what I say.

The $4 fee is almost trivial, but I wonder whether companies are to be charged that fee when they are being restructured. Honourable members have been told that the $4 will be a handling charge. Will companies be charged a handling charge when they undergo restructuring? I would have difficulty in arguing against that.

I ask the Treasurer to reconsider the amendment. Probably it will have to be widened, because many members of the Government, including the honourable members for Cooroora and Warrego, have raised the issue with the Treasurer. I know that a concerted effort has been made to have the situation explained. I can only repeat that if the Government can afford a ridiculous statue it can afford to extend some kindness to the community.

Hon. L. R. EDWARDS (Ipswich—Deputy Premier and Treasurer) (3.53 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable member for their comments. However, it should be recognised by all honourable members and the community generally that when they level criticism at taxation, they should be equally adamant in supporting measures to reduce services to the community when finance is not available. Services cannot be provided without revenue. Without doubt, all of us would like to remove stamp duty and all other forms of taxation. However, there is a limit to what the Government can do. It has to live within its means, and it has always done that.

If the Government pursues its policy of keeping Queensland a low-tax State and acts to reduce stamp duty and other taxes, it must equally maintain its policy of giving service to the community. Opposition members who asked for a further reduction in stamp duty should be just as adamant in advocating reductions in health, welfare and education services. It amazes me to hear members of the Opposition criticising the Government on class sizes and calling for the expenditure of more and more money, and then, with equal vehemence, criticising the Government for collecting stamp duty. I make it very clear that they cannot have it both ways.

Stamp duty is a necessary evil; I make no apology for saying that. Governments have to be sure of the correctness of documentation. That is why throughout history stamp duty has been applied to documentation. From his remarks, one might almost infer that the honourable member for Woodridge supported tax evasion. I hope that he is not espousing that policy. I make no apology for saying that I have no time for people who avoid taxation. I have shown my commitment to that principle by the number of times I have amended the Stamp Act since I became Treasurer. I believe that loopholes in the Act must be closed to prevent those who can well afford to pay stamp duty avoiding their responsibilities while those who can least afford legal advice have to face up to their responsibilities under the legislation. The honourable member could not understand where the increased stamp duty was coming from. It has resulted from increased sales of land and property throughout the State. That is well known and well documented.

I want to clear up another matter not understood by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. The Government had no intention of legislating to impose stamp duty on the sale of matrimonial homes following divorce; that is already provided for in the Act. I am disappointed that the Government has been criticised for introducing a provision that already exists.

When the Commonwealth Government amended the Family Law Act, it stated that it did not believe that stamp duty should apply and declared invalid the section of the Act which was mirrored in State legislation. Following that declaration, the Victorian Government—not the Queensland Government—challenged in the High Court the validity of that declaration. The High Court found that the Commonwealth Government's declaration was invalid. As a result, without any amendment to the Act—I am disappointed.
that it was suggested that the Government did contemplate changing the Stamp Act—the Act that had applied for many years but had not applied since 1974, when the Family Law Act was introduced, was therefore invoked once more.

The Government’s policy was to adopt a uniform approach with the other States, and only one State said that it would move to avoid collecting stamp duty. As a commitment had been made, the Government decided to reimplement the system and collect the stamp duty as required under the legislation. Because of a recent election in one State and an imminent election in another, there was a sudden change of heart. A third State quickly followed suit, and a fourth State has left the matter to the discretion of its Commissioner of Stamp Duties. As a result, the Queensland Government reconsidered its position and is now prepared to amend the Act.

Although I am not always amazed by what the honourable member for Lytton says, I was amazed by his criticising the Government for rushing this legislation through the Parliament and then criticising it for not passing it through all stages today. That is a gross inconsistency. It is about time that the honourable member showed some consistency. I am glad to see the honourable member for Archerfield supporting me by nodding his head.

Let me move on to the speech of the honourable member for Sherwood, who showed that he understood the amendments and that the Government faces an enormous problem in revising the Stamp Act. As he said, it is necessary that we continue to adjust the Act. As it has done in the past, the Government makes a commitment to further revising the Act, which it believes is essential. I thank the honourable member for his support.

I was interested in the comments of the honourable member for Cooroora with regard to the continuous increases in charges made by ALP Governments elsewhere in Australia. During the August session, I intend to table figures showing the increases in charges in New South Wales under an ALP Government. By that time, I will also be able to give figures showing similar increases in Victoria and Tasmania.

Mr Fouras: Will you go back five years?

Dr EDWARDS: I will be very happy to go back five years. Although it has not yet been sworn in, the ALP Government in Victoria has already announced that it will reintroduce probate duty and increase hospital charges by 20 per cent. That is not bad only two days after an election! I can imagine what that Government will be like in six months’ time.

The honourable member for Cooroora made a relevant point about the charges imposed by a Labor Government. The Labor Government in New South Wales is in a disastrous financial position. Its deficit is presently $131m although, just before the last election in that State, it aimed at a balanced Budget.

The honourable member for Woodridge said that a Labor Government in this State would deficit fund. I do not know what he means by deficit-funding. If he means that he would fund the State by budgeting for a deficit, he would plunge this State into an extremely difficult position. I am absolutely disgusted that any responsible member would suggest that a State should operate on a deficit Budget. Of course, that is how the Federal Labor Government operated and that is why the Federal state of affairs are still in a mess.

The present Liberal-National Country Party Government inherited a deficit of many billions of dollars, and Opposition members know that. When the Labor Party came to power in Canberra in 1972, there was a balanced state of affairs, but when it left office there was a deficit of more than $3,000m. Opposition members can talk as much as they like about deficit budgeting, but this Government will have no part of it. Indeed, any responsible Government wants to pay its way and live out of the revenue that it receives. After 125 years of government in this State, we have an accumulated deficit of only $1m.

Mr Fouras interjected.

Dr EDWARDS: We have the least loan funds of any State. It is about time that the member for South Brisbane understood what he is talking about. Nobody else understands him, and I can understand why he is having difficulty in trying to hold his seat.
The member for Aspley raised the matter of divorce settlements, and I know her views on that subject. I apply to that situation the same argument that I applied to the general question: We cannot continue to exempt everything unless we are prepared, with the same vehemence, to reduce services. The honourable member referred to the charges imposed in the other States and the relative position of Queensland.

I am not sure what the member for Lytton was talking about. To be quite frank he said nothing, so I have nothing to reply to. He did not understand the Money Lenders Act. It applies a prescribed rate of interest, and that is what the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General was speaking about recently. Once people lend money above that prescribed interest rate they are considered by law to be money-lenders and, therefore, have to abide by the Money Lenders Act and its regulations.

The member for Warrego raised a question that I believe is important and should be looked at by the Government. I assure the honourable member that the Government will examine that matter in the future.

The member for Salisbury referred to divorce proceedings and stamp duty, and I understand her feelings. I have responded to the representations made by the honourable members for Salisbury, Aspley and Cooroora, and one or two other members.

The Government receives approximately $230m a year from stamp duty, so it is not a mean duty. A staff of between 90 and 100 people collect that duty. That is a remarkably low number of people to handle the amount of documentation involved. That revenue represents about 7 or 8 per cent of our total Budget revenue. At this stage, payroll tax raises about $329m. The moneys raised by those two taxes represent about 20 per cent of the total revenue of the State.

The honourable member mentioned that businesses should be included. Of course, the Government would like to introduce that provision but there is a limit to what can be done. The Government will consider the problem that arises with farm areas when the house and the business activities must be separated. Because of the cost involved I cannot assure the honourable member that the Government will go as far as she would like.

The Bill is part of a continuing upgrading of the Act and I thank honourable members for their comments. I assure them that the Government will continue to revise the Act and if, over the next few months, members have submissions on a revision of the Act during the next session, I will be very happy to receive them.

Motion (Dr Edwards) agreed to.

Committee
Mr Akers (Pine Rivers) in the chair

Clauses 1 to 7, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

Bill, on motion of Dr Edwards, by leave, read a third time.

ANZAC SQUARE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT BILL

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 25 March (see p. 5178) on Dr Edwards's motion—

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

Mr D'ARCY (Woodridge) (4.8 p.m.): The Opposition welcomes this Bill which at long last has been introduced. As the Treasurer pointed out, an interim agreement has already been signed by the respective parties: The Brisbane City Council, the State Government and Wales Properties Limited.

The one thing that stands out in everybody's mind is that the Bill is an indictment of the Government and particularly the Liberal Party. At the conclusion of his second-reading speech the Deputy Premier said that after almost 15 years of effort by a great number of people it has finally been possible, with the support of the community in general, if not unanimous, to develop a scheme to enhance the city centre. For 15 years the Liberal Party has procrastinated over this matter to such an extent that Brisbane has had an ugly hole in its centre for that period.
I am glad that the Minister for Transport (Mr Lane) has entered the House and
is smiling, because he is one of the people who have attacked the Brisbane City Council
over this matter for so long.

It is a shame that in this Parliament the Liberal Party has degenerated to mouthing
little innuendoes. The member for Salisbury said that she has observed pettiness in the
House. Every time a Bill is under discussion we witness the interplay when the member
for Sherwood tries to air his legal knowledge. On every occasion it is a play staged by
the Liberal Party. Then we see his little duchess, the member for Aspley, rise and support
him. What we see on every occasion is an interplay, with the Liberal Party running a
little show.

Procrastination by the Liberal Party in this State is the name of the game. We know
where the National Party stands on issues such as this one. It does not understand them
and it does not care. The Liberal Party is supposed to represent the south-east corner—the
area that the Bill is concerned with—but we have had 15 years of procrastination. We
wonder why, but when we see incompetence—

Mrs Kyburz interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Miller): Order! The member for Salisbury will have an
opportunity to enter the debate at a later stage.

Mr D'ARCY: The members for Salisbury and Aspley might say that I am a male
chauvinist. The honourable member for Salisbury at least makes some sort of attempt and
her poor shadow, the member for Aspley, projects her type of image.

Dr Edwards: It's council property. It's got nothing to do with the State Government.

Mr D'ARCY: The Government has delayed what the Brisbane City Council wanted to do.
Four times the council put proposals forward, and the Treasurer knows it. The city of
Brisbane, which has made some progress over the years, has been blighted by a huge, ugly
hole. It has not been the fault of the Brisbane City Council: it has been the fault of this
Government. At long last there is an agreement—after 15 years of procrastination by the
Liberal Party. The interplay and the pettiness in the House on every occasion worries me.
If competent women sit in the Parliament, nobody minds; but we have two incompetent
female members of the Liberal Party.

Mrs Kyburz interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Persistent interjections will not be tolerated.

Mr D'ARCY: We did have a very competent lady from Ipswich West in the House.
It was unfortunate that she was defeated.

Dr Edwards: She was stabbed in the back by one of your members.

Mr D'ARCY: No. She was very competent. She was defeated on that occasion, as the
two female members of the Liberal Party will be at the next election.

We are very happy to welcome the Bill. We are sick of little pettiness, and I suppose
we will continue to see it. I suppose they will back one another up and pat one another
on the back, and stab Dr Edwards. That is what they were doing in the earlier debate.

The Bill is something that we have wanted introduced for 15 years—since the days of
Clem Jones. It could have been introduced earlier by the Government to enhance the city.
The Liberals claim they represent the people of Brisbane. They wanted to lead them
in the Brisbane City Council. They do not deserve to. They do not deserve to represent
the people of Brisbane in Parliament. The next election will see the demise of the Liberal
Party in this State, because the people of Brisbane will react against the type of treatment
they have received as a result of the Liberal Party's procrastination.

We welcome the Bill. It has been welcomed by the RSL. The project that has been
authorised is acceptable. The only thing that can possibly happen is that the Liberal Party,
which has at last said that the Bill can be introduced, will change its mind or, which is
more likely, will be pressured by the National Party.

Mr AKERS (Pine Rivers) (4.14 p.m.): We have just heard why the Labor Party is the
Opposition in this State. If the member for Woodridge is the second best member that
Labor can produce to represent it in the House, we will remain on this side of the Chamber
for a long time. He totally misrepresented the facts and put them back to front.
We have had at least six years of total blackmail by the ALP council. Despite the desire of many people in Queensland for a Queen Street mall, the former Lord Mayor of Brisbane said that he would not allow anything to happen about the Queen Street mall until the Anzac Square extension was agreed to.

Mr Hooper: Which Lord Mayor was that?

Mr AKERS: A whole series of administrations, the latest one headed by Mr Sleeman. He said that privately and publicly. That is the attitude that has been expressed.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition said that there was procrastination by the Liberal Party. My views on this project have been constant. Anzac Square needs to be extended. The hole in the ground, which is to the shame of Queensland, must be transformed by the construction of a building. The link from Brisbane GPO to Central Railway Station must be established in such a way that it is a credit to the people of Queensland.

The development has been delayed because members of the Brisbane City Council, under a series of Labor administrations, could not get their own way and destroy Anzac Square and construct buildings over it. The council stopped development of the project. The hole in the ground has existed for many years.

Southern architects who have visited Queensland three and four years apart have said, "What are you doing with that hole in the ground? Is it still there?" I have had to explain to them that it was still there because of the obstruction by the city council, that it wanted to either destroy Anzac Square entirely or do nothing and that it acted like a child who, unable to have his own way, takes his football home.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition tried to mislead the House. He blamed the Liberal Party for the blot on the face of Brisbane. As a result of the introduction of the Bill, that blot will be removed.

I pay great credit to the late Norman Kelly. It has taken the determination of a few people and the brilliance of Robin Gibson and his staff to allow this project to proceed. They found a way round the impasse that the Brisbane City Council created. Governments at all levels should make more use of the enormous talent of people such as Robin Gibson and the other architects and town planners in Queensland, so that the State can develop. More environmental initiatives are needed so that Brisbane can develop.

Brisbane lacks co-ordination of its building projects. Projects such as the Queensland Cultural Centre, the Victoria Bridge, the Captain Cook Bridge and the South East Freeway are good structures but they are unrelated to the overall environment of Brisbane.

The destruction of the Bellevue Hotel was an ad hoc decision. The demolition of the Hoffnung building was unrelated to the development of Brisbane. No work has been carried out on the cathedral square site. The Queen Street Mall project and the Anzac Square extension are being developed. They are important parts of the built environment of Brisbane, but they are unco-ordinated.

Some proper planning and forethought by local authorities and government at all levels would enable the provision of a better environment. A lack of planning exists in Brisbane, especially in the city area. Not only the Brisbane City Council is lacking; State and Federal Governments must also take their share of the blame. Intermingled wrangles go on between all levels of government over projects. They cause grave concern to those who care about the quality of the built environment in Brisbane.

Even the Queen Street Mall, to which very few people would object, is being constructed in an ad hoc architectural and engineering manner. It is not being constructed as part of an overall project. Between the Valley and the city area lies an important concourse. If it can be developed in a way that will enable Brisbane to breathe properly and to provide for a true connection, the city will have the feeling of a real city of the world. Until all projects in the city area are co-ordinated, the city will lack that feeling. The feeling will be more like that of a country town that has grown up in an ad hoc manner. The city will lack feeling and the continuity of going from one part of the city to another.

What is needed is indicative planning together with the promotion of that planning so that people know where they are going. Very long lead times are involved. Decisions that were made in 1972 are affecting us severely now. Decisions made in the town plan affect us for a long time ahead. The lead time is there and the decisions have to be made now
so that in 10 years' time there will be some co-ordination. Unless some of our resources are transferred to proper planning, Brisbane will not be the sort of city that all of us want. It is possible to get it with proper indicative planning.

A further example of the lack of co-ordination is the Holy Name Cathedral site in Ann Street in the Valley. The area of land is large, it is in a dominant place, it is part of the concourse to which I referred earlier. It is at the connecting point of many of Brisbane's main arterial roads. The site is a very important one. Yet it is being put forward simply as a commercial project. Frightening figures have been quoted concerning its development. It will not be developed in relationship with the rest of the city.

I do not blame the owners of the site for that. Under the present system all they can do is offer it for sale and get the best return they can. There is a great chance to do with that site something that will be really good for Brisbane, but that chance is slipping away very quickly. No action has been taken by any planning authority to find some way of incorporating the site into the city.

I have asked architects in Queensland to let us know what they think should happen. I have the suggestions that they put forward. They vary enormously. Within the next couple of weeks I shall be collating them in readiness for putting forward a submission to the Treasurer in the hope of obtaining some indication from the Government that it would like the site to be developed in a certain way. I am not asking that it be acquired by the Government, but that would be ideal. The cost involved would probably be of the order of $5m or $6m, and I am not sure that at a time when everyone is talking about reducing costs the Government should be asked to outlay expenditure of that magnitude.

Governments at all levels can encourage things to happen. I am hoping that I will get some indication from the Government as to the way in which the site can be developed to give Brisbane the best chance of gaining from it.

The projected cathedral would really have suited that site. Gothic cathedrals can give a city a real centre point. There is no chance of that now. We will probably get a couple of high rise buildings that will destroy the concourse between the two sections of the city. They will destroy the site as an important part of the environment. We will not be ashamed of what we get, but it will be of far less value than the building we might have had. A submission will be made to the Treasurer very soon. I urge him to take note of it.

The project outlined in the Bill for the redevelopment of Anzac Square provides a link across the city from Central Station to the General Post Office. It will be a pedestrian link as well as a visual link. We will be proud of it. I will be very happy to face architects and planners from other States when they come here. I will be able to say, "It has taken a lot of effort by many people but at last we have something worth while."

As a last request, I urge the unions to lift their black bans as soon as possible. Far too much is at stake for the project to be held up by black bans. Virtually no-one who cares about planning is opposed to the proposal. The unions have adopted an unrelated course. Brisbane can only gain in prestige from the project rather than suffer the damage that will occur if the project is not finished in time for the Commonwealth Games when we are on show to the rest of the world. If people from all over the world come with their cameras and see that site and the cathedral site in their present condition, they will not leave us thinking that Brisbane is a beautiful city. They will leave wondering how we can be content to leave them in such a shambles—and, as sure as hell, they will be told that the hole has been there for a long time. They will wonder what sort of a State they have visited that can leave such ugly sites in such important parts of the city.

Hon. L. R. EDWARDS (Ipswich—Deputy Premier and Treasurer) (4.28 p.m.), in reply: I will deal firstly with a few of the comments made by the honourable member for Woodridge. I have heard him make some pitiful speeches, but his speech today was his worst-ever performance. It was worth while to see the honourable members sitting behind him shaking their heads in absolute amazement. It is no wonder that his endorse­ment by his party is under threat.

It is untrue for the honourable member to suggest that the Liberal Party held up this project. Mr Deputy Speaker and the member for Windsor have been outspoken critics of the Clem Jones plan. Clem Jones and the Labor Party wanted to destroy Anzac Square. If the honourable member for Woodridge wants to identify himself with that plan, let him be counted. Neither the Government nor the Liberal Party would have anything
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Mr Shaw: Is that the difference? The raising up?

Dr EDWARDS: Exactly. We would have no part of that, and we told Clem Jones at the time.

The honourable member for Woodridge identified himself with that project. We indicated as a party, and the Government responded to our call, that we would not have Anzac Square desecrated in any way. We were able to negotiate with all parties. The Brisbane City Council was most co-operative in this part of the exercise.

I pay tribute to the honourable member for Pine Rivers for his co-operation and the expert advice he was able to give me during the negotiations with architects and the Brisbane City Council in an endeavour to reach an acceptable compromise so that the only part of the square that will be disturbed is the small garden, which will become part of the footpath. I believe that the proposal is acceptable.

For the member for Woodridge to suggest that we have held up development for 15 years is total hypocrisy. I apologise to the people of Queensland for the fact that he has identified himself with the Clem Jones model, which was a disgrace architecturally. No city could have tolerated such a project in its centre and the returned servicemen of this State were not prepared to accept it.

Mr Shaw: You are saying it was a bad plan.

Dr EDWARDS: Of course it was.

Mr Shaw: And that is why you held it up.

Dr EDWARDS: Yes, and we make no apology for it, because it was far better not to proceed than to have a project that would damage Anzac Square. We identify ourselves with that delay.

Let me say further that we were concerned about Anzac Square, not the hole in the ground, because the Brisbane City Council could have gone ahead at any time with the development of the hole in the ground. It did not need legislation to do that, and for the member for Woodridge to suggest that the Government held up the development of the hole in the ground is, once again, totally irresponsible.

I think it was the member for Pine Rivers who said that the hole in the ground has been a blight on the city, which could have been corrected by the Brisbane City Council at any time, but the reason we objected to its proposal was that we would not allow Anzac Square to be desecrated. We make no apology for taking that stance. The Brisbane City Council owned the hole in the ground and could have developed it in any manner it wished.

The proposal that has now been accepted will delight the entire community. I hope that the member for Woodridge will be around the place—I doubt that he will be a member of this Parliament—to pay credit to the architects and other people who have been involved in the project.

The honourable member for Pine Rivers made some very pertinent points about town planning and indicative planning, and I totally agree with his views. It is about time that councils throughout the State, rather than look at town plans as they do and refer to this and that type of zoning, got back to the basics of what town planning is all about, and that is the proper use of land. The comments made by the honourable member about architectural and environmental planning should be noted by the Parliament and adopted in the future.

Finally, might I say that I share the concern of the honourable member for Pine Rivers about black bans. The present ban on the project is one of the most irresponsible ever applied by any trade union. It is a despicable state of affairs that, because the Government is not prepared to go along with the wish of a trade union, it has placed a black ban on a project that is supported by the party with which the union is associated and to which it is affiliated. I call upon the Builders Labourers Federation to remove its ban as quickly as possible so that this project can proceed and bring delight to many people.
I foreshadow a minor amendment at the Committee stage. Motion (Dr Edwards) agreed to.

Committee

Mr Row (Hinchinbrook) in the chair; Hon. L. R. Edwards (Ipswich—Deputy Premier and Treasurer) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 8, as read, agreed to.

Clause 9—Subdivision of project land—

Dr EDWARDS (4.35 p.m.): I move the following amendment—

“At page 4, line 14, omit the expression—

‘1980’

and insert the expression—

‘1981’.”

This is purely to correct a typographical error. Amendment (Dr Edwards) agreed to.

Clause 9, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 10 to 15, and schedule, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, with an amendment.

Third Reading

Bill, on motion of Dr Edwards, by leave, read a third time.

LIQUOR ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 25 March (see p. 5147) on Mr Doumany’s motion—

“That the Bill be now read a second time.”

Mr R. J. GIBBS (Wolston) (4.38 p.m.): I certainly do not intend to take up a great deal of the time of the House in speaking to this Bill because I believe that later this year the Minister intends to introduce some major amendments to the liquor laws of this State. The Opposition awaits those amendments with interest.

I concur with the attitude that my colleague the honourable member for Sandgate adopted in a previous debate today. He said he hoped that some of the modifications to the liquor laws that the Government is introducing specifically for the Commonwealth Games will be included in amendments that will be introduced later this year. I am referring to whether smaller hotels could be sited in the various suburbs of Brisbane. However, that matter will be discussed later.

Basically, the Opposition has no objection to the Bill. In fact, I note that, under clause 6, section 117 of the Liquor Act is being amended to provide for a stepson, stepdaughter, etc., of a member to become a member of an RSL club. That move is long overdue and has probably come about as a direct result of representations from the RSL.

I consider that I should make a mildly critical comment about the RSL. The RSL itself should adopt a more enlightened attitude to the liquor laws in this State. That is not a general criticism of all members of the RSL or of other ex-servicemen’s clubs, but I fervently believe that, given the opportunity, the majority of members would agree with the criticism of the RSL that is voiced in this Chamber from time to time.

The criticism that I express in this debate relates to the fact that Anzac Day this year falls on a Sunday. It is not only absurd but also hypocritical of the RSL to raise a hue and cry about hotels being allowed to open on the Sunday morning of Anzac Day. The ordinary member of the public who does not belong to a serviceman’s club or an RSL club will have to wait until 1 o’clock on Sunday afternoon before he can partake of some liquid refreshment at his local drinking house. When the basic objection to
opening hotels early on Anzac Day comes from the upper echelon of the RSL, it is the height of hypocrisy, because those who voice that criticism can themselves begin drinking as early as 4 o'clock on the morning of Anzac Day. In fact, many of them consume quite a quantity of liquor before the dawn service, continue on after the dawn service and then through till all hours of the evening of Anzac Day. But this year members of the public will have to wait until 1 o'clock in the afternoon before they can purchase a beer at their local hotel. As I said, that is a hypocritical attitude on the part of some members of the RSL.

When the Minister considers amendments to the Liquor Act later this year, I hope that he will take that into consideration. I am sure that it is only the very conservative upper echelon of the administration of the RSL that wishes to cause the public such inconvenience on Anzac Day. I am sure also that the majority of members of the RSL would be quite happy to see some liquor reform, and, although I do not mean to be disrespectful in any way, I am quite sure that if one could speak to those people who departed this life many years ago in the service of their country, many of them would not have any objection to members of the public having a beer in civilised surroundings on Anzac Day.

I wish to query the clause of the Bill that allows an invited guest who has been signed in by a club member, who then has to leave, to remain at the club and consume liquor without the member being in attendance. Part (b) of that clause states—

"... the member has subsequently left the club for a special and compelling reason ..."

I am quite happy with "special and compelling reason" because that can be spelt out if need be. However, the clause continues—

"the guest may be or continue to be supplied with liquor in the club premises on the day in question;"

I interpret that as meaning that an invited guest who has been deserted by a member of the club can continue to drink on the premises if the member has left for a special or compelling reason. However, the words used are "may be or continue to be", and I ask the Minister for clarification of that.

At the time of the last Federal Budget, the Federal Government gave an undertaking that local authorities would be able to purchase airports. The newly elected Lord Mayor of Brisbane (Alderman Harvey) has mentioned the possibility of the Brisbane City Council's purchasing the Brisbane Airport. One of the provisions in the Bill gives the statutory right to a local authority that purchases an airport to nominate a person of good character to maintain, manage or control the liquor licence at the airport.

While I am on the subject of licensing conditions and bars at airports, I suggest to the Minister that it is high time that he had a very close look at the operation of liquor licences at the Brisbane Airport. Two of the most disgraceful bars in Brisbane would be those in the TAA and Ansett terminals. The service is absolutely appalling. I was there a few weeks ago. I have heard complaints from members of the general public and members of Parliament from time to time about the filthy glasses in which beer is served and the exorbitant prices one has to pay. I sincerely hope that the Minister gives some consideration to my comments.

Mr Hansen: Who has control over the licences? Is it the Minister or are they on Commonwealth territory?

Mr R. J. Gibbs: It would be Commonwealth territory but, as I mentioned a moment ago, the Brisbane City Council, if it so desired, could purchase the airport. One would hope that we would see a difference then.

I take some of the points made earlier about the Commonwealth Games to be held in Brisbane this year. Many visitors will be using the bar facilities at the Brisbane Airport, and I would hate their impression of Brisbane to be based on the type of service and the filthy conditions under which liquor is served at the airport at present.

One of the amendments contained in the Bill relates to the licensing of the Queensland Cultural Centre, one which is welcomed by the Opposition. Visitors to the centre are entitled to modern facilities. They are entitled to a good meal and a drink to accompany the meal.
I raised the following matter with one of the Minister’s staff, and I take the point
he made. I have consulted the New South Wales legislation dealing with the Sydney
Opera House and the South Australian legislation dealing with the Festival of Arts
Theatre in Adelaide. Neither specifies how the liquor licence should or could operate.
It concerns me that at times we legislate on matters such as this in a rather narrow
sense. I realise that there would be problems in spelling out in legislation how liquor
licences at the new Cultural Centre should operate. We would not be so difficult as
to expect the Bill to lay down hard and fast guide-lines, but I would have expected some
indication. Perhaps in his reply the Minister may indicate what type of licence will
apply at the Queensland Cultural Centre and the hours of operation. From time to time
I have misgivings about the operations of the Licensing Commission in Queensland. As
members of Parliament we are entitled to be told of some of the considerations of the
Licensing Commission when a licence is granted to the Cultural Centre.

Basically, the Opposition has no objection to the legislation. However, I reiterate
that we look forward to the next session, when we hope to see further amendments to
the Liquor Act 1912-1981, particularly in the light of the special amendments that have
been made for the Commonwealth Games in Brisbane. As the Opposition spokesman,
I will certainly be expanding on a number of provisions that the Labor Party believes
ought to be included in the legislation.

Mr HOOPER (Archerfield) (4.49 p.m.): I, too, agree with the introduction of the
Bill. I also agree with the granting of a special licence for the Queensland Cultural Centre.
After all, I think all honourable members would agree that it will be Queensland’s
most prestigious centre for the arts. It is costing the taxpayers of this State $100m,
which is considerably more than the original estimate of approximately $40m.

Inflation has played a part in the increased cost, but the contractors have left a
lot to be desired in many instances. The walls were erected and a few days later they
were knocked down because they were a few inches out of place. A number of other
incidents of incompetence have occurred, but I will not go into them now.

It is common sense that the trust should have flexibility to arrange for the sale of
liquor at various outlets. For example, temporary bars are set up on the various levels
of the Sydney Opera House to meet the needs of people attending different performances.
In the opera house the bar remains open for one hour after performances. All honourable
members, including the Minister, would agree that that is a very civilised approach.

People who have been to the theatre with a group of friends, particularly if they
come from different suburbs, find it very relaxing to sit down for a quiet drink and
discuss the performance before breaking up for the evening. One thing that disturbs me
is the tendency of the operators of these so-called prestige bars to charge outrageous prices.

Mr Kruger: It’s shocking.

Mr HOOPER: As the honourable member for Murrumba said, it is shocking.

There is usually no rhyme or reason for the charges. They seem to be based on
what the traffic will bear.

The member for Wolston made reference to the airport bars, at which outrageous
prices are charged. Every time I have had a drink at an airport bar I have gained the
impression that the licence to sell liquor is a licence to print money.

We are all aware that admission to most theatrical performances is not cheap. After
paying a high price for a ticket, it is very annoying to arrive at the theatre and find that
the bar prices are nothing short of a scandal. In other words, the operators charge like
wounded bulls. Honourable members opposite will no doubt tell me that penalty rates
are covered by those charges.

Mr Kruger: It is a smoke-screen.

Mr HOOPER: The very literate interjections made by the member for Murrumba
prove that he is one of the most erudite members in this House.

Mr Tenni interjected.

Mr HOOPER: The honourable member for Barron River is the most illiterate of
interjectors.
As an ex-union official, I am quite aware that penalty rates—
Mr Tenni: You got caned this morning.
Mr HOOPER: Only six on the hand. All the marks have gone.
Mr Tenni: Why is your face so red?
Mr HOOPER: That is because I have had to listen to the inane interjections made by the member for Barron River.

As I was saying, I am aware that penalty rates have some bearing on prices. Dozens of other establishments seem to be able to absorb those operating expenses without charging prices that are nothing short of daylight robbery. The charges imposed on the long-suffering public by some liquor outlets are like the prices that used to be charged by the member for Barron River when he was the proprietor of certain hardware stores in Mareeba and Cairns.

I hope that Sir David Muir and his fellow trust members will keep an eye on bar charges. They should be reminded that the Cultural Centre is costing the taxpayers of Queensland $100m so that they can enjoy the arts in modern comfort. They are not spending $100m for some greedy, profiteering liquor licensee to fleece them dry. I can assure Sir David Muir and the trust that I will be keeping a watchful eye on this matter.

The amendments to other sections of the Act are relatively straightforward and plain common sense. We are always aware that ex-servicemen's clubs are suffering from declining membership owing to the ageing of ex-servicemen. After all, it is 64 years since World War I ended and 37 years since the end of World War II. To allow the survival of these clubs, it seems natural to expand membership to ex-servicemen's families.

The amendment relating to a member's guests being allowed to remain in a club after the member has left is long overdue. I ask the Minister to clarify the word "may" in the Bill. I am sure that all honourable members have been in a situation in which they have had to leave a club urgently. It is a crazy situation that somebody's guest should be dragged out of the club because the member has been called away. I hope that the Bill will correct this anomaly. I have no opposition to the Bill.

Hon. S. S. DOUMANY (Kurilpa—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (4.55 p.m.), in reply: I thank the honourable members for Wolston and Archerfield for their support for the legislation. I reiterate that it is a specific piece of legislation and it is being introduced because of the urgency of a couple of issues covered by it.

A major review of the Liquor Act is under way. During the recess it will be pursued with vigour. I will be calling for submissions from all interested parties—honourable members, people in the liquor industry and the community generally—on such a review. Quite clearly, many anomalies exist and many gaps can be found in the whole licensing arena. It has to be looked at closely. Some of the anomalies affect ordinary people in the course of their daily living, others affect clubs and others affect the tourist industry, which is basic to the economy of the State. The type and extent of licensing arrangements have a good deal to do with the viability of major tourist operations, which obviously are becoming more and more important to the economy of Queensland. We will have a major exercise on our plate, and I trust that honourable members who have views of their own, or who know of important aspects that should be highlighted, will come forward with them without delay. The sooner we get that type of information, the sooner it can be considered in the review of the Act.

The two honourable members referred to the distinction between the words "may be" and the words "continue to be". Basically it is a matter of timing. If a member left before the first round of drinks is bought, the term "may be" would be applicable; if the member left after the first round of drinks is bought, in other words, after the guests begin to partake of the services of the club, the words "continue to be" would apply. The application of the terms is merely semantic and is in no way meant to imply any mysterious connotation.

The honourable member for Wolston asked what will happen at the Queensland Cultural Centre. The legislation has embodied in it flexibility. What will occur at the centre will ultimately have to be approved by the Governor in Council. It is recognised that experience is needed of the operating conditions and the type of demands that will be imposed on the various facilities offered. There will be room for the trust and
The various agencies that will be operating outlets to vary their operations as the pattern of demand emerges and develops. Room is being left for an evolving pattern of licensing arrangements in the centre. The Government does not want to apply a rigid framework or a rigid system. It will be interesting to see how the pattern evolves and what type of demand the people place upon the centre.

The honourable member for Archerfield referred to liquor prices at Brisbane Airport. It is, of course, a Commonwealth installation. Whatever jurisdictional controls can be applied must emanate from the Federal Government.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: What would happen if, following the Federal Government's offer last year to sell airports, the Brisbane City Council took over the conduct of the licence? Would you be prepared then to step in to bring the conditions up to scratch?

Mr DOUMANY: Obviously the State would be prepared to step in and to exert its influence in the interests of the community if it had jurisdiction. If a local authority is involved in the ownership of an airport, our Act applies. The amendment is opening up the matter, so that if any other type of title applies, such as ownership by a harbour board, the Government has jurisdiction. If the Brisbane City Council took over the licensing arrangements at Brisbane Airport, it would come under the purview of the State authority, which would take responsibility for the efficacy of the operation.

I reiterate that the Act will be the subject of a major review. I trust that in the next session a far more significant piece of legislation will be brought before the House concerning the liquor laws.

Motion (Mr Doumany) agreed to.

Committee

Mr Row (Hinchinbrook) in the chair.

Clauses 1 to 9, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

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

LAND ACT AND ANOTHER ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 30 March (see p. 5351) on Mr Glasson's motion—
"That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr KRUGER (Murrumba) (5.2 p.m.): Depending on clarification of certain points that I intend to raise, the Opposition has no real objection to the Bill. Because certain provisions in the Bill appear to be diametrically opposed to Labor Party policy, Opposition members seek clarification of them.

The Land Act and Another Act Amendment Bill of 1981 excluded perpetual lease selections and auction perpetual leases in irrigation areas. According to advice that I received from the Minister, that is the main reason for the legislation now before the Chamber. It seems that certain other leases should be included in irrigation areas, as was done in 1981. At that time Opposition members raised certain objections. The leases are covered by the Irrigation Act and are administered by the Water Resources Commission. Purchasing of land leases and the valuation of land within the irrigation area are to be handled as they are handled outside the irrigation area. I will not spell out the terms and conditions, because they are all available for honourable members and the public to view, if they so desire.

The Opposition is concerned mainly about whether the Government will still have the power to alienate land for closer settlement in an irrigation area. Unless I have missed the point, it seems to me that, although it has not been spelt out, the Government has the power to alienate land in an irrigation area.
Honourable members should be aware that irrigable land is much more valuable than non-irrigable land because of the possibility of increased productivity. Irrigation schemes have always been undertaken to supply water that will enable production to be increased. Therefore, a living area is much smaller in an irrigation area than it was before the scheme was implemented. With that in mind, I believe that it should be possible for the Government to alienate land for closer settlement in irrigation areas instead of allowing the opportunities of a select few to be enhanced.

Land is land, and should be administered by one organisation. I appreciate the fact that this provision is being tied in with the activities of the Land Administration Commission and will not be administered by two authorities, as was the situation in the past. That should not be done, however, unless we can avoid the future alienation of such land in irrigation areas.

I now want to discuss the list passed around by the Minister regarding leases which will be affected by the Bill. Perhaps I could best demonstrate this in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Perpetual Lease Selections</th>
<th>Auction Perpetual Leases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bowen</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsville</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bundaberg</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairns</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springsure</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St George</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodore</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>446</strong></td>
<td><strong>314</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That is not a great number, but it could represent a large area. Unfortunately, the Minister for Lands and Forestry is not present, but perhaps the Leader of the House could answer my queries. I hope that an honest answer about the area of land involved is forthcoming, particularly in regard to the Bowen and Home Hill areas which will be affected in the near future by the Burdekin irrigation scheme.

I wish to know if the Cox land, which was mentioned recently in the House, and some of the larger holdings in the Burdekin Dam area, come under the provisions of the Bill. Has there been a great increase in the number of inquiries about the freeholding of land since the 1981 Act was passed? If so, has there in fact been a major increase in freeholding over that period? The Opposition would like to know what area of land has been sold since freeholding occurred. What is the value of any freeholding, and the purchase price of the land sold? In other words, we are interested to know whether, as we suggested in 1981, the land is being freeholded under the simple method and being turned over at great capital gain.

During the debate on amendments to the Land Act in 1981, the Opposition raised several points about the simplicity of freeholding, and it still maintains that there are problems. However, we are not in a position to argue about it, nor is there any real point in debating all that again, because the Minister has indicated that there is a tie-in with the irrigation areas as against the sort of thing that happened in the rest of the State. The method of paying the Crown the total rent commitment, less 5 per cent over the relevant period, has led to abuse of the scheme that was introduced in 1980. I would like some clarification of the scheme. I believe that Queensland will see an increase in problems and, in the not too distant future, will rue the day that the 1981 Bill was passed. Many points were raised during that debate, and the problems are still current.

The freezing of valuations of leasehold land has been a blessing for graziers and large landholders. I trust that that will not continue. In 1981 the Opposition said that it did not like the provision and it did not believe in it. City dwellers still have a revaluation every five or six years and are charged extra rates on those revaluations, but there is no revaluation of landholdings in the rural sector. Landholders can be assisted in other ways. I believe that the Government has sold us out on that score.
I want to read a few extracts from a letter written to Mr Smith, the secretary of the Home Hill Vegetable Growers Association, by the Water Resources Commission about the Burdekin Dam project. I hope that the Leader of the House can say that it is not relevant and that I am on the wrong track. On the subject of resubdivision the letter stated—

"In those areas to be served, a complete redesign of the subdivision of the lands to be served is proposed to provide an efficient and economical arrangement of the irrigation and drainage reticulation systems. The detailed subdivision design and location of channels, drains and roads to serve the new subdivision will be based on detailed topographic and soil surveys."

That indicated to me that the idea was that those areas could be broken up or alienated in a way that best suited the greatest number of people. On the subject of retention farms the letter stated—

"Existing landholders whose properties are totally or significantly acquired for resubdivision may be offered one irrigation farm of a size and containing suitable soils to enable them to continue agricultural production under irrigation. Where the area acquired is limited, a retention farm may not be offered.

This is referred to as a 'retention area' or 'retention farm'.

The area offered will vary according to the type of production existing in that section, the nature of the subdivision in that section, soil suitability etc."

There again, it points out that there is an entirely different ball game under an irrigation system. Under irrigation, 10 acres may be a living area on better land, and 40 acres may be living area on poorer land. The letter indicates that the applications for certain lands will be dealt with on their merits.

The main query of the Opposition is: Will the Government have the power, and will it act, to resume land that it can subdivide as irrigable land, or will it allow the freeholding of large areas of land by people such as the Cox family in the Home Hill/Burdekin area? Can the Government indicate whether those lands in an irrigation area can still be subdivided, alienated or used in a way that is for the betterment of Queensland? Can we be assured that the Government will not tie itself down and that people in an irrigation area will be able to freehold major areas of land for their own benefit and not for the benefit of the State?

In his second-reading speech the Minister made some statements that back up what I am saying. He said—

"A special lease can be offered to public competition by way of an auction sale or, where good and sufficient grounds exist, it can be issued without public notification. The auction system is used when the nature of the proposed purpose of the lease is adjudged to be likely to attract interest from as yet unidentified quarters or, alternatively, when it is known definitely that two or more persons are or are likely to be interested in competing for the lease at a public auction.

On the other hand, if after due and proper inquiry by the administration, it is clearly evident that only one person is interested or that one person has outstanding claims over all other applicants, a lease may be granted in priority."

To me, that leaves it quite open for the Minister to say he believes that somebody has an outstanding claim over all other applicants. That it not right. Some formula should be used to indicate whether somebody has, or does not have, the right to take over a piece of land.

Further on in his speech the Minister said—

"As I said earlier, there are some differences in the relevant provisions as they apply to holdings in the irrigation areas and to holdings (far greater in number) that are not in irrigation areas. It was for this reason that the holdings in the irrigation areas were proposed for exclusion in the 1981 amendment. Further consultations with the Minister administering the Irrigation Areas (Land Settlement) Act were indicated at the time."

There again, it appears to me that the Minister did intend to bring these irrigation areas into line with areas in other parts of the State that are able to be freeholded, which would exclude this Government or any future Government from alienating lands within the irrigation areas. If that is the intention, the Opposition strongly opposes the proposal.
The idea of irrigating is to achieve better productivity and closer settlement within an irrigation area. If that sort of result cannot be obtained, there is a limit on how far one goes with irrigation. For many years, I have been associated with irrigation on my farms. The main idea is to get greater productivity from a smaller area; in other words, less working of land and increased production.

I trust that the Minister will give some clarification of the points I have raised. If he does, the Opposition will not oppose the Bill because, as the Minister said, its provisions tie in with a previous Bill. If the Minister will not give that clarification, it will be recorded that the Government's introduction of the Bill is a smoke-screen to cover favouritism of a few.

Mr HARPER (Auburn) (5.15 p.m.): I rise to support the Bill because it is completely in line with Government philosophy, which provides the opportunity for ownership of land by the people who work it. Not surprisingly the Opposition spokesman on land matters, the honourable member for Murrumba, reaffirmed Labor's dislike of freehold tenure. Historically, the Labor Party has been opposed to any suggestion that the people who work the land should own it. That is where the philosophy of the coalition differs completely from that of the Opposition. The Government believes that the people who do the work should have the opportunity to own the land.

The Bill merely brings into line auction perpetual leases and lands in irrigation areas, which were inadvertently excluded from the 1981 legislation that provided for the freeholding of auction perpetual leases and perpetual lease selections. The conditions are very similar. The Land Act and Another Act Amendment Bill 1981 removed the periodic rental assessment of those leases and the Bill removes the 10-yearly reassessment of rental through determination of unimproved values, and the present lessees will be able to obtain freehold title on paying the Crown the total rent commitment, discounted at 5 per cent over the relevant period. Many people have found it difficult to understand that. In very simple terms it means that the Crown will require those people to pay the total of their commitment at present-day values but, in determining present-day values, a very small percentage of 5 per cent is considered. So when present-day interest rates are considered, the Crown certainly gains.

The Bill should meet with no opposition. It merely extends to irrigation areas the same privilege that the House afforded owners of similar land in non-irrigated areas some 12 months ago. The Theodore area of my electorate contains 255 pieces of land or just over a third of the leases throughout the State that will be affected by the Bill. During the last 12 months those people have suffered somewhat, but that injustice will be rectified by the Bill.

Mr TENNI (Barron River) (5.18 p.m.): I support the Bill. I have been involved in these matters from the time it was noticed that the 1981 legislation overlooked these lands. The electorate of Barron River contains the Mareeba-Dimbula Irrigation Project.

As my colleague said a moment ago, it allows the people whom I represent to freehold their land. That is not the policy of the Labor Party, which believes in perpetual lease, not freehold. It is most important that the amendment be passed to protect the people of the Barron River electorate, particularly those in the area covered by the Mareeba-Dimbula Irrigation Project. I thank the Minister for introducing the amendment. I can return to my electorate and tell the people that I have played my part in having the Act amended to allow them to do what the Labor Party does not want them to do—freehold their land.
Mr EATON (Mourilyan) (5.21 p.m.): The member for Murrumba expressed the doubts that I have about the Bill. However, I shall touch on a couple of other matters.

It is often said that no more land is being made. Therefore, we should be looking to the future.

The member for Auburn said that the Bill is in line with Government philosophy. During his second-reading speech, the Minister said—

"it can be issued without public notification. The auction system is used when the nature of the proposed purpose of the lease is adjudged to be likely to attract interest from as yet unidentified quarters or, alternatively, when it is known definitely that two or more persons are or are likely to be interested in competing for the lease at a public auction."

That brings me to the Government's philosophy, which is to sell land to the highest bidder and to make openings for the rich. That is the aspect of land-settlement policy in Queensland that has deteriorated over the years. The Government has adopted the philosophy of get big or get out. To ensure that the policy was implemented more quickly, the Government allowed financial institutions such as the Agricultural Bank to run down and private enterprise to take over. Today interest rates are so high that they prohibit young people from establishing themselves on the land as they did, say, 30 years ago. The Government has killed incentive by the public-auction system of releasing land.

From time to time I have heard many Government members criticise the Queen Street grazier and the Queen Street farmer. Those people are buying land because they can afford to buy it as a tax dodge or as a business investment. They are not buying it to produce. The majority of people who settle on the land look upon it as their future and their home. The Government is falling down on its policy of public auctions. If land can be developed for a certain type of primary industry, the Government should supervise its availability and then submit it to ballot, where the young and not so young have an equal opportunity with the big man—the businessman and the investor. In that way, instead of incentive being killed, opportunity will be created not only for young people but also for those of middle age who want to settle on the land and spend the rest of their lives working it, following a calling that they choose and rearing their families in that environment. That is my greatest reservation about the Bill.

I agree that, at times when miners' homestead leases are involved, too many departments are involved—the Water Resources Commission, the Lands Department and the Mines Department. I agree that an attempt should be made to streamline the Lands Department. If any Government department needs overhauling and an increase in staff, it is the Lands Department. I have reason to go to the Lands Department on many occasions. Although members of the staff have always been very courteous and helpful to me, I have seen the work-load with which they are faced because of shortage of staff to process titles, deeds and grants. I would praise the Government if it made money available to employ more staff in the Lands Department. I sincerely hope that the Bill fulfils its intention and that no-one makes use of the loopholes that the Opposition sees.

Mr HANSEN (Maryborough) (5.25 p.m.): I was interested to hear the member for Auburn put forward the proposition of freeholding property. A few years ago a survey was conducted into land use between the Elliott and Toolara areas. In some cases people had held special leases for 60 years. Those persons were denied the opportunity to freehold their land. They were told that nobody is sure what will happen to the land.

Some of the leases were granted over 50 years ago. Most of them front an estuary and were taken up by people who were looking for sites on which to erect week-enders. The land would not be suitable for agricultural production because of its size and the nature of the country. The parcels of land are on the waterfront. In recent times they have been sought by speculators. The land is not different from the land offered by the Lands Department round the Tin Can Bay inlet.

The people who hold leases over the land have been refused an opportunity to freehold the land. It may be said that some people are using the land for residential purposes. One leaseholder is a beekeeper who, over the years, has had up to 300 hives on his property. He has obtained a living from that, as did his father before him. His lease contains an area of approximately 75 acres. However, most leases would vary in size.
between less than 10 acres and 15 acres. Half the land could not be used when the tide is out because the area is a salt-pan, and sometimes difficulties are encountered when the residents try to cross the creeks at high tide.

Whilst I am very pleased to hear Government members espouse the philosophy of their Government, I hope that the Minister is able to give me the reasons why the leaseholders have not been given an opportunity to freehold the land. The applicants have been told that no leases will be freeholded and that the land will not be surveyed or reduced in size. The occupiers of the land have hinted that if the land was freeholded, their parcels of land would be reduced in size. Nevertheless, during the last six years no undertaking has been given to freehold these lands and to remove the problem that is hanging over the heads of these people. Although this matter is not covered by the Bill, Government members should express their attitude that all lands should be freeholded.

I would like the Minister to explain why the people who have had leasehold tenure over this land for the past 50 or 60 years have been denied the opportunity to freehold the land, if that is the Government’s policy.

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Leader of the House) (5.29 p.m.), in reply: I thank the members for Murumba, Mourilyan, Maryborough, Barron River and Auburn for their contributions to the debate. I appreciate their comments. The member for Murumba said that he had made a thorough examination of the Bill.

Most members were somewhat wide of the mark in their contributions. The Bill deals with irrigation areas under lease. The Land Act and Another Act Amendment Act 1981 excluded from its application perpetual lease selections and auction perpetual leases within irrigation areas. It removed the periodic rental assessment of auction perpetual leases and perpetual lease selections and placed them on a final monetary rental period of 30, 40 or 60 years, as the case may be, commencing on 1 January 1981.

It is proposed to extend the legislative provisions of the Act to encompass auction perpetual leases and perpetual lease selections situated within irrigation areas. In doing so, the legislation may provide that where rent has been determined for a lease for a rental period which commenced after 1 January 1981 the capital value so determined shall be the capital value for the final monetary rental period. It may provide that where the rent has been determined for a rental period after 1 January 1981, which rent is in excess of the rent that was payable for the rental period current on 31 December 1980, that determination shall be set aside so that effect may be given to the capital value for the rental period current at 31 December 1980. It may also provide that any application for conversion to freehold that has been completed prior to the passing of the Act be outside the provisions of the legislation, but where any such application is “live” as of the date of the passing of the Act, the lessee be given the option to continue with such application or to allow it to remain subject to the provisions of the Act as amended.

The vast majority of auction perpetual leases and perpetual lease selections are in Bowen, Townsville, Bundaberg, Cairns, Springsure, St George and Theodore. There are 446 perpetual lease selections and 314 auction perpetual leases, of a total area of 911 000 ha.

The Bill deals with these particular leases. As the honourable member for Auburn said, the Bill is designed to put everything into the one boat, as it were, in relation to irrigation leases. Certain areas were left out inadvertently.

Mr Kruger: My main question was that if we do freehold those we can no longer subdivide them in an irrigation area.

Mr WHARTON: When a person freeholds a property it becomes his property. Freehold tenure allows the holder to develop it to the full extent.

The honourable member for Auburn understands the Bill, which ties in the irrigation areas. When a person freeholds land the Government cannot take it back again.

Mr Kruger: Wouldn’t it be an advantage to keep those irrigation areas on a leasehold arrangement so that they can be broken up?

Mr WHARTON: The holders are given an opportunity to freehold either part of the area or the whole of it, either surveyed or unsurveyed. The areas are only small. The Burdekin lands have nothing to do with the Bill.
The honourable member for Mourilyan referred to interest rates. All of us are deeply conscious of the problems confronting young people, but the Queensland Government is not to blame for high interest rates. They are fixed at a national level. The State has done its best to try to keep them down. Young people who are desirous of going onto the land face enormous problems. I agree with the honourable member for Mourilyan that high interest rates create difficulties when trying to finance any proposition. The young farmers establishment scheme provides some relief for about eight years under an irrigation scheme.

Many factors are responsible for the high interest rates. For instance, costs are high, inflation is running at a high level, wages are high, people are getting special concessions, housing costs have increased and the electricity industry employees got a nine-day fortnight—and they want a $50 a week rise. Our main problem lies in curbing interest rates.

I thank the honourable member for Maryborough for his contribution. He raised several salient points about his own area. I repeat that the areas concerned are very small. This legislation does not apply to general freeholding of land, or land generally. Only 11,000 acres throughout the State are affected. The legislation gives smaller people a chance to freehold land.

I thank the honourable member for Barron River for his contribution. I have visited his area and I know the problems experienced there with irrigation. The honourable member understands these matters very well. He is very close to the people who are concerned.

Motion (Mr Glasson) agreed to.

Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr Miller, Ithaca) in the chair; Hon: C. A. Wharton (Burnett—Leader of the House) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 6, as read, agreed to.

Clause 7—Extension of period of existing purchases—

Mr KRUGER (5.38 p.m.): This clause uses the words "as the Minister in his discretion allows", and "the Minister may in his discretion extend the period as he thinks fit" On several occasions recently the Opposition has been worried about Ministers being given a lot of discretion. In certain instances the Minister needs discretion but, on this occasion, a formula should be established whereby, with a little flexibility, these matters could be handled in a more appropriate way. It seems that the whole decision rests with the Minister. Surely some formula, with a little flexibility, could be devised so that people would know where they were going. No indication is given as to what people must do. If they make representations to the Commissioner an answer will be given, and the Minister will have a further say. Is there any way around this problem? It seems that the responsibility lies a little too heavily on the Minister.

Mr WHARTON: This provision applies only to leases and primary industries.

Mr Kruger: That is fairly serious.

Mr WHARTON: Wouldn't the honourable member prefer it that way? The whole point of the exercise is that it applies to leases and primary industries.

Clause 7, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 8 and 9, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

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

LEAVE TO MOVE MOTION WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr CASEY (Mackay—Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to move the suspension of so much of the Standing Orders as is necessary to allow the House to debate Government Business—Notice of Motion No. 1 standing in the name of Mr Wharton, which deals with the Standing Orders.
Question put; and the House divided—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ayes, 17</th>
<th>Warburton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burns</td>
<td>Hooper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey</td>
<td>Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D'Arcy</td>
<td>Kruger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>McLean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eaton</td>
<td>Milliner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fouras</td>
<td>Shaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibbs, R. J.</td>
<td>Vaughan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noes, 36</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>Jennings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird</td>
<td>Katter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booth</td>
<td>Kaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borbidge</td>
<td>Kyburz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doumany</td>
<td>Lester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliott</td>
<td>Lickiss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FitzGerald</td>
<td>Lockwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goleby</td>
<td>McKechnie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood</td>
<td>Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunn</td>
<td>Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harper</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hewitt</td>
<td>Powell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innes</td>
<td>Randell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>Ahern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>Glasson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prest</td>
<td>Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Tomkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yewdale</td>
<td>Bjelke-Petersen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>Edwards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resolved in the negative.

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Leader of the House) (5.45 p.m.): I indicate to honourable members that the report of the Standing Orders Committee will be discussed early in the next session.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Leader of the House): I move—

"That this House, at its rising, do adjourn until 11 o'clock a.m. on a date to be fixed by Mr Speaker in consultation with the Government of this State."

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Leader of the House): I move—

"That the House do now adjourn."

Alleged Corruption, Pine Rivers Shire Council

Mr KRUGER (Murrumba) (5.49 p.m.): I wish to bring to the notice of the House what a land developer in the Pine Rivers Shire has described as corruption within that council—that is, the council as it was prior to the election on 27 March. For some time a notice outside his real estate agency has read, "Pine Rivers Shire Council is corrupt". It now reads, "Pine Rivers Shire Council was corrupt". He may have had good reason to say that. The only councillor to remain from the previous council's Division 2 elected representatives is Councillor Chapman.

The allegations of corruption relate to a subdivision opposite where Mrs Chapman and her husband operate a welding works in Anzac Avenue, Kallangur. The subdivision is being developed by DEP Investments Pty Ltd and handled by Glenbar, a company
in which Kim Bridges, the National Party candidate for Aspley at the last State election, is involved or perhaps even owns. Honourable members will recall that Mrs Chapman was also a National Party candidate at the last State election. That could be a coincidence, but I do not think so.

I shall now explain what has happened since the matter was raised with me, and begin by quoting from page 36092 of the minutes of the Pine Rivers Shire Council. Item 1.05 deals with a survey done by J. W. Mott on behalf of DEP Investments Pty Ltd. The file number is 5956/1. The minutes of the meeting contain the history of the matter in the following terms:

"This application was received by Council on 29th June, 1981. Since the receipt of this application a considerable amount of time has been taken up in the applicant's negotiations with A.P.M. in an endeavour to obtain a clear discharge right across A.P.M.'s land.

The possibility of discharge of stormwater in Dohles Rocks Road has been examined and there is no practical means of discharge in the road. Council cannot therefore grant a subdivision permit for this application.

Town Planning Department's Recommendations:

That the subdivision application be refused on the following grounds:

(1) Council is not satisfied that the drainage from the proposed subdivision will be carried to a point at which it may be lawfully discharged without causing nuisance or annoyance to any person.

(2) Council is not satisfied that where the drainage from the proposed subdivision is to be carried through land not owned by the applicant that there is a legal right of

(i) Drainage through that land; and

(ii) Support the pipes in favour of the land to be subdivided."

The committee's recommendation was that it favoured the subdivision going ahead. One of the special conditions reads—

"Council requires the construction of the drainage system from the estate which involves the upgrading of existing stormwater lines from the estate to the southern side of Dohles Rocks Road."

At that stage I wrote to the Minister and indicated that the Pine Rivers Shire Council had created a problem by making that decision. Previously the Pine Rivers Shire Council had sought the consent of owners of downstream land, but on this occasion it did not do so. In reply the Minister said—

"It is noted also that the Council, in considering this application, held that other lands to the east of this particular catchment would drain towards School Road and that, having regard to the application and the configuration of the catchment, the upgrading of an existing drainage system to the southern side of Dohles Rocks Road was considered to be the most appropriate method for draining the subject land.

I would point out that while it is desirable for an applicant to obtain the consent of the owner of downstream property to discharge stormwater across his land, there is no legal requirement for such consent to be obtained. As you would be aware, the Local Government Act only requires that stormwater drainage be taken to a point of lawful discharge at the property boundary and that such point of discharge is the location where waters from the catchment area would flow if the land had not been developed."

The natural catchment of the area falls in the opposite direction to that in which the developers will drain it.

The land developer's allegations about corruption seem to be quite correct. The letter from the Minister is nothing more than a whitewash in an endeavour to cover up the council's actions. Quite clearly corruption has existed in the Pine Rivers Shire Council, otherwise approval would not have been given to such drainage conditions as I have mentioned. I go as far as saying that water from the western side of the subdivision off Anzac Avenue, which is a main road reserve, quite clearly flows down a drain and
goes to the point that should be the lawful point of discharge. That is the point to where the water would have flowed had the subdivision not been approved by the council. The Minister has given me nothing other than a bum steer.

(Time expired.)

Reckless Semi-trailer Drivers

Mrs KYBURZ (Salisbury) (5.54 p.m.): Tonight I relate to the House the fears of many drivers of small cars. There is terror in the community about the kamikaze semi-trailer drivers. That fear exists because some semi-trailer drivers think that they own the whole road, not just their side of it. Last night I was terrorised by the driver of a semi-trailer, the registered number of which was QVZ-671. It was a 20 metre semi-trailer, fully laden, which overtook me at 120 km/h. My little car just could not keep up with it.

The incident occurred on a two-lane section of the Bruce Highway at Beerburrum. With me I had a girl-friend in the front seat and my brother's girl-friend and my dog "Fred" in the back seat. My car was simply unable to keep up with the semi-trailer. Although cars were approaching in the other direction, I moved over to let him pass. He ran us into the gravel off the side of the road. We were absolutely terrified and decided that we really ought to try to get his registration number. It took me three-quarters of an hour in a chase to the Caboolture turn-off to get it.

I am jolly angry about it. My anger is the same as that expressed to me by many members of the public about semi-trailer drivers. Their recklessness is occurring in every electorate, not only in the country. In the next session of Parliament I will be asking some very searching questions of the Minister for Police. I want to know why more mobile patrols are not on the highway, particularly where semi-trailers are driven at great speeds in such a dangerous manner. It is about time we took a long, hard look at this problem.

I realise that the Minister for Transport made a statement about the matter this morning, but I did not have the opportunity to ask questions. It is a very important issue because of the accidents that have occurred and because of the many accidents which could have occurred. Had there been an accident last night, it would have meant a by-election and some very sad families of the three adults in my car. Obviously, the people in the oncoming car would have been killed.

That stretch of road at Beerburrum is extremely dangerous. Some drivers of large transports deliberately intimidate the drivers of small vehicles. Let us face it: most vehicles these days are small.

The incident occurred at 7.20 p.m. I repeat the registration number: QVZ-671. It is registered in the name of a Mr Alan Henderson, P.O. Box 1, Palmwoods. I have no fear in mentioning the registration number in the House. I checked it with the Main Roads Department this morning. I do not know who was driving the semi-trailer, but quite obviously such a kamikaze driver needs to be named in this place. That is precisely why I am raising the matter.

In my opinion, he took the Caboolture turn-off to deliberately avoid the Burpengary weighbridge. The only reason I was able to catch him was that he had to slow down to turn right to take the Caboolture turn-off. In fact, I considered pulling in to the Burpengary weighbridge because they should be told that semi-trailer drivers are avoiding the weighbridge by taking the back roads.

An urgent need exists for the formation of a highway patrol involving all permanent traffic police and Main Roads Department officers. I repeat that QVZ-671 was speeding and overloaded. I accuse the driver of attempting to avoid the Burpengary weighbridge. I wonder how often that goes on. I therefore demand that the Government take action on the dangerous mentality displayed by some semi-trailer drivers. Let us abolish the lunatic fringe of heavy transport drivers from the roads and get back to some sensible actions on the part of all drivers.

ALP Redistribution Proposals

Mr LESTER (Peak Downs) (5.59 p.m.): I enter the debate to absolutely castigate the ALP's latest redistribution strategy for the State of Queensland. I understand that three and a-half seats in North Queensland would be abolished and, in all, 10 country seats would be
eliminated. In any following redistribution, even more seats would be lost. That will mean
the elimination of 10 seats in the country areas and 20 seats in Brisbane. It will totally
eliminate the voice of the country people.

An Honourable Member: They will never stop you.

Mr LESTER: I will not let them get away with it.

Country members have tried to obtain a better deal and better representation. However, when the chips are down, the ALP is not there. It does not want to help the
country people. When reference is made to the reduction of electricity charges in country
areas, who is the first to kick up a hell of a stink? It is the ALP. It says, "What about
Brisbane? Brisbane has to pay higher electricity charges and the people in the country
should pay more." Members of the ALP say how good they are to the country people.
They go out into the country areas and tell them what they are doing. However, when
the country people turn their backs, members of the ALP move in and try to take away
country representation. My electorate contains 364 000 sq. km. It could be extended
in size to about 600 000 sq. km.

Mr Hansen: How would it go under the Liberals?

Mr LESTER: I am referring to the Labor Party at the moment. The member for
Maryborough would realise that in a coalition the Liberal Party tends to look after
the city areas and the National Party tends to look after the country areas. The Labor
Party is supposed to represent all of Queensland; however, it does not do that. It wants
to eliminate totally the voice of the country representatives and prevent us from obtaining
benefits for the people in country areas. The people in country areas feed the people of
the nation and contribute towards the financial resources of the State.

Mr Vaughan interjected.

Mr LESTER: Under the administration of the ALP when Whitlam was in power
not one new coal-mine was established in Queensland. The member for Nudgee cannot
deny that. The ALP is particularly naive. Opposition members do not like it when they
are hit below the belt.

Mr Vaughan: What about the price of petrol in country areas?

Mr LESTER: The price of petrol in country areas is too high. Who did not support
the Government with the introduction of the Bread Industry Committee Bill, the petrol
Bill and other Bills when we tried to establish a fixed price for petrol for everybody in
Queensland? The Labor Party was frightened of the consumers in the city. It was
frightened that the price would increase just for the benefit of country people. However,
the Government was knocked down. No support was offered by Opposition members.
They should not show their faces in the country areas.

When Whitlam was in power the nation was bankrupt. We have been flat out pulling
ourselves out of bankruptcy ever since. Nothing is happening in New South Wales at
the moment. Industry has ground to a halt. Approximately 78 ships are held up off
the port of Newcastle waiting to be loaded with coal. It is called Wran's Navy. Berths
are not available at the port of Newcastle because the new coal-loader will not be
built there. The New South Wales Government likes to be democratic in a fashion.
However, if anybody wants to get something done in that State, he must go through
no less than 15 departments. One can imagine the turmoil and hassles that are encountered
in that State. I would ask the members of the Labor Party: Why is it that so many
people are leaving New South Wales and coming to Queensland? 2 000 came from New
South Wales—

Mr Vaughan: Last time you spoke you said that 4 000 a month were coming to
Queensland.

Mr LESTER: 2 000 from New South Wales, 1 000 from Victoria, 500 from Tasmania
and 500 from South Australia, and a number from Western Australia. The member for
Nudgee will not fool me on a technical point. He does not do his homework, and he
certainly has not done it on this occasion.

If ever the people of Queensland, particularly those people living in the country
areas, have a twisted coalition——

Opposition Members interjected.
Mr LESTER: I am referring to the twisted coalition that the Labor Party tried to set up in Victoria. It put forward all sorts of deals.

(Time expired.)

Country Health-care Services; Interest Rates

Mr EATON (Mourilyan) (6.4 p.m.): It was interesting to hear the previous speaker’s claims about what a Labor Government would do to hurt country people in Queensland. I remind him of the way in which health-care services in Queensland have deteriorated under the present Government. I wonder how many specialists visit his electorate these days, and I wonder how that number compares with the number years ago when the Labor Party was in power.

I should like him to come to my electorate, where he will observe a tremendous fall-off in health-care services and other services. The Queensland Government no longer stations public servants in small towns in my electorate, with the result that local people are forced to drive as much as 150 miles to interview an officer in the Department of Primary Industries or some other Government department. That state of affairs has been brought about by the policies of the National Party-led Government.

The honourable member claimed that a Labor Government would impose charges on country people in order to lessen the burden on city dwellers. I would remind him of electricity charges. All consumers, whether they live in the country or in the city, subsidise Comalco.

Mr Lester: Don’t you want to see industry start in Queensland?

Mr EATON: Yes, of course; but as soon as a company gets on its feet it should have to pay its own way. The big companies pay millions of dollars a year by way of taxation after writing off millions of dollars by way of depreciation. Those that can afford to pay should be taxed in accordance with their capacity to pay.

I arose primarily to speak about the effect of high interest rates on families, small businesses and rural industries in North Queensland. In the housing and building industries, the Government has promoted private enterprise and reduced Government involvement. Under Labor Governments, people were able to afford to build their own home. Today, however, in spite of high wages, workers are not able to afford to build their own home. The whole matter revolves around high interest rates. With the help of the Government and private enterprise, money is being channelled away from the building societies. No-one can be criticised for investing his money to gain the highest return. However, the building industry is failing and, in spite of an alleged shortage of tradesmen, large numbers of tradesmen are unable to find work.

Many young couples cannot afford to borrow money. The cost of a block of land and a house on it is enormous. I tell young couples who come to me for assistance that they must have security of employment before they can even think of borrowing finance for a house. If there is any thought of future unemployment, they should not even contemplate borrowing money. No-one who relies on social security benefits for his income can afford to pay off a home.

A young working couple may be quite able to afford the repayments on their housing loan. However, trouble starts when, for some reason, either the husband or the wife becomes unemployed. Their capacity to make repayments is based on two incomes, and they suddenly find that they are reduced to one income.

(Time expired.)

Dr Harvey Sutton

Mr KATTER (Flinders) (6.9 p.m.): I wish to speak about a matter that is very near and dear to my heart. I plead with the Government to reconsider its decision on the funding of the Australian Inland Medical Service founded by Dr Harvey Sutton in Cloncurry. In doing so I will pay a small tribute to the achievements of this man. Very few people who strode across the stage of inland Australia have been greater in stature than he.

Some two years after my election, Charters Towers had no private doctors, and it seemed that both chemist’s shops, serving 12,000 people, would close because of the absence of a doctor. It was an incredible situation. I approached many people in
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Queensland to get a doctor to go to Charters Towers. Eventually I had to go to Dr Harvey Sutton in my home town and ask him if he could help. He supplied two doctors, one of whom is still there. The people of Charters Towers owe him a big debt of gratitude.

No medical service had ever been provided for the township of Pentland in which 600 or 700 people reside. Pentland is about 60 to 70 miles west of Charters Towers. The first medical service in the centre was provided by Dr Harvey Sutton of the Australian Inland Medical Service.

In the three years prior to my election, Julia Creek was without a doctor for 2½ years. The fact that Julia Creek has had a doctor since then can be attributed to the work of Dr Harvey Sutton. If he had not had doctors available in Cloncurry I am certain—and this is not a reflection on the Health Department—that the doctors would not have been replaced when they left Julia Creek. On at least one occasion the department could not replace a doctor, but Dr Harvey supplied one. In addition, he provided a free car and other aids to help the doctor set up in private practice in Julia Creek. There is not a shred of doubt in my mind—and I should be the one who knows—that there would be no doctor in Julia Creek today but for Dr Harvey Sutton.

In living memory there had not been a doctor at Normanton until Dr Harvey Sutton offered to provide one. The Health Department kept refusing his offer but eventually it became embarrassed and appointed a doctor in Normanton. I am ashamed to say that the 3,000 people living in Kurumba and surrounding areas do not have a doctor. It is shocking that there are fewer doctors per head of population in the Gulf country of Queensland and in the Northern Territory than in some undeveloped countries. That dreadful situation was overcome by none other than this remarkable man Dr Harvey Sutton who, I say very proudly, lives in Cloncurry.

Mary Kathleen did not have a doctor until one was provided by this man. Gunpowder did not have a doctor until, once again, Dr Harvey Sutton provided one. He was unable to keep a doctor permanently in either Mary Kathleen or Gunpowder, but surely the presence of a doctor for even one extra day is a wonderful advantage.

Some extremely foolish people—and often, they are members of the Opposition—say that Aborigines were better off in the old days. I ask them to reflect on the number of times that they have been lying in pain waiting for a doctor to administer pain-killing drugs to help them recover.

Unfortunately, the people of Mary Kathleen, Gunpowder, Normanton and Julia Creek have gone without medical assistance for most of their lives. They are the people who create great wealth for Australia. Indeed, the whole Australian economy is structured on the beef industry. It is Australia’s greatest industry and helps us to buy foreign goods.

I do not know how many of my relatives have delivered babies at the side of the road or in cars bogged to their axles in the bush. I regret to say that the only person who has made a concrete effort to help them is this very fine, incredible Australian.

In addition, Dr Harvey Sutton had the courage to stand up for Aborigines in Cloncurry in the days when he was called a nigger-lover and a racist, not these days when it is a wonderful bandwagon for the Opposition to jump onto time and again. At one time some people in Cloncurry would not speak to him because he dared to stop the council from bulldozing the homes of Aborigines on the outskirts of Cloncurry. The old people's home at Cloncurry is totally his achievement.

He was also responsible for creating the Cloncurry museum, which is one of the finest museums in Australia. Dr Harvey Sutton has carried out an incredible amount of historical research. In addition to all of his other achievements he has been the only Anglican minister of religion in Cloncurry and other small towns. He is truly one of the greatest giants to ever step across the Great Dividing Range.

(Time expired.)

Motion (Mr Wharton) agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.15 p.m.
BILLS ASSENTED TO AT CLOSE OF SESSION

The following Bills, having been passed by the Legislative Assembly and presented for the Royal Assent, were assented to in the name of Her Majesty on the dates indicated:

(20 April 1982)—
- Filled Milk Act Amendment Bill;
- Fire Brigades and Fire Safety Acts Amendment Bill;
- Churches of Christ, Scientist, Incorporation Act Amendment Bill;
- Girl Guides Association Act Amendment Bill;
- Bread Delivery Act Repeal Bill;
- Margarine Act Amendment Bill;
- Industry and Commerce Training Act Amendment Bill;
- Marine Parks Bill;
- Police Complaints Tribunal Bill;
- Workers’ Compensation Act Amendment Bill;
- Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act Amendment Bill;
- Land Act and Another Act Amendment Bill (1982);
- Racing and Betting Act Amendment Bill (1982);
- Consumer Affairs Act and Another Act Amendment Bill;
- Harbours Act and Other Acts Amendment Bill;
- Traffic Act Amendment Bill;
- Racing Venues Development Bill.

(23 April 1982)—
- Land Act (Aboriginal and Islander Land Grants) Amendment Bill;
- Stamp Act Amendment Bill (1982);
- Commonwealth Games (Modification of Laws) Bill;
- City of Brisbane Market Act Amendment Bill;
- Railways Act Amendment Bill.

(29 April 1982)—
- Petroleum (Submerged Lands) Bill;
- Mining Act and Other Acts Amendment Bill;
- Noise Abatement Act Amendment Bill;
- Liquor Act Amendment Bill (1982).

(5 May 1982)—
- Anzac Square Development Project Bill;
- Commonwealth Games Bill;
- Fishing Industry Organization and Marketing Bill;
- Apiaries Bill;
- Registration of Births, Deaths and Marriages Act Amendment Bill (1982);
- Mines Department (Administration) Bill.

PROROGATION

On 1 July 1982 the following Proclamation was issued by the Deputy Governor:

A Proclamation by the Honourable Sir Walter Benjamin Campbell, Chief Justice of the State of Queensland, Deputy for and on behalf of His Excellency Commodore Sir James Maxwell Ramsay, Knight Commander of the Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George, Commander of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, upon whom has been conferred the Decoration of the Distinguished Service Cross, and Commodore in the Royal Australian Navy (Retired), Governor in and over the State of Queensland and its Dependencies in the Commonwealth of Australia.

[L.S.]

W. B. Campbell,
Deputy Governor.

In pursuance of the power and authority vested in me, I, Sir Walter Benjamin Campbell, the Deputy Governor aforesaid, do, by this my Proclamation, prorogue the Parliament of Queensland to Tuesday, the Twentieth day of July, 1982.

Given under my Hand and Seal at Government House, Brisbane, this first day of July, in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and eighty-two, and in the thirty-first year of Her Majesty’s reign.

By Command,

J. Bjelke-Petersen.

GOD SAVE THE QUEEN!