

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, October 10, 1973

The SPEAKER (Hon. J. R. Ryan) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITIONS: CASINO

Mr. MATHWIN presented a petition signed by 53 persons who expressed concern at the probable harmful impact of a casino on the community at large and prayed that the House of Assembly would not permit a casino to be established in South Australia.

Mr. MILLHOUSE presented a similar petition signed by 104 persons.

Mr. LANGLEY presented a similar petition signed by 35 persons.

Dr. EASTICK presented a similar petition signed by 185 persons.

Petitions received.

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISEMENT

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition) moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable a motion without notice to be moved forthwith.

Motion carried.

Dr. EASTICK: I move:

That in the opinion of this House the campaign being conducted by the Premier in respect of land prices and associated matters is grossly misleading and in defiance of the normally accepted processes of Parliamentary democracy.

In moving this motion, I draw attention to the fact that, over a period, we have read and heard several pronouncements by the Premier that are mischievous, in many material aspects untrue, and I suggest, culminating in the advertisement that appears on page 23 of this morning's *Advertiser*, misrepresentative of fact. In the Unfair Advertising Act, passed by this Parliament in 1971, "unfair statement" is defined as follows:

"unfair statement" in relation to an advertisement means a statement or representation contained in the advertisement that is—

- (a) inaccurate or untrue in a material particular; or
- (b) likely to deceive or mislead in a material way a person to whom or a person of a class to which it is directed.

The advertisement that appears in today's *Advertiser* (and I am informed that it would cost \$2 000 to insert) is written and authorized by the Premier, and the address given is the State Administration Centre, Victoria Square, Adelaide.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: A very good Premier, too.

Dr. EASTICK: I do not know whether or not this advertisement was authorized by Cabinet or whether members opposite, including the Minister of Transport, accept the decision to permit the expenditure of \$2 000 of taxpayers' money on its insertion. In common with other pronouncements made by the Premier, several statements in the advertisement are misleading and are aimed at causing mischief in the community, based on untruthful statements. The second point listed in the advertisement states that there will be a three-member South Australian Land Commission. There has been no decision of this Parliament creating a three-man Land Commission. That feature of the Land Commission Bill and other aspects were opposed in this House. No vote has yet been taken on the second reading of the Bill in another place, and I do not presuppose what that vote may be, or what action may be taken either to accept the Bill at the second reading stage or amend it in Committee.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You aren't playing politics now, are you? Give some truthful facts.

Dr. EASTICK: In the *Advertiser* of September 14, there is a report—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Are you suggesting that nothing—

Dr. EASTICK:—stating that on the previous day the Premier attended a meeting. That report headed " 'Drivel' Talked on Land Prices, Dunstan Says", states:

The Premier (Mr. Dunstan) told the Master Builders Association yesterday that the Government had a mandate to implement the control of land prices and would insist on doing so.

The statement then attributed to the Premier has been referred to by me before in this place and has not been denied by the Premier. The Premier is quoted as saying:

I imagine the committee will seek to influence the more reactionary Legislative Councillors to reject or weaken the Bills, relying on the weight of conservative numbers to make itself felt.

That was an outright attack on members of another place, before they even had the measure before them and before it had been debated in this place. The report also states:

Mr. Dunstan said land in the metropolitan planning area was a scarce resource and regulated marketing of it was now absolutely essential. Hence the two Bills, the Land Commission Bill and the Urban Land (Price Control) Bill, now being considered.

Who is to blame for the position we are in at present? Would the Premier and his Ministers have us believe that the cause is other than a result of their own actions or, more particularly, the Premier's failure to heed the advice given to him more than two years ago about the need to ensure that the rate of servicing blocks be increased if there was not to be a shortage of blocks? Would members opposite deny that for a period (certainly before December 1 last, and since) there has been a backlog of activity in the Lands Titles Office and the State Planning Office, materially affecting the number of parcels of land becoming available in the community?

Would anyone opposite deny that the services section of the Engineering and Water Supply Department has not had the opportunity to undertake sufficient servicing in water supply and sewerage facilities to allow a more constant release of blocks, thus increasing the supply and decreasing the cost factor? What I have said is no reflection on the Engineering and Water Supply Department as such or on the people who work there: it is a direct reflection on the Government administration. This is a position of supply and demand, and every member opposite knows it.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do you think speculation had anything to do with increasing prices?

Dr. EASTICK: Subsequent to that announcement in the *Advertiser* of September 14, the Premier has made several other pronouncements. The matter was highlighted again in the *Sunday Mail* on October 7, wherein a complete untruth was stated, namely, that house block costs had soared by 52 per cent. The report states:

Land prices were again starting to get out of hand in the newly developing areas of metropolitan Adelaide, the Premier (Mr. Dunstan) warned yesterday. Figures prepared by the Premier's Department showed that in June and July prices had risen at an annual rate of 52.7 per cent in the Noarlunga area, 331 per cent in the Tea Tree Gully area, and 30.2 per cent around Salisbury.

This was an annual rate, not one that relied only on what had happened in the previous two months. The report goes on to say:

At the same time, the number of transactions had increased sharply. Mr. Dunstan said this alarming trend

made it urgent that Parliament approve the legislation now before it controlling land prices, otherwise young families could be priced out of the market.

The Premier was holding the gun at the head of people in respect of legislation that has not even been discussed in this House, let alone forwarded to another place for consideration. The report also states:

The figures suggest that the impact of the Government's announcement earlier this year, which had a dampening effect on the market, is now wearing off, Mr. Dunstan said.

The direct inference from this is that in that short time this marked increase had taken place. I said (and this was reported briefly in the *Advertiser* of October 8) that this legislation was still before the House and that debate in this House would not conclude this week. I said this because of the assurances which had been given to me last week that even if the subject matter came on for debate, the Bill would not be taken through Committee until the Premier had returned to South Australia, yet now we find that he will not be available in this House until next Tuesday.

Much could be said concerning the actual stage of discussion of these measures in this House and the stage of discussion and decision reached in another place, but I now refer to the advertisement headed "What's the Government doing about rising land prices?". The advertisement adopts the premise that this Government is doing much more than the Government in any other State.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Hear, hear!

Dr. EASTICK: Instead of interjecting "Hear, hear!", the Minister might indicate where this State Government has taken a tangible approach to this matter and arranged to release 13 000 building blocks as Mr. Hamer has done in Victoria.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What are the land prices in Melbourne?

Dr. EASTICK: The Minister will have his opportunity to make a contribution soon. It is interesting to note that this measure has been brought forward only a day or two after the Australian Labor Party Federal Executive meeting in Adelaide. What is the significance of that?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: None.

Dr. EASTICK: It will be interesting to see whether that situation develops further. Certainly, the Government in Western Australia introduced similar measures in May this year, but that Government has not proceeded with them, because it recognizes the faults existing in the legislation which Canberra has asked it to bulldoze through.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You obviously have the ear of Mr. Tonkin, the Western Australian Premier.

Dr. EASTICK: I have had discussions with him.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Is that what he told you?

Dr. EASTICK: Even though he has been requested as recently as the week before last to bring this measure on in the Western Australian Parliament, he has not brought it forward. The responsible Ministers of all State Governments were willing to go to Melbourne last Friday week to discuss various aspects of the land price and land commission issue. Members opposite were represented by the Chief Secretary, as announced by the Deputy Premier. As a result of the general agreement reached by representatives at that meeting (the general agreement was referred to by the Premier himself), the six Ministers have now requested the Commonwealth Government to hold a conference with representatives of State Governments to discuss various aspects of the implementation of certain land measures.

We have here part of the reason for the appearance of this \$2 000 advertisement this morning. The advertisement is meant to pull the wool over the eyes of the people of South Australia and to have an effect beyond South Australia, showing that the measures introduced at the insistence of the Commonwealth Government are measures which should be supported and which are advantageous to the people of the Commonwealth. Many areas that were exposed in the debate on the Land Commission Bill clearly indicated the disadvantages that would arise as a result of the forced passage of these Bills: it was a forced passage with gags imposed, and Government members know that very well.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It was a filibuster by your crowd, too.

Dr. EASTICK: It was not a filibuster, but a responsible discussion on important matters—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You can't keep a straight face when you claim that.

Dr. EASTICK:—that the Minister refers to.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It was the worst drivel I've ever heard.

Dr. EASTICK: The Minister has taken the word out of the press report of September 14. I come back to the points we have seen today in this advertisement, and the series of statements which I do not intend to discuss further and which are a direct attempt to hoodwink the people of this State and have an influence in other States in advance of a meaningful discussion that should follow the conference to be called between the responsible Commonwealth Minister and Ministers from all States. I again refer to the fact that the conference held in Melbourne last Friday week was called at the insistence of the responsible Labor Minister in the Tasmanian Parliament. I look forward to all members supporting this motion. This situation, which goes beyond this issue, was most apparent last evening during a debate on another matter in which the House was asked to debate an issue with both hands tied behind its back. That is what the Minister of Education wants.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: In your record on history you are as bad as the member for Goyder.

Dr. EASTICK: Is that the Minister's contribution? I repeat that I look forward to the total support of this House.

The SPEAKER: Is the motion seconded?

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I second the motion and strongly support it. If there were any evidence that the motion was hitting home and that it richly deserved to be moved, we have seen it in the reaction of Government members. In my time as a member of Parliament I do not think I have seen such discomfort exhibited by Ministers as we have seen today. They have been decidedly uncomfortable over the previous two or three days, and I understand why they have been uncomfortable.

The Hon. L. J. King: You're using the same notes as you used yesterday: why not get the right ones?

Dr. TONKIN: I am unhappy to have to use similar notes or to voice similar sentiments. The advertisement that appears in today's *Advertiser* is evidence of a total disregard by the Premier of the due processes of the law and of Parliamentary democracy.

Members interjecting:

Dr. TONKIN: I thank the Attorney-General for referring to yesterday, because I should have thought that he would like to forget it. I shall not develop that theme further, because I know that you, Mr. Speaker,

will not allow me to do so. I am sure that the Attorney-General is happy to raise the subject by way of interjection. Apart from the fact that this advertisement is blatantly unfair advertising, the proper place for debate on these matters is in this Chamber at the proper time, which is when the Bills are to be debated on second reading and in Committee. The proper place is not in the newspapers, certainly not in a newspaper advertisement inserted by the Premier of this State and paid for, presumably, by the taxpayers. There is a proper time to debate all these matters and that time should have been taken in this House and public action should have waited until this Parliament had had every opportunity to consider these matters, to amend them if necessary, and to go through the due processes of Parliamentary democracy.

We know that the Premier, at the beginning of this year, embarked on an intensive public relations campaign. I am not sure who is in the gun most; I think they are what he calls "the big land speculators". Nevertheless, he has made dire threats in the press and these threats have culminated in an article in the most recent issue of the *Sunday Mail*, which states that the Government is aiming to control land prices and that it hopes the two Bills referred to will pass through Parliament before the end of the week, although, when the article appeared, neither of the Bills had gone through this House. The Premier implied in the article that if both these Bills had not passed through Parliament it would be the fault of either the Opposition or, more particularly, of the Legislative Council. The Premier then took off for another State.

It was impossible (and he knew it was impossible, as the business of the House was planned) for both these matters to get through both Houses before the end of this week. Indeed, he knew that full well when he made that statement. He followed it up with another statement, this time from Canberra. He announced there would be a campaign to tell the people of South Australia what was happening. That is the biggest laugh of the year. He has no intention of telling people what is happening; he is trying to brainwash them, to influence them. In this way he is trying to influence the decisions of Parliament before the matters come before members. He is trying to abrogate the responsibilities of this Parliament. I believe that in this way he is holding this Parliament in contempt and thereby holding the people of South Australia in contempt.

Regardless of the desirability or otherwise of this legislation (and I think members opposite know what we think about that on this side), these matters must be discussed. They must be considered and the legislation must be amended if necessary. The Bills must come before this Parliament for consideration and their passage through these Houses must not in any way be hampered. That is the whole principle of Parliamentary democracy: the things we stand here for, the things which you represent, Sir, and which we, as members, represent. The Premier has very little regard for the law. We have heard him say so. He has said that, if he does not approve of a law, he will break it. If a law does not suit him, he will change it retrospectively to suit his own ends.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out that there is a substantive motion before the House to be considered. This is not an open and general debate; the subject matter is the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

Dr. TONKIN: I agree entirely. This motion refers to due processes of Parliamentary democracy, but the Government's action is in defiance of those processes. I believe that the Premier stands indicted for contempt of Parliament,

if there is such an offence (if there is not, there certainly ought to be).

If this principle is adopted from now on, we may well ask ourselves why we should have Parliament at all. The only reason for having Parliament apparently is to add respectability to decisions made by a small minority. We have seen the attitude of members opposite, including responsible Ministers, who I should have thought would know better and would uphold the principles of Parliamentary democracy. They accuse this Opposition of filibustering and of holding up the business of the House. We saw another example of a reaction to that, I think only last week, or possibly the week before. We wish to exercise our right of free speech and to discharge our responsibilities to our constituents by speaking for them in this House, as long (and as far) as the Standing Orders of this House will permit us. Yet we are told that, for some reason, this is holding up the business of Government; for some reason it is filibustering. It would suit the Government very well if we never got up on our feet to say anything. The Government would feel much more comfortable.

Members interjecting:

Dr. TONKIN: The Government has gagged us on several occasions so far, and I have heard that we will see this happen again, because this is what it wants. I am unfortunately reminded of the situation in Germany before the last war, when a dictator gained power by constitutional means and then took over—

Members interjecting:

Dr. TONKIN: —the running of a country by ignoring the processes of that country's Parliament and Government. I am disgusted that it should ever have been necessary to move this motion, and I am disgusted at the attitude of members opposite.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Deputy Premier): I have never seen a better display of feigned indignation.

Mr. Venning: How weak can you be!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I suppose the member for Rocky River would be a good judge of how weak anyone could be, because one would have to have some experience in that field before one could judge others. However, let us treat this motion seriously because, after all, I think the Leader of the Opposition has given the Government an excellent opportunity to further the campaign which I think was launched by the Premier today in the *Advertiser* (a campaign, I might add, that members of the Government Party entirely support). I am afraid that the Leader of the Opposition will be disappointed, because he will not gain the support he has asked for from this side.

Dr. Eastick: Who paid for the advertisement?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Government paid for the advertisement; the taxpayers paid for it and—

Mr. Venning: Disgraceful!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: —I shall come to that later. I refer the Leader and members of his Party to the policy speech delivered by the Premier prior to the election in March this year. At page 6, under the heading "The Price of Land", it states:

Labor will keep the price of land down. We will not in South Australia allow metropolitan land prices to escalate as they have done in Sydney, Melbourne and Perth. In conjunction with the Commonwealth, land will be purchased, subdivided and placed on the market by Government authorities to ensure an adequate supply of land at a reasonable price. If this measure does not halt the escalation, price control of land will be introduced. We will peg prices at a specific date and allow thereafter only increases in value through development costs and changes in general monetary value.

I think that is sufficiently clear, even for the Opposition. That was the policy enunciated by the Premier last March, and that policy was overwhelmingly supported by the people of this State. There was nothing equivocal about it and nothing that people could misunderstand. It was perfectly clear and—

Mr. Duncan: It's our mandate.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, a clear mandate indeed. Since this Government was re-elected at the 1973 election, people who have a vested interest in ensuring that land prices are not controlled have been extremely active against the Government's proposal. We do not deny them that right: in spite of what has been said by members opposite, we respect democracy, and the people concerned can go their hardest. However, what we do object to is the misrepresentation and the distortion applied to any measure proposed by the Government in this field. The need to establish this commission has been brought about by the actions of those people for whom the Leader and members of the Opposition are speaking today—

Dr. Eastick: We speak for the people—

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: —the speculators who have become rich over the last few years. The Leader referred to what had been done in Victoria: did he read in the press (he must have) where a person sold his property the other day and made \$3 000 000 overnight? Who will pay for that? The Leader may laugh, but the person concerned made \$3 000 000 on this property, for which he paid \$100 000 some years ago.

Mr. Evans: That's not overnight.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That is what happened: the person concerned owned it. It was worth \$100 000 one day and, because of certain events, it was worth \$3 000 000 the next day. That is not the situation that will obtain in this State, and it is the very thing that we are trying to prevent. If the Leader and his members want that situation, that is their business. However, we are ensuring that we implement the mandate we received from the people of this State as a result of the policy enunciated by the Premier last March. I draw members' attention to a paper available to any member of this House, namely, the Report of the Working Party on the Stabilization of Land Prices, which was presented to the Government last April. This working party consisted of responsible men, the leader of the party being Mr. D. A. Speechley (Deputy Director of Planning, State Planning Office); Mr. B. L. Bentick (Senior Lecturer in the Economics Department of the University of Adelaide); Mr. Lewkowicz (Research Officer, Department of the Premier and of Development); and Mr. Maguire (Research Officer, also in that department). The Secretary of the committee was Mr. Balfour, of the State Planning Office.

Mr. McAnaney: That would be a one-eyed crowd.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: These are competent people with integrity, and I guess the honourable member would agree with that. We gave them a job of work to do, and they did it properly. If the honourable member cares to read the report, [think he will see that a tremendous amount of research and work went into it. That report is the basis of the legislation currently before the House. True, some alterations have been made to that legislation since it was introduced. However, what is clearly set out in the advertisement to which the honourable member has referred (and I cannot and will not accept that there are misleading points in it) is put there so that members of the public can see for themselves exactly what the Government is trying to

achieve. It could be said, as the Leader has said, that we are trying to push this down the necks of people so that they will be on our side. It could well be that many people will disagree with some of the points made, but we are saying to the public, without bias, exactly what the legislation means, because we have been driven to do this by the distortion and misrepresentation of people whose interest is to see the legislation defeated.

Dr. Tonkin: The place to say that is in Parliament.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: We will say it in Parliament, but what is said here is never seen by the public at large, as the honourable member knows. How many people in the community read *Hansard*? The honourable member knows that only a few people read it. If people read *Hansard*, they would probably be able to sort out the matter for themselves, but too few people read it. It is important to the Government, as a matter of Government policy, and to the people of the State that we get this story across so that they can see that what we are doing is nothing untoward and is not crook.

Dr. Tonkin: It's just a political advertisement.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is not: it is a matter of Government policy that has been explained for the sake of the people. The Leader said that there were several reasons why blocks of land were in short supply. If he looks at the report to which I have referred (and, although he has probably done so already, I advise him to do so if he has not read it), he will see that the lack of services, etc., to which he referred is not the cause of the present shortage of blocks. Many other factors come into the matter. I do not want to take up the time of the House enumerating them all. I refer the Leader to this report so that he may see for himself that the points he brought up with regard to the shortage of land are really not the matters that count.

Mr. Evans: But it—

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If he wants to do so, the member for Fisher will have an opportunity to refute my statement. He may also look at the report and see that the lack of services is not the only reason for the shortage.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Not even the main reason.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: True. In fact, I can tell the honourable member right now that it is a strange thing that certain subdividers are not seeking to have services connected to their subdivisions at this time. I wonder why! The honourable member can probably answer that, too. We cannot force subdividers to install services when we want them to, as the honourable member knows. The Leader and the member for Bragg attacked the Government, saying virtually that we should not have spent taxpayers' money to make known to the people of the State the policies of the Government, as such action should not be taken. But what did members opposite say when the Hall Government brought out its 14 points, at the taxpayers' expense, with regard to Chowilla? When things are different, they are not the same. What did those members say when the glossy-covered publication was brought out at the taxpayers' expense to explain to the people the policies of the Government so that there would not be distortion and misrepresentation? They did not say anything. What did they do when we published a brochure on consumer affairs, telling the people what protections were available to them? They did not criticize that. In fact, they took those brochures and utilized them as they should have done. How often do we see in national newspapers and other newspapers throughout Australia advertisements concerning matters of Government policy and

the services available to people from Government agencies? We see that continually.

Dr. Tonkin: After the legislation is passed.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As I have explained already to the honourable member why we have commenced this campaign now, I do not want to go over it again. He knows as well as I do that there is a powerful lobby. Someone has said that now people will have the opportunity to come to Parliament and put pressure on members, getting them to vote for the legislation. What have real estate agents been doing? They have not been sitting here licking their fingers. They have been lobbying members opposite, as is their right. We do not deny them that right. However, we claim that the Government also has a right to put the case fairly to the people.

Dr. Tonkin: In Parliament.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: In Parliament and out of Parliament.

Dr. Eastick: After it has been decided.

The Hon. I. D. CORCORAN: In Parliament and before it has been decided. The Leader knows full well that there is nothing untoward about this move, and I assure him it will continue, even if he does not like it.

Mr. Venning: Until the next election.

The Hon. I. D. CORCORAN: If this is offensive to members in this Chamber and to members in another place, I can only say that they are easily offended. They do not like to see the truth put before people in the form we have used, because it upsets some of the points that they want to make on behalf of their influential friends.

Dr. Eastick: We like the truth.

The Hon. I. D. CORCORAN: That is the truth, as the Leader knows. This is what the Government is attempting to do.

Dr. Tonkin: Attempting to do!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, and we have a perfect right to do that: neither the Leader nor the member for Bragg will convince me otherwise. I can understand why the Leader has moved this motion. At lunch time, over the radio, I heard the word he used, although I am not sure of it now.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Despicable.

The Hon. I. D. CORCORAN: Yes, he said this was a despicable action on the part of the Government, but many people in the community will be grateful to the Government for taking this so-called despicable action, because they will now be able to get a clear picture of what we are trying to do for the young people of the community who, if this type of legislation is not passed, will have to pay exorbitant prices for land.

Dr. Tonkin: Until it comes into effect; you aren't waiting until it does.

The Hon. I. D. CORCORAN: That is right, because we know what will happen between now and the time the legislation passes, and we make no apology for our action. This campaign is designed to show people what we are trying to do in this place right now. I make no apologies for our action; I do not think there is anything unusual about it, so the honourable member need not get upset about it. I repeat that the Government believes that this is the proper procedure. We have a clear and unmistakable mandate from the people to do exactly this.

Dr. Eastick: Have you—

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will set it out again for the Leader if he wants me to, but he knows we have a mandate. The Opposition and its friends will not deter

the Government one bit from putting these policies into effect. During the debate on the relevant measures before the House, several reasons will no doubt be brought up why land is in short supply. The reasons why land is not freely available throughout the State are referred to in the report I have cited, which has gone a long way as the basis of legislation currently before the House. This is not the first time, nor will it be the last, that the Government has spent taxpayers' money to put its policies to the people in a proper and accurate light. We make no apologies at all about that. All I can say to the Leader is that I hope the campaign will be entirely successful and that the Government's aim in this matter will be achieved.

Mr. HALL (Goyder): I entirely support the motion, because the advertisement in today's *Advertiser* is dishonest and the Government is being dishonest in promoting the matter in this way. The Minister has used dishonest arguments to bolster his defence. For instance, he has referred to the pamphlet concerning Chowilla put out by the Government I led, although he knows that in that case legislation had been approved by this House and the Legislative Council, and at that time it was the concerted view of the entire South Australian Parliament. In this newspaper advertisement we have Labor Party policy, and the Deputy Premier at least has had the decency to say that. It is not legislation. It is not a consumer affairs matter, giving members of the public their rights under the law of South Australia. This is no-one but the A.L.P. speaking, and once again misusing and misappropriating Government funds. I should like the Auditor-General in this State, if he is worth his salt, to examine how the Premier could have spent money on behalf of the A.L.P. to promote the resolutions adopted at Party conferences.

That is what this is: a Party resolution put forward in today's *Advertiser* on behalf of the Party, at the expense of everyone in the community. As people drive their cars or ride on public transport tomorrow, in the few moments before they get to work they can reflect on how their daily taxation will be misused by the Government for its own political ends. It will be nice for them to contemplate that the Government, through the Deputy Premier, can say here that it will continue what it is doing and be damned to the public.

Mr. Venning: They're proud of it.

Mr. HALL: They are proud of the misuse of funds. I challenge the Government to be honest and put the Party name and that of the Party secretariat under the advertisement. The Premier hides behind the State Administration Centre although he advertises on behalf of the Labor Party, and he is a coward to do that. I suppose that I could say a few more things. The \$2 000 is just peanuts, just a tick of the clock in expenditure, as far as the Labor Party is concerned, when it spends as though money has gone out of fashion. I repeat that I have made those statements on the basis of what the Deputy Premier said. He has said that it is Labor policy and that this is a campaign. He did not say this advertisement was a presentation of Government policy. *Hansard* has recorded that he said it is a campaign, and it will be there tomorrow for all of us to read.

Mr. Gunn: It's a Labor Party campaign.

Mr. HALL: It is no other campaign. It is not a campaign by the Legislature: the Legislature has not passed the measures. His Excellency, therefore, has not assented to them. The legislation has not gone through Executive Council and, as the Minister has said, this is a campaign.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Would you like it to go through?

Mr. HALL: What has that got to do with the matter? The Minister for Environment and Conservation used to be the junior Minister, and that is what he ought to be still, because of his tactics in this House. The point is that this advertisement does not show the view of Parliament: it is Labor Party policy. The Minister has said there is a campaign and he has amplified that statement by saying that the Premier's policy speech referred to this matter. The Premier, however, made out no policy. He said, "We will use public funds on behalf of the A.L.P. campaign," and I repeat that he is a coward, because he stands behind the shadow of the State Administration Centre.

Mr. Duncan: He just may be the Administration.

Mr. HALL: That is what is unfortunate in this State. In point 1 of the statement, we have some of the details that the Deputy Premier has said reveal all. The Premier states:

It's streamlining its own operations. At the administrative level, the Government's acting to ensure that the Public Service makes land transactions as quick and easy as possible.

That will be a change! A person whom I sat next to at a function recently told me that it was normal for him to take two years to get his blocks of land on the market. The price has increased by 40 per cent or more, merely because of Government delays. The Government, because it does not understand practicalities, blames all the trouble on speculators. It forgets that land near all big cities increases in value whether it is being used or not.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What a profound statement!

Mr. HALL: At least the Minister recognizes that. The price of land within a radius of about two miles of Adelaide has increased enormously in this time, and agents say that the increase has been about 40 per cent in the past 12 months. The price of land is what the economic value of that property is to people. The Premier does not intend to control that. He is not to control buildings that have been occupied for over 12 months. He must realize that the land he is talking about is essentially not within that area, because it is all practically built on. He is not talking about the high-priced part of Adelaide, and that is where he is misleading the public. It is nice to read that the Public Service is doing all this! When replying recently to a question I had asked about the latest increase for clerks in the Public Service, the Premier said that the cost of the increase was about \$2 800 000. The Government is setting the economic pace in the community.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must stick to the motion.

Mr. HALL: This is the Government of the day. The Premier is providing for an escalation in price of 7 per cent a year, although his Commonwealth colleagues have increased expenditure by 20 per cent. Further, although I have not calculated it, I guarantee that the increase in this State's Budget is not less than 12 per cent. The Government can have an increase of 12 per cent but the rest of the community cannot! Nothing is fair in this inquiry. The Government is sacrosanct and, by its own negotiations, it can increase the costs to this community. Every industrialist will tell you that the Public Service, which used to be a place for security and in wages—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is speaking to the motion moved by the honourable Leader of the Opposition. That is the only matter under discussion.

Mr. HALL: I appreciate your drawing my attention to the point. Linking my remarks with the economic conditions that prevail, I was showing how this proposed price control plan would operate, but perhaps I got a little wide of the mark. I come back to the point that the present inflationary spiral is probably due more to Government action than to any other factor in this community.

Mr. McAnaney: What about the Commonwealth Government?

Mr. HALL: I have referred to the 20 per cent increase in that Government's Budget. Point 2 in the advertisement assumes that the legislation will be passed. It states:

There's to be a three-member South Australian Land Commission.

The Government cannot say that yet.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Read the rest of it.

Mr. HALL: I will read some of it to the Minister. I do not know whether the Government intends to ask for a double dissolution on this matter at some future time.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Read the next sentence. You haven't read the advertisement.

Mr. HALL: I will not be put off by the greatest twister in debate in this House. He may make his own speech. Let him get up and make it. Point 2 also states:

The Land Commission will buy or acquire broad acres and release it as demand requires, to help keep land prices down.

Mr. Millhouse: It's been doing its best to put prices up. Why has the Government not been doing that until now?

Mr. HALL: I remember, when in office, discussing land prices in the community and stating that we must keep them down.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What did you do about it?

Mr. HALL: We took practical action. The Government does not understand the lessons of the past that are right before it. One of the greatest factors in keeping down land prices in this community was the establishment of Elizabeth. The Minister may laugh: he has some miraculous transport plans. The lesson of Elizabeth was the purchase of broad-acre land at farm-land prices to provide building blocks. There was a marvellous situation when that city was developed, because the land prices were practically negligible. We stand by that lesson, a lesson which was learnt throughout Australia: that it is necessary in all cases to provide more land than the public requires. I remember in this instance making an assessment with officers of the Housing Trust in respect of the land available to the trust and directing the officers to buy a huge new tract of land. Why did the Government stop that procedure? Why has it not purchased more land? The land is available. Why does the Government need to dress this up in A.L.P. policy at this time, when it could have been doing this all the time? Apparently, it has not proceeded with the policy of previous Governments which deliberately, by policy and financial backing, kept the price of land down for home builders in this community. We are to get an artificially imposed army of super civil servants inquiring into people's bank balances in an expensive and totalitarian way to artificially keep prices down at the top of the scale. That is what will happen.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Read that bit about the land commission.

Mr. HALL: Point 3 states:

Then there's to be land price control to remove speculators from land market.

Are members opposite so dumb; are they so failing in their assessment of this as not to understand that every

control brings an illegal speculator and profiteer? Do members opposite believe that by setting up penalties they can stop people who should not get a profit from getting a profit? Do they believe there will not be a black market simply because of the imposition of a \$2 000 fine? If members opposite believe that, they are too naive a Government to administer. Further, the lessons of the past are right in front of them; indeed, during the Second World War the severe penalties under the national emergencies of war time did not prevent people from growing rich on the needs of others through black marketeering and many other illegal devices about which members opposite would know. This is what the Government intends to establish.

In this great frank document, why has not one word been printed about one matter? Although there is to be a selling price for blocks of land based on the original purchase price, the purchase price of blocks will differ. Some people will have bought before May 16 at a good price, some will have bought at a higher price, and values placed on land in certain districts alter according to the fashion or need or as an area changes. However, we know that certain blocks will be worth the economic assessment placed on them by the community and the same blocks will be offered at an artificially and automatically determined price, but there will be different prices. What will automatically occur under this scheme will be the same as what has occurred under earlier price control when blocks of land were sold far below the free sale price. Neither the Minister nor the Premier has tried to tell us in this Labor Party presentation in what way the buyers will be selected. The Minister knows that for some blocks 150 people will apply saying they want the block at the top price. In what way will the Premier or Minister allocate a block?

Mr. Evans: They'll give it to their friends.

Mr. HALL: True, they will give it to their friends or work out a lottery system. Therefore, the free market price, which is the reason why city and metropolitan property prices differ, will be affected, yet the free market policy is the only way to determine how land values differ. An imposed artificially low price system has buyers selected by lottery, and I believe there will be undesirable money exchanges, equivalent to black marketeering, which will affect sales in many cases.

The Government has introduced this measure in a supposedly free society living under peaceful conditions. The Premier has not even bothered to say how the buyers will be selected when prices of blocks are kept artificially below their free market value. I cannot accept the introduction of a situation like this and imposing it on a community to create criminals in the community. Any law that encourages people to break it is a bad law, and this law will make criminals of otherwise honest people. I now refer to the heading "What about very new homes?" From this situation I believe there will be less competition in the housing industry. The advertisement states:

If a dwelling has been completed since May 16, 1973, an owner will be able to sell it without restriction provided it is lived in for more than 12 months.

The Commissioner of Land Prices will determine the sale price on the merits of the situation. How many civil servants will be required to check on the merits of the situation? Who will fix the price? How many people will be involved? How many weeks of work will this take? How long will it take to sell a house? How many policemen and how many pimps will be required? No member opposite can answer those questions. Further, under this

system the profit on a house will be allocated, and it will not matter if a builder is efficient or not, so long as the cost can be shown, and the profit can be added to the cost—

Mr. Coumbe: It is cost plus.

Mr. HALL: True, and the same building industry in South Australia which has provided better and cheaper housing for a broader spectrum of people than has the building industry in other States and which in South Australia is based on competition will be destroyed as we know it. One of two things will happen: either builders will go along easily knowing their profit will be allocated by the Commissioner (and they will not have to try so hard as long as they have a share of the market), or they will get out of the State. Is that what the Minister and the Premier want? Do they want the leading building firms in South Australia to leave? Can members opposite say that the names of the leading building firms, which I respect, are names they do not respect? Will they go through the names of real estate and building firms and say that the leading builders are crooks? Yet, that is what they are saying, and I do not say that. The comparison throughout Australia is around us to be made. They are not crooks, although that is not to say that every person and every part of the industry is without need for rebuke in respect of behaviour. That applies in every industry, but there are no more dishonest people in the building industry than there are in any other industry.

They have presented those who live in South Australia's houses (and that includes all of us here) with the most competitive and efficient building industry in Australia. What the Government cannot understand, and what it cannot accept, is that Adelaide is achieving big-city status. Further, the Government does not understand the economic consequences of a city achieving such status. It cannot understand the demand for properties within a reasonable distance of Adelaide. Surely, when members opposite go to another State, to the bigger cities, they see that it is an inevitable rise that cannot be stopped. Surely, if they look at books of Government departments, members will find many reasons why the price of vacant blocks is so high. Developers will tell Government members, if they care to listen and put aside their prejudices against private industry. If Government members listened they would find that the development cost of a block today is high indeed. So we have this ideological advertisement, this presentation of the Labor Party campaign, about which the Deputy Premier spoke, at public expense. The millions of dollars, which will be lost to the South Australian community as a result of black marketing that will go on if the Bill is successful, will overshadow the \$2 000 or \$20 000 the Government will squander in promoting its Party's policy. This principle should shame this Parliament, and it is on that basis that I support the motion.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): One could be pardoned for believing that we were debating again a Bill that was passed by this Parliament last week.

Mr. Hall: The one you gagged!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not know whether the member for Goyder was gagged or was not here, because he and the member for Mitcham are so rarely here now that I am not sure whether they were here or not.

Mr. Millhouse: Obviously, you haven't got any argument.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: This afternoon the member for Mitcham admitted that he was not present on an earlier occasion. I do not think that the member for Goyder

touched on the subject matter being debated for more than one-tenth of the time he spoke.

Mr. Millhouse: You haven't started yet!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not think the honourable member is likely to get a chance to speak to this motion if he keeps interjecting as rudely as he is doing now, because time will expire.

Mr. Venning: What have you been doing all the afternoon?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member can get his name on the list if the Leader will let him speak, but I doubt whether the Leader trusts him enough. The Leader, like the member for Bragg who has left the Chamber, rarely referred to the motion. We have heard much from the member for Goyder about so-called honest and dishonest land agents, but I do not wish to start categorizing agents. I was amazed to hear the honourable member speak about dishonest land agents.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: He said they were crooks.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That has nothing to do with the motion. The motion states:

That in the opinion of this House the campaign being conducted by the Premier in respect of land prices and associated matters is grossly misleading and in defiance of the normally accepted processes of Parliamentary democracy.

We should be asking ourselves whether this advertisement is misleading. The Leader merely said, "Yes, it is misleading", but then he spoke about land prices, about the Bill that was debated previously, and about an alleged affront to members of the Legislative Council because they have not yet passed the Bill. The member for Goyder raved on about it being Labor policy. I do not know what he expects the Government to do. Would he expect us to introduce Liberal Party policy? That is what happened in 1970, when this House started to become an honest House from the point of view of representation.

Today the member for Bragg spoke about a person who was a dictator in Germany before the Second World War, but the honourable member obviously forgot who governed in this State before 1965 without the support of the people. Let us get that sort of hogwash out of the way. We have a democratically elected Government that democratically put a policy before the people and democratically received the majority support of the people, and we are now giving effect to the policy on which we were elected. What is dishonest about that?

Mr. Mathwin: Let's get on with the advertisement.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am sorry if the point has not been made clear, because the member for Glenelg would be honest enough to acknowledge the truth of what I am saying. I was not impressed this afternoon with the sudden new-found unity between the member for Goyder and members of the Liberal and Country League Opposition. Suddenly, we find a unity between the member for Rocky River and the member for Goyder, although it is only a few weeks since they tried to punch each other on the nose. Also, although the member for Hanson ratted on the Liberal Movement, today he suddenly applauds the member for Goyder.

The SPEAKER: Order! The House is considering a motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition, and all members are duty bound to confine their remarks to the motion being considered.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am trying to deal with some points that have been made, such as the point made by the member for Goyder when he said that there had been a misuse of public funds and that the Government was promoting A.L.P. policy. I point out that that policy is

Government policy: it is A.L.P. policy and it was endorsed by the people. Therefore, it is South Australia's policy and is the policy the people said that they wanted. Let us consider what the Leader in this sham motion is trying to do.

Dr. Eastick: There's nothing sham about it.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Leader says that this is a grossly misleading advertisement designed to hoodwink the people.

Dr. Eastick: That's true.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: What part is grossly misleading?

Mr. Dean Brown: Point 1 for a start.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Point 1 states:

It's streamlining its own operations. At the administrative level, the Government's acting to ensure that the Public Service makes land transactions as quick and easy as possible.

What is misleading about that?

The Hon. D. H. McKee: No answer!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If Opposition members had read it properly and could understand it, obviously it is the truth and is what the Government is doing. How can the Leader claim that that is a grossly misleading statement when it is the truth? Let us consider point 2. It seems that a problem has been raised by the member for Goyder, who unfortunately cannot read more than one sentence at a time. He says that this is misleading because it states:

There's to be a three-member South Australian Land Commission.

He failed to read the next sentence—"The Bill establishing this is now before Parliament." What is misleading about that?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: No answer!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: And so one could go through the whole advertisement. This motion is a sham and a cheap political trick to try to do exactly what the member for Goyder was accusing the Premier of doing, when he said that the Premier was a coward because he was using this advertisement, his office, and the State Administration Centre to hide behind Labor policy. The cowards here today, however, are the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Bragg, the member for Goyder, and I think the member for Torrens, who will be the next speaker. The first three I have named have stood up and told untruths and have distorted the facts, when the Premier is not here to defend himself.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: They are the cowards: the cowards are sitting on that side, and that is the right side for cowards to sit.

Mr. Becker: Go back to the railways!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The member for Hanson had better not talk too much or I might tell him how he has been the coward when there have been some very unfortunate incidents. The advertisement is a factual statement of what the Government is doing, and doing for one purpose and one purpose only: it is attempting to make a positive contribution to the young people, particularly, of this State, who are in the process of establishing themselves in new houses. Members opposite are not interested in this sort of person. They want to protect the speculator, the man who is making thousands and thousands out of the escalating price of land, in exactly the same way as has happened in the Eastern States. We have acted to protect the young people, the people who will populate South Australia when the members opposite are gone and forgotten. If the Leader of the Opposition wants to blow

his trumpet continually in support of the speculators, he has the right to do so, because they are here often enough blowing in his ear.

Mr. Mathwin: Do you want a list of them? I have a list here.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I would not want any list of speculators from the member for Glenelg: they are probably on his contribution list. I am concerned that the young people of this State are given a fair go, and I want to see that they are given an opportunity to establish themselves as useful members of society. The first thing they have to be able to do is establish themselves in a house, and we are taking some positive action to help them attain this end. We certainly will not take action to harm them and merely help the speculators. I have yet to hear one member opposite say one sentence of truth supporting the motion that that is a misleading statement. There is nothing untrue in it, and I defy any member opposite to show where there is one sentence in it that is untrue.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I support the motion. Having just listened to the Minister of Transport, I say straight away he was right in one respect, and that was that I would follow him in the debate. However, he was wrong when he said I would tell lies. That is the sort of statement we normally expect from the Minister of Transport. I will not tell lies: it is not my habit to do so in this House. He accused members of my Party of telling lies. What a pitiful display we have heard this afternoon from the two Ministers who have spoken in this debate. The Minister of Works, in his capacity as Acting Leader of the House, did his very best to show a righteous indignation. His philosophy was that might is right. Predictably, the Minister of Transport used abusive and abrasive language and made sneering remarks throughout his speech. It was the typical soapbox type of speech we are used to hearing from him. Once again he resorted to personalities. We all know that when one does not have a case one resorts to personalities.

Dr. Eastick: Denigration.

Mr. COUMBE: Precisely. The Minister tried to hit the bucket.

Dr. Eastick: The fan was not going.

Mr. COUMBE: The Minister of Works recited a number of policy speech items. If this advertisement had been part of an election policy speech before an election, the position would have been different: it would have been paid for by the Australian Labor Party. This advertisement is different because it is being paid for by the taxpayers of South Australia, not the Australian Labor Party, not a political Party. It is different from an election advertisement because it appeared after Bills had been presented to this House and before they have been passed by the Parliament. One Bill has passed this House but it has not yet been passed by the other place, and other measures have not been debated in this House: the second reading explanation has been given, and that is all. Surely, that is an abrogation of Parliamentary rights, as anybody in the free world would understand. This is a splendid example of Executive Government control, and it smacks of some of the Latin-American types of Government and dictatorship we see today. Where has democracy gone? Where are the great democrats on the Government side of the House? Why do they not stand up for the rights of Parliament? They are the elected members from their districts, so surely they could stand up for the rights of this House. The Minister quite clearly said that this advertisement was the start of a Government campaign; he blatantly admitted that.

Dr. Eastick: \$2 000 for the first lick.

Mr. COUMBE: How many more advertisements are there to be? How many orders have been put in for repeats? This advertisement is criticized because of the influence it could have on the Parliamentary process, and there is no doubt that it could have an influence. It could affect members of this House and of the other place on how they may vote on the Bills which have been referred to but which have not yet passed through this Parliament. Does this not reflect on the cherished phrase "Parliamentary privilege", the right of every member to get up in the House and freely express his views without let or hindrance.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What are you doing now?

Mr. COUMBE: I am taking advantage of that, but it is an attempt to sway the votes that may be cast in this House. You, Mr. Speaker, are the custodian of the rights of members of this House to cast a free and unfettered vote as they see it. Why was the advertisement authorized? We know that the Premier authorized it. Why did the advertisement appear? It did so simply because the Government, quite openly and blatantly, wanted to influence people in this State. As the Leader said, it could influence members of this Parliament in the way they voted. Numerous cases in history are being cited in which people in outside organizations have tried to influence members on how they should vote in Parliament, and here today we have the most blatant example of that, involving an advertisement authorized and paid for not by an outside body but by the Government of the sovereign State of South Australia.

The Government has used the people's money to put its case before them. It would be interesting to know whether the Government would make a similar sum and space available to those who might hold an opposing view. We are perfectly entitled at this stage to ask how many advertisements will appear. Is this a forerunner to this great campaign to which the Minister of Works has referred? Will the situation be continued? Will it be a serial? The advertisement promotes the Government's view and the A.L.P.'s policy, and it has been paid for at Government expense, not by a Party but by the Government from money provided by the people of this State. I recall an occasion during the period of a previous Government when I think the Premier, as the then Leader of the Opposition, bitterly complained in this place because the Government of the day had made an important announcement to the press before making it here in Parliament. That shows the complete hypocrisy of the Government in this regard. This motion is timely, for the matter should be brought to the notice of this House and of the people of this State, so that we do not see a recurrence of this defiance of the processes of Parliamentary democracy.

Mr. CRIMES (Spence): When I opened up the *Advertiser* this morning and read that part of it that—

Mr. Blacker: You were amazed.

Mr. CRIMES: I was not. I read that part in which I am most interested, and that is the first section of the *Advertiser*. But when just by chance I turned to the second section, which is mostly taken up with advertisements, I came across an excellently presented full-page advertisement that was crystal clear for everyone to read and understand. However, my pleasure at seeing this advertisement was unfortunately tempered by the fact that it had probably been placed in that part of the paper, right at the back, intentionally by the *Advertiser* staff in order that the Government should not obtain full value in conveying to the people the truth about the Bills in question. What catches members of the Opposition on

the raw is that, in a newspaper where the headlines and the bylines are usually distorted in their favour, we saw refreshingly that the truth was easy to read for once.

I will not say that the *Advertiser*, *News*, and *Sunday Mail* do not always publish the truth, but we know their tactics full well, and they know the public full well. They know that people often do not have time to read all the small print, so it is in the small print where one sees the facts but where they are not usually read. But the damage is done in the distorting headlines that appear day after day, week after week, month after month, year after year. These headlines indicate the ideological support of the press in Australia for members opposite. We have heard much about democracy this afternoon, but is it not incumbent on a democratic Government to convey to the people on every possible occasion what it intends to do in legislation?

Mr. Gunn: What about the other side of the story?

Mr. CRIMES: We are apparently still waiting to hear the other side of the story from the honourable member's side. I have not heard any reasonable argument on this as yet, but do not think that I am not pleased that this matter has been raised: I am pleased it has, because it has validated what I have always thought, namely, that if anything gets under the skin of the Conservatives in this community it is the iteration and reiteration of political truths. The Opposition is tremendously keen on democracy when it monopolizes the right to convey messages to the public, but when a Labor Government or the Australian Labor Party tries to exercise the principle of democracy it is a very different thing indeed. When we hear members opposite talking about democracy, I should not be a bit surprised if they approved of what recently happened in Chile, where the Labor movement was destroyed in its attempt to get a message to the people.

Members interjecting:

Mr. Mathwin: That was a Marxist Government. What are you talking about?

Mr. CRIMES: It does not make any difference what Government it is. Members opposite claim they are concerned with the processes of democracy: if they were, they would be willing to accept the will of the people, no matter whom they were supporting, but of course they would not do this. Democracy is all right for them, so long as they get their own way through it. But, if the people want something different, members opposite condemn it out of hand, and that is exactly what they have been doing in this House today. They corrupt the very name of democracy when they talk about it the way they do. Great emphasis has been placed on Parliamentary democracy, and this was particularly evidenced from the member for Bragg, but he does not seem to realize that one cannot qualify democracy. Democracy means exactly what it says: we cannot alter it because we say "Parliamentary democracy" and then try to imply that that democracy should exist only in the Parliament.

I thought we were part of the general community and that we represented the people, but what is going on here today? We are being told that when legislative measures are foreshadowed and when Bills are introduced, people have no right to know what is in them. In other words, members opposite are saying that the people should have no voice in or knowledge of what we attempt to do here. They are saying that we should present the people in the community with a *fait accompli*. Members opposite are saying that they comprise the democracy and are not just a small minority of people who are members of this House.

We have had thrown up at us the question of the cost of this advertisement: \$2 000 was the suggested cost, and I do not know whether that is right or wrong. But what a small cost it is to get a message to the people about What is intended by a Government that truly represents them. This Government has a specific mandate for the legislation referred to in the advertisement being objected to by members of the Opposition.

It is obvious that, if anything appears in the public eye that hinders the selfish exploitation of the public, this touches Opposition members to the quick, and they are soon complaining about the situation. This afternoon, the member for Bragg equated this Government with the Government in Hitler's Germany. Either the honourable member does not know his history or he is doing what he frequently does in this House and distorting the truth. I point out that the first thing Hitler did when he got to power was to destroy people such as members on this side of the House. He destroyed the Labor movement and the trade union movement, and that is what members opposite would like to see happen to us. What is wrong with being a Socialist? What would members opposite do to me as a Socialist? I would be willing to let them exist, but if they had power, they would not let me exist?

Mr. Becker: Isn't a Socialist something like a Commo?

Mr. CRIMES: That is exactly what I like to hear—the smear that indicates the depths of degradation to which members opposite can sink. It is a fair indication of the course they will take when they find they have no argument, and when the truth is put before the public in a publication which normally does not genuinely report what happens in this Parliament. Members opposite do not mind what is said here being reported in *Hansard*, but, as has been asked, who reads *Hansard*? Precious few people read it, and that is why members opposite do not mind the speeches of members on this side being reported in it. However, once the truth is put before the public, it is a different story altogether. This Government will do its utmost to help people understand the legislation that it brings forward. I dare any Opposition member to say that that is not a truly democratic process. We are determined to have good relations with the public so far as that is possible. I believe that discussion and dialogue on everything proposed that relates to the destiny of the people is part of the democratic process.

I point out that, if it is wrong for the Government to publish in the newspaper its views on proposed legislation, perhaps it is equally as wrong for the Leader, for example, to make statements to a newspaper that then publishes those statements. The member for Torrens made the extraordinary suggestion that the speech of the Minister of Transport was a soap-box speech. I think that the Minister should be proud of having his speech described in that way, for I suggest that soap boxes are much closer to the interests of the people than are the speculators who are represented eloquently and vocally but so ineffectively in this House this afternoon. We have been asked how many more of these advertisements will appear. I would like to see a continual stream of them appear, because this would enable South Australians to understand the workings and intentions of the Government.

Then there is the question of the cost of the advertisement and the advertisements that I hope will follow the one that has so raised the enmity of Opposition members. They say that taxpayers' money is used to pay for these advertisements. All right, it is, and we do not apologize for that. Who, in heaven's name, pays for all the advertisements in newspapers and on radio and television? They

are all paid for through the private taxation system known as prices. Why do not members opposite get that into their heads? Members opposite forget that Government costs are frequently based on the fact that the Government has to pay ever-increasing prices for goods and services supplied to it by the people represented by members opposite. The basis for the increase in land prices and for speculation in every realm in which it exists can be found in the people who are invisible at the moment but who generally stand behind members opposite. Today we have had an attack on the Government (a welcome attack) by what I will term in future, without any doubt whatever, the speculators' Party. I oppose the motion.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): In supporting the motion, I remind members, especially the member for Spence, of the wording of the motion, as follows:

That in the opinion of this House the campaign being conducted by the Premier in respect of land prices and associated matters is grossly misleading and in defiance of the normally accepted processes of Parliamentary democracy.

The member for Spence said that, if the Government can use taxpayers' money, he would like to see streams of advertisements in all forms of the media with but one tactic in mind: to brainwash the community to accept what the Government suggests is the only course to take. Brainwashing tactics are the most dangerous tactics a Government can use. In the past fortnight, we have seen legislation introduced that is most dangerous. The Government is not fit to provide for the future of citizens of the State. Anything can happen.

Mr. Jennings: Why don't you—

Mr. BECKER: If the honourable member wants to speak, he can put his name on the list of speakers. In its advertisement, the Government states:

What's the Government doing about rising land prices? It's doing a lot more than any other State.

I remind members that, in Victoria, the Labor Opposition recently moved a motion to establish a land prices commission. That motion failed because the Victorian Premier announced that his Government would immediately release 13 000 building blocks near Melbourne, with the Housing Commission spending \$8 000 000 on special land purchases. That is what the Victorian Government is doing, yet the South Australian Government says that it is doing much more than any other State in this respect. That part of the Government's advertisement is misleading.

If this Government was genuine and sincere in its desire to reduce land prices, it would release land held in this State by the Housing Trust, as the Real Estate Institute and builders have been advocating. Why will the Government not release this land, with the Housing Trust then buying large tracts of other available land? That is what the Government should do, rather than spend taxpayers' money on newspaper advertisements. Why has the price of land escalated? What is this Government doing to improve the processing of land transactions by the Public Service? As it now takes two years to get a block of land subdivided, surely that is adding to the cost. Costs in all other fields (wages, the provision of services, and so on) have escalated. What action has the Government taken? How can it justify putting this advertisement in the newspaper? It could not justify such action in a thousand years. All I can say about this advertisement is that it is a shameful and wicked waste of the taxpayers' money. To say that it is disgusting misappropriation would be putting it mildly.

This advertisement is the first shot to be fired in the campaign for the referendum that the Commonwealth

Government will conduct on December 8. That Government is determined to get control of prices and incomes and the Premier has announced from Canberra that he is starting the campaign on land prices. It is ironical that he should be in Canberra this week, when this advertisement is published, and it is also ironical that the A.L.P. conference was held in Adelaide last weekend. This all ties up with the fact that taxpayers' money is being used to condition and brainwash the people for the forthcoming referendum. Any Government that uses brainwashing tactics is a dangerous Government and the sooner the people throw it out the better.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): In opposing this motion, I draw the attention of members to the fact that this Government's policy was stated clearly in the Premier's policy speech before this year's State election. Most of the people throughout the State endorsed that policy, and the problem that arises now is how to put it into effect. If we had an Upper House that was democratically elected and formed one part of a genuine form of Parliamentary democracy, there would be little concern about how the policy of a democratically elected Government could be put into effect. However, that is not the position and we face a situation to which this Government has become accustomed.

Even though over 50 per cent of the people of this State have voted for Labor Governments through the 1960's and during this decade, the Labor Party has only six members of the 20 in the Upper House. To a significant extent, the forces of conservatism and the interests associated with those who own property and stand to gain from speculation in land control the Upper House of this State.

Legislation has been presented to this Parliament and already part of it has been passed. All members know that the debates in this House and in the Legislative Council are not reported in any detail in press, radio and television. There are several reasons for that, not the least of which is the quality of the debates. Nevertheless, the fact is that the basis of any argument that the Government may have for legislation is never reported effectively in our media. The only circumstances in which the media will give additional attention to the debates is if there is a big controversy, and at least the Opposition, by the motion moved this afternoon and the ensuing debate, has done a service and there should be additional reporting in the *News* and the *Advertiser* on the matter, and the people of this State are more likely to read the advertisement to which objection has been taken, thus finding out the facts.

Therefore, I congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on at least helping the Government to draw the attention of the people of the State to the facts regarding land prices. I ask members what a Government must do if it seeks to implement a policy on which it has been elected and then that policy is misrepresented and distorted. The member for Davenport may smile at that: I think he needs to give more attention to what goes on in this world.

Mr. Jennings: He wasn't smiling: it was wind.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Whether it was wind or not, he still needs to give more attention to what goes on in the world, because clearly the people who stand to gain from speculation in land stand to lose if the Government's proposals are approved. Those people no longer will be able legally to make the speculative profits that they have been able to make in the past year. Those speculators have a vested interest, therefore, in doing all that can be done to defeat the Government's legislative proposals.

If those proposals are not fully supported and understood by the people of this State, they can be defeated in the

undemocratic Upper House. The member for Goyder would describe some members of that place as puppeteers if he was arguing in a way different from that in which he was arguing this afternoon. The great democrats of this State, the members of the Legislative Council who control half of the Parliament, have never been elected by a majority of the people of this State. All those members of the Upper House owe their election to a period during which the Labor Party has had the support of more than 50 per cent of the people of this State.

Mr. Duncan: And to the property franchise.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes, and in circumstances where members of the Upper House considered that there was not much public concern about land prices, it would be easy to throw the legislation out. In that way, the mandate given to the Government at the last State election could be rejected. Opposition members prate about democracy and say that the Government is acting in defiance of the normally accepted processes of Parliamentary democracy. The difficulty about this is the term "normally accepted processes". The Opposition's view of normally accepted processes of Parliamentary democracy is that it is normal to have one House of Parliament controlled in an undemocratic way. That may be normally accepted by Opposition members.

Mr. HALL: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The Minister is discussing the merits of Legislative Councillors and the way they hold their positions. I consider that this has nothing to do with the motion and I ask for your ruling.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order, but I ask the honourable Minister of Education to discuss the motion.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That is exactly what I was doing, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I was discussing the normally accepted processes of Parliamentary democracy. The member for Goyder, who is a candidate for election to an Upper House somewhere else, has suddenly changed his tune on the nature of Upper Houses and is seeking to defend them.

Mr. Millhouse: You're obsessed with this idea.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No. If the member for Goyder is elected to the Senate, that certainly will improve the standard of this House and possibly of the Senate. In this State we have never had a true Parliamentary democracy, because we have never had an election for the Upper House conducted on the basis—

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I object to the fact that the Minister is not speaking to the motion before the House: he is speaking on the election of the Upper House, and that has nothing whatever to do with the motion.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order. I call on the honourable Minister of Education.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I know that members opposite are not really aware of the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition; that motion refers to the normally accepted processes of Parliamentary democracy. The complaint made was that the statement in the press was misleading because it said that there was to be a three-member South Australian Land Commission, and the Leader tried to make great play of the fact that it had not yet been approved by Parliament. Of course, the advertisement then said:

The Bill establishing this is now before Parliament.

The whole argument of the Opposition is that it is wrong to put an advertisement like that in a newspaper while the matter is still before Parliament; hence the words "normally

accepted processes of Parliamentary democracy" in the motion. I would hate to have to explain to the member for Davenport the nature of the motion that his Leader moved. The point I am making in reply is that the processes of Parliamentary democracy normally accepted in a true democracy do not apply in South Australia, because the Legislative Council has never been a democratic House. I am quite happy for the member for Davenport to do what he wants to do, but I assure him that neither a speech by me nor a speech by him will be circulated in the schools.

Mr. Mathwin: What about *Hansard*?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is not circulated: it just gets put in a corner somewhere, and no-one reads it. I realize that members opposite still want to cling to the view that their Party colleagues in the Upper House, who are there basically to represent vested interests in the community, are somehow democratic; they are not democratic, and they never have been. After the next two State elections perhaps the Upper House will be democratic. However, at present it is not democratic, and the Party colleagues of members opposite are in a position to exercise power in the Legislative Council.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The Minister is persistently speaking on topics that have nothing to do with this debate. He has been speaking for the past 10 minutes, despite two other points of order, on the question of the Upper House; that has nothing to do with this motion, which concerns an advertisement that appeared in the *Advertiser* this morning and its propriety, and nothing else. The Upper House does not come into the matter. I ask you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to accept my point of order that the Minister of Education is speaking irrelevantly, and I ask you to direct him to come back to the subject matter of the motion.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not accept the point of order. I ask the Minister of Education to speak to the motion before the House. I point out to the House that the motion deals with the normally accepted processes of Parliamentary democracy. The honourable Minister of Education.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If that is your considered opinion, I move:

That the Deputy Speaker's ruling be disagreed to.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member for Mitcham to bring up his reasons in writing.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, Sir.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, how many hours of the House's time is the member for Mitcham allowed to occupy in writing out his reasons and in making them up as he goes along?

The Speaker having resumed the Chair:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I have to report that the honourable member for Mitcham has disagreed to my ruling in relation to remarks made by the Minister of Education, and I replied to the honourable member for Mitcham that I believed the motion dealt with the normally accepted processes of Parliamentary democracy.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Mitcham has moved to disagree to the Deputy Speaker's ruling that the Minister of Education is not in breach of Standing Orders in canvassing questions concerning the Upper House rather than the subject matter of the motion. At this stage I must uphold the ruling of the Deputy Speaker. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am sorry for you, Mr. Speaker, because apparently you were not listening to the debate in

your room, and you therefore do not know what has gone on.

The SPEAKER: Order! No reference must be made to that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: All right. Perhaps I should explain what has gone on. The Minister of Education has been speaking at some considerable length; I will not say more than that, but it was typical of him. The Minister spoke in opposition to the Leader's motion but, instead of canvassing the merits or demerits of the motion, he spent the whole of his speech, certainly the greater part of it in the last 10 minutes at least, discussing the Upper House and whether it is democratic or undemocratic, good or bad, upside down, or whatever it may be. On two occasions other members took points of order asking your Deputy to bring the Minister back to the subject matter of the debate; that was done first of all by the member for Goyder, and the Deputy Speaker brushed that aside. It was then done by the member for Davenport, and likewise he was brushed aside, and the Minister continued in the same vein. I then took a further point of order, which was also rejected, and accordingly I moved to disagree to the Deputy Speaker's ruling. At that stage you came back into the Chamber and resumed the Chair.

The reason for moving disagreement to your Deputy's ruling is that we have here a motion moved without notice by the Leader of the Opposition, and I may say very properly moved, this afternoon in view of the advertisement which appeared in this morning's newspaper. That motion concerns, as I said before you resumed the Chair, the propriety or otherwise of the action of the Government in inserting an advertisement in this morning's newspaper canvassing a Bill which is now before the House, in spending Government money in doing so and, frankly, in advancing Government and Labor Party policy on this matter.

Those are the matters which have been discussed by honourable members on this side and, I think, by one other Minister and the member for Spence from the other side. I know that in a debate much latitude is allowed, but certainly I do not believe that Standing Orders allow a Minister, in rebutting a motion of this kind, to dwell on matters which have nothing whatever to do with the debate. Times without number Speakers (both you, Sir and your predecessors) have pulled up members for discussing matters irrelevant to the subject of the debate. Why should that not have been done in the case of the Minister of Education as it is done in the case of any other member? Your Deputy refused three times to pull up the Minister of Education and to get him back to the subject matter of this debate. That is just too much. The Minister should be bound by the same rules of procedure (and he is bound by the same rules of procedure) in debate as is any other member. It is for those reasons that I have moved to disagree to your Deputy's ruling.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Mitcham has moved disagreement to the Speaker's ruling. Is the motion seconded?

Mr. HALL (Goyder): I second this motion and support the member for Mitcham, because it seems obvious that, in the absence of their Leader, the front bench cannot obey the Speaker. They would not adhere to his direction that they should maintain a proper stance in this debate and refer to the subject matter outlined in it. The reason is that they are obsessed at the moment with this disgraceful journey into Party politics. The A.L.P. machine is fuelled with public funds on this journey and they are obsessed with that to the degree that they are attacking their

traditional enemy rather than directing themselves to this debate. I have no liking for the practices which the Minister has outlined and which have occurred in the past in the Upper House, but that is not the subject matter of this debate, and it is not for us to go back over old ground after we have had the argument out previously in this place and after this House has played a leading role in democratizing the Upper House: that has gone and belongs to the past—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HALL: —and it is not now to be pursued by the Minister in this debate. It is quite clear that the Minister wilfully will not obey the Chair.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: He is obeying the Chair; it is only your opinion.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HALL: The problem is that the Deputy Speaker's direction was contained in advice and did not carry whatever strength is carried in this House by a ruling. Everyone who was present knows that the Deputy Speaker repeatedly advised the Minister to restrict himself to the terms of the motion and he would not do so. Now the honourable member's disagreement to the Deputy Speaker's ruling is brought up because the Deputy Speaker would not reinforce his advice with a ruling. It is as simple as that and as simple as the fact that the Minister is wilfully disobeying the rules of this House.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): It really is incredible that we should have such points of order raised and a motion to disagree to the Speaker's ruling. I have never heard anything so incredibly distorted as the remarks of the member for Goyder. The Deputy Speaker ruled on three separate occasions that there was no point of order. In each case I was confining my remarks most strictly to the motion. I would not—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I would not expect the member for Mitcham or the member for Goyder, or many other members of the Opposition, to be aware that I was confining myself directly to the motion, which says that the advertisement is in defiance of the normally accepted processes of Parliamentary democracy. I was pointing out that the normally accepted processes of Parliamentary democracy in my view would involve the existence of a democratically elected Upper House, which we have not got. One of the objections taken is to the advertisement about the Land Commission Bill, which has passed this House and is now before the Upper House, and we are told that the advertisement is incorrect because it is putting something before the public before this legislation has passed the Upper House. The nature and constitution of that other place is obviously highly relevant to the decisions of the Government regarding the placement of the advertisement and highly relevant in any judgment of what is or is not the normally accepted process of Parliamentary democracy. The trouble is—

Dr. Eastick: You are admitting that it's a bit of political skulduggery?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Nothing of the sort. The trouble is that every member of the Opposition, although they all voted for adult franchise, regards an Upper House, elected on a restricted franchise and acting undemocratically against a mandate given by the people at an election, as part of the normally accepted processes of Parliamentary democracy. That is what they want to argue.

Dr. Tonkin: Very specious!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is not specious at all; it is a fact. I am sorry members opposite are not able to

understand the argument, but the argument I was using related directly to the terms of the motion and the question of what is meant or what is not meant by the normally accepted processes of Parliamentary democracy, and what a Government can do in circumstances where the standards of Parliamentary democracy do not apply because of the nature and the constitution of the other place in this State. I support entirely the ruling of the Deputy Speaker and your ruling, Sir. I think the motion of disagreement is a complete attempt to waste time and just occupy the crease in this House.

The SPEAKER: If the honourable member for Mitcham speaks he closes the debate.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): The Minister of Education, who has been in much trouble in this House in the past 24 hours, has opposed this motion to disagree to your ruling and in doing so he compounded his offence by spending the whole of his time talking about the Upper House, because he tried to link up what he was saying earlier through the phrase "the normally accepted processes of democracy", well knowing that that phrase in this motion has nothing whatever to do with the franchise for the Upper House. It has to do with the propriety of the Government, at this stage in the debate on a Bill, inserting a full-page advertisement in the *Advertiser* to influence public opinion. That is the only point the Minister could make.

He threw in a bit of abuse, just for good measure, as he had nothing else to do, by saying that members on this side really cherished a restricted franchise. Even he does not believe that, because of what has happened. The only other point I refer to is the only other point that came out of the debate, which is the one made by the member for Goyder and which I overlooked making when I spoke. The first time the point was taken by the member for Goyder your Deputy would not accept it as a point of order, but he asked the Minister to confine his remarks to the Bill. He did not have the intestinal fortitude to give a ruling on the matter, but asked the Minister to confine his remarks to the Bill.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That is a reflection on the Chair.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That was a most eloquent admission of the strength of the point that had been taken by the member for Goyder, and I have no doubt it fortified the member for Davenport, and also me in moving this motion.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: He loves reflecting on the Chair, that bloke!

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (18)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Gunn, Hall, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (22)—Messrs. Broomhill, Max Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Groth, Harrison, Hudson (teller), Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Goldsworthy, Nankivell, and Rodda. Noes—Messrs. Dunstan, Hopgood, and McRae.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): There have been times when I have strayed from the subject matter of a motion, but I certainly did not do so today. The problem we have is of getting some understanding among Opposition members about what is meant by the

phrase "the normally accepted processes of Parliamentary democracy". The trouble is that what they regard as the normally accepted processes of Parliamentary democracy contain all sorts of undemocratic features that are not acceptable to the Government as normal or reasonable. Surely, Parliamentary democracy involves the election of Parliament at a general election. We have had that, and at the general election the policy was stated by the Premier. I quote from the Premier's policy speech as follows:

Labor will keep the price of land down. We will not in South Australia allow metropolitan land prices to escalate as they have done in Sydney, Melbourne, and Perth. In conjunction with the Commonwealth, land will be purchased, subdivided and placed on the market by Government authorities to ensure an adequate supply of land at a reasonable price.

The questions of price control and the establishment of a land commission were clearly stated by the Premier at the time of the previous election. People gave the Government the majority support, and no-one can deny that a clear mandate was given to implement that policy. The trouble is that we have forces at work within the community, some of them represented within the L.C.L., that seek to deny the effective implementation of that mandate. When the Government takes a counter-measure to try to get across to the public generally the nature of the policy that it is putting forward, again objection is taken by members of the Opposition, and an argument is put forward that the advertisement is misleading or not consonant with the normally accepted processes of Parliamentary democracy. The L.C.L. has been associated with the speculators all the time, and it is willing to contemplate action that will protect the interests of those who gain from speculation.

When we are speaking of the interests of the taxpayer and who is using taxpayers' money, it is worth remembering that millions of dollars is involved in the success or failure of the Government's proposals. If the Government's proposals are thrown out and, if land prices continue to escalate as they are doing, the losers will be the ordinary people of the community and the gainers will be those in our community who gain from speculation in land: the land millionaires. We have heard much about land millionaires in Victoria, but let us not fool ourselves into thinking that land millionaires have not been created in South Australia—not by their productive work or by any action they have taken in contributing to the development of the community, but simply because they happened to hold land that increased in value. People who hold rural land on the fringe of the metropolitan area which has changed in value from rural land values to values of between \$10 000 and \$20 000 an acre (.4 ha) have become millionaires or near millionaires through being lucky enough to hold on to that land.

Opposition members are apparently willing to support the continued existence of that practice, but the people who suffer are the general taxpayers of the community. When the Opposition is trying to defeat Government legislation on this matter, it is clear that it is going against the interests of the general taxpayers in the community and supporting that minority who hold the bulk of the wealth in the community and who stand to gain most from land speculation. They stand to gain most because they hold more of the land or, if they do not hold the land, they are financially able to buy up large tracts of land for speculative purposes. That is the group of people within the community that is being looked after by the actions of the L.C.L. The Opposition talks about the taxpayers'

money but, if land values continue to skyrocket as they are doing, without any effective action being taken by the Government, what will happen to the basis of valuation on which council rates are determined, to the basis of valuation on which land tax is determined, and to the basis of valuation on which water and sewerage rates are determined? Who will be the losers? The losers will be the ordinary taxpayers of the community.

When the Government acts to implement legislation with respect to the establishment of a land commission and with respect to price control on land, it is acting in the interests of the community as a whole, and in the interests of the general taxpayer. We have heard specious arguments that the advertisement is misleading. The only point I have not already taken up was made by one or two Opposition members who tried to say, in relation to point 2, that the statement that there is to be a three-member South Australian land commission was misleading, because the legislation has not yet been passed by Parliament. Yet, the very next sentence in the advertisement states that the Bill establishing the commission is now before Parliament. So, the advertisement makes clear the exact point which the Leader and the member for Goyder were making. That seems to me to be absolutely incredible. As the Minister of Works pointed out, there have been occasions on which a Liberal Government has used Government money to promote a policy it felt was in the interests of the community as a whole. The then Labor Opposition did not object to money being spent by the Hall Government in promoting Chowilla dam in the short time that it was able to promote it.

The Labor Opposition did not object when thousands of dollars of taxpayers' money was used for that purpose because it believed Chowilla to be in the interests of the community as a whole, just as we consider the proposals for a land commission and land price control to be in the best interests of the community as a whole. We are concerned not just with the young people of the community who are about to purchase land in order to build their own house but with every ordinary person in the community who already lives in a house. The ordinary person pays rates and taxes, and land values are a significant portion or the entire basis of the valuation of the land which he holds and which determines the taxes he pays. The trouble is that the Opposition has never been able to develop flexibility in attitude in relation to Government action. However, there were times when Sir Thomas Playford showed a certain amount of flexibility. He was willing to contemplate Government action, but we have, in the beguiling features of the Leader of the Opposition, one of the most doctrinaire advocates of private enterprise it is possible to imagine.

Dr. Eastick: What rot!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Leader looks after the land speculators, but it does not matter what the general interests of the community are, or that Parliamentary practices of democracy are inadequate. It does not matter that we have an Upper House elected, as it has been for years, on a restricted franchise. That does not matter, even though the L.C.L. Party had the minority of the votes in this State for several years.

Dr. Eastick: That's political skulduggery.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is not. The Leader is associated with a Party which has been instructed, no doubt, to defeat the legislation in the Upper House.

Dr. Eastick: What about waiting to see what happens first?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If the Leader can arrange with his colleagues (he belongs to the same Party as they do) to secure the passage of the Government's legislation, it would be unnecessary to wait.

Dr. Eastick: With all its socialistic policies!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As I say, the Leader is a doctrinaire advocate of private enterprise. Anything he does not like, he calls Socialism. Any action by a Government to purchase land to subdivide and sell to private individuals is Socialism to him. Of course, that is only what the Playford Government did through the Housing Trust, and what the trust still does. That is apparently not Socialism, because the Playford Government did it; the trust, under the Playford Government, purchased land, subdivided it and sold it off. As soon as I make a valid point, the Leader, that great advocate of the doctrine of Liberalism, says that it is Socialism, runs for cover, and says that I am talking about red herrings.

Dr. Eastick: I didn't use that term.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Leader and his colleagues, because they have not understood the Government's proposals or appreciated the extent of the mandate that exists for them, have opposed them all along. They hope to see them defeated in the Upper House. When the Government acts to try to even up the political balance a little (because of the undemocratic nature of the Upper House), they squeal, distort words, talk about the normally accepted processes of Parliamentary democracy, and make up charges of misleading advertisements in order to try to defeat the policy on which the Government was elected and for which it has a mandate. I hope that the Leader's motion is thrown out without any further ceremony.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I support the motion, because there has been not only a misuse of Parliamentary process but also a blatant abuse of Parliamentary privilege. The point about the matter that disturbs me most is the defiance that has been displayed of the normally accepted process of Parliamentary democracy. So far this afternoon members have heard 2¾ hours of debate on this matter which has covered all sorts of points, ranging from millionaires right through to the abuse of which previous Governments have supposedly been guilty. However, members have been getting away from the real issue, throwing red herrings across the trail.

This newspaper advertisement is an attempt to influence a Government decision at the taxpayers' expense, and little regard has been given to the proper Parliamentary process. I could ask whether the Government and the Premier intend to give the Opposition \$2 000 to enable it to publicize the other side of the story and, if they do not, why not. After all, the advertisement was inserted in advance of a law to be passed by this Parliament: it related to a proposed law. It would be equally as right for the Opposition to claim \$2 000 to enable it to campaign in this matter. Opposition members have been democratically elected in their districts, so why should they not have the same privileges?

In his opening remarks, the Deputy Premier admitted that this advertisement was intended to open a campaign to attract public attention to and arouse public interest in the matter. He referred to the Labor Party's policy speech in reference to keeping land prices down, and I openly admit that that was part of his Party's policy speech. He also claimed that the Government had a mandate to implement its policy. True, it did, but this should have been done through the proper Parliamentary process and

not by outside means that were unavailable to the Opposition. Why was it necessary to conduct the campaign in this manner? Why could not the Government go through the proper process?

The Deputy Premier also referred to the pamphlets and publications issued by the previous Government on the Chowilla issue. They involved Government policies that were stated in this House. The Minister of Transport said he was a member of a democratically elected Government that had a policy which was presented to the people in a democratic manner. He therefore claimed that he had a democratic right to use certain privileges. However, he does not have that right. The member for Spence tried to justify the Government's action regarding this advertisement in order to—

Mr. Crimes: It doesn't get into the paper generally, so why shouldn't we do this?

Mr. BLACKER: Why did the member for Spence have to justify the necessity to use this advertisement?

Mr. Crimes: To answer the lies and distortions that appear in the press from day to day.

Mr. BLACKER: The normal channels were open to the Government. Surely the Government is sufficiently attractive to the press to be able to—

Mr. Crimes: We don't own the press.

Mr. BLACKER: I realize that. However, the Government has the biggest team of press men possible, and they are unavailable to other sources. The Government has fobbed off the question by saying that the Opposition is defending speculators. This is merely drawing a red herring across the trail because this is not the issue at stake. The Government is using funds contrary to the processes of democracy, and is abusing the power given to it in a democratic election. The Minister of Education said at least three times that the Labor Party's policy was clearly stated and endorsed at the election, and that is not disputed. That policy was clearly publicized, and the Minister can rightly claim that the Government of which he is a member has a mandate from the people. However, that mandate involves the passing of legislation in this House in a proper manner. He said the problem was to put the policy into effect, and he went on to draw another red herring across the trail, referring to a difficulty being experienced with another place. He tried to justify the reasons for inserting the advertisement.

It seems strange that the Government, which has the majority in this House, as well as many press representatives and many public servants concerned with the various portfolios, has had to resort to using public funds to sell its view to the public, at the expense of the taxpayer. Land tax and water rates have been referred to in the debate, but they are totally irrelevant to this matter. If the former Liberal and Country League Government used money in the same way in the past, does it make this action by the Government correct? Do two wrongs make a right? They certainly do not. I must oppose the Government's action. No Government has the right to use other than the democratic process in an attempt to even up the "political balance", the words used by the Minister of Education, who would set out to even up the political balance by buying advertising at the taxpayers' expense. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. PAYNE (Mitchell): I oppose the motion.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you going to say anything about Myers?

Mr. PAYNE: If the member for Mitcham wants me to, I can give him quite a bit on Myers. However, in defer-

ence to your wishes, Mr. Speaker, I will try to adhere to the motion now before the Chair. First, I congratulate the member for Flinders, who has just resumed his seat, on something he said. Although I do not often find myself doing this when referring to Opposition members, I congratulate the member for Flinders on his honesty. He said that on the matter we are discussing today the Government had a clear mandate from the people. He made clear that he accepted that fact and did not argue that the Government ought not to be able to proceed on such a matter when it had a mandate from the people. I could not say that other Opposition speakers have been as honest in their contributions to the debate. However, I take minor issue with the member for Flinders.

He was trying to show that there was some undesirable change from normal Parliamentary processes by the Government's placing an advertisement of this type in a newspaper. I do not think he has really examined the advertisement. He is apparently trying to suggest that the mere publication of information in a newspaper (and the advertisement consists of information) somehow interferes with Parliamentary processes. With other members on this side, I cannot see what he is driving at. The Government has simply made available in a form that is clear and easy to read information for the benefit of the people of this State. The Government of a State does not exist for its own purposes: it exists for the benefit of the people of that State. Therefore, despite the honesty that the honourable member displayed in more than half of his speech, I cannot accept the latter point that he tried to make.

The member for Goyder was one of the Opposition members who spoke earlier. Although I have been a member for about 3½ years, I have never ceased to be amazed at the gymnastic ability of the honourable member to espouse, apparently sincerely and fiercely, various points of view. However, he does not always present the same point of view about the same subject. In a case such as this, it is better to give an example. Today, I heard the honourable member going on about the impropriety of the Government in using this sort of tactic. Yet earlier this year (and one would think the honourable member could remember that far back), when speaking to another matter, he is reported to have said, at page 100 of *Hansard*:

The community lacks confidence in a Government that will not say what it will do.

However, when this Government says publicly in the largest newspaper in the State what it has done and will do, the honourable member does not agree with that any more.

Mr. Hall: It isn't what it is doing—it's the way it's doing it.

Mr. PAYNE: It is only a few months since the honourable member advocated a point of view quite different from the point of view that he has put forward on this occasion. Let the honourable member explain that. He cannot do so, because the Government is taking people into its confidence. I well recall listening to the honourable member on another occasion develop to some extent his theory about open Government. The Labor Party and this Government do not disagree at all with that type of argument; on the contrary, we do not just talk about open Government, we practise it.

Mr. Gunn: You insist on wasting taxpayers' money. You only want to put one side of the argument. What about letting the other group put its side of the picture?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Standing Orders provide for one member to speak at a time, and the present speaker is the honourable member for Mitchell.

Mr. PAYNE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In transgressing Standing Orders, the honourable member referred to a waste of money. I have doubts sometimes about the value he gives for the salary he receives. That is only my opinion but, as I am forced often to listen to the absolute drivel he propounds, I believe I have some qualification to judge whether he gives value for money. This motion was carelessly moved by the Leader, who tried to suggest that the Government had been guilty of not presenting, in the advertisement, the entire truth. He disagreed with one or two points in the advertisement. Earlier speakers from this side of the House have clearly established the absolute truth of those points. The third point in the advertisement states:

Then there's to be land price control to remove speculators from the land market. A Bill now before Parliament will provide the Government with the power to do this.

One member opposite has said that this is misleading advertising. Does any member doubt that the Government is setting out to remove speculators from the land market? That is the guts of the matter. Speculation was the cause of the astronomical rise in land prices in this State, until the Government stepped in and made its ruling in relation to sales after a certain date in May this year. All members can give examples from their personal experience to prove that what I am saying is true. For the block on which I built my house 22 years ago, I paid \$170. A block in my street that remained vacant until about 18 months ago was sold at that time for more than \$6 000. I think that all members would agree that we cannot afford to see this kind of increase continue.

Mr. Chapman: Have you sold your place?

Mr. PAYNE: No, I still have it. As it is a war service house, I would be rather foolish to dispose of it. After the Second World War, the Commonwealth Government made available to ex-servicemen money at a fair and reasonable rate of interest on houses of this type. Apart from that, I like the house. I have not heard from Opposition members in this debate any reference to speculation in land. I have had matters brought to my attention recently that I believe will be of interest to honourable members. I understand that one organization in this field, called Holiday International, tells its members that its sole aim is to purchase land throughout the metropolitan area and farther out. One of the articles of the charter of that organization is that all members must agree not to sell any land until it has appreciated 700 per cent—not 100 per cent or 200 per cent but 700 per cent! Everyone will agree that that is getting a little beyond what one may call a reasonable profit. No doubt, many people who join that organization do not think of what we may call the ethics of the situation. They are probably people like most of us here who in some way believe they are doing something for the benefit of their children, and so on, but at the same time there is no doubt that they are actively contributing to the escalation of land prices. This aspect of land transactions, where there is no intention by the people holding the land to build on it, illustrates the more serious side of the speculation that goes on. It is this kind of thing that the Government has set out to tackle.

Mr. Chapman: By advertising its land policy at public expense.

Mr. PAYNE: Unfortunately, the member who has just interjected missed the early and telling part of my speech; otherwise, he would not have made that interjection, because I made clear to all members of the

House that the Government does not exist for its own benefit: it exists for the benefit of the people and devotes its whole time to spending public money on behalf of the people who have elected it by a large majority. Let us get that clear. The Government is constantly called on to make decisions about expenditures of money, whether it be for the Housing Trust to build some houses, whether it be to lay more pipes in a water programme, or whether it be to fulfil an equally important function of putting before the people the vital and absolute truth in a matter. Also, in answer to that interjection, we make available our policy, apart from the public media, in our own publications, and those members on the opposite side of the House think so much of our policy that they keep referring to it and carry around in their pockets our little hand-book.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: They have no policy of their own, and they want to find out what they are opposed to; they do not know.

Mr. PAYNE: Let us deal with another aspect of this motion which refers to "normally accepted processes of Parliamentary democracy". I suppose one may be excused for wondering, in effect, what the devil that last part of the motion means anyway, because what are "accepted processes of Parliamentary democracy"? I have spent much time in this Chamber listening to members opposite espousing the cause of bicameral government: there must always be two Houses, one to sit in judgment on the other, and all that clap-trap we have been fed for so long by members opposite. Yet I have never heard them before say, or even suggest, that this kind of democratic Parliamentary process that they refer to should be conducted in absolute isolation, that it should in some way be treated as I imagine jurors are treated, when they are locked up for the entire duration of their deliberations with no access to them by any of the media. Or are members opposite suggesting that the fact that the truth is made available to the people will result in pressure being brought to bear on them by those people who helped to elect the present State Government, to ensure that they refrain from opposing the Government's measures? I have a feeling that this is much nearer the truth, although it was never mentioned by members opposite. That is what they meant by trying to say that the advertisement was in defiance of the "normally accepted processes of Parliamentary democracy". On our side of the House we welcome the normal processes of Parliamentary democracy. We regard the electors of this State (and, remember, we have a different view on this matter, too: all the electors being equal, they should have the same weight in a vote, and so on) as having every right to know all the facts possible about the issues, and we regard them as having every right to approach their member of Parliament.

The Deputy Premier, speaking earlier this afternoon in opposing the motion, pointed out that we on this side have often been able to witness direct approaches being made to members of the Liberal and Country League within the House on matters which at the time were before the Chamber. Some of the people concerned can be easily identified as they are well-known. We have seen apparent approaches occur and members have then come back into the Chamber to support a certain measure. We do not object to that; we have not objected in the past. This is one of the ordinary democratic Parliamentary processes by which people who have something to say and put forward on an issue can see their members of Parliament.

Why the devil is putting something in the press for everyone in the State to see any different? I cannot find anywhere any exhortation from the Government for any person to do anything. The advertisement simply puts before people the true facts of what the Government proposes in its legislation. To take up more time on such a puerile motion is not necessary. I am certain that speakers on this side of the House have disposed of the few weak points made in support of the motion by members opposite. As I sit down, I make clear that I utterly oppose the motion.

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): I support the motion. I do not desire to repeat many of the strong arguments presented from this side of the House but one or two points I think must be dealt with. A Minister this afternoon has said that procedure must be flexible but, in my opinion, the Government has been a little too flexible in this matter and has advertised in the newspaper on something that has not yet been fully decided by this Parliament. I agree with the motion, which states that this action is costly and misleading. It is costly because taxpayers' money is being used in a manner that should be reserved for other purposes. As regards the misleading aspect, it is not always what is said that counts: very often it is what is left unsaid that counts. I draw honourable members' attention to point 2 of the advertisement, which states:

There's to be a three member South Australian Land Commission. The Bill establishing this is now before Parliament.

Correct! The advertisement continues:

The Land Commission will buy or acquire broad acres and release it as demand requires, to help keep land prices down. Both State and Federal Governments will supply funds to allow the commission to do this. It will make sure orderly development occurs, too, so that costs are kept down in providing services like water, sewerage and electricity. In most cases the commission's land will be privately developed—but if it's necessary, to keep prices down, in special cases the commission will do the job itself. The impression that people will gain is that the land will be freehold, and I challenge members opposite on this fact. I make this challenge, because no mention has been made whether the land will be available under a leasehold system, yet the Bill concerning this matter provides for this system. I challenge the Government on this omission, because it is about this point that something should have been said but about which nothing has been said.

True, the sale price of land can perhaps be kept down and this target achieved, but what is the situation concerning the rent that must be paid? What other charges will the Government make? Statements have been made on behalf of the Government and members opposite have accused people of acquiring land, thereby causing the escalation in the price of land. I suggest that it is the Government's objective to secure land and keep it in its own possession by providing land on a leasehold basis. Another point I wish to stress is that I consider this advertisement appeared as a result of the debate on the Bill in question by members on this side. The debate must have been impressive and most effective to cause the Government such concern.

This has been a most costly exercise for the taxpayer, because it has been too flexible as far as Parliamentary procedure is concerned. Further, I believe the advertisement is incorrect as it is misleading to the extent that no mention is made whether land acquired by the Land Commission will be leasehold land rather than freehold. I support the motion.

Mr. WRIGHT (Adelaide): Of course, I oppose the motion. Before commencing on my deliberations, I point

out that this motion represents probably the greatest political blunder made by the Leader of the Opposition since his appointment as Leader last year. If ever a situation developed beyond the control of members opposite, this is it, because I am sure that in no circumstances did they want the debate on this matter to continue for as long as it has. Further, as far as the Government is concerned, the display by members opposite has been beautiful, and I support members opposite at least for thinking about this matter if not for raising it. However, the most despicable statement made in this House on this matter was by the former Leader of the Parliamentary Liberal and Country League and present Leader of the Liberal Movement, the member for Goyder. I suppose he will be a Senator if he is fortunate enough to get 16⅔ per cent of the votes in May or June next year, whenever the Senate election is held. In this House, that honourable member called the Premier a coward. In my opinion that is the worst statement that has been made here, particularly as it was made in the absence of the other party. The honourable member does not show courage by talking like that behind a man's back. There is no courage shown when the honourable member says it in the coward's castle, as he has done.

If he wants to call a man a coward, he ought to do it in the street, where the other person can either punch him on the nose or take action for defamation against him. For a member in this House to accuse a man who is not here of being a coward because he is doing something that he was given a mandate for is the most cowardly and dastardly act that I have known in this place. Of course, other statements made today need close examination and I am pleased that the motion has been moved. As I have said, it gives us an opportunity not only to discuss the situation but also to adopt the tactics that we required to be adopted (today, in any case). The Opposition has taken strong objection to the way the Minister of Education has dealt with members opposite, but I congratulate him on his speech, because it has been the best speech made in this debate.

Mr. Gunn: Yesterday's exhibition was even worse.

Mr. WRIGHT: I thought his speech yesterday was good, too, but I commend him on his speech today, because I think it was much better. He introduced the very matter that the Opposition avoided introducing, namely, the truth of the matter of the normally accepted processes of Parliamentary democracy. The Opposition has not any democracy. Members opposite say much about it, but I do not think three of them could even spell the word. They have hidden behind the cloak of the Legislative Council for so long that, when the position is exposed to them here, none of them can accept it. The important point about the advertisement is that there is nothing wrong with it, and no member opposite has proved otherwise. The Opposition has tried to make political play and say that, because the Premier has endorsed the advertisement, he is endorsing Australian Labor Party policy. Of course, he is not doing that. He is endorsing Government policy as contained in legislation already introduced in this House. We all know that, irrespective of what happens to the legislation in the Legislative Council, there is no doubt that it will be passed in this House, although it may be amended here. To say that this advertisement is a misleading document that contravenes Parliamentary democracy is utter rubbish and, as I have said, the Opposition made one of its most blatant blunders at its Caucus meeting today, or the Leader blundered.

Dr. Tonkin: No. Caucus is your meeting.

Mr. WRIGHT: There is not much doubt that the Opposition has a meeting every Wednesday, but I am not sure whether the decision to move this motion was made by the Opposition Caucus. Nevertheless, the decision was the greatest political blunder you have made, because you have been answered on every facet of your argument. There has not been one facet of your argument to which a logical defence has not been put forward. You have been given the greatest caning that you have ever had in this House. As the Minister of Education said, if the motion has done nothing else it has promoted some debate in this House. I have often heard you make the accusation that Government members do not speak often enough but, if you throw down the gauntlet sufficiently, you will find that many Government members are willing to defend the actions of the Government. The whole point is that usually you cannot mount sufficient opposition to stir even the strongest characters on this side to get up and answer you. There is no question that either last week or early this week you have been—

Dr. TONKIN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I really cannot allow the member for Adelaide to continue, in error, addressing you as "Mr. Speaker" and then appearing to talk about you in the third person, when I think he is probably referring to members of the Opposition.

The SPEAKER: The procedure of the House is, of course, that a member can refer to another member only by the title to which he is entitled. I draw the attention of the honourable member for Adelaide to that fact.

Mr. WRIGHT: I am not sure what the member for Bragg is talking about, because I merely referred to you, Mr. Speaker, in the way I learnt when you taught us how to conduct ourselves in this House. The member for Bragg is as far off the track as he usually is. Oscar Wilde once said:

Do not say you agree with me. When people agree with me I always feel I must be wrong. Surely what has happened here today is a classic example of that. When Opposition members disagree with the Government, it certainly makes up my mind that the Government is acting correctly. About two weeks ago, when the Land Commission Bill was discussed in this House, land speculators were sitting in the gallery with sour looks on their faces while Government members were speaking but those same land speculators had sweet smiles on their faces when the member for Bragg spoke. I took particular notice of what happened. During the evening I happened to walk outside, and the member for Bragg was having a good discussion with the land speculators, and there were smiles on their faces. As the land speculators entered the lounge one of them said, "That was a great speech," and the member for Bragg replied, "Oh, that was only grandstanding; wait until I really get going." How correct Oscar Wilde was! I am very pleased that the Opposition does not agree with the Government's attitude to the motion, and I oppose the motion.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I should like to push aside the rantings and ravings of the gentleman opposite and return to the advertisement that appeared in the newspaper. The first line of that advertisement says:

What is the Government doing about rising land prices? A far more suitable question would be: what has the Government done about rising land prices up until now? About 18 months ago a group of developers approached the Premier and pointed out to him that insufficient land was being subdivided to meet the likely demand in the

following two years. Because the Premier scoffed at their claim and failed to take action at that stage, we have the present situation, where there is a demand for land of about 10 000 lots per annum, and the supply is falling far short of that. If there is short supply, the price will rise, and that is exactly what is happening in our present situation. So, through the advertisement, the Government is trying to cover up the actual situation. The Minister of Transport asked for information as to where the advertisement was grossly misleading; I refer him to the following part of the advertisement:

Point 1: It's streamlining its own operations. At the administrative level, the Government's acting to ensure that the Public Service makes land transactions as quick and easy as possible.

Government members have been trying to support that case, but we should consider whether the facts support the case, and they clearly do not. As a valid example, I refer to a case that occurred in one of the northern suburbs of Adelaide. The land developer concerned had unofficially taken plans to the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Highways Department and the State Planning Office. He then took the plans to the local council, which suggested certain alterations. He returned the plans to the council on February 28 of this year. The amended plans were then lodged with the State Planning Office on March 30. On April 4 copies were sent to the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Highways Department, the local council and the Lands Department. In a communication the developer says:

This also is to eliminate time and to orientate all the departments with our layout. On May 11, I approached the State Planning Office and saw an officer and explained to him in detail how urgent it was to us to get approval before May.

The department was contacted, but it could not see the surveyor until May 15. The communication continues:

The new amended plan then was lodged on May 18. On May 22 we physically, to save time, delivered the copies from the State Planning Office to the E. & W.S. Department and the Highways Department. On June 30 the council approved the new plan subject to 16 conditions—the major condition was the alteration to the layout, which meant the loss of two blocks. Our surveyor, on July 13, inquired of the State Planning Office the progress of the approval. The clerk informed us they were waiting for replies from the Surveyor-General and the council.

The council had already granted permission on June 30, and 13 days later the State Planning Office claimed that it was waiting on the council. The communication continues:

On August 8 we contacted the State Planning Office to inquire the progress of the application. We were then informed that they were waiting on a letter from the Highways Department. On August 19 I contacted the department myself and they informed me that they had not received a letter of approval from the council.

On August 19 it was still being claimed that the council had not granted approval, or at least sent a letter indicating approval. That approval was submitted by the council on June 30. He then returned to the council to find that, on May 22, a letter was delivered from the council. To this date, approval is still being awaited on this block of land. It has taken, after unofficial Government approval, from February 28 to October 10, and still no approval has been granted.

That is one of many cases of delay by the State Planning Office and associated Government bodies of approval for development. It is for this reason that land prices have risen: approvals have been held up. One wonders whether the Government has not deliberately delayed applications for approval for subdivision so that a situation would arise where land prices would increase, creating a favourable environment in which to implement this legislation. I have

quoted one case and I shall quote further instances of the length of time taken for bodies to receive form A approval—and this is after initial discussions with various Government departments, seeking their unofficial approval.

Case B occurred at Kidman Park. On October 27, 1972, full details and plans were lodged and approval eventually was granted on April 18, 1973, a delay of six months. In case C, the forms were lodged on June 4, 1972, and approval was finally granted on February 14, 1973, a delay of eight months. In case D, the forms were lodged on March 30, 1973, and to this day approval of form A has not been granted. Those are some of many cases. I could go through my file of such cases to substantiate my argument regarding delays in approval for subdivision. This is why land values have increased. There is sufficient land in the pipeline, so to speak, to ensure that, if approval was being pushed through as quickly as possible, the value of land in this State would drop dramatically.

Mr. Evans: There are 11 000 blocks in the pipeline.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Yes, 11 000 blocks and the total annual demand in the State is 10 000, clearly showing that the price of land would level out and probably drop if the State Planning Authority and associated bodies would push through these approvals. To reply to the comments of the Minister of Transport, we see first a most important area in which the advertisement of the Government has been quite misleading. It claimed to be ensuring that transactions were being processed as quickly and as easily as possible, but that is definitely not the case and I have produced facts to prove it. By inserting the advertisement in the newspaper today (and I understand there are similar advertisements on radio and television), the Government has tried to short-circuit the Parliamentary processes.

The Minister of Education was the one person opposite who tried to defend the Government's action more strongly than anyone else. Other members, as on previous occasions, raised red herrings, attacking the L.C.L. for trying to support land agents (which is not the case), and attacking us for this and that, but they did not come to the real crunch of what we are debating today. The Minister of Education, despite points of order taken by me and other members, carried on a great tirade against the Legislative Council, but the Legislative Council has not yet voted on either of the Bills presented; it has just started to debate the first of them. Obviously, the advertisement was planned over the weekend, yet we saw the Minister of Education blaming the Legislative Council for the necessity to insert the advertisement, although the Council, at the time of the planning of the advertisement, had not debated the Bills. His entire argument is therefore without foundation.

He has picked on the Legislative Council as an emotional issue to throw up to the South Australian public. He is trying to drag up a red herring, but again the facts show that the red herring was not even there when the advertisement was planned. I wonder, as a member on this side said, why this advertisement is appearing now and why it was not delayed until both Bills had gone through both Houses. If the Government had intended to make a case, I would have thought that would be the time to do it. Instead, it has tried to legislate through the press rather than through the normal democratic procedures of this House and the other place. The A.L.P. in this State has created an unfortunate precedent by legislating through the press, using Government funds, public funds, the funds of the people of South Australia, to finance that legislation.

Furthermore, the legislation refers to two Bills that are before the House or that have been debated and voted

on by this House. The first related to the Land Commission. Members opposite claimed that the Premier had a mandate for that Bill, but in his policy speech of February 19, 1973, he said:

In conjunction with the Commonwealth, land will be purchased, subdivided, and placed on the market by Government authorities to ensure an adequate supply of land at a reasonable price.

Yet when we read the Bill we see "leasehold" in it. Obviously, the Government intends to lease out the land, not to sell it. The Premier has a mandate to sell that land, but not to lease it. Again, we see the misleading ways of the A.L.P. Government in inserting this advertisement. The other Bill deals with prices in an effort to place a fixed interest rate on the increase in land prices, and also to place a reasonable value on houses that are built. The Minister of Transport and the Minister of Education made a great plea about trying to produce low-cost housing and low-cost land in this State. That Bill is to come before this House shortly but will have the effect of increasing the value of housing.

The second point made in the advertisement claiming that the value of houses will be held down through the legislation is inaccurate; it will in fact increase the value of houses. Unfortunately, before making the foolish statement in the press through the use of Government funds, the Government had not had the patience to allow the issue to be debated in this House. It allowed the Premier to give the second reading explanation, but did not allow the Opposition a chance to put forward a case suggesting that the legislation may not work. It is unfortunate that the Government has seen fit to take the unfair and unjust action of using public funds for such an advertisement. It is against the best interests of a democracy, against the traditional procedures of our Parliament, and is certainly an abuse of public moneys. I fully support the motion.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) moved:

That the question be now put.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (22)—Messrs. Broomhill, Max Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Groth, Harrison, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King (teller), Langley, McKee, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Noes (16)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick (teller), Evans, Gunn, Hall, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Tonkin, and Venning.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Dunstan, Hopgood, and McRae.
Noes—Messrs. Goldsworthy, Rodda, and Wardle.

Majority of 6 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

The House divided on Dr. Eastick's motion:

Ayes (16)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick (teller), Evans, Gunn, Hall, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Tonkin, and Venning.

Noes (22)—Messrs. Broomhill, Max Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran (teller), Crimes, Duncan, Groth, Harrison, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Goldsworthy, Rodda, and Wardle. Noes—Messrs. Dunstan, Hopgood, and McRae.

Majority of 6 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

WETLANDS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Arnold:

That in the opinion of this House all remaining wet-lands in South Australia should be preserved for the conservation of wildlife, and where possible former wet-lands should be rehabilitated.

(Continued from September 12. Page 709.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I support the motion and congratulate the member for Chaffey on the amount of detail he has presented to the House. I believe that Government members will be pleased to support the motion. So that the Minister of Environment and Conservation can participate in the debate in due course, beyond saying that I support the motion and commend it to the House I have no further comment to make.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Millhouse:

That this House disapproves of the intention of the Federal Government to reduce or cut out altogether grants to certain independent schools and is of opinion that the State Government should, by additional grants, make up to those independent schools so affected what they will lose from the Commonwealth,

which the Minister of Education had moved to amend by striking out all words after "That" and inserting the following:

this House recognizing that the recommendations of the Interim Committee of the Australian Schools Commission—

- (1) represent a charter for improved educational standards for the vast majority of Australian schools, both Government and non-government; and
- (2) that as a consequence for the first time in Australia, all school students can expect in future years to receive an education which will develop their particular talents to the fullest possible extent;

approves the action of the Australian Government in accepting those recommendations.

(Continued from September 12. Page 722.)

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): A small school, called Marbury, has been started in my area recently but, unfortunately, it has been included in the list of schools that will be excluded from Commonwealth Government financial assistance. I do not believe that a thorough enough investigation was made of the school's requirements. The school property is not owned by the school, which carries a heavy mortgage on the property and which is only a little over two years old. Yet the Commonwealth Government has, in effect, said to the school, "You have too many resources. You are in the rich class. We cannot support you." No valid argument exists to support the Commonwealth Government's action in this case, and what has happened is unjust. The people involved in the running of the school deserve credit, though it is not the kind of school I have chosen for the education of my children.

It is a school in which there is much freedom for a child to develop in his own way and at his own pace, which is the modern concept of thinking of many people. A group of citizens set about creating the school, but they have been penalized by the Commonwealth Government, which has said that it is interested in the education of all children regardless of the financial resources or the wishes of their parents. What has happened to Marbury is wrong. I believe that the Minister of Education would agree with me that what has happened is wrong. My wife and I have chosen not to send our children to a private school, as we would not like to have them educated

there. We are satisfied with State schools, so I have no personal interest in the private school concept. However, I accept that, if people pay taxes and if money is available to help educate children, those people should be entitled to receive money towards the education of their children.

That is not the case with the Commonwealth Government, which believes that, because a school may have some assets, the parents of the school's children do not deserve any help in educating their children, even though they may be in the lower-income bracket. A husband and wife may make terrific sacrifices because they believe there is an advantage in sending their children to one of the A classification schools, as classified by the Commonwealth Government. Such parents may make greater sacrifices than parents who send their children to State schools, even though they may be on the same income level. I suppose it has cost the taxpayers in my case about \$1 500 a year for the last five or six years to educate my children; yet other people, who may be in the same income bracket as I, will be denied any help from the Commonwealth Government. This cannot be justified. I agree that perhaps the schools which have the greatest need (although I prefer it to be done on the basis of the child's or the parents' need) should be given more money, but it is wrong to discontinue the grant to Marbury.

This procedure is not what the Prime Minister promised before the last Commonwealth election he would do. If he breaks one promise he will surely break more, and he cannot be trusted. There are doubts about the future, because the Prime Minister does not always keep his promises. The Minister's amendment is a smart alec way of trying to get around the purpose of the motion moved by the member for Mitcham. Marbury has been unjustly treated, as have many other schools, but it is a school of which I have some knowledge. There is no justification for saying that parents who send their children to an A classification school are not entitled to any financial help, when they themselves could be in poor financial circumstances. They make sacrifices by the wife working at night while the husband looks after the children. I know of one such case in my area. I support the motion.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I have been extremely surprised at the attitude taken by Opposition members regarding the recommendations of the Karmel committee and the position the Australian Government has taken with respect to that committee's recommendations, which placed Commonwealth Government assistance to education on a sound, firm and reasonable footing, both in Government and non-government schools, in a way which has never been done before and which is a distinct advance on attitudes to financial assistance to education that have been adopted in the past. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

URBAN LAND (PRICE CONTROL) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 23. Page 500.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): All members will realize that the title of this Bill is a misnomer, as it says this is an Act to provide for price control upon certain land; to amend the Prices Act, 1948-1972; and for other purposes. It does not really spell out the extent of the intended intrusion on the public and, more particularly, on the housing industry. Clearly, many of the statements made earlier today and those made recently

regarding other Bills will apply equally to this Bill. Some of the material that has already been used will be used again, so that the impact of this measure can be illustrated. Certainly, the Premier's announcement, which appears in the most recent edition of the *Sunday Mail*, is a clear sham that has now been exposed on many occasions, particularly where it relates to a supposed delay on certain measures by Opposition members in this House and by our colleagues in another place.

The true facts on this matter have been clearly put to the people, and it should not have been necessary to do so again: we in this House have been denied the opportunity to debate the matter because it has been set aside by the Premier and other Ministers who were from time to time in charge of the conduct of business in this Chamber. The measures about which complaints have been made were not being held up in this House or in another place, because members did not have an opportunity to scrutinize them. However, sufficient has been said on that matter.

The intrigue surrounding this matter and the baseless comment made by the Premier in his weekend announcement have been a mere drop in the ocean when one compares them to the information which was made available in this morning's press and which again failed to highlight the principle in respect of all these matters. That we had discovered an expenditure of \$2 000 of the taxpayers' money in this manner, together with the claim by Government members, particularly the member for Spence, that other announcements of this nature will be made, clearly proves that Government members have no conscience at all when it comes to squandering the taxpayers' money. I refer now to the September, 1973, newsletter of the Housing Industry Association, some contents of which fit in well with certain aspects of the Bill. The editorial on page 3 of that newsletter asks, "How the hell is it all going to work out?" Everyone has doubts as to how it will work out. It was necessary for the State Ministers to meet in Melbourne last Friday week because many of them, of both political persuasions, were concerned how to implement the measures directed to their attention by the centralist Government in Canberra.

Mr. Burdon: By the Australian Government.

Dr. EASTICK: I call it the centralist Government, as that term is certainly more descriptive of it and, indeed, it is certainly more truthful. The Premier having indicated that all who attended that meeting have reached general agreement and that the matter is to be further discussed with the Commonwealth Government, Opposition members await with interest the results that flow from the meeting. We will be interested to see what changes occur over the whole scene as a result of the Commonwealth Government's acceptance or otherwise (and I suggest its acceptance) of the points of view expressed at that meeting. Members have no knowledge of what happened at the meeting other than having been told by the Premier that general agreement was reached. The need for all concerned to get together in this way indicates a realization that changes should occur. The editorial continues:

Let us assess some previous Government statements concerning housing, both Federal and State. We have announcements of more money for housing followed by tighter loans for housing and suggestions of some sort of control on building societies, which can only mean less funds for housing loans from this quarter. We have announcements of increases in some interest rates. We have announcements of decreases in other interest rates and, to further complicate matters, we are blessed with an increased bond rate of something in the order of 8 per cent. How the hell this is going to work out is anybody's guess. If this

isn't the biggest headache of all time, we have our State Government attempting to legislate for price control on land and housing. Does or has price control ever been instrumental in giving the general public the cheapest possible prices? If it has or does, then why was it ever dropped from our economy in favour of control by competition? However, be that as it may, we have a frightening inflationary problem and the Government is taking action in an attempt to overcome it.

I do not know whether the editorial is referring to the State Government or to the centralist Government. We know from the Premier's announcements in this Chamber that it is certainly a Government that has refused to face reality and to realize the co-operation that is needed at all levels to overcome inflation. The Prime Minister has also refused to do this, as is illustrated in a letter which I received from him last evening and in which he says that, following a discussion I had with him in Adelaide two weeks ago, he cannot accede to my request for a discussion at all levels to consider the problem of inflation.

The agenda for the Premiers' Conference in Canberra tomorrow is a narrow one, relating as it does only to local government representation on the Loan Council. State Premiers across Australia have asked the Prime Minister to broaden the agenda so that they can come face to face with inflation and discuss the matter with the Prime Minister in an attempt to solve the problem. However, they have been denied that opportunity. This afternoon, members opposite said that they were interested in the welfare of the people of this State. It will be interesting to see whether, at the meeting in Canberra tomorrow, Labor Premiers will grasp the nettle and get down to a meaningful discussion on all aspects of inflation. An attack on inflation will be meaningful only when there is a spirit of total co-operation. The editorial to which I have referred highlights the need for us to deal with the total problem of inflation before we can come face to face with the problems connected with land and houses. The editorial states:

They are attacking the problems on all fronts, and at the present time the only thing that is predictable is that a result is absolutely certain one way or the other.

It could be said that that is a backhanded sort of compliment, but it is a statement of fact. The Government does not know where it is going; it will not accept co-operation; it will find a solution, but it does not know what it will be. The editorial continues:

In the meantime, we reiterate our advice of a couple of months ago: tighten your belts, dig in, plan your future business to withstand a solid battering, and let's hope the storm passes over.

That is not a very happy situation for anyone to be in. Much of the public debate, and the material in the newspaper advertisement, which was the subject of an earlier motion, is an intrusion into the affairs of the public. It is poorly conceived; it ignores facts; and it is destined to worsen the already chaotic situation, which is Government-made, in this State. The provisions forthcoming from this Administration have been inadequate in certain areas. On several occasions, the Premier has sought and received expert advice from people in the land business. Over two years ago, such people told him that to pursue the course he was pursuing would lead to difficulties. Unfortunately, we cannot hear from the Premier any possible rebuttal of that statement.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You will.

Dr. EASTICK: I hoped that it could be at the close of the second reading debate.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: He'll tell you in Committee.

Dr. EASTICK: That is nice. At least we know that consideration of this Bill which, according to the Government, is so vital and important will not be completed immediately.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I told you that last week.

Dr. EASTICK: Yes, but it would be nice to obtain this information from the Premier before the Committee stage. I do not suggest that all advice given to the Premier or to anyone else can be followed, but at least it can be compared with other advice and considered in the spirit in which it is given. This advice was not followed through. I do not refute the statements contained in the report referred to this afternoon by the Minister of Works. However, since that report was compiled, land has become increasingly unavailable, and this comes back to the inability of the Lands Titles Office, the State Planning Office, and the servicing branches to honour their obligation, making it possible for more parcels of land to be made available.

The best way to try to cover tracks and move away from the facts of life after one has refused to accept advice is to put up a smoke screen, such as we have seen from the Premier, who has attacked members of another place, as did the Minister of Education this afternoon. This is sheer political skulduggery in an attempt (and I stress that it is an attempt, because the public will cause it to fail) to take the heat off the Government for its failures. In the present inflationary situation in the housing industry, little or scant regard has been had to several factors. The situation has not been helped by the actions of this Government, and certainly not by those of the Commonwealth Government. The alteration in immigration policy has reduced the number of people available to work in the building industry, with the result that there is a major shortage of manpower. I accept that, in part, this is a world-wide problem. However, by closing the door on these skilled workers, who have always looked to come to Australia, we have aggravated the situation, certainly in South Australia.

Mr. Crimes: You would rather have a surplus of labour?

Dr. EASTICK: The Commonwealth and State Governments have markedly increased expenditure in the public zone, and this has not been done to create a balance between the private and public sectors. This increased spending in the public zone, which has removed building resources needed to meet demands from the private sector, has inevitably led to increased costs. This has contributed to the situation that exists in South Australia today where an inflation rate of 18 per cent is acknowledged—

Mr. Crimes: Why blame it on the public sector?

Dr. EASTICK:—in the building industry.

Mr. Crimes: What about the financial pages of the press?

Dr. EASTICK: I have not said that the Government should totally withdraw; indeed, I pointed out that there should be a balanced approach recognizing the responsibilities in both the private and the public sectors. However, the attitude now pursued by both the State and Commonwealth Governments is leading to problems in this area. I refer to the Government's statement of intention to completely remove speculators from the housing industry, although this will destroy the present industrial base of the industry which has provided in South Australia housing that is second to none in Australia. Further, it will destroy a situation where it is recognized that 40 per cent of housing in South Australia is supplied by speculators.

The Opposition does not suggest that it would tolerate activities by individuals against normal business ethics, yet

if we eliminate the speculator and so remove from the building industry the group responsible for constructing 40 per cent of our housing, we will throw the responsibilities of building back on to individuals or on to the public sector. This will create regimentation, or would the member for Spence rather describe it as nationalization?

Mr. Crimes: I don't mind.

Dr. EASTICK: That is in keeping with the honourable member's philosophy, which he expressed so ably this afternoon. The housing industry has benefited many in our community over a long period. I refer particularly to the situation in which a person can purchase his house at the foundation stage and then take an active interest in its construction. That opportunity would be completely eliminated by the measure we are now asked to accept. There are many other aspects of the industry that have worked to the advantage of the community at large, especially the ownership of a person's own home and property, the opportunity to achieve which will be destroyed by this Bill.

It is pleasing to note in the amendments to be moved by the Premier (on which we cannot comment now) that the almost impossibly complicated formula previously incorporated in the Bill has been removed. This formula would have created a situation where anyone unable to use a log table could not determine effectively the costs that would apply in respect of his house. Such clauses of Bills and statements by the Premier, which are becoming commonplace, hide the real intention and prevent a clear understanding of the Government's measures.

The Premier said that it was intended to introduce controls of a selective nature. What is the criterion in respect of the word "selective"? It is impossible to define this word, as was the case with "substantial", about which we spoke last evening. If there is to be a set of standards, what will they be and how can standards be defined any more efficiently than, say, the word "selective"? The use of such a basis as this would lead to chaos, which would be totally unfair unless the Premier was willing to lay down a complete series of guidelines.

The Premier has claimed that the Bill will not disrupt the plans of subdividers, but that is a matter of opinion, and I believe the effect of these measures will be drastic. They will considerably disrupt the plans of subdividers. Already the activities of subdividers are seriously influenced and affected by their inability to get through various Government departments the documentation needed for subdivision. The Premier has said that this Bill will not deter those who plan to develop or use land. Obviously, those who plan to develop or use land will be deterred when they have no clear indication in this Bill of the changing circumstances and the different financial climate that could obtain (like the different financial climate forced on us in recent weeks by the centralist Government), and they will be unable to proceed with their development because they will not know clearly how they can best proceed.

The Premier, having introduced the word "speculation" into a discussion of the Bill, has suggested that it connotes only a quick profit. I refer to the *Concise Oxford Dictionary* definition, "speculative investment or enterprise", with no time limit attached. I refer to the fact that no time limit is attached, because that is a most important point.

Mr. Crimes: High profit in perpetuity?

Dr. EASTICK: I suggest that the honourable member look at the definition in the dictionary and then make his statement. Shares are speculative, and no-one would deny that.

Mr. Crimes: They certainly are, and they are passed on from generation to generation, and all you do is sit back and take the profit.

Dr. EASTICK: The honourable member does not believe that one should own shares?

Mr. Crimes: No; I don't have any.

Mr. Jennings: Not even B.H.P. shares?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no reference to B.H.P. shares in the Bill. We are discussing the Urban Land (Price Control) Bill.

Dr. EASTICK: It was interesting to hear the interjection of the member for Spence concerning the meaning of the word "speculation". I wonder whether the honourable member will list his interjections, together with his contribution to this afternoon's debate, on the front page of next month's *Herald*. We come now to one of the most descriptive terms of all! In his explanation the Minister said that controls would end when the Government was satisfied.

Mr. Langley: Hasn't that ever happened before?

Dr. EASTICK: How does one define "satisfied"? What will satisfy the Government?

The Hon. D. H. McKee: When the wishes of the majority of the people are satisfied.

Dr. EASTICK: I suggest that Government members are not close to the people because, if they were, they would realize the abhorrence that people feel towards Bills such as this one; Government members would also realize the abhorrence that the people feel towards the two-timing advertising campaign that was launched in the *Advertiser* this morning.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: You lost that one.

Dr. EASTICK: Not at all. In his explanation of clause 21 the Minister said a reasonable margin of profit would be allowed. How does one define "reasonable"?

Mr. Payne: Something less than 700 per cent.

Dr. EASTICK: "Reasonable" is impossible to define in this context.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: There are none so blind as those who do not wish to see.

Dr. EASTICK: That interjection only goes to show that Government members do not clearly understand what the Premier is promoting or what the legislation will achieve. In connection with Bills of this nature we must expect that further empires will be developed and that there will suddenly be a commission and a tribunal. What will their powers be, and who will pay for them? The people who will have to pay are the same people who are paying the \$2 000 for the advertisement in this morning's *Advertiser*. If empires of the kind I have referred to are created, it will cost more for the man in the street to obtain the services with which he will be provided. Bills of this nature will further increase the cost of land and houses. The same type of situation unfolded when members opposite supported the secondhand car dealers legislation, which increased the cost of cars to the man in the street by using a steamroller to correct a situation that could have been corrected in a less disastrous way. The same kind of steamroller has been used on Opposition members frequently, including immediately before dinner this evening, when debate on an important issue was stifled.

The SPEAKER: Order! Reference to decisions of this House do not enter into this debate.

Dr. EASTICK: In his explanation the Minister also said:

Of course, the Government realizes that the formula will not invariably produce a just result.

The Premier has already backed off from using the formula: he has now introduced the idea of 7 per cent compound

interest. It is interesting that the Premier has done this at a time when the price of money in the market place is tied to the Commonwealth Government's decisions, which have increased the cost of money. In South Australia, people responsible for providing land and houses will be permitted an increase of only 7 per cent per annum compound at a time when they must pay more than 7 per cent to provide facilities for the community. Are we to accept that situation? Clearly, the Government will stifle progress in the building industry and in the preparation and presentation of land to the community. Further, the Government will destroy the opportunity for an individual to provide services for the community, because it is seeking to place total control in the hands of a Government authority. Where is the member for Spence, with his "Hear, hear", now?

This afternoon it was said that the Government had a mandate for this Bill. So long as there is a Parliament there will be argument as to the extent to which a Government has a mandate, whether the Government be a Government of the Deputy Premier's persuasion or a Government of my persuasion. There will always be argument as to how much of the total policy was agreed to by those who supported the Government Party. We were told by members opposite that there was a clear mandate and that the Government would implement the policies it had laid down prior to the election. The Deputy Premier even read parts of the policy. In his policy speech prior to the last Commonwealth election, the Prime Minister said:

The land is the nation's basic resource. A home is usually the largest investment which a family ever makes; it is an investment which most families have to make.

The speech does not say that most families in future will not be allowed to make the investment referred to because the families will not have freehold tenure, which is so much a part of the security for which families look. The Prime Minister continued:

A Labor Government will have two overriding objectives: to give Australian families access to land and housing at fair prices—

no-one would disagree with that policy, if it were put into effect—

and to preserve and enhance the quality of the national estate, of which land is the very foundation.

He then goes on to say, "We will set up a Commonwealth-State land development commission"—not that the Commonwealth Government will co-operate with the States to set it up, not that it will inquire from the States whether it may proceed to set it up, but that the commission will be set up. We have already seen the method by which it is to be introduced, with the Prime Minister nominating one member of the commission and having a say in the appointment of the other two members. Later in the document and in subsequent statements we were told that the Government would give people in the community, particularly those on lower incomes of \$4 000 and less, the opportunity to take from their income tax the interest payments made on house mortgages. The Commonwealth Government was going to be Father Christmas himself on the basis that this was one of the mandates it was given at the last election, but when it came to power it suddenly found that this would be far more costly than it had contemplated.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader must link up his remarks to the Bill under discussion. I will not stifle debate, but at the same time it must have some direct connection with the Bill.

Dr. EASTICK: Thank you, Sir. I shall link up the figures I am about to use, which have a significant part to play in relation to the cost of housing, and that is an integral part of the Bill. The promise of allowing housing loan interest as a tax deduction up to a certain limit is not to be implemented in that way, although as a result of pressure there is to be a partial introduction of the measure. However, one must take heed of the erosion that has occurred as a result of increased interest rates. First, let us consider a man with an income of \$5 000 a year. That is the average salary today and members opposite will be aware that the figure announced last week showed that, for the first time, the South Australian average take-home pay had reached \$100, which is very close to \$5 000 a year. A man on that income will find that the advantage promised has been eroded to the extent of 31 per cent if the interest rate in his case has increased by only ½ per cent, as announced by the Savings Bank of South Australia. At the \$4 000 level the erosion is equivalent to 34 per cent. If he has borrowed

through a building society or a bank that is increasing its interest rate by more than the ½ per cent applying to the Savings Bank of South Australia (and most increases have been of 2 per cent) then the loss is even more marked. On a loan of \$12 500, which I understand is now the average loan applying and which will apply equally to the person in a house covered by this measure, the increase in interest will be \$125 a year for every 1 per cent increase in the interest rate. At 2 per cent increase, the effect is to wipe out any advantage for all except those in the \$6 000 to \$7 000 income bracket; they would benefit by less than \$20.

So much for the promises made and for the help that was to be given. To give members opposite, as well as other people in the community, an opportunity to look at the scale of charges, I seek leave to have incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it a table setting out the position relating to incomes from \$4 000 to \$14 000 a year.

Leave granted.

INCOME CALCULATIONS

	\$ 4 000	\$ 5 000	\$ 6 000	\$ 7 000	\$ 8 000	\$ 9 000	\$ 10 000	\$ 11 000	\$ 12 000	\$ 13 000	\$ 14 000
<u>Actual income</u>	4 000	5 000	6 000	7 000	8 000	9 000	10 000	11 000	12 000	13 000	14 000
Taxable income after dependant deductions.....	3 168	4 168	5 168	6 168	7 168	8 168	9 168	10 168	11 168	12 168	13 168
<u>Tax payable</u>	396	659	973	1 320	1 694	2 095	2 522	2 970	3 452	3 944	—
Interest deduction allowable . . .	100pc	90pc	80pc	70pc	60pc	50pc	40pc	30pc	20pc	10pc	—
Actual amount (on \$12 500 @ 7¼ per cent).....	906	815	725	634	544	453	362	272	181	91	—
<u>New taxable income</u>	2 261	3 433	4 443	5 534	6 624	7 715	8 706	9 896	10 987	12 077	—
<u>New tax payable</u>	213	460	743	1 095	1 488	1 911	2 320	2 843	3 364	3 895	—
<u>Tax advantage</u>	183	199	230	225	206	184	202	127	88	49	—
Less additional amount resulting from increased interest	63	63	63	63	63	63	63	63	63	63	—
<u>Net gain</u>	120	136	167	162	143	121	139	64	25	Loss of \$14	—
Erosion by increased interest . .	34.4pc	31.7pc	27.4pc	28pc	30.6pc	34.2pc	31.2pc	49.6pc	71.6pc		

These calculations are based on the likely average effect on a home owner, using three dependants (wife and two children) to give an average total deduction in arriving at a taxable income. The loan is for \$12 500 at 7¼ per cent p.a., representing a ½ per cent increase.

Dr. EASTICK: Many aspects of this Bill will come under severe scrutiny in the Committee stage. I have a mind to oppose the Bill completely, but to enable us to look at the Bill in its entirety, and so that we can question the Premier and receive replies to those questions, the Bill receives conditional support at the second reading stage. I want to emphasize the farcical situation existing in the administration of the Government at present, when members opposite speak of the advantages they will provide for the community, especially those seeking houses. *Hansard* has recorded a question I asked the Premier on the sale of Swedish-type houses constructed by the South Australian Housing Trust. In the past those houses were available to people who had lived in them. This applies especially in the districts of the members for Gilles and Florey, and in similar areas.

Previously, the purchase of a property was permitted after a period of residence on the basis of the value of the property shown in the books of the South Australian Housing Trust. Within the last two years certain people have been able to purchase the properties in which they have lived for about \$6 400, with consideration given to any improvements they have undertaken as well as to the rental paid over a period. However, as a result of a change that took effect, I think in April last, the person living in a house adjacent to one of the \$6 400 houses and wishing to purchase an identical property is asked to pay \$10 300. This is for a similar house, built at the same time, given similar maintenance, and presumably looked

after by the tenant, on average, in the same way. Suddenly, the tenant finds an increase in the cost of the property of \$4 000. So much for a Government that is supposed to be interested in providing individuals with a chance to own their houses at the cheapest rate. Other members, including the member for Glenelg, will give details about the cost of land and the return to the Government through selling land that it previously owned. I believe the aim should be to concentrate on co-ordinating Commonwealth and State objectives, rather than enforce detailed machinery measures to implement objectives that have been forced on this Government by the centralist Government.

The funds to be made available to the State for land and house purchases should be available without intervention by the Commonwealth Government, leaving the broad objects to be followed and allowing local people to ensure the greatest return for the outlay involved. We will not have the sort of prices related to urban development if we are to have a centralist authority telling us how to build and how to proceed, unless it co-operates on the local scene. We will not have a situation that will be financially advantageous to the community, when we are having extensive duplication of machinery, supervision, direction, and all other aspects of management. If the Commonwealth Government wants to help the average man (indeed, everyone in the community) in relation to land and housing, it has a responsibility to make funds available but to allow the State to spend this money in the best interests of the people.

We do not want from a centralist Government unduly rigid directions or artificial categories that force the State Government to put money into this and into that. The South Australian Government should determine its own priorities, and, if extra money is needed to develop an area or provide amenities in an urban development, the Commonwealth Government should allow the State Government to decide what will be most beneficial to the community. There should be a system of flexibility that will allow the advancement of orderly and pleasant development at prices that the man in the street can truly afford, and this situation could apply without the duplication that this measure, directed from Canberra, seeks to introduce. Two aspects of development require an entirely different approach. I accept the situation that stabilized prices should apply in urban or general development in new growth centres, whether at Monarto, Wodonga-Albury or Orange-Bathurst. I accept the situation that stabilized prices would be an advantage, but I do not believe, contrary to the provisions of this Bill, in having a general price control of land and housing development.

We must support a system of full security of tenure by the owner, more particularly where the owner will occupy the dwelling that has been built. A system of leasehold operates against the best interests of the community and against the wishes of most State Governments. After considering details that have been placed before the present committee inquiring into land tenure, I believe that the weight of evidence supports the retention of freeholding, in which the owner has the right to a security of tenure. I believe it is necessary for the Commonwealth Government to give a clear undertaking to the States that there will be a continuity of funds available for the necessary development of housing and for the provision of general amenities that are required of a Government, but, until this assurance is available, the attempt to stabilize prices and the interference by the Commonwealth Government that would occur under this measure will create major difficulties and will not be to the benefit of the people of this community. The Opposition gives conditional support to the second reading.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): This is a most curious Bill, and it was difficult for me to understand parts of the second reading explanation given by the Minister of Environment and Conservation, the second sentence stating:

While the purpose of that Bill is to ensure that there is a regular supply of allotments on the market which will continuously meet demand, the present Bill is designed to moderate demand for allotments . . .

That was a curious statement for him to make.

Mr. Langley: You didn't read the whole sentence.

Mr. COUMBE: I shall, in a moment. The member for Unley is always impatient.

Mr. Langley: No, I'm not.

Mr. COUMBE: What does that statement mean? Does it mean that young people who want allotments in the future will not be able to get them, because there will deliberately be fewer of them on the market? That is how I interpret the statement literally. The Minister's second reading explanation continues:

. . . by ensuring as far as possible that those who purchase building allotments do so for the purpose of home building and not for speculative gain.

The operative words are "to moderate demand for allotments"; that is the predicative part of the sentence. The Government, under the guise of price control, is saying that it will moderate the demand, but how can it genuinely say such a thing? What the Government should be doing is getting on with the job of providing more and more

allotments and increasing the supply of allotments so that young people can purchase blocks and build houses; that is what it should be doing, instead of moderating the demand for allotments. Another curious phrase is "the control period" referred to by the Minister at page 500 of *Hansard*; but to find an explanation of the term I had to turn to page 499, where I found the following curious statement by the Minister:

The controls imposed by this Bill will continue until the Government is satisfied that the supply of building allotments is in balance with demand and the Government's object of stabilizing land prices has been achieved.

Anyone as naive as the Minister would read that literally as meaning that, as soon as there are sufficient blocks on the market to meet demand, price control will be discontinued. Can we believe that for a moment? What a stupid point to put forward in the House, because I have yet to see a Labor Government which, having obtained a power, ever removed it. That is what the Minister is asking us to believe: having obtained a power and reached a certain stage, the Government will remove that power. The Government is asking for "the control period" to continue forever. When reading about the "controlled area" the first time, one could be excused for believing that the Bill deals with the urban area. Clause 5, the interpretation clause, defines the "controlled area" as including the many municipalities, plus the District Councils of Munno Para, East Torrens, Stirling and Noarlunga, the Garden Suburb, the wards known as the Happy Valley, Coromandel, Clarendon and Kangarilla wards of the District Council of Meadows, and the portion of the hundred of Willunga that lies within the District Council of Willunga. That is all well and good, but paragraph (f) of clause 5 states:

Any other area declared by proclamation under this Act to constitute a controlled area.

Dr. Eastick: It would be outside the scrutiny of Parliament.

Mr. COUMBE: Yes, it would be by means of a proclamation signed by His Excellency the Governor, in Executive Council, about which Parliament would know nothing until it was published in the *Government Gazette*. Parliament will have no say regarding what the "controlled area" will be, because this will be done not by regulation but by proclamation. The main purport of the Bill is to impose price control on new allotments purchased after May 16, 1973. The Bill also imposes price control on new houses built, or houses which have not been occupied for a year, after that date. So, both land and houses in these areas will be controlled and, by this means, the Government piously hopes that it will keep prices down. That is the whole object of the Bill, which was explained by the Minister and at some length during debate today, and which is the object of the full-page advertisement, in today's *Advertiser*, that cost \$2 000 of the taxpayers' money. No-one can dispute that. What could happen if the Bill is passed? Opposition members do their homework, in contrast to Government members, judging by the contributions they make to many of the debates.

Mr. Langley: When Sir Thomas Playford was here, you couldn't speak.

Mr. COUMBE: I spoke many times when I was a back-bencher, and this is more than the member for Unley does. I remember getting into trouble with Sir Thomas when I spoke at length on one occasion.

Mr. Langley: Things are different when they're not the same.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Torrens.

Mr. COUMBE: We must examine carefully what the effects of the Bill will be in the community, apart from what the Minister hopes it will achieve. I believe that serious doubts exist in the minds of many people whether the aims that the Minister hopes the Bill can achieve will be achieved. The Minister said that the Bill was designed to "moderate demand for allotments", but the Government needs a little common sense in this area: the Bill could easily destroy the incentive of those people who have been willing to take risks over the years and who have provided the bulk of housing in the metropolitan area and other parts of the State. If the Government does not use a little common sense, these are the people whose incentive will be destroyed and who will be driven away. Surely all members know that there are several commonsense and practical ways, apart from price control, of keeping prices down.

First, more allotments should be made available, and the best way to do that is to encourage subdividers to open up more land for building. Secondly, services can be made available to subdividers and developers more speedily. Thirdly, we should overcome the scandalous bottlenecks that have been occurring in the last couple of years at the State Planning Office and the Lands Titles Office. Because of these inordinate delays, people are having to wait not weeks but months to obtain approvals. The Minister should be speeding up the availability of allotments instead of moderating the demand.

The Bill is aimed at controlling prices. Let us examine what effect it will have on house purchasers. Under the Bill, the Commissioner, having considered the price of the land and house in question, will have to determine a fair margin. Therefore, the incentive for builders to compete with one another will be lost, house prices will increase, and we will return to the old system of cost-plus that obtained 25 years ago, with all its disadvantages and malpractices.

Mr. Langley: You believe in subletting?

Mr. COUMBE: What is the member for Unley talking about?

Mr. Langley: Subcontracting, if you want it that way.

Mr. COUMBE: Now I understand what the member is talking about: he is trying to introduce into the debate a completely extraneous matter. The advertisement which has been referred to today and which has a bearing on this matter stated, "Builders will be able to stay in business with confidence." Why did the Government have to refer to that aspect? Was it intended to reassure the many people in the building industry? Did the Government have some qualms and doubts about the whole scheme? After all, the building industry, which is a major industry in this State, employing many people and using much material, needs to be fostered and not disadvantaged.

Members have been referring to houses, but they are not by any means the only type of dwelling that is constructed in urban areas. I refer now to home units and flats, and in this respect I ask members to examine the Bill and the second reading explanation. Where does the Minister refer to home units and flats, which form a large part of the total number of buildings erected in urban areas every year? Indeed, there are hundreds of them in my district, and the same would apply to the Minister's district and, certainly, to most metropolitan districts, as well as to those of members representing provincial towns in this State. This type of dwelling, which is so popular today and which provides housing for many people, is greatly sought after not only by young

people wanting to get married but also by older people in the community.

This type of accommodation provides a higher living density in certain areas with a resultant cost saving in public utilities such as the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Postmaster-General's Department and councils in the provision of various services, not to mention savings on roads, kerbing, footpaths, and so on. If this Bill passes, how many private persons will have the resources necessary to build this type of unit, which is usually built by developers? It appears that this type of development will either be barred or be made so unattractive to developers that they will be frightened off. If one carefully reads the Bill, throughout which this theme is evident, one can see how this can happen. After the nominated date, the developers will be kept out.

Has the Government stopped seriously to consider what effect this measure will have on existing housing in the built-up metropolitan areas such as Unley, Semaphore or Prospect? This is an important aspect to consider and, indeed, is one of the faults inherent in the Bill. If a developer is stopped from opening up new allotments, as could happen if this Bill passes, the effect will be to reduce the number of houses and certainly the number of home units being built, and obviously (and the logic is so plain that it stares one in the face) the purchase price of existing houses will soar to an extent we have never seen in the metropolitan area. Although the Government is on one hand introducing a Bill to control land prices (and, therefore, the price of new houses), its action will, on the other hand, artificially and unnecessarily increase the cost of existing houses. Is this meritorious? I suggest to the member for Unley that the prices of houses in his district and of those in mine are likely to rise suddenly.

Mr. Langley: They are rising now.

Mr. COUMBE: I do not deny that. I keep a close watch on the prices paid for houses in my area, too. However, I point out that the indirect effect of this Bill will be to accelerate instead of slow down inflation in this field. It will be harder and harder for young people and others to get houses. Many people who want to get married, buy a house and start a family will be adversely affected. This is only one effect of introducing controls of the type included in the Bill. One can look around the world to see the effects of controls and the malpractices that have crept in following the introduction of those controls. No matter how clever one is legislatively, there is always someone who gets around the legislation, so that all sorts of malpractices occur. I am rather intrigued by the complicated formula in clause 15, which provides for 7 per cent compound interest a year to apply with regard to the value of vacant serviced blocks of a size of one-fifth of a hectare. I do not know how long this 7 per cent will be realistic.

Dr. Tonkin: It isn't realistic now.

Mr. COUMBE: Since the Bill was introduced on August 23, we have already had an increase, caused by the Commonwealth Labor Government, in the bond rate and interest rates. In one fell swoop this has almost done away with the hoped for effect of this Bill brought in by this sister or daughter Government in South Australia.

Mr. Becker: It isn't a daughter; it's a slave.

Mr. COUMBE: I will not comment on the parentage or otherwise. By that very action of the centralist Government of Australia a serious blow has been dealt to house seekers throughout Australia. The Bill sets up yet another board. About six weeks ago I asked how many boards

there were in South Australia. I do not have the information with me now, but I was astounded at it. We have had several Bills since then setting up more boards. This will be the third Bill setting up a board that we have dealt with in two weeks.

Mr. Evans: A white ant's paradise.

Mr. COUMBE: Yes. Both the Land Commission Bill and the Motor Fuel Distribution Bill set up boards. Now, the present Bill sets up another board. There will not be enough people to fill all the positions on boards. We are entitled to ask how many boards we will be saddled with. In this case, we will have a land price tribunal of three members. The person who has to do the hard work will be the Commissioner of Land Price Control. That is a fine sounding title, and I hope he does his job. He will be hard worked; I do not envy him his job for one moment. In addition, an expert committee will be set up to assist and advise the Commissioner.

Mr. Becker: That will come from the trade unions or from the Premier's staff.

Mr. COUMBE: I suppose that applications will be called shortly for these positions. On top of this, there will be a registrar of the tribunal. If there is to be a tribunal, there has to be a registrar, but we do not know how many supporting staff of clerks, assistant clerks, typists and so on there will be. Before long the whole State will be run not by Parliament but by a series of boards set up by the Government. How long will all this cumbersome machinery take to set up? How long will it take to appoint these officers and to find a registrar? How long will it take to process the plans, applications and permits that have to go to the Commissioner?

Mr. Evans: About the same time as it takes the State Planning Office—about 24 months.

Mr. COUMBE: That is a good example. Earlier, I referred to the inordinate delays occurring at the State Planning Office. This is just another cog in the wheel, another place where plans and applications have to go, as well as to the council, the State Planning Office, the Lands Titles Office and, in some cases, the Highways Department. Now the Commissioner of Land Price Control will be involved. In these circumstances, will people not just about give up trying to get a block of land on which to build a house? This is supposed to be a land of free enterprise. We are living under open Government: a Government for the people, we are told. What we are getting is more and more bureaucrats in the State. What will happen to those who really want houses? The tragic part of this is that many young people will have to wait for a house for a terribly long time. They will have to wait for this control to be imposed under the Bill and for the Commissioner to come to a decision. Before a decision is made, all these various boards and so on will have to be gone through. I am afraid that these will be some of the effects of this Bill. At the beginning of his explanation, the Minister said:

While the purpose of that Bill is to ensure that there is a regular supply of allotments on the market which will continuously meet demand, the present Bill is designed to moderate demand for allotments.

I reiterate that the Government should be getting on with the job of providing more allotments, and not moderating the demand for them. As the population is growing, people should be entitled to get houses if they want them. The way to keep costs down is to make more allotments available. Subdividers should be encouraged to open up land. Services should be made available more readily to subdividers and developers. Bottlenecks occurring at the State Planning Office and the Lands Titles Office,

where people cannot get applications processed, should be overcome. That is the positive way to go about the matter, instead of introducing this most repressive Bill.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I am conscious of the problem we face with the recent escalation in land prices throughout the Commonwealth, as well as the escalation in house prices and in the cost of constructing houses. However, we should not be hasty in the action we take. Ministers from all States are still trying to make up their minds about the action that is best in the short term and the long term to stabilize prices of land for housing construction.

The Minister jumped on the band wagon early; on August 23 he introduced this Bill and said that it was an urgent matter, yet we are only now at the second reading stage, because the Premier has adjourned the matter week after week since August 23. This shows that the Premier, his Cabinet colleagues and other Government members have doubts about the matter. Apparently the Government has now decided that, since a Commonwealth referendum will be held in connection with price control, it is time to get on the band wagon and advertise in the press what it would like to do and thereby gain sympathy for its Commonwealth colleagues in connection with the referendum on December 8.

I support the point made by the member for Torrens in relation to the Minister's statement about a regular supply of allotments. This is where the problem has arisen in the past; we have not created enough allotments. In 1959 and 1960 there was a mass provision of allotments throughout the State, particularly in the metropolitan area, and in 1962 the Government of the day decided to force subdividers to supply services when they created new allotments. In fact, in the last decade we have lived on the surplus of the 1959-61 era. In the last two years the cost of supplying the services to the raw land has approximated the price paid for an allotment created in the 1950's or early 1960's. At that stage the subdividers had only just started to move into the field to create more allotments. What happened when they did that? The State Planning Authority was not able to handle the applications. Further, councils slowed down the process of considering applications for subdivision, mainly because of the public's attitude towards subdivision. The Engineering and Water Supply Department and the Highways Department were also involved. Negotiations must be undertaken with all those authorities before any physical work can occur on the raw land that is to be developed.

The present Government has been in power since May 30, 1970, and it knew full well that there would be a shortage of housing allotments. I do not deny that in that period many people with money realized that there would be a shortage of allotments because of inaction by the Government and by Government departments. When those people realized that, they saw an opportunity to make a few dollars and they bought land that was put up for sale, retained it for a period, backed their judgment, and picked a time when they thought they could gain the most money. The opportunity to do that was created by the Government and by Government departments. Members on both sides have gained through purchasing an article at a relatively low price, knowing that in the future they would gain substantially by selling the article at a higher price. If that attitude is discouraged, society will eventually stagnate.

The whole problem falls back on inaction by the Government and by Government departments. I have

some knowledge of this matter. If one goes to the State Planning Authority one sees a notice saying, in effect, "Don't bother to phone, and don't come and annoy us: put your queries in writing, because we do not have time to handle your case now. We have a bottleneck." The department cannot make time available to discuss problems with people. One of my constituents came to me last Monday; he has a piece of land that is cut into two allotments. When he checked with the State Planning Authority he was told that the papers had been lost. And they are lost to this time. I cannot understand how papers like that can be lost in a Government department, because they are important to an individual in the community. The department is supposed to serve the people: the people are not supposed to serve the department. It is a pity that we cannot streamline the operation of Government departments. In connection with what the Government is doing, the advertisement in this morning's *Advertiser* states:

It's streamlining its own operations. At the administrative level the Government's acting to ensure that the Public Service makes land transactions as quick and easy as possible.

At the very time that the Premier placed that advertisement in the newspaper with the support of his colleagues, the main Government department handling these matters was losing applications and papers that had been lodged by members of the community. The person I referred to is not a speculator or a developer; he is an average person who wishes to build a house on one section of his land and make the other section available to his family.

During the last two or three years not more than 5 500 allotments, on average, have been created each year but, on average, we have been using between 8 500 and 9 000 allotments. In the immediate future we will need between 9 000 and 10 000 allotments each year to keep up with the demand. I believe it is important, if people are to have the opportunity of selection and if speculation is to be discouraged, that we have about 40 000 allotments on the market—4½ years to five years supply. If we have that, there will be no need to consider price control on allotments or houses. This is where we are falling down, and it is in this area where the Government should be taking action. In 1962 the Government of the day took drastic action regarding the supply of services to allotments by placing the burden on the developer to provide those services. Developers then drifted away from creating allotments, and that action has had much to do with the problems with which we are faced today and, although the Government that took that action held the same political philosophy that I hold, I do not deny that. However, because of the mistake we then made in frightening developers away, we should now be conscious that we might be frightening developers away from South Australia to another State and we could face an even worse situation.

It is important that we see what the other States are going to do and that we try to implement uniform legislation. If we cannot obtain exact agreement with other Premiers regarding this matter, our legislation should be as near as possible to uniform so that we will have no fear that we will lose the developer from our State. Even the Government's intention at this stage is to allow private enterprise to take over the development of subdivisions. That is at least the stated intention, and I hope it is fact when this policy goes into operation.

Let us all be warned. The developer is the person or organization this State needs, because he has the expertise. South Australia wants more allotments. Instead of the advertisement published today expressing Party policy, we

should advertise to attract developers to South Australia to create allotments. We should be encouraging well-designed subdivisions of a modern and acceptable standard. We should attract developers by saying that we are willing to make areas available for development through rezoning. That is the first step we should take.

The second step is to ensure that Government instrumentalities supplying services can supply them at a more rapid rate than that currently applying. It is with some fear that I have heard of a mass meeting to be held six days from today at the Trades Hall, Adelaide. Three people (unfortunately not from my district but from the district of the member for Mawson) approached me and gave me a circular from the Australian Government Workers Association. That circular states:

To all workers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department and Sewers. Contract work—your job is at stake unless you fight now. The contractors are rapidly moving in and your union leadership intends to fight this with your support. A mass meeting will be held on Tuesday, October 16, 1973, at 7.30 p.m. in the Shannon Room, New Trades Hall, corner South and West Terraces. Every worker must attend.

Mr. Coumbe: Must attend?

Mr. EVANS: Underlined with two lines. It continues:

Your executive have decided to ban all supplies to contractors and direct action is contemplated.

One cannot get anything more direct than banning supplies; indeed, the next move must be either to picket the contractors or to go out on strike.

Dr. Eastick: Was not the Minister of Works going to attend to that at 9.30 a.m. this morning.

Mr. EVANS: I have not heard of the result. The circular continues:

March on Labor Day, Monday, October 8, 1973, against contract workers. Members marching please assemble at Her Majesty's Theatre, Grote Street, at 10.20 a.m., signed, J. Thomson, General Secretary, H. Armstrong and J. Campbell, Branch Secretaries.

What hope has the Minister of Works in this regard if he has such action going on behind the scenes? Eventually this scene will be right in front of us slowing down the provision of services to allotments. I believe I can say with confidence that the Australian Government Workers Association need not be afraid of any action that the present Minister of Works may take regarding contract work. Within his own Party there are sufficient people interested in the union movement to ensure that a balance of contract work with day workers employed by the Government departments is maintained. At least, we will be able to draw a comparison and the Minister of Works will be able to draw a comparison with the quality, quantity and price of work carried out by both groups.

I believe it is important at this time when we are short of building allotments (and services are part of those allotments), that the Minister has the opportunity to expedite the supply of services. This association's action must in the long term affect some of its own employees, but this action will affect also the rest of the community, especially young people trying to acquire their own home. The Engineering and Water Supply Department has in the past not made full use of its plant. True, in fairness to the gentlemen who approached me, they believe they have not been given the right equipment or sufficient equipment for the work in hand. I believe that in the sewerage extensions branch there are only two back hoes. Further, if one of these breaks down there is only one left for use, yet back hoes are important in such construction. They are necessary and every gang should have one and, if only one back hoe can operate, what is the result? The result

is that some of the men have no work to do, they feel ashamed, and they are criticized by people in the community, yet it is not their fault, but rather the fault of the department in not making available the right equipment.

Mr. Coumbe: There are only two back hoes in the State?

Mr. EVANS: There are only two operating in the metropolitan area. True, there are other trench diggers of a different kind, but there are only two back hoes. The next point to be considered is that the department's equipment does not effectively work more than about five hours a day. There can be no doubt that if private enterprise moved into the field it could not survive on only five hours effective work from its machines during the working day. Further, even though there is a backlog facing the department in the provision and installation of sewers, what happens is that there is virtually no overtime available for such activity, yet this is at a time when we should be trying to catch up the leeway. Although this involves overtime payments, if there is a backlog every step possible should be taken to make it up.

When the Premier states that the Government is streamlining its activities, I do not believe that, because the men in the field have had the courage to come forward and say, before the publication of the advertisement, that every possible step has not been taken within the department. One of the moves made by the Government is its attempt to control the prices of allotments and houses. The Premier is seeking to control the price of houses with up to 12 months use, but I believe this attempt will fail in cases where big operators are involved. If a firm has sufficient finance to build houses or home units on a large scale, and if it can let them for a little more than 12 months before placing them on the market, there is no control and that firm can ask whatever price it wishes.

Many houses and units will be available for rental for the next 12 or 13 months, after which the number available for sale will be about the same as at present. The big operator will have the finance to build the houses and hold them, to let them out to cover some of his interest costs and, at the end of the 12-month or 13-month period, to place them on the market without restriction. However, the small man will be knocked out. It was interesting to see at the foot of the advertisement in today's *Advertiser* (the last bit before the bad bit, which was the signature of the Premier) the following:

Builders will be able to stay in the industry with confidence.

The Premier should have talked with the Housing Industry Association before being convinced by his colleagues that those words should appear in the advertisement. In the association's newsletter of September, 1973, we see the following:

Price control on South Australian housing will hit all builders. Large and medium sized building contractors consider that all aspects of their business will be affected by provisions of the proposed Act No. 35 regarding price control on land and houses.

That industry has no confidence in the Bill, yet the Premier is advertising to the effect that builders should be full of confidence and that there are no problems. The industry has a fair knowledge of its own field of endeavour and I prefer to believe its statements on this matter rather than those of the Premier. There is a way around house price control for the big operator, and therefore the small operator will be forced into a field he finds unprofitable.

How will the Commissioner decide the price to be put on houses? Will he go to the builder and ask how much it cost to build the house? Will the builder produce the

cost of construction? In that case, and if the builder is allowed 10 per cent on the cost of construction, will he consider that it does not matter if the house cost an extra \$1 000 because he will be allowed a 10 per cent profit margin, involving perhaps another \$100 profit? Is it wise for him to try to keep the cost of construction down to a minimum when we face a three-year wait for a rental house, a wait of three or four months before a builder will even start a contract, and sometimes up to 18 months to get a house completed? At least four members of Parliament are in the throes of building new houses, and if they were to say how much it was costing them and what delays were involved I am sure my argument would be supported to the hilt.

At this stage there is no danger of the builder not being able to sell houses he has constructed. If he does not have to worry, and if he is to be allowed a percentage on the cost of construction, he will not bother to keep costs down. He will tell the men on the job to work on Sundays, to work at night, and he will pay triple time. He will be able to tell the timber yard not to take off the usual 10 per cent discount just as long as the timber is on the job immediately. People will be concerned mainly with getting houses constructed as quickly as possible and offering incentives for the supply of goods and services, knowing that in turn they will be allowed a percentage on their costs. If another argument is to be used, and if they decide to work on a cost for each square of a solid construction cream brick house with a tiled roof, whether cement or terra cotta, we get back once more to the quality of work. One builder might slap it up quickly, not worrying about quality, providing inferior workmanship, and getting down to the minimum standard acceptable to the Builders Licensing Board. We are putting into an industry bugs that will create problems.

It has been suggested that an artist could be employed to paint a landscape of an allotment in its original state, before any earthworks had been carried out. The allotment could then be advertised and the painting could be included in the price at about \$1 000 or \$1 500. Alternatively, the house could be included in the painting. Some people will think of a lurk of this kind to get around any law passed by Parliament.

We are all conscious of the problem of escalating land prices. The report of the Working Committee on the Stabilization of Land Prices made the point very strongly that we gave an opportunity for the person investing a few dollars. We created the situation that gave rise to the opportunity to bring about an even greater shortage, and the only way in which we can overcome this effectively and avoid black marketing and other rackets is to create more allotments. We should buy a full-page advertisement asking developers to create allotments for the sake of South Australia and for the benefit of young couples who wish to build houses or buy allotments for future houses.

We must not class as speculators those individuals who buy an allotment thinking of their future, knowing they will want a home one day and that there will be an inflationary trend, and wanting to give themselves a little security. The parent who buys a block for the future of his children is not a speculator, but is showing a sense of thrift in protecting the future of his family. The person with an allotment beside his home for a tennis court or swimming pool is not a speculator, but is merely trying to obtain a little more privacy and a slightly larger area than average around his house. It is not always the rich person who does this. Many people on average incomes make sacrifices to do this, and members on both sides will have

friends who have done these things in the past and who will do so in the future to obtain just a little more freedom and privacy than the average urban allotment offers.

I represent an area in which, to a degree, people live in fear of Government departments. It is probably an area in which there is more fear of Government departments than there is in any other part of the State. Landholders and those who own houses, allotments, or broad acres in the Adelaide Hills never really know what is going to happen next, and with a land commission to be created and now a land prices control commission being set up, they will have another trauma to face. If it is not a matter related to reservoir catchment areas, freeways, arterial roads, recreation parks, national parks, or the Woods and Forests Department, it will be some other organization that will move in, and the Hills' people are afraid of all the boards and commissions that can walk in and say, "Mr. Landholder, you will move on today because we have no more use for you in this area."

The member for Torrens is correct when he says there has been a massive increase in the number of commissions and boards that have been created in this State: they are octopuses of a type like monsters that get bigger and bigger, and the man in the street foots the bill. In the long term the cost of increased taxation may be greater than the price he has to pay for his allotment or his house. The Leader says that it is the centralist octopus in Canberra that has forced this situation on us in a way that makes one fearful of the tentacles that come from Canberra. The Premiers are trying to decide the correct action, but the centralist octopus is squeezing life out of them and saying that if they want money they will not get it unless they do exactly as Canberra wants them to do. In other words, the sovereign powers of the States are being taken away.

Dr. Eastick: Do you think it is a centralist octopus or a Gough octopus?

Mr. EVANS: One can call it the Gough octopus. I know of no other animal that has as many tentacles as an octopus, but the animal to which I referred as a centralist octopus in Canberra would have more than the eight tentacles of the octopus, so that I cannot describe it as anything other than a centralist octopus.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: I am disappointed in your imagination.

Mr. EVANS: I have great reservations about this sort of legislation and its effects, and I shall be interested to see what amendments can be made to it in Committee.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I join with my colleagues in expressing my concern and opposition to this Bill, and I commend them for the way they have scrutinized this legislation. It is obvious that Government members (the Ministers and those "yes" men who sit behind the Ministers) are not interested, because they are under instructions. Because of the poor showing the Government has made this week, they cannot justify to the House, and particularly to the people of this State, the action that the Government is forcing on people and on this Parliament under directions from the bureaucrats in Canberra. If one examines the legislation, it will be clear that it is part of the plan of the Commonwealth Labor Party to nationalize all land in this country. That is the Party's aim and desire: it is a great Socialist desire to take away from people their democratic rights. This country has been proud of the record that most people desire to own their own bit of Australia, but the introduction of this legislation in conjunction with the Land Commission Bill (and the Minister stated clearly that this legislation complements that Bill)

indicates that the Government wants to destroy the freehold system. During the recent Victorian election the Commonwealth Minister for Housing told the Victorian Government that, if it did not agree to the Commonwealth's plan, there would be a campaign against the then Victorian Government on that basis. We know the result of the Victorian election: the Liberal Party in Victoria was returned to power with an increased majority.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: But with a reduced number of votes.

Mr. GUNN: The people realized they had an outstanding and dynamic person at the head of the Liberal Party and supported him, in the same way as they will support the Party in this State and throughout Australia, because already the Labor Party has had to use taxpayers' funds to promote policies that have been laid down by the Federal Executive of that Party. It is disgraceful that the Government should spend taxpayers' money whilst the State is facing a record deficit, and this money will be spent (although we do not know for how long) at the rate of \$2 000 a day in order to advertise A.L.P. policies.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The honourable member is referring to a matter which is outside the province of this debate and which was, I understand, disposed of by the House this afternoon.

Mr. Mathwin: You're worse than Hudson!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order raised by the honourable Minister. The matter being discussed this evening is in line with the debate that took place this afternoon. I will ask the honourable member for Eyre to confine his remarks more definitely and refer to price control on certain land and amendments to the Prices Act, which is the subject matter of the Bill before the House. I ask the honourable member not to continue in the same vein as he was when he was interrupted.

Mr. GUNN: Obviously, what I was saying was correct.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member not to join in a debate with the Minister of Development and Mines.

Mr. GUNN: I was completely ignoring him, Sir, because I was about to refer to the Government's action in introducing a Bill and then promoting it by using taxpayers' funds, before giving Parliament the chance to scrutinize it properly and before the Bill had been passed by one House. If that subject is not connected with this matter, I do not know what is.

Dr. Eastick: Do you know who adjourned the debate in another place this afternoon? It was the Government.

Mr. GUNN: Yes, because it was smarting as a result of the criticisms it had received. If the Government intends to spend taxpayers' money to explain proposals that are in line with its general philosophy and to promote its own cause, will it make the same opportunity available to allow its opponents to put their point of view? We live in a democracy. If Government members are the democrats they claim to be, surely they will allow the opposite point of view to be advanced in the same prominent fashion as has been done by the Government. If the Government will not allow this action, it should be charged with the misappropriation of taxpayers' money because, when the Government spends taxpayers' money, the people are entitled to see concrete results, and all sections of the community should be treated equally. This Government, however, has failed to do that, and it has misappropriated funds collected from taxpayers. When I read the advertisement this morning, I thought it was an

advertisement of the Australian Labor Party and not one published by the Premier, who was under direct instructions from the Federal Executive and, in particular, the Prime Minister.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Perhaps it was his idea!

Mr. GUNN: I think it is probably the Prime Minister's idea. Let us examine the matter more closely. I have said that Australians like to own their own houses. Recently, the result of a survey widely circulated in the *Bulletin* of August 25, 1973, indicated clearly that 82 per cent of people who were interviewed (and over 2 000 were interviewed) believed that Housing Commissions should make available for sale all rental properties they had under their control. That is the kind of policy the Government should be putting into effect to encourage people to own their own houses. The best way of doing it is not to follow the pattern the Government has tried to put into effect (I do not think it ever came into effect), but to encourage the Housing Trust, which has the facilities and experience, to subdivide the land it holds. That is the policy the Victorian Government is putting into effect by acquiring land and getting it on to the market quickly—not by setting up bureaucracies as this Government is doing.

The more Government departments that are created, the more red tape and such nonsense is involved. The policy adopted by the Labor Party is nothing short of shameful. Obviously the hearts of Government back-benchers are not in this legislation. How many of them have spoken in this debate, and how many have been present in the House this evening? Only three Government back-benchers and one Minister are present in the House now. The Minister in charge of the Bill is absent. The Premier, who is absent, is rarely present in the House nowadays.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! What reflection is the honourable member for Eyre casting on the House? Is he drawing attention to the state of the House?

Mr. GUNN: I was counting the number of Government members present in the House.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Is the honourable member drawing attention to the state of the House?

Mr. GUNN: Yes.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Then ring the bells.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. GUNN: The proper way to handle the situation in which the Government has found itself is to put more blocks on the market, because it is purely a matter of supply and demand. This afternoon by interjection, Government members have clearly demonstrated that they dislike land agents and anyone else involved in the building industry or in any industry connected with it. It is all right for the ex-junior Minister to wave his hand, but I shall be interested to see how he handles the charges made against the Government today. No Government member has tried to justify—

The SPEAKER: Order! References to debates that have taken place earlier are not permitted.

Mr. GUNN: I was alluding not to any debate that had taken place this afternoon but to the one in which we are now engaged. The Labor Party has a dislike of land agents, but I do not know why.

Mr. Langley: Not all of them.

Mr. GUNN: Judging from the remarks of the Minister of Labour and Industry and the member for Spence, the Labor Party dislikes anyone who shows any enterprise in wanting to develop the country and to get it moving. The Government wants to control such people with its

socialistic policies. The Labor Party believes that it is the speculators who have caused the increase in land prices, but it has failed to criticize the Commonwealth Government, whose actions are one of the reasons for the increase in land prices. The Commonwealth Government has created an economic situation in this country where inflation is running at over 13 per cent.

Mr. Langley: In nine months!

Mr. GUNN: Yes, and I thank the member for Unley for his remark. In nine months, the Commonwealth Government has created such an economic mess in this country that inflation is running at the rate of 13 per cent. The Commonwealth Government has increased the interest rates on housing loans. This has proved once again to the people of the State that the policy speech of the Prime Minister was nothing more than a document of deceit and dishonesty. Although he promised the Australian people that he would reduce interest rates, he has increased them, thus affecting every person in the country who is trying to buy a house or to pay off a mortgage. If that has not affected the cost of houses, I do not know what has. The member for Unley cannot deny that the Labor Party has increased the interest rates imposed by banks and other financial institutions on loans for house building. If that has not had an effect on the cost of housing, I do not know what has.

Mr. Venning: And the availability.

Mr. GUNN: Yes. I suggest that the member for Unley speak about this aspect of the problem to the people who suffer. Another matter the Labor Party fails to recognize is that, through its economic mismanagement of the country, it has also increased the cost of building materials. The *Australian* of August 29, 1973, contains an article headed "Material for homes up 6.8 per cent in year". If that has not affected the cost of house building, I do not know what has.

Mr. Simmons: It didn't happen when your Party was in Government!

Mr. GUNN: I should love to answer the member for Peake, but I will ignore him.

The SPEAKER: He was out of order, anyway.

Mr. GUNN: The member for Peake has failed to exercise his democratic right by defending the illogical actions of his Government.

Mr. Venning: He can't.

Mr. GUNN: No. In conclusion, obviously, if the legislation is passed, it could result in the sale of houses on the black market. The Labor Party must want such a situation, because it has been proved in the past that the more controls are applied, the more restrictions are imposed, and the more bureaucrats run things, the greater the likelihood of creating a flourishing black market. That is the kind of situation the Labor Party wants. Obviously the member for Unley wants it. It is all right for the ex-junior Minister of Environment and Conservation to laugh, but his exhibitions in the House over the past few days have not been very good. I warn the Minister and his colleagues that Opposition members will not take this kind of legislation lying down, because we believe that Australians do not want this kind of illogical and restrictive legislation that is designed to destroy the freeholding of land in Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is wandering away from the Bill.

Mr. GUNN: I would not want to do that in any circumstances.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will not be allowed to do that.

Mr. GUNN: Mr. Speaker, the Bill refers to leases and, if you were to refer to the Bill, I am sure you would agree that I would be in order in discussing titles and leases. The land commission will be empowered to purchase any land, whether freehold or leasehold.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order in discussing a matter that has already been determined by the House this session. The honourable member is in order only if he speaks to the Bill under discussion.

Mr. GUNN: In his second reading explanation, the Minister said (speaking about the Bill):

It is designed to introduce price control on certain land. It complements the operation of the Land Commission Bill. If it complements the operation of another Bill, I contend that I should be able to refer to the other Bill. However, I do not wish to flout Standing Orders, because I know that you, Mr. Speaker, have always protected the rights of the minority to a degree to which we have not been used in this House. However, I will not dwell on that aspect.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member should certainly not reflect on decisions of the Chair.

Mr. GUNN: I would not do anything like that, Sir. Finally, I add my opposition to this type of legislation, for I am convinced that it is part of a plan drawn up by the centralist Government in Canberra to nationalize all land and to deny the people of this country the right to own their own small bit of Australia.

Dr. Tonkin: And to fix prices for their own benefit.

Mr. GUNN: That is so, and I hope the member for Glenelg again gives the House details of the prices State Government departments have been paying for land, the same as he did previously when debating another Bill. Members were enlightened when he read those figures to the House and, if he does so again, it will show just how hypocritical is this Government. I join my colleagues in opposing the Bill.

Mr. PAYNE (Mitchell): I can only—

Mr. Becker: Support the member for Eyre.

Mr. PAYNE: Someone ought to, because he cannot do it himself. I rise in sympathy for Opposition members, who have a tough job to do in opposing a Bill that the South Australian public not just wants but demands.

Mr. Venning: That's not true.

Mr. PAYNE: The people of this State demanded this Bill at the last election. This matter was part of the Labor Party's policy speech, and the people returned the Government to office with a handsome majority.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. PAYNE: The contents of the Bill were clearly placed before the people of this State in the Premier's policy speech. There was no equivocation about it, and no-one doubted what the Government intended to do on this matter. The people endorsed the Government's stand on the matter and returned it to office with a handsome majority. Opposition members can bark all day, but they cannot get round that point.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: The people endorsed the Commonwealth Government's policy on the same matter.

Mr. PAYNE: That is so, and that is why I sympathize with Opposition members. Fancy their being stuck with the job of trying to oppose a measure that has this type of support outside the Chamber. Fancy their having to be the puppets and obey the pull of the strings: in other words, having to do what they are told and not having Buckley's chance from the beginning of being able to make

out a reasonable case. Opposition members have proved tonight that this is the case.

I hope the member for Torrens will not take exception to my describing him as a wily old bird in the matter of politics. I say that with humility, as he has had much experience not just in this Chamber but in politics generally, but I sat here tonight and watched him squirm and feel discomfited, and his discomfort was evident from what he said. He began his speech by referring to the Minister's second reading explanation. I should have thought that any reasonable person could understand what the Minister said and, indeed, I am certain that the member for Torrens understood it. I am also certain that he was so discomfited by the stand he had to take that he had to try to diffuse the matter a little when referring to the initial part of the second reading explanation. He tried to show that there were inconsistencies in the following part of that explanation:

While the purpose of that Bill is to ensure that there is a regular supply of allotments on the market which will continuously meet demand—

he paused there, and continued—

the present Bill is designed to moderate demand for allotments . . .

He stopped there and tried to show that there was an inconsistency between the first and last parts of that statement.

Dr. Tonkin: Can't you see it?

Mr. PAYNE: No, I cannot, because there is no inconsistency. The member for Torrens continued reading the Minister's second reading explanation, as follows:

. . . by ensuring as far as possible that those who purchase building allotments do so for the purpose of home building and not for speculative gain.

That was the operative part of the whole matter. Certainly, we should moderate the demand not for sites on which to build houses but for sites purchased for speculation. We should be helping the ordinary people, whom Opposition members claim to represent, and not be holding them to ransom. Can we prove that they are being held to ransom? Opposition members have not spoken on this Bill: they have merely stood up and made noises. They were trying to make so much smoke that they could have got a job in Tel Aviv right at this moment.

I refer now to an article in the *Advertiser* of June 22, 1973, by Stewart Cockburn. I do not suppose any member would suggest that Mr. Cockburn is a politician: he is a journalist who obviously researched the matter before his article was published. Members should therefore do Mr. Cockburn the courtesy of listening to me while I refer to part of his article. Under the heading "South Australian land speculators in retreat", the article states:

The speculator—

the speculator (and I will spell out that word for Opposition members) and not the planning authority, as has been alleged—

in urban land appears at last—

Dr. Tonkin: Will you come back next week and carry on?

Mr. PAYNE: I should have thought the member for Bragg would not use the words "carry on", because that is all I have seen him do since he entered Parliament. The article continues:

The speculator in urban land appears at last to be in full retreat from his greediest year of easy pickings in almost a generation.

Speculators have been holding the public to ransom in these matters. The article continues:

Urban land speculators have included many hundreds of well-paid young business and professional men and skilled workers who rode the mining boom in the late 1960's. One young man I know tells me he made a profit of more than \$1 000 by buying a hills block early this year and reselling it within three months.

The reference there is to speculators; no mention is made of the State Planning Office. The article continues:

I have heard of other blocks changing hands within a month at profits of up to several hundred dollars.

Mr. Gunn: Give us some cases.

Mr. PAYNE: Very well. The article continues:

In some cases (a new subdivision at Redwood Park is a case in point) profits of up to 300 per cent have been made over a period of 18 months.

This is not a political statement but an article by a reputable journalist who went to the trouble of investigating the situation. This is not a case of a centralist octopus forcing the Government to introduce this Bill. In a second article on June 23, Mr. Cockburn states:

Government economists have been using computers to try to measure the extent of land speculation in recent years.

The position is so out of hand that computers have had to be used to try to keep track of it. The article continues:

Blocks which have been sold more than once rose from around 40 per cent of all transactions in 1970 to 42.7 per cent in 1972 and then jumped sharply to 49.9 per cent during the first four months of this year When research is completed, I believe that a "speculation factor" of up to 30 per cent might be indicated. In the real estate industry, estimates of the number of speculators in the market during the past year go as low as 5 per cent. I leave honourable members to draw their own conclusions about that latter figure. The article continues:

But whatever the truth, there is wide agreement that land speculators, big and small, are in retreat.

This happened before the Bill was introduced. When the possibility of legislation such as this was announced, benefit accrued at once to the people of the State, and it is the Government's duty to look after the interests of the people in these cases. The article continues:

Many real estate people are glad of the fact. "Some sort of sanity has returned to the market in the past month," Mr. John Ulman, one of the principals of Barrett and Barrett Proprietary Limited, said Mr. Hawkins agrees. He is confident that genuine demand by professional builders and by private home buyers is strong enough to absorb indefinitely all blocks available.

Apparently he has more faith in the future of builders and developers than members opposite have, judging by the arguments they have put forward. One of the main arguments advanced by members opposite has been that there is a bit of a bottleneck in the State Planning Office and that if we can fix that all will be well, as that is the only problem in South Australia. I think that we should explore the problem to see how large it is. The member for Eyre referred to the great leader of the Government of the fair State of Victoria. Let us look at the situation in that State. An article in the Melbourne *Herald* of October 8 is headed "Land will go up 60 per cent". According to members opposite, the Premier of Victoria (Mr. Hamer) has solved the problem by spending a few dollars. All that people have to do there is build the house they want. However, what is the real position? In this article by Peter Fitzgerald, the President of the Commonwealth Institute of Valuers (Mr. S. P. Moser) is quoted as saying:

A small housing block at Emerald recently sold for \$6 000. Twelve months ago it sold for \$1 000.

It appears that Victoria has trouble in its planning office, too! Mr. Moser continues:

The little available land left in the Waverley municipality was selling for \$22 000 an acre 12 months ago. Now it is selling for \$40 000 an acre.

The important part of the article states:

Since the survey—

he is referring to a survey carried out in Victoria—in April the price pressures are just as great.

This statement was made two days ago after the announcement in Victoria about the new Government measures. Members opposite have said that stacks of blocks are being handed out, and that the Government having acted quickly, the problem has disappeared. The President of the Commonwealth Institute of Valuers seems to have different views. He continues:

There is every indication that the way price pressures are going land is likely to be comparable in price to that in Sydney.

In Sydney there is another Liberal Government, under the direction of Sir Robert Askin. It seems as though Sydney has problems in its planning office, too. Mr. Moser is then quoted as saying that something could and should be done about the situation. The survey undertaken in Melbourne was comprehensive. A map attached to this article shows the price increases over the past several months in Victoria. Once again we have exposed the attempt of members opposite to try to show that the price inflation problem in South Australia is due solely to problems in the State Planning Office. I am sure that I have demonstrated that this is not the case. I understand the difficulties of members opposite in having to support the sort of proposition they have had to support against the wishes not only of the Government but also of the people of the State. They are behind the eight ball before they start.

Dr. Eastick: Is that why your Party is losing so much support? Look at the Gallup polls.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You wouldn't believe them: they show you haven't got any support at all.

Mr. PAYNE: The Leader has said that our Party is losing support. I do not want to argue that point with him, but the point I will argue with him is that many people in my district are living in rental accommodation but are seeking to purchase a house. Most of my electors who have approached me have indicated their full support for this Bill. I have also had one or two approaches from people in real estate and, predictably, their approaches have been from the opposite direction.

Every member should ask himself why we are not getting complaints from the public about this Bill: the only complaints are from real estate and speculative operators. Whom are members opposite representing? Are they speaking just for themselves, or do they claim that they are speaking for the ordinary people who wish to have houses built? If members opposite are not representing the ordinary people, they must be representing the only other group interested in the Bill. The answer is self-evident. The member for Eyre made some remarks on the Bill, some remarks on a matter canvassed earlier today, and some remarks on his favourite theme, the Government's socialistic policy. The honourable member will realize one day that we are proud of being Socialists. Evidently he thinks he is casting an aspersion on our policy when he refers to us as Socialists, but he is really confirming that we are acting in the manner in which we want to act. The member for Eyre proved beyond all doubt either that he was dissimulating in the matter or that he was abysmally ignorant. Members who heard his speech will know that he claimed that the Bill was solely a result of a centralist, Socialist, octopus-like plot emanating from Canberra. I will

not say whether the honourable member was dissimulating or abysmally ignorant: I will leave it to him to work out. It was boloney for him to maintain that this Bill was introduced by direction from Canberra. I have already shown that the public demands and needs this kind of Bill. The Government promised it would introduce the Bill, and it will carry through its policy.

Dr. Eastick: Would you care to mention the position in Western Australia?

Mr. PAYNE: The Leader is still smarting under an earlier defeat today and he wants to evade the issue by trotting out the old red-herring ploy. I ask the Leader to be honest: every member uses the ploy from time to time, but on this occasion he is the one who is using it. This Bill was introduced because the Government, elected by a majority of the people, keeps the wishes of the majority in mind all the time. This Government puts policies before the people of the State, adheres to those policies, and makes every endeavour to carry them out. Members opposite may not be accustomed to this, but that is the way in which the Labor Party and this Government operate. I turn now to the report of the Working Party on the Stabilization of Land Prices; I do not believe that members opposite would be foolhardy enough to try to criticize the qualifications of the members of that working party, one of whose recommendations is as follows:

That the Government announce its intention to introduce legislation to provide that any vacant allotments below half-an-acre with water services purchased after May 1, 1973, (or other suitable date) cannot be resold at a price in excess of an additional 7 per cent of the purchase price plus rates and taxes in any period of one year The control should be removed when the Government is satisfied as to the correct balance between supply and demand for allotments.

That measure has proceeded according to the correct Parliamentary processes, and this Bill is a corollary of that legislation. For the benefit of members opposite who have not researched the matter, let me say that there is another report in the library (the First Report of the Task Force on the Price of Land) issued by the Australian Institute of Urban Studies, members of which would never belong to the Labor Party. Among the consultants was Mr. Alan Hickinbotham, so I have established the lack of bias from my point of view concerning the contents of the document. The report recommends that the Government should become the authority to set prices in this field. This is an open recommendation from a body of people skilled in the matter of urban studies, and it is in line with the provisions of the Bill.

Mr. Chapman: That is the one you have chosen not to quote from.

Mr. PAYNE: Some people (and the member for Alexandra is one) are born walkers-up. By that I mean that they lead with their chins all day, and even after a left and a right cross they still come up again. I suppose one must admire them. One would think after his remarks on another matter that the honourable member would have remained quiet for about 12 months. I can only hope so. I was diverted when I was discussing the remarks of the member for Eyre, who criticized the Government and said that Opposition members had not had the opportunity to study the Bill properly and that the Government was pushing matters along. However, the Bill was introduced into this House on August 23, so any member would agree that sufficient time had elapsed in which to study it.

Another matter on which the member for Eyre tried to wax eloquent and finished up merely waxing (and there is quite a difference) was his reference to what he called

the disgraceful practice of the Government in spending taxpayers' money. I have never heard such a load of old tripe! I thought it was the job of the Government to collect moneys and then to decide, in conjunction with Parliament, the best use for those moneys. Having been placed in this position by the strings that manipulate them, members opposite have to trot out anything to justify the stand they must take; one can feel only sympathy for them in that position.

The member for Eyre made some remarks about treating all sections of the community equally, referring to the advertisement that was the subject of a motion earlier today. I do not know how much more equal one can be regarding all sections of the community than to publish the facts in a newspaper that goes into almost every home. If that is not treating all sections equally, then I do not know what is. Perhaps he had a point, and perhaps it was a good one, but he did not bring it out.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Perhaps he thought it should have gone into the evening paper, too.

Mr. PAYNE: The Minister has raised a point I had overlooked; perhaps the member for Eyre wanted it repeated in the evening paper to make sure no-one was left out. I have clearly shown the need for such a Bill, and demonstrated the probity and the absolute and utter integrity of the Government from the time this matter appeared in its policy until the Bill was introduced into the House. I have great pleasure, on behalf of the people in my district as well as the people of South Australia who elected the Government, in supporting the Bill.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I oppose the Bill, because I believe firmly that it will breed black marketing such as we have never seen in Australia. This country has not been involved in the black market.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I suppose you are an expert on it?

Mr. MATHWIN: Quite, I have seen it operating in many countries, and the Bill is one way of bringing the black market into our community. The South Australian situation has been aggravated by this Labor Government, this Socialist Government, and I wonder whether it was done by design as a foul means of trying to get the public on-side by saying, "We will provide some relief, and this is how we will do it." If this situation was not brought about by design, why did the Government not take action to order the South Australian Housing Trust to release parcels of land? The trust has many thousands of blocks, yet the Government has never instructed the trust to release them. Had it done so, the position would not be as bad as it is. The Government wants control, and of course if it makes land leasehold instead of freehold it will have considerable control, because it can regulate sales. This Bill balances another, and I see it, in conjunction with that other measure, as a measure of nationalization. The Government wants to take this industry as a starter in its nationalization policy and it is taking a leaf out of the book of the Socialist Party in the United Kingdom, which has said it will nationalize many industries. In his second reading explanation, the Minister said:

The control imposed by this Bill will continue until the Government is satisfied that the supply of building allotments is in balance with demand and the Government's object of stabilizing land prices has been achieved.

That is one method the Minister intends to use. Later in his explanation on what the Bill was designed to do, he said:

. . . the present Bill is designed to moderate demand for allotments by ensuring as far as possible that those who

purchase building allotments do so for the purpose of home building . . .

What would be the effect of this? Many thousands of young people become engaged to be married and immediately decide to invest in a block of land. Anything can happen: a young couple might want to separate, or just change their mind, and the Government is not assisting these people at all. One of the first things a migrant wants to do is to get his own land on which to settle, but the Government now says that it will tell him what he can do. The taxpayers of this State have paid for a \$2 000 policy advertisement by the State Labor Government. Under the heading "What about very new homes?", the advertisement states:

So that land speculators do not try to evade land price control by raising the price of new homes (new houses, home units and flats) . . .

The member for Torrens referred to home units and flats. I point out that good home units are sold even before the foundations are laid. Although the demand for home units is so high, a person who has built units or flats must now rent them for a year or submit to a profit margin that must be determined. Who will determine that margin, whether it be for a home unit, a flat or a house? Who is to say what the charge of a tradesman will be? The Government can say that the charge of a bricklayer is X amount of dollars, but I know that few bricklayers are paid by the hour, because they are paid on the basis of each thousand bricks they lay. The Minister of Labour and Industry has denied that there is a shortage of bricklayers. He says the industry can cope with the demand, but the silly scheme of apprentices takes five years and provides only about 80 people at a time. To obtain a good bricklayer it is necessary to pay more than the going rate. Why is it necessary to lay down the sum charged by a tradesman? Who will determine what is the correct sum to get these people to work? If the amount offered to a tradesman is too low, he will go to another State, as tradesmen did when the Labor Government was last in office; they fled to Western Australia and Victoria.

We know of the Government's hatred of subcontractors, and of its wish to prevent the benefit of a person's initiative from applying. The Government's idea is to stamp out the subcontractor. Is this legislation another method to remove the subcontractor? The subcontractor has made the building industry what it is today. Because of the cost and unavailability of building materials, I challenge the Minister of Environment and Conservation to buy at his local hardware shop 21b. (.91 kg) of 4in. (106.6 mm) nails. The Minister would not be able to get them. I refer to the heading of the \$2 000 advertisement:

What's the Government doing about rising land prices? It's doing a lot more than any other State.

What State is it talking about? It certainly cannot be any State in Australia. The last sentence of the advertisement states, "Builders will be able to stay in the industry with confidence," and the rider there should be "provided they leave the State of South Australia". They would then be able to stay in the industry with confidence. The Premier knew this advertisement was to be published before he left the State, and he left his henchmen on the front bench to try to smooth out the situation. Where are they now? I suppose they are watching the golf.

The SPEAKER: Order! This Bill has nothing to do with golf.

Mr. MATHWIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker; I was only trying to drive home a point. The member for Spence wants all policy to be published in the manner published today. I suppose that the honourable member, as Editor of the *Herald*, is now working on obtaining a

\$2 000 advertisement by the Government for that publication. The Government has no need to use public money for the purpose of brainwashing the South Australian taxpayer. Each Minister has a public relations officer and promotions officers. Surely that should be enough without resorting to what we have seen in today's press. The cost the taxpayer has to bear is already too great, yet the Government is continuing to spend the taxpayers' money. If this type of advertising is to be the normal thing, the Government should allow its opponents the same facilities at the expense of the taxpayer, as this would then be a fair situation. The member for Mitchell said that the Government had the right to spend taxpayers' money on advertising the Socialist Party in South Australia.

I now turn to another topic. The Government wishes to hit the speculator, but who is the largest speculator in land? I say it is the hypocritical Government. When the Government wishes to dispose of land, it uses the auction system, and I have copies of many advertisements that have appeared in newspapers. Although the Government states that it does not support speculators and their operations, let us consider what the Government has done in selling land. The Government bought a block in Oaklands Road, Marion, for \$7 760 and sold it later for \$22 650, a profit of 191 per cent. Another block in Burbridge Road, Brooklyn Park, was bought by the Government for \$7 000 and sold for \$43 000, a profit of 514 per cent. Another block in Burbridge Road was bought for \$720 and sold for \$8 500, a profit of 1 080 per cent. In Murray Street, Marion, the Government bought land for \$5 000 and sold it for \$9 204. The land was bought in 1970, and in just over two years the Government made a profit of 84 per cent.

In my district in Morphettville the Government bought land for \$21 200 and sold it for \$90 000. How disgraceful! Perhaps the member for Spence could publish these details in the *Herald* under the heading, "My Government is a hypocrite because it makes profits on land". This is the Capitalist Socialist Government, claiming that speculation in land must be controlled, and introducing this legislation for that purpose. The member for Mitchell provoked me to provide these details, because this afternoon in another debate he said that people were making large profits on land in his district. It seems that the Government is also making large profits. In Aldridge Terrace, Marleston, the Government bought land for \$38 400 and sold it for \$91 200, a profit of 137 per cent. In Lucas Street, Richmond, the Government bought a block for \$3 000 and sold it for \$6 875, a profit of 129 per cent. In Nunyah Avenue, Parkholme, the Government bought a block for \$2 800 and sold it for \$9 500, a profit of 239 per cent; and a block on Anzac Highway, Plympton, was bought for \$11 850 and sold for \$45 000. Yet the Minister has said that the Government will control speculators. Another example: at Grange Road, Findon, the Government bought land for \$12 700 and sold it for \$15 300, a 20 per cent profit in two years. That is disgraceful. The Government purchased a block of vacant land at Hayward Avenue, Torrensville, for \$12 200 and sold it for \$63 500.

The Government says that we must kill the land speculator, yet it made over 500 per cent profit on this piece of vacant land. No wonder the Minister of Development and Mines has his nose in a book, probably about Marxism. In Novar Gardens, in the district of my friend the member for Hanson, the Government bought a block of land for \$63 200 and sold it for \$132 500, representing a 110 per cent profit. This is the Socialist-Capitalist Government we have in South Australia. No wonder the Government

can use money to promote its socialistic policies in an advertisement, in today's *Advertiser*, that cost \$2 000 of the taxpayers' money. In Everard Park (and I think the member for Stuart will appreciate this, because I think that he was looking for a block of land there at one stage), the Government paid \$38 800 for a block of land and sold it for \$60 000. (I do not know whether the member for Stuart bought it.) They are some of the prices at which the Government bought and sold blocks of land, the profit percentage on which was as high as 1 080. If that is not disgraceful, I do not know what is. No wonder the member for Spence is sitting with tears in his eyes.

Mr. Keneally: How was the land sold?

Mr. MATHWIN: At public auction, and I will let the honourable member know when the next auction is to be held so that he may attend it. I have a copy of a brochure that sets out blocks of land which will be sold in an industrial estate called Regency Park. I do not know where Regency Park is, but I know that it is against the law to call an area other than by its correct name. I know where Islington is. In the pretty brochure I have, with the South Australian Government crest on the corner, the area is called Regency Park. It will be interesting to find out who will be fined for giving an area a name it should not be called. Blocks of land at the sewage farm

will be sold for \$58 000, \$103 000, \$106 000, \$117 000 and \$300 000. I do not wish to go into this matter now, but I will have more to say when the member for Mitcham speaks next Wednesday, and I will support his remarks. Seeing that the Government was in a responsive mood, I introduced this topic, because the Minister, in introducing the Bill, said that the Government would get at the big land speculator. I believe that I have proved to the Government that it is the biggest speculator in the land business.

Mr. Keneally: The Government mightn't be able to sell at huge profits after the legislation is passed, so what are you complaining about?

Mr. MATHWIN: We had a little idea last evening of what the Government can do. I will not refer to Queens-town, otherwise I will be ruled out of order. I hope that I have brought to the Government's attention some of the Bill's finer points. The Government would turn to any jiggery-pokery to try to bamboozle the people of the State. I oppose the Bill.

Dr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.58 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, October 11, at 2 p.m.